

CASE STUDIES IN LOYALTY: EAST TENNESSEE IN SECESSION, CIVIL WAR AND
RECONSTRUCTION

by

KATHARINE DAHLSTRAND

(Under the Direction of John Inscoe)

ABSTRACT

In East Tennessee during the mid to late nineteenth century, loyalty translated into action. Citizens in the Union stronghold of a Confederate state fought for secession or they fought to preserve the United States, but the reasons behind their decision went beyond broad calls to defend either side of national conversations. The constant presence of occupation, terrorism, violence and intimidation ensured loyalties grew out of intimate designs for self-preservation. Throughout the Sectional Crisis, the American Civil War, and Reconstruction, white southerners in East Tennessee allowed personal ambition and harbored resentments to inform what loyalty looked like when put into practice. Preserving white supremacy remained an objective on either side. *Case Studies in Loyalty* lifts the veil of motivations held by individuals who allowed their worldview, their community, their historical literacy, and plans for a postwar world to inform which side they defended in the American Civil War. At the same time, it follows the families into the postwar period and examines how wartime loyalties informed their postwar experience.

INDEX WORDS: Appalachia, Civil War, Loyalty, Community Studies, East Tennessee,
Occupation, Reconstruction, Andrew Johnson, White Supremacy

CASE STUDIES IN LOYALTY:
EAST TENNESSEE IN SECESSION, CIVIL WAR AND RECONSTRUCTION

by

KATHARINE DAHLSTRAND

B.A., Florida Atlantic University, 2011

M.A., Florida Atlantic University, 2013

A Dissertation Submitted to the Graduate Faculty of The University of Georgia in Partial
Fulfillment of the Requirement for the Degree

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

ATHENS, GEORGIA

2019

© 2019

Katharine Dahlstrand

All Rights Reserved

CASE STUDIES IN LOYALTY:
EAST TENNESSEE IN SECESSION, CIVIL WAR AND RECONSTRUCTION

By

KATHARINE DAHLSTRAND

Major Professor: John Inscoe

Committee: Stephen Berry
Scott Nelson
Dan Rood

Electronic Version Approved:

Ron Walcott
Interim Dean of the Graduate School
The University of Georgia
December 2019

For David, Larry, Arthur and Mom.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Anyone who studies political history at the state and local level during Reconstruction will have seen petitions on behalf of the character of an individual seeking pardon. Some of the case studies that follow held these lists in the archival collections of once powerful men. Letters and petitions gave accounts and testimonies on behalf of one's character. Let the following paragraphs serve a similar role. My journey through this graduate program depended upon the kindness and generosity I encountered along the way. Please allow me to testify and seek recognition for these honorable women and men.

I'll begin with the personal. My mother moved in with us one year into my PhD studies. Her support has been unmatched. Thanks, Mama. My sister, Becky, earned her M.A. at the same time and so she commiserated with me when we had time to talk and understood my silence was based on pending deadlines when we went weeks between phone calls. My brother, Sam, demonstrated a pride in me that made me grateful to have the family I do. This degree is a collective win for the Broome family.

None of this would have been possible without my husband's support. David moved across the country, sold our house, and worked long hours throughout this process. He told me he was proud of me when I voiced doubts or concerns. He reminded me to enjoy life outside of academia; whisking me to see Hamilton on Broadway on our ten-year anniversary. He cooked dinners and solved problems when I could not leave my desk. He is my partner in crime and my best friend. Thank you, David.

In a process that invites isolation, having old friendships prevents despair and provides a sounding board for sanity. Jama Grove, Matt Elmore, Shannon Webb, Isaac Sherman, Cecil Baldwin, Laura Coates Woods, Steve and Nancy Perkins, James Moses kept me grounded. Newer friendships developed in Athens and I look forward to maintaining them as we scatter across the country landing in positions throughout this country but keeping our community tightknit and supportive. Katie and Andrew Fialka, Laura June Davis, Kathi Nehls, Alisha Cromwell, James and Anna Owen, Bryant Barnes, Nicole Gallucci, Alexander Stephens, Kathryne Veale, Alex Nordland, Liz Busquets, Kaitlin Dotson, Ashton and Jess Ellett, Kurt Windisch, Jonathan Hepworth, Whitney Priest, Derrick Angermeier, Leah Richier, James Wall, Sam McGuire, Luke Manget, filled the years here with laughter and support. Michele Johnson, doubly so. Her friendship means the world to me.

I am a veteran who studies and writes about veterans and developed an oral history program here that investigates student veterans and their transition from soldier to student. Ted Barco, director of UGA's Student Veteran Resource Center, continually supported my mission to capture and preserve the voices of our veteran population. Christian Lopez, Media and Oral History Archivist for the Richard B. Russell Library for Political Research, provided the materials and archival space. Thomas McShea is continuing the mission and ensuring its perpetuity. I'm grateful for them all. Before I discovered history, while I still wore a uniform, I served alongside a world of people who shaped my ideas. They also knew me on my hardest days. Mark Baush, Wanda Harvey, Anthony and Kelly Abele, Joe Cardamone, Miranda Summers, Paul McCallister, Windle Day, Melissa Christmas, Angie Acker, Tarharshniki Raiford, Stephanie Tillery, and Charity Dermid all made me a better person and I'm grateful to them for their friendship and example. Josh Tillery, Paul Kelly, and Darryl Booker never came home. I mourn them.

Before arriving to UGA and the Athens community, I earned my MA at Florida Atlantic University under the direction of Dr. Stephen Engle. I would not be here without his guidance. The

faculty at FAU is small, but gracious and kind. Many thanks go to Sandy Norman, Evan Bennett, Eric Hanne, Zella Linn, Talitha LeFlouria and Derrick White. Victoria Thur and Teresa Van Dyke from FAU Special Collections library became dear friends and I thank them as well. Once I got to Athens, I quickly discovered the women who make this campus work and I am grateful for all of their assistance. Ms. Barbara Christopher and Laurie Kane, specifically, have ensured my time here at UGA was well spent. I value their friendship and our hallway conversations.

While researching the “not so great” men in these case studies, I traveled throughout East Tennessee, Washington DC, and the Huntington Library in San Marino, California. The archivists and librarians I encountered along the way facilitated my work. Thank you to the women and men at the Calvin M. McClung Historical Collection, the Archives of Appalachia, the Library of Congress, the Tennessee State Library and Archives, and the Huntington Library. UGA librarians, Diane Trap, Deborah Stanley, and Amy Watts were dependably helpful and encouraging throughout my time here in Athens.

I held two internships while at UGA. One as a researcher for off-site patrons to the Hargrett Rare Books and Manuscripts Library; another as an acquisitions intern for the UGA Press. Both of them provided professional development and taught me the value of good mentorship. Many thanks to Kaitlin Dotson, Mary Linnemann, Jim StipeMaas, Ashton Ellett, Erin Leach, and Rob Lay. Lisa Bayer, Walter Biggins, Patrick Allen, Mick Gusinde-Duffy, Beth Snead, Jordan Stepp, and Steven Wallace at the Press gave me a well-rounded education on book proposals, acquisitions, and professional kindness.

Learning from the giants in my field has influenced how I think about historical events and the questions I ask from sources. Stephen Berry’s brain is a national treasure. He’s a true champion and advocate for his students and we are all his students. Thank you for allowing me to contribute to your CSI: Dixie project. Thank you for your time and your energy. Thank you for your kindness.

Thank you for reminding me to “leave room for wonder” in the history I explore. Scott Reynolds Nelson gave me the structure for this dissertation. When I defended the prospectus, he told me what he saw and in that moment I mentally re-arranged chapters and arguments. He recommended all the right books and loaned many of them to me. He helped everything fall into its place and I am grateful. Dan Rood’s office is next door to mine and his doorway conversations throughout the last couple of years kept me grounded and focused. He never hesitated to offer sound advice or stop me from over-reacting to a world gone mad.

I saved the Dean of Appalachia, John Inscoc, for last. I first met him on a bench outside the book floor of the SHA in Mobile, Alabama. One of my professors at FAU, Talitha LeFlouria, had set up the meeting. He asked what my thesis was about and when I told him it examined East Tennessee during Reconstruction, he wanted to know why a Florida student cared about Appalachian history. I explained I was not from Florida; I was from Knoxville, Tennessee. He laughed and said, “of course you are.” He has been steadfast in my progress ever since. Any historian will tell you; John Inscoc is the nicest person you will ever meet. Listen to his students, though, and let that description build in depth and strength. He has given his time and his energy to me. He has paid for more meals and introduced me to more scholars and handed me more books; he’s been franker and more honest about what I write and how I write it than any student might ever expect from her mentor. And it was all done with kindness and generosity. Thank you, Sir.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	v
CHAPTER 1 Introduction and Literature Review.....	1
CHAPTER 2 Loyalty to Class and Social Status: The Moffetts of Jefferson County.....	32
CHAPTER 3 Divided Loyalties: The Fain Family and Historical Literacy.....	64
CHAPTER 4 Disguised and Undisguised Loyalty: The Hales of Fentress County.....	95
CHAPTER 5 Demanding Loyalty: Greeneville and Andrew Johnson's Dress Rehearsal for Reconstruction.....	121
CHAPTER 6 Conclusion	175
BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	189

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION AND LITERATURE REVIEW

The 2016 Biennial Meeting of the Society of Civil War Historians took place in Chattanooga, Tennessee and offered a guided tour of the Chickamauga National Military Park. For several hours, a park ranger relayed the battle movements and intentions to a bus full of historians, fielding questions about the specifics, and entertaining the group with stories that incorporated the human experience, geography, weather, and loyalties played out on the battlefield. After several hours, the tour ended, and the park ranger rode the tour bus back to the conference hotel. On the way he made an observation that stuck with me. At some point he wished aloud that he knew more about the Reconstruction era but, alas, “Tennessee didn’t have a Reconstruction.” No one on the bus challenged this statement.

As an emerging scholar on Tennessee’s Reconstruction era, I found this appraisal unsettling, if unsurprising. By 1860s standards and a strict interpretation of the term, Tennessee did not stand subject to the same reconstruction formalities put into place elsewhere between 1863 and 1877.¹ Andrew Johnson made sure of that while acting as military governor of the state. Tennessee experienced the unique position during the second half of the Civil War, when it fell into Union

¹ Here, the formal years of Reconstruction are presented as it was Presidential and Congressional Reconstruction to which the ranger referred. According to historian Eric Foner, Reconstruction began in December 1863, when President Abraham Lincoln announced plans to establish governments in the South loyal to the Union. Historian Stephen Engle has made the case that Reconstruction commenced in April 1861, “when an assembly of spirited Unionists gathered in Wheeling annulled Virginia’s ordinance of secession.” For the purposes of this dissertation, I argue Reconstruction began in Tennessee once President Lincoln placed Andrew Johnson into America’s first military governorship and gave him the federal authority to commandeer state power from a hostile Confederate government. Eric Foner, “Why Reconstruction Matters,” *The New York Times*, March 28, 2015; Stephen Engle, “Mountaineer Reconstruction: Blacks in the Political Reconstruction of West Virginia,” *The Journal of Negro History* 78, no. 3 (Summer, 1993), 137.

control only nine months after it declared secession. The eastern portion of the state experienced a war of occupation, hardship and violence. East Tennessee has long been described as a Unionist stronghold within a Confederate state. While the sentiment rings true, the population was more evenly divided, if unevenly distributed, on the issue of secession. Families split on the issue and communities regarded each other with suspicion. In this social climate, then, loyalty was an action as much as a sentiment.

East Tennessee's actions during the American Civil War era have long been a curiosity to those within and outside of the region. In 1902, Tennessee Union veteran Felix A. Reeve stood before a Washington DC crowd gathered for the Military Order of the Loyal Legion. The patriotic order was established in Philadelphia by three Union officers in the hours after President Lincoln's assassination. Rumors spread throughout major cities along the East Coast of a southern conspiracy to destroy the government through a series of key political assassinations. The Military Order of the Loyal Legion originally sought to thwart future threats and eventually transformed into a society who commemorated and cherished "the memories and associations of the war waged in defense of the unity and indivisibility of the Republic."² The organization had invited Reeve to speak to why East Tennesseans participated so heavily in the federal front to quell rebellion. In the decades between this guest lecture and his service as an officer in a Tennessee Infantry regiment, Reeve took on the role of amateur historian. His recollections, however, descended into nostalgia. The "people of the mountains," he insisted, "breathe their free and wholesome air [and] inherit a spirit of freedom and sublime inspiration little known to the inhabitants of the plain." Sixteen years before his speech, in 1886, the *North American Review* published a three-page defense of southern unionism that Reeve had submitted. In "The South in the Union Army," Reeve pointed to the 25,000 white

² Robert G. Carroon and Dana B. Shoaf, *Union Blue: The History of the Military Order of the Loyal Legion of the United States* (Shippensburg, PA: White Mane Books, 2001), 4.

East Tennesseans who joined the Union Army *en vérité*. “There was no draft to encourage enlistment,” he reminded readers, “and no bounty funds to reward and allure. It was simple patriotism, sublime in principle and pathetic in its circumstances, and inspired the brave and self-sacrificing loyalists of that historic region” to fight against the Confederacy under which they lived.³

Reeve’s breakdown of the situation in East Tennessee captures perfectly the trope of Appalachian exceptionalism that developed into a persisting myth during the late nineteenth century. The stereotypical portrayal exploited imagined ideas of isolation. Low enslaved populations explained Union support. East Tennessee, as other Appalachian regions, defined austerity: both as the physical example of white poverty and as the noble “hardscrabble” survivors who persevered in spite of national neglect. These tired ideas have long since been dismantled with scholarship, and yet the existence of Unionist loyalties in such strong numbers require further examination. If East Tennesseans’ loyalties cannot be dismissed as examples of the “pathetic” or “sublime,” then a new investigation into loyalties held by individuals can be examined under the assumption that their Civil War experience does not support exceptionalism.

Loyalties on both sides ultimately demonstrated a firm commitment to white supremacy in the region. Historian John Inscoe investigated the scholarship of race in Appalachia in his 2008 collection of essays, *Race, War, and Remembrance in the Appalachian South*, finding the field of history wanting. He argued that fiction writers often did a better job describing the nuance of race relations and community reactions to emancipation, abolition, suffrage and citizenship. Inscoe has dismantled the trope of “Holy Appalachia,” where Unionism translated into an enlightened and progressive stance on race. He has noted that “Carter Woodson in the 1910s to Don West in the 1970s have

³ Felix A. Reeve, “East Tennessee in the War of the Rebellion,” in *War Papers of the Loyal Legion of the United States*, ed. Military Order of the Loyal Legion of the United States, vol. 43 (Wilmington, NC: Broadfoot Pub. Co, 1993) 391, 399, 400; Felix A. Reeve, “The South in the Union Army,” *The North American Review* 143, no. 360 (November, 1886), 515-6.

implied that Appalachia was thoroughly and deeply abolitionist.” While abolition was undoubtedly an important topic of debate in East Tennessee, as evidenced in historian Durwood Dunn’s study in *The Civil War in Southern Appalachian Methodism*, those who favored abolition never held a mandate in the region. As Inscoe has highlighted, the Mountain South’s demographic deviations in racial makeup had little effect on social attitudes and East Tennessee’s “views of African Americans in theory and treatment of them in practice” fit well within a white southern mainstream mindset. More important than slavery or threats of emancipation, was a self-interested dedication to preserving white supremacy’s role in the social order.⁴ Whiteness had to mean something.

The war years illustrate the human condition when placed in extraordinary circumstances and that is a lesson that travels far beyond the Appalachian Mountains. What follows are four case studies that offer an opportunity to explore the complex interplay of locality and loyalty. The Appalachia that developed into a perpetual myth of isolation and simplicity grew, despite never being the “truly isolated or historically backward place that has existed in the popular image of the mountain South in literature and media.”⁵ East Tennessee has never been as isolated as outsiders have insisted, not where rivers converged and marketplaces existed. Exceptions existed, but the case studies in this dissertation are focused on the rule. This dissertation examines the loyalties expressed by four white men, their families and their associated communities during and after the war. They called East Tennessee their home; some were born elsewhere and moved to the region for the future it promised; others were born into communities and witnessed secession and war destroy their homes and lives. Some supported and fought for the Confederacy and others fought for and

⁴ John Inscoe, “Race and Racism in Nineteenth Century Appalachia,” in *Race, War, and Remembrance in the Appalachian South* (Lexington: University Press of Kentucky, 2008), 18, 22-23, 35; Durwood Dunn argues that segregation of Methodist churches in postwar East Tennessee grew out of a white population who allowed their “absolute racism” inform the future of Methodism in the region. East Tennessee, “although largely opposed to slavery, were unprepared for any sort of racial amalgamation” in the church pews or society writ large. Durwood Dunn, *The Civil War in Southern Appalachian Methodism* (Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press, 2013), 136-140.

⁵ Richard A. Straw, introduction to *High Mountains Rising: Appalachia in Time and Place* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 2004), 5.

supported the Union. White slaveholding men in the Mountain South fought to protect their interests; they merely came to different conclusions as to what side would successfully defend the mantle of white supremacy. For there was nothing but uncertainty should white supremacy falter.

Loyalty born of community identity manifested into demonstrable actions that went far beyond the ballot booth. Elections in East Tennessee offered political party diversity, but the voting population demographics always ensured both sides of an issue worked towards favoring white supremacy. Historian Mary Campbell has highlighted how, when East Tennessee's Whig Party organized in 1824, the party "had not originally involved a repudiation of Jackson's national program; it, like the Democratic party, emphasized both states rights and nationalism without attempting to draw any definite line of demarcation between the two." When former Whigs recognized their allegiance to the Republican party, East Tennessee's influential men confided in each other that, while they were not ready to quit the Whig party platform, they preferred the Republican ideologies to those of the Democrats, a "many-headed monster" that threatened Tennessee. Any "temporary triumph" of the Republican party in East Tennessee ensured Democratic strongholds would weaken so that "it would then be easy to organize a great conservative Whig Party."⁶ Temple, who considered himself a captain of industry in Knoxville, supported national internal improvements and actively sought northern investment for East Tennessee economic development. Republican Unionists "sought to bring the discipline and rationalized work processes of industry into the mountains," without racial equality, according to historian Gordon B. McKinney.⁷ White Unionists in East Tennessee who did not support the

⁶ Mary Emily Robertson Campbell, *The Attitude of Tennesseans Toward the Union, 1847-1861* (New York: Vantage Press, 1961), 36; Kate Dahlstrand, "Temporary Triumphs: The Carpetbagger President of the Knoxville Industrial Association," *The Journal of East Tennessee History* 86, (Spring 2014), 48.

⁷ Gordon B. McKinney, *Southern Mountain Republicans, 1865-1900: Politics in the Appalachian Community* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1978), 129.

Democratic party, supported an agenda that acknowledged the desire for similar outcomes via different means.

Democratic Governor Isham Harris, the state's first governor from West Tennessee, saw Tennessee's future in the southern Confederacy. In January of 1861, he called the General Assembly into special session and made an appeal for state legislatures to recognize "the destiny" of Tennessee. State lawmakers agreed to call a convention to decide the future of their state but demanded that voters be able to voice their opinion in a referendum. Fifty-five percent of voters rejected secession, but the three regions of Tennessee saw growing disparities in where their loyalties lay. Sixty-five percent of West Tennesseans voted for a convention on secession. Middle Tennessee divided almost equally, with a narrow margin of 2,400 hundred voters deciding that 51% of voters rejected secession. East Tennessee's numbers were dramatically different, as 81% of voters chose loyalty to Union over loyalty to the South. Unlike the governor who represented them, the men who voted to remain only saw their future protected within the federal government.⁸

Attitudes shifted on April 14th, 1861, when President Lincoln called for 75,000 troops to suppress southern rebellion in the wake of the Confederate attack on Fort Sumter. Many of those who initially voted to remain in the United States interpreted Lincoln's move as disastrous and an act that the president had no right to evoke. Eleven days after the call for troops, Governor Harris called the state legislature into another special session. This time, lawmakers drafted "A Declaration of Independence" to be ratified or rejected in another statewide vote on June 8th. Harris did not wait for the vote to take place and immediately began working with the Confederate military on strategic troop placement in his state and to encourage enlistment into the Confederate army. He also vowed to keep Tennesseans away from Union borders to prevent federal enlistments. East Tennessee

⁸ Charles F. Bryan, Jr., "A Gathering of Tories: The East Tennessee Convention of 1861," *Tennessee Historical Quarterly* 39, no. 1 (Spring, 1980), 28.

leaders also acted, organizing an East Tennessee Convention in Knoxville, where loyal Unionists might gather and reconcile their leanings and their recognition of the difficulties that lay ahead.⁹

In June of 1861, by a state legislative vote, fifty-one county representatives determined the fate of the other thirty-one and Tennessee seceded from the United States. It would be the last state to do so.¹⁰ The capital, Nashville, fell to Union forces the very next February and Andrew Johnson accepted a commission as brigadier general when President Abraham Lincoln placed him in the role of military governor. During the secession crisis, Civil War, and Reconstruction, Tennesseans had to choose a side and declare their loyalties. The men and women presented in this dissertation upset the simplistic generalizations of the region by highlighting four different types of loyalty that compelled residents of the region to pick a side and actively move towards it.

East Tennessee is a unique region to study loyalty in the mid-nineteenth century. Citizens needed to prove their loyalties in a place like East Tennessee. When the state seceded, Union men were charged for crimes of treason via the Confederate court system and harassed and terrorized via the extralegal systems in place throughout the regions. Loyalty to Union translated to treason to the newly established Southern Confederacy and so an oath of allegiance seemed a reasonable “political purgation” as the new government apparatus tested its strengths and limitations.¹¹ With freedom of speech and political dissent no longer protected under the United States Constitution, the seceded South had to practice statecraft and government building alongside army building and combat preparedness.

⁹ Charles F. Bryan, Jr., “A Gathering of Tories: The East Tennessee Convention of 1861,” 30.

¹⁰ Even acknowledging Tennessee’s secession is problematic for some historians of the state. In his 1950 article for the *Journal of Southern History*, Thomas B. Alexander commented in a footnote that “strictly speaking Tennessee did not secede,” but instead adhered to the Confederate government after the “power of the Whigs who had denounced secession as an unconstitutional technique led to a declaration of independence by referendum.” Thomas B. Alexander, “Whiggery and Reconstruction in Tennessee,” *Journal of Southern History* 16, no. 3 (Aug. 1950), 293.

¹¹ Humes, *The Loyal Mountaineers*, 141.

Historian Noel Fisher has argued it was a “decentralized, local, and often surprisingly detached” region, participating in something altogether separate from conventional definitions of war. The geographical terrain, the political climate, and the severity of guerrilla violence clearly affected how government officials and military generals approached the region. The very physical attributes that made it important also made it difficult to attack, sustain an occupation, or travel through.¹² Historian Richard Current has highlighted how President Lincoln looked to East Tennessee as a place of strategic importance because of the railroads that linked the Atlantic Coast to the Mississippi River. Lincoln also saw its “tremendous potential” for recruitment to Union forces to form a “loyal legion in the mountains.”¹³ Those deemed traitors to the Confederacy were at risk for hanging, imprisonment, or expulsion from their homes. And while Fisher has suggested, in the scope of the Civil War, East Tennessee “was a backwater theater” with “no major cities, ports, rivers, or industrial centers that demanded defense,” it was still a place where ideologies were contested and loyalties determined access to opportunity.¹⁴ The internal conflict that existed in this border state also provided a point of departure for a study that goes beyond 1865 to investigate how wartime loyalty held consequences for East Tennesseans well into the postwar decades.

Occupation played a large role in how men and women displayed their loyalties in East Tennessee. Historian Brian D. McKnight has argued that invasions of local areas created turmoil and citizens, “not sure how an erroneous declaration of loyalty might impact their future,” dealt with their uncertainties multiple ways, “from manipulating personal loyalty to actually fighting back in armed conflict.”¹⁵ Occupying forces outed neighbors to each other when families either resisted or

¹² Richard Nelson Current, *Lincoln's Loyalists: Union Soldiers from the Confederacy* (Boston: Northeastern University Press, 1992), 29, 33.

¹³ *Ibid.*, 38-9.

¹⁴ Noel Fisher, *War at Every Door: Partisan Politics and Guerrilla Violence in East Tennessee, 1860-1865* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1997) 3-5, 21, 175.

¹⁵ Brian D. McKnight, *Contested Borderlands: The Civil War in Appalachia Kentucky and Virginia* (Lexington: University Press of Kentucky, 2006), 4.

supported the efforts of whoever happened to be claiming authority over a region in East Tennessee at the time. Guerrilla outlaws intimidated towns and the neighboring farmland communities.

Resistance efforts against them generally ended with violence or death. But resentments and grudges also developed as a result from local issues that had existed before the sectional crisis. It was never just outside threats that disrupted peaceful communities. Guerrillas came from these communities, as did enlistees to both armies. Between November of 1861 and the Spring of 1865, for example, Fentress County experienced thirteen separate attacks on the community that resulted in bloodshed, extralegal justice, raids and looting. The occupiers were often Champ Ferguson and his gang of outlaws. They murdered and intimidated anyone they suspected of Union sympathies. But other Confederate gangs roamed the region and harassed Fentress County as well. Tinker Dave Beatty's gang of Confederate guerrillas killed three local Union soldiers home on leave. Union guerrillas retaliated in kind.¹⁶ In light of this, it is the practiced loyalties that reveal how total war affected members of a community. The communities the case studies identified with did not necessarily turn out to be the one in which they lived. It was not the issue that these families spent their war years completely surrounded by hostile forces. Some did for weeks or months at a time, but for the most part newspaper editorials and town halls and informal or formal debates facilitated strained tensions in neighborhoods. Community became a selection informed by self-preservation. Sometimes they had to be imagined.

Opportunity, throughout the dissertation, represents access to the marketplace and the maintenance of one's respectability. Historian W. Todd Groce has provided data on the social origins of East Tennessee Confederate leadership, concluding that the white merchant class favored

¹⁶ Stephen McBride, "The Civil War in the Upper Cumberland Plateau, Including Effects on the Local Population: A Guide of the major events and themes, for teachers and interested citizens of the Upper Cumberland Plateau of Tennessee and Kentucky," Big South Fork National River and Recreation Area, Kentucky Archaeological Survey Report 236, 14-17.

disunion. The professional class derived “their strength from their commercial and business ventures rather than from agriculture and Whiggery,” Groce concluded. The Confederates in this study follow that same pattern.¹⁷ Still, self-interest and personal expectations fueled loyalties on both sides in East Tennessee. They had to in a war of occupation. As historian Robert Tracy McKenzie has argued, material devastation was a hallmark of the region’s Civil War experience. For much of the antebellum era, East Tennessee “rivalled the Shenandoah Valley of Virginia as one of the leading food-producing areas in the entire South.” McKenzie highlights this to make the larger point that “despite a significant measure of geographic diversity within the region, on the eve of Civil War, upper East Tennessee as a whole constituted the very antithesis of the Cotton South. Yet, when war came, the region was every bit as profoundly affected by the chain reaction of events inexorably set in motion.”¹⁸ Salvaging small scale farming, maintaining access to the marketplace, answering to a constituency that demanded the preservation of white supremacy, defending a historical narrative of patriotism, and voicing an expectation of safety and social order all informed how loyalties manifested in East Tennessee.

The term “loyalty” generalizes an internalized acknowledgment of personal identity within a community’s framework of world views, political ideologies, and understanding of history. It is not easy to define loyalty and the term has often suffered exploitation because of its vague nature. Historian Susanna Michele Lee has argued that loyalty was an action that demonstrated citizenship. When residents of former Confederate states appealed to local government for assistance organizations like the Southern Claims Commission “demanded a thorough reconceptualization of citizenship that replaced exclusions of race and gender with inclusions according to loyalty.”

¹⁷ W. Todd Groce, “The Social Origins of East Tennessee’s Confederate Leadership,” in *The Civil War in Appalachia: Collected Essays* edited by Kenneth W. Noe and Shannon H. Wilson (Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press, 1997), 35, 48.

¹⁸ Robert Tracy McKenzie, ““Oh! Ours is a Deplorable Condition”: the Economic Impact of the Civil War in upper East Tennessee,” in *The Civil War in Appalachia*, 200-201.

Susanna Lee has highlighted how southern men and women who submitted claims to the commission had to prove that they possessed Unionist sympathies during the war and had contributed to the Union cause. She called this process “active citizenship.” Lee has also provided a guiding question for the chapters that follow when she suggested that few histories analyze southern loyalty to the Union in the postwar years. “Many studies of Civil War loyalties conclude with Appomattox as though that moment ended the story,” and she has argued “Loyalty continued to matter in the postwar years.” The case studies presented in this dissertation examine what happened when loyalty to the Union or the Confederacy influenced what was possible postwar.¹⁹

Historian William Blair argued loyalty represented the opposite of treason and attempting to define it during the war was a constantly evolving struggle. The federal government constructed policies against “the contours of loyalty on the northern and Confederate homefronts.” In *With Malice Toward Some*, Blair has focused on the practice of determining loyalty or treason. Blair has examined government officials and courts as they explored the limits of their authority to determine what might be considered treason or what definitively proved loyalty. The goal, he explained, “was to show the intersection of high policy with low practice.” His emphasis that “popular understandings of treason, not legal definitions in civil courts, guided actions by Union functionaries, both high and low, throughout the Union and Confederacy” has provided guidance to how loyalty is treated within the community studies that follow. Loyalty to the Union, or to the Confederacy, only held consequence in the case studies because local opinions and understandings of loyalty informed the social order. Where Blair directs his focus on the Confederates who suffered

¹⁹ Susanna Michele Lee, *Claiming the Union: Citizenship in the Post-Civil War South* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2014), 4, 3, 8.

economically and politically for their treason, this dissertation considers those who paid for their loyalties on either side.²⁰

Historian Tom Dyer used the term as a spectrum. A white male East Tennessean's loyalty depended upon his education, his understanding of the world around him, his financial prospects, his commitment to the southern system, and the communities with which he identified. As Dyer argued, there were "many shades of gray and blue—many shades of loyalty." His investigation into loyalty focused on the actions of Cyrena Stone, a Vermont woman and Union supporter living in Atlanta, Georgia during the Civil War. Cyrena Stone's wartime experience, however, was that of a loyalist who had to "learn how to live under conditions of silence, isolation, and pressure unlike anything (she) had ever known." Her postwar experience differed from the studies that follow because a Union victory in Atlanta, after Sherman's campaign, left a small coterie of citizens in the wake of battle, "But those who did stay were Unionists." East Tennessee counties that bordered Union could not harbor their loyalties in secret, nor did their citizens hold any claim to keeping their homes safe. Everyone's wartime loyalties came under scrutiny during Reconstruction in that part of the state. Proximity to Union did not translate into an easier wartime or postwar experience.²¹

Loyalty, for this project, will be considered from four different vantage points: loyalty born from an expectation of ambition and recognition, loyalty informed by historical literacy, and demanded loyalty employed as a punishment or act of submission. The case studies investigate how East Tennesseans made their decisions about who to support, how that decision looked in practice, and how their wartime loyalties affected their postwar lives. All the men and women in this study made firm decisions about which side deserved their allegiance, and then spent a lifetime living with

²⁰ William Blair, *With Malice Toward Some: Treason and Loyalty in the Civil War Era* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2014), 1, 4, 12.

²¹ Thomas G. Dyer, *Secret Yankees: The Union Circle in Confederate Atlanta* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1999) 3, 52.

the consequences. Nineteenth century rhetoric offers a more appropriate way to describe the personal nature of the decisions made. John Moffett and Hiram Fain, in chapters one and two, were secessionist scoundrels and traitors according to the Unionist zeitgeist. The Hale Family and Andrew Johnson, subjects of chapters three and four, were labeled enemies in their own land for choosing to defend the Union as a perpetual nation-state.

These studies situate the families within the communities with which they identified. Historians Steven Nash and Bruce Stewart have introduced a working definition for community in their introduction to *Southern Communities: Identity, Conflict, and Memory in the American South*. They argue that community “is more than just a physical space,” but also represents “the product of interpersonal relationships and associations, common experiences and feelings, and a shared past that connects people together.” They go on to isolate the term community as “much more than a feeling. It is the ties that bind, imagined and real, for better and for worse; it is the web of personal relationships that link disparate people together and gives meaning to their interactions.”²² The case studies in this dissertation show each East Tennessee man identify with a community that shaped how they interpreted the world around him. The wives, daughters, and enslaved laborers experienced the consequences of these men who stood out as representatives of the professional classes in East Tennessee. In Thomas Bender’s *Community and Social Change in America*, he defined community as being “independent of particular structures.” By focusing on the progression of American communities from a historical perspective, he facilitated a reorganization of how communities are defined and how they work. As social networks, communities signal sentimentality and mutual obligation. They depend upon both emotion and strength. Bender restructured Ferdinand Tönnies’ *gemeinschaft* (community) and *gesellschaft* (society) so that they are no longer

²² Steven E. Nash and Bruce E. Stewart, “Southern Communities during the Long Nineteenth Century,” in *Southern Communities: Identity, Conflict, and Memory in the American South* edited by Steven E. Nash and Bruce E. Stewart (Athens: University of Georgia Press, 2019), 2-3.

opposite ends of a spectrum. Instead, they are “two patterns of social relations that coexisted in everyone’s social experience.” Bender asserts that diaries and correspondence reveal the various communities to which individuals belonged.²³ Cultural anthropologist James C. Scott has suggested that too much focus is given to the actions leading to rebellion and not enough to the “shared values and goals” of those who engage in rebellion.²⁴ The shared values of the individuals in this dissertation speak to the power of community in shaping one’s understanding of the world in which they live. Geo-political borders work alongside crafted narratives. Other communities are created through marriage or military service. Communities can be coveted; an eager young merchant with designs on entering the upper class. Communities can be reviled; the hardscrabble tailor whose loyalty to Union placed him in extraordinary positions of power with many old axes to grind.

Nineteenth century East Tennessean’s identities encourage a biographical perspective throughout this dissertation with chapters that discern individuals against “the broader contours of the social and cultural landscape.”²⁵ These are personal stories in which the emotional and psychological impact of post-war struggles are given as much attention as the social and economic consequences of identifying as a Unionist in a Confederate state or a Confederate in a Unionist stronghold. The inhabitants of East Tennessee during the secession crisis, Civil War, and Reconstruction measured their local identities and self-interests against the rest of their state in addition to the nation to which they pledged allegiance. This determination factored in which side they chose to serve and support. Historian Stephen Berry demonstrated the effectiveness of biographical works in *House of Abraham: Lincoln & The Todds, a Family Divided by War*. Through a

²³ Thomas Bender, *Community and Social Change in America* (New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 1978), 58, 33, 128.

²⁴ James C. Scott, “Protest and Profanation: Agrarian Revolt and the Little Tradition, Part 1,” *Theory and Society* 4, no. 1 (Spring, 1977): 5.

²⁵ Ronald Hoffman, preface to *Through a Glass Darkly: Reflections on Personal Identity in Early America* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1997), viii.

family biography of Lincoln's in-laws, Berry has argued that the Todd experience stood as a portrait "not of a family but a nation." Divisions amongst blood relatives when the American experiment was tested with fire; combat created a space where case studies reminded citizens of something "pathetic and disturbing. The family embodied something the nation wanted to forget—that the war wasn't "us vs. them" but "us vs. us." If the American Civil War was a "family crisis in a larger, more symbolic sense," then a consideration of East Tennessee case studies offer a lesson in the daily decision to act on loyalty.²⁶ The Moffetts, Hales, Fains and Andersons, and the Johnsons consistently encountered the consequences of their loyalties. Politicians, generals, and newspapers watched the eastern third of the state where occupations, home guards, guerrillas, imprisonment, political risks, and uneasy tensions ensured a society perpetually on edge.

In personal letters, in memoirs, and in diaries the veterans of combat and occupation catalogued their personal connections. They engaged in heated debate on the written page. They exploited professional connections for their benefit. They preserved their understanding of the historical narrative. They kept lists of the names of the living. They did the same for the dead. They defined the world around them as they understood it, and it is this process about which my scholarship speaks.

The case studies presented hold some similarities and typicality in individuals considered. They all focus on white men who called East Tennessee their home at the time of secession. Most were slaveholders and all held expectations about the future. They believed that white men stood as the measure of the best humanity has to offer. These are people who had to pick a side and show their loyalties with an understanding that the losers would suffer consequences.

²⁶ Stephen Berry, introduction to *House of Abraham: Lincoln and the Todds, A Family Divided by War* (Boston: Mariner Books, 2009), xiii-xiv.

The voices of women are stronger in some chapters than in others. The families who preserved the letters and diaries of the wives and women family members undoubtedly did so because of the outward opinions expressed in them. Chapter one's Sallie Moffett possessed the same level of literacy in her letters as those of her husband, John. She paid attention to politics and wartime updates. She held opinions and her husband solicited them in their correspondence. In chapter two, Hiram Fain's sister-in-law, Eliza Rhea Fain, kept a diary during the second half of the nineteenth century. In it she detailed her thoughts on politics, her family's wartime actions, occupation and violence she witnessed, and parsed out a defense for secession that, like her brother-in-law, hinged on her historical literacy. Pheroba Hale tracked guerrilla movement throughout Kentucky and Tennessee in the fourth chapter. She also maintained a network of suppliers who kept her husband, a Union spy, and the general he worked for, General George Thomas, flush with currency, intelligence, propaganda, and supplies.

Such is not the case in chapter five; the daughter and wife of Andrew Johnson are noticeably absent from an examination into the community who shaped the seventeenth president's identity and agenda. The provenance of the Andrew Johnson Papers held at the Library of Congress give some clue as to why Eliza McCardle Johnson's voice seemingly disappeared from the historical narrative. In late 1862, Confederate occupying forces in Greeneville, Tennessee ordered Eliza Johnson to evacuate her home and join her husband in Nashville, who was serving as the Union's military governor of Tennessee. For the remainder of the war, Johnson's home and office were used by "both armies at various times as hospital, barracks, officers' residence, and den for camp followers." General James Longstreet's troops were in Greeneville in 1864 and he recalled in his memoir being told about a "heavy box in Johnson's Library" which one of his officers had commandeered. "Old Andy was very fond of good old rye whiskey" and Longstreet assumed the box contained alcohol. They wanted a taste. Longstreet recalled how "eyes glistened with anxious

expectation” but quickly turned to despondency as the box revealed mothering more than “Andy Johnson’s old letters and private papers.” Some of the documents were eventually recovered by the Johnson’s eldest daughter, Martha, who held onto them until her death in 1901. The Library of Congress acquired most of the Andrew Johnson Papers from this collection, however “a large number of Johnson’s private papers” never made it into the archives in Washington D.C. However much this contributed to Eliza Johnson’s absence in letters or diaries is unclear.²⁷ What is clear is that Andrew Johnson’s community study necessarily relies on the white men who engaged Johnson in paper and ink.

Historian Thavolia Glymph has argued that white women throughout the South, and especially during the Civil War, “wielded the power of slave ownership.”²⁸ The Fains, the Hales, and the Johnsons all owned enslaved laborers. Young John and Sallie Moffett did not own slaves *yet*, but they came from slaveholding families and had every intention of participating in the benefits of slave ownership once the war ended. Little is known about the enslaved laborers who shared spaces with these families, except in the rare descriptions offered by Pheroba Hale or Eliza Rhea Fain. All of the families expected slavery to survive the Civil War right up until the time the institution was abolished. Even then, the white survivors of occupation and intimidation still expected loyalty from Black men and women in their lives. The families represented the professional slave-holding class of upper East Tennessee. Drew Gilpin Faust’s *Mothers of Invention* argues that the women who benefited most from the South’s “class and racial arrangements,” the elite upper class, had the most to lose from war-born transformation.²⁹ In historian Stephanie McCurry’s book, *Confederate Reckoning*,

²⁷ “Provenance,” in the Introduction to *Index to the Andrew Johnson Papers* (Washington D.C.: Library of Congress, 1963), v-vii.

²⁸ Thavolia Glymph, *Out of the House of Bondage: The Transformation of the Plantation Household* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008), 4.

²⁹ Drew Gilpin Faust, *Mothers of Invention: Women of the Slaveholding South in the American Civil War* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1996), 7.

McCurry has explored the political path-breaking in which poor white women engaged during the Civil War. The women in her study practiced political power through direct action. They broke social decorum out of necessity and, in the process, “emerged as a salient new constituency in Confederate political life.”³⁰ Historians Wilma Dunaway, John Inscoe and Keri Leigh Merritt have furthered historical acknowledgement of the disparate races and classes that lived and worked within southern Appalachia. Dunaway’s studies of Cherokee women, enslaved Appalachians, and Free Black populations in East Tennessee, paired with John Inscoe’s investigation into the slaveholding class of Western North Carolina highlight the different wartime experiences held within a region so commonly reduced to a monolith. Keri Leigh Merritt’s *Masterless Men*, similarly, identifies the motives, moods, and loyalties of the lower class.³¹ This dissertation introduces the wives and family relations of a professional class. The women in this dissertation do not fall on either ends of this spectrum. They are, instead, “Mountain Mistresses” of the middle class.³² They are small-scale slaveholders, or soon to be slaveholders, that recognize the privilege of their status and seek to defend it.

Whenever political ideologies or mental frameworks informed by language in the news or the rhetoric of the historical narrative are discussed, the women are included as participating

³⁰ Stephanie McCurry, *Confederate Reckoning: Power and Politics in the Civil War South* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2012), 151.

³¹ For community and case studies into the lives of Appalachians of color, women in Appalachia, and the role of gender politics in Appalachian society, Wilma Dunaway’s scholarship exposes Antebellum and Civil War populations through the lens of capitalism and race history. See *The First American Frontier: Transition to Capitalism in Southern Appalachia, 1700-1860* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1996), *Slavery in the American Mountain South* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003), and *Women, Work and Family in the Antebellum Mountain South* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008). Inscoe offers a portrait of Western North Carolina’s slave-owning elite and highlights how a rural community maintains an integration into larger market systems in the Antebellum South. Many of the “Mountain Masters” he studies were considered professional men and many identified as belonging to the business class. See *Mountain Masters: Slavery and the Sectional Crisis in Western North Carolina* (Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press, 1989). While not specifically focused on Appalachia or East Tennessee, Keri Leigh Merritt’s *Masterless Men* uses examples of landless white men looking to men like Andrew Johnson to improve their material and economic condition. Keri Leigh Merritt, *Masterless Men: Poor Whites and Slavery in the Antebellum South* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2017).

³² Reference to John Inscoe’s book, *Mountain Masters: Slavery and the Sectional Crisis in Western North Carolina* (Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press, 1989).

members of the community with which they identify. Sallie Moffett, Eliza Rhea Fain, and Pheroba Hale, specifically, are considered active supporters of their husbands acts of loyalty. Even when not mentioned directly, these women are considered, at the minimum, passive recipients of lessons on their respective loyalties. As such, whenever national conversations presented on the printed page, or when troop movements and battlefield casualties are described in letters and newspapers editorials, it is assumed women were not only aware of their surroundings and situation, but that they also held opinions about them. It represents one more means of capturing a generally absent voice.

Enslaved laborers belonging to the families presented here are almost entirely absent from the historical record. When writing to his parents and siblings, John Moffett occasionally sent his regards to the family's enslaved, but never by name. Hiram Fain did not mention his enslaved laborers in his diary. John Fain Anderson did not own slaves and neither did his family. Andrew Johnson's opinion on slavery, emancipation, and Black people are explored via his professional correspondence, legislative agenda, and numerous speeches made throughout his career, but there is no private reference to the individuals he and his wife owned. The exception for this dissertation comes in chapter 4 where the Hales routinely wrote about one of their enslaved laborers, Lavender Hale. The Census slave schedule of Fentress County for 1860 show that the Hales owned five people, a young woman named Louise, Lavender who was 18, another unnamed woman described as "mulatto" and two male "mulatto" children, one and four years old, names also unknown.³³ Confederate guerrillas kidnapped Lavender in the summer of 1861 and sold him to a slave dealer. He managed to escape and make his way to Pheroba who had moved the family to safety in northern Kentucky, in Covington. Eventually he joined Jonathan Hale where they worked as civilian

³³ 1860 U.S. Census, Fentress County, TN, slave schedule, civil district 6, page 2, "Jonathan D. Hale, Slaveowner."

spies and guides for the remainder of the war. Lavender was literate, as evidenced by the preserved letter he received from his mistress, Pheroba, while working alongside Jonathan. His response did not get saved, but correspondence suggests Pheroba and Lavender wrote back and forth several times during the war. His thoughts on slavery are provided in a postwar printed recollection of Jonathan Hale. Whenever possible, the wants, needs, immediate condition or dreams of a population erased from the archives have been re-inserted.

While women and Black people illustrate the shortcomings of archival curation, the case studies that follow also highlight an embarrassment of riches when tracing the lives of white men in the professional class. The geographical parameters of this study focus primarily in northeastern counties of Tennessee. The individual collections identified stand out for their comprehensiveness. All four case studies are able to trace the actions and fortunes of families as they navigated the Secession Crisis, Civil War, and Reconstruction eras. With the exception of Andrew Johnson (only because he died in 1874 and was followed five months later with the death of his wife, Eliza), the family papers extend well into the early 20th Century. Their stories are possible because their words were deemed worthy of preserving. Acknowledgement of the curatorial decisions made by previous generations necessitates a recognition that these stories are incomplete and focused on the white man's experience.

East Tennessee has provided historians with a lens for understanding the complexities of the Civil War for well over a century. As early as 1869, the appeals to northern investors reminded prospective businesses about the region's Unionism. Greeneville native, Oliver P. Temple, a prominent attorney who fancied himself a captain of industry in Knoxville throughout the second half of the nineteenth century, told the world about East Tennessee's Civil War experience and the men who participated in rebellion during the Civil War. Much like speeches given throughout the 1860s and 1870s that advocated economic development, two of Temple's books, *East Tennessee and*

the Civil War (1899) and *Notable Men of Tennessee* (published posthumously in 1912) offer explanations of how and why so many East Tennesseans rejected secession. His history offers eight reasons, in fact, claiming that all of them descended from “old Whig” intelligence. They were as follows: 1) Most folks in East Tennessee were “disciples of Clay and Webster,” who feared a Confederate dismantling of the American System; 2) No “adequate cause” existed to justify a rebellion against the United States; 3) Secession would not solve any misinterpreted “existing evil(s)” and slavery was far more susceptible in a fledgling nation than in one which demonstrated a long-standing commitment to the peculiar institution; 4) The constitutional right to secession “was absolutely and unqualifiedly denied;” 5) Union leaders were the true “friend(s) of African slavery” who offered a commitment to seeing it preserved; 6) Because a peaceable secession was impossible, “slavery would perish” in the conflict; 7) Any government founded on the right to secede “could not permanently endure;” 8) They knew that any civil war would be a cruel one and did not want to encourage an inevitable slaughter for an unwinnable fight. Temple ended this list of reasons by making a point that it was “easy to be a Union man in Ohio or Pennsylvania, but difficult and dangerous to be one in the South.” Tennesseans’ loyalties were a hard-fought contest on both sides of secession where more than just the soldier felt the repercussions for sides chosen.³⁴

Similarly, Knoxville clergyman and educator Thomas Humes explored East Tennessee loyalty in his 1888 work, *The Loyal Mountaineers of Tennessee*. In the preface, Humes asserted that East Tennessee’s experience “had no precise parallel” within the seceded states, isolating the region even from the rest of Southern Appalachia. He mourned the suffering Unionists endured during two years of Confederate rule and occupation where, “starvation, like a gaunt wolf, threatened the door,” of the good mountain people. Quick to offer hyperbole, Humes portrayed East Tennesseans as a united front against secession fueled only by the “deep and strong love for the Union of the States

³⁴ Oliver P. Temple, *East Tennessee and the Civil War* (Cincinnati: The Robert Clarke Company, 1899), 547-551.

in one Nation—deep and strong love for their *whole country*.” They did not know the evils of slavery, according to Humes. The small slaveholding population who might have “owned a few negroes,” chose Union over slavery and if one of these institutions must perish, it was the United States that must survive.³⁵

The late nineteenth century witnessed Civil War veterans turned orators for the Military Order of the Loyal Legion of the United States and the topic of East Tennessee’s experience was a popular one. Standing in front of large crowds in places like Boston or Detroit, Union veterans offered personal recollections of their time spent defending East Tennessee from Confederate tyranny. Men like Orlando Poe and Byron M. Cutcheon, both Union generals and veterans who spoke to crowds for the Military Order of the Loyal Legion in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, stressed the strategic importance of the region and the northern desire to “afford relief to a section where Union sentiments were known to exist to a very considerable extent.”³⁶ They also referenced the active participation in battle preparation. Cutcheon described the Siege of Knoxville in 1863 where “several hundred civilians were brought out from the city under guard of soldiers” and proceeded to dig entrenchments near Fort Sanders.³⁷ Poe expressed his reverence for a committed community who never questioned who would win; they only worried they would starve before victory. He argued that for any suggestion of Confederate military superiority, he did not “abate one particle of my confidence in the valor and persistency of those which opposed them.”³⁸ These veterans, much like local historians Humes and Temple, drank from a decidedly Unionist well with little attention given to the Confederate sympathizers that inhabited the region. But they also

³⁵ Thomas W. Humes, *The Loyal Mountaineers of Tennessee* (Johnson City, Tennessee: The Overmountain Press, 1888), 5, 8, 11, 31.

³⁶ Orlando M. Poe, “Occupation of East Tennessee and the Defense of Knoxville,” reprinted by the East Tennessee Historical Society, (Knoxville: 1963), 4.

³⁷ Byron M. Cutcheon, “Recollections of Burnside’s East Tennessee Campaign of 1863” reprinted by University Microfilms, (Ann Arbor: 1970), 9.

³⁸ Poe, “Occupation of East Tennessee,” 37.

highlight a very early pride in East Tennessee's resistance to rebellion, and the actions of citizens working alongside military officials in concert. The lines between soldier and civilian, between homefront and battlefield, blurred.

In the 1930s, historian and Tennessee native, Samuel C. Williams urged scholars to tackle the topic of Confederate leaders that lived in the region, suggesting in a footnote, "The leaders in favor of the Confederacy in East Tennessee anterior to and during the war have been neglected—in sharp contrast with those who favored the Union cause...The particular field is one of promise to a researcher."³⁹ No one seemed ready to answer his call, though, until W. Todd Groce started a dissertation project that would go on to be published in 1999 as *Mountain Rebels: East Tennessee Confederates and the Civil War, 1860-1870*, some sixty years after Williams pointed out the need. Civil War scholars in the Mountain South knew Confederate supporters existed; John Inscoe's, Gordon McKinney's, Phillip Paludan's, and Steven Nash's work in western North Carolina, Kenneth Noe's work in southwestern Virginia, Jonathan Sarris's work in northern Georgia all broaden the scope of how the Confederacy operated in higher elevations and without the larger plantation model that existed further west. Groce argues that East Tennessee Rebels were not, "shadowy characters operating on the fringe," nor were they of the same character as Rebels throughout the Deep South.⁴⁰ He asks questions of the secessionists of East Tennessee: Who were they? Why did they choose separation over union? What happened to them during and after the war that made them so invisible in the present day narrative? These guiding questions also inform the questions asked of the families in the following case studies. This is a study of men and women placed in extraordinary circumstances who made decisions that would impact the rest of their lives.

³⁹ Samuel C. Williams, "John Mitchel, The Irish Patriot, Resident of Tennessee," *East Tennessee Historical Society* 10 (1938), p47, footnote 8.

⁴⁰ W. Todd Groce, *Mountain Rebels: East Tennessee Confederates and the Civil War, 1860-1870* (Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press, 1999), xiv.

Historian Philip S. Paludan used a small and remote North Carolina community to tell a Civil War story with broader implications about guerrilla activity and violence in *Victims* (1981). He suggested that “the power of kinship, the isolation of the place, and the highly developed individual sense of right and wrong” all worked in concert to dispense a particular brand of extralegal justice for citizens who defied the status quo. “Nurtured by an environment in which betrayal was a constant possibility,” Paludan argues, the Civil War in Appalachia possessed a brand of savagery not present where occupation and guerrillas did not define the war.⁴¹ And while *Victims* focuses on a Unionist portion of western North Carolina, this betrayal seems to be the exception rather than the rule. Still, the framework for the book would just as easily work in East Tennessee and its complex understanding of where loyalties were directed.

In *War at Every Door* (1997), historian Noel Fisher tackled the “unorganized” conflicts between Unionists and secessionists in East Tennessee. He argues that guerrilla violence contributed to the political shape of the region and made East Tennessee significant within the history of the Civil War. The populations of this region shared the same economically driven fears as other southern states, even if on a smaller scale. Indeed, perhaps that smaller scale made their actions and beliefs all the more critical. If, as Fisher has argued, “East Tennessee fit comfortably with neither the North nor the South,” then a variety of case studies and communities may offer a clearer picture of how loyalties were determined and later justified. As a regional study, Fisher’s work contributes much to our understanding of Appalachia’s role in America’s greatest conflict. His error comes in a concluding paragraph where he mentions, offhandedly, that East Tennessee represented only a “backwater theater.” This assertion is undermined in his other book, *The Civil War in the Smokies*, where Fisher lays out with careful detail how any “backwater” attribute only existed because Union

⁴¹ Philip Shaw Paludan, *Victims: A True Story of the Civil War* (Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press, 1981) 23, 78.

and Confederate leaders, alike, demonstrated reluctance to dedicate sufficient manpower and artillery to an unforgiving mountain landscape.⁴²

Historian Robert Tracy McKenzie rejects any backwater association in his Knoxville study, *Lincolmites and Rebels* (2009). Instead, McKenzie places the largest East Tennessee city squarely in the center of the Civil War, drawing lines between antebellum activities and Union loyalty. His timeline proves a useful tool for inquiry into how the people of Knoxville came to support either secession or loyalty to the United States, but for the purposes of a broader experience Knoxville represents an urban, and therefore an often unique, perspective of East Tennessee. Most of East Tennessee was rural and that fact played a factor in both how the inhabitants shaped both their identity and their community.⁴³

In light of what's been written and studied, this dissertation will contribute to our understanding of the Civil War era in East Tennessee. Intimate case studies provide insight that illustrate the complexities associated with loyalty and civil war. Those loyalties are, more often than not, deeply personal in nature and suggest the grand national causes promoted in the historical narrative dismiss the pragmatic influence of self-preservation and ambition.

Chapter two examines John Moffett and his family, who came from Jefferson County and sided with the Confederacy. Their loyalty exemplified a rural mountain commitment to preserving paths of opportunity to its white citizenry. Moffett's loyalty to the southern model of social hierarchy belies an entrenched understanding that success came from the preservation of the status quo. His loyalty was born of ambitions for the future. Throughout the chapter, Moffett's commitment to the cause waivers as he witnesses atrocity. Once Union forces captured him and

⁴² Noel Fisher, *War at Every Door: Partisan Politics & Guerrilla violence in East Tennessee, 1860-1870* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1997), 4, 173; Noel Fisher, *The Civil War in the Smokies* (Gatlinburg: Great Smoky Mountain Association, 2005).

⁴³ Robert Tracy McKenzie, *Lincolmites and Rebels: A Divided Town in the American Civil War* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009).

transported him to Chicago's Camp Douglas as a prisoner of war, the weight of his loyalties settles in and he worries how his decision to fight for the Confederacy will affect his prospects for the future. The remainder of his wartime years, his long trip home, and his postwar years find him grasping at opportunities that no longer exist and a somberness settles in as he discovers that loyalty born of ambition has nowhere to manifest once his dreams for the future are dismantled.

The Moffetts experienced a sort of loss only made larger when they openly dreamed about what might have been had John Moffett been successful at the level he expected at the start of the Civil War. He remained loyal to his privileges and the promises they held. As a recruiter and a supply sergeant in the Confederate army, Moffett developed social and professional networks that he hoped to use in a new southern nation. The son of a merchant with strong desires to enter the professional class with connections to extended marketplaces, he developed a strong loyalty born of self-interest and expectation. While the Moffett's material wealth informed his loyalty to the southern cause, it was not the only reason he made the decision to defend the Confederacy. Multiple factors contributed to any one man's decision in what side to support. However Moffett's commitment to the life he expected as part of the spoils of a successful wartime campaign for secession is the loyalty expressed most often in his letters. Self-centered class expectations created John Moffett's interpretation of loyalty. As a case study, his example demonstrates the intimate desires that factored into military service.

In the third chapter, loyalties were divided within the Fain family and the sides chosen by Hiram Fain and his second cousin, John Fain Anderson, were heavily influenced by their understanding of American history. Fain and Anderson looked to the legacies of Founding Father George Washington for inspiration and guidance. Hawkins County native Hiram Fain revered Washington as a revolutionary and opted into a version of historical interpretation that married well with a defense of secession. In contrast, John Fain Anderson of Sullivan County delivered messages

for the Union as a young man and regarded Washington as the creator of a perpetual union. Their respective interpretations of history, and the subsequent communities with which they identified, left a family divided on issues of secession and still committed to values that transcended it.

Historical literacy guides the tracing of loyalty for the Fains of Hawkins and Sullivan Counties. The term refers to the depth and breadth of one's understanding of history and his place within the broader historical narrative. The interpretation of history Hiram Fain and John Fain Anderson learned, particularly their interpretations of George Washington, illuminates the power of rhetoric, apocryphal and revisionist history, and imagined communities that use history as a guiding principal for loyalty. As with the previous case study, historical literacy cannot explain every action or belief held by the men in this chapter. It does, however, provide a convenient thread to follow as each Fain navigated the nineteenth century.

Chapter four introduces the Hale family of Overton County and the long-term effects of disguised and undisguised loyalties. Jonathan Hale served as a spy and a guide for federal forces through the Appalachian Mountains. His loud and physical displays of Union support back home earned him and his family the focused ire of guerrilla bushwhacker and Confederate outlaw, Champ Ferguson. While the Jonathan Hale traveled throughout Tennessee on missions for the Union, his wife, Pheroba Hale, moved her family to northern Kentucky in the middle of the night in an effort to evade Ferguson's violence. From the safety of Covington, Kentucky, Pheroba Hale sewed Union uniforms, negotiated the purchase of supplies for her husband and his men, kept her husband flush with Confederate currency, procured newspapers and propaganda pamphlets for Jonathan to distribute to Confederate communities searching for underground information on the Union war effort, and supplied information to Jonathan Hale and General George Thomas on the movement of Confederate militias. Still, and despite a Union victory, the Hale family still paid for their loyalties during war and their postwar lives were hungry, isolated, and unsung.

Loyalty for the Hales, similar to the case of the Moffetts, centered on an expectation of postwar acknowledgment of service. Recognition of Unionism needed to include payment for services rendered. The physical violence and destruction of property the Moffetts experienced necessitated loyalty to lead to financial recompense. His loyalty, as was the case for most men who experienced a border war where occupation and openly hostile insurgents terrorized entire communities, was informed by deeply personal grudges. As a lens for studying loyalty during secession, war, and decades that followed, Hale's focus on revenge and his efforts to recapture prewar wealth and social status in Fentress County illustrate a commitment to retribution. The Civil War's consistent presence along the Tennessee-Kentucky border, in the form of official occupying Confederate troops and the unofficial extralegal efforts of guerrilla terrorists, transformed loyalty into a lifelong resentment and inability to reconcile.

The final chapter of this dissertation attempts to make the large small with a case study of Andrew Johnson of Greeneville. He was a self-made man who resented the slave-holding elite and as a vice-presidential candidate his background as a working-class southerner and Unionist proved a positive influence in the 1864 election. His failures as a Reconstruction president are well established, but the community that informed Andrew Johnson's working understanding of the world around him did not disappear when Johnson found himself in the most powerful political position in the country. Andrew Johnson demanded loyalty from others and this trait was instilled in him by his early career as a Tennessee politician. Demanded loyalties, loyalty oaths, and the use thereof as punishments to traitors are explored in chapter five.

As a United States Senator who watched his state politicians, planters, and the professional class debate leaving the Union, Andrew Johnson gave a speech reacting to any coercive powers the federal government might employ against rebellion. He rejected secession outright, asserting "the Constitution of the United States makes no provision, . . . for its own destruction," and the federal

government held every right to “take care of all of its public property, and to enforce the collection of its revenue; but if, in the execution of the laws; if, in the enforcement of the Constitution, it meets with resistance, it is the duty of the Government, and it has the authority, to put down resistance.”⁴⁴

Andrew Johnson’s developed sense of loyalty as an act of submission clarifies his approach to Reconstruction. His early political career followed a pattern of promoting the extension of opportunities to the poor white populations throughout Tennessee. Greeneville citizens corresponded with their representative all the way through his time in the White House. They reminded him of his obligations to his constituency. They demanded his loyalty and he, in turn, used his political grooming and military governor experience as a dress rehearsal for his Reconstruction agenda. His case study identifies points throughout his career where demanded loyalties and the loyalty to white supremacy and poor white voting men become inextricable.

All of these chapters situate the cast of characters within the communities they called home. Some rejected the political beliefs of the physical communities in which they lived, Confederates living amongst Union-heavy populations and vice versa, and others felt the weight of support for their actions in the letters they received family and friends. This deviation is precisely what makes studying the origins of their loyalties so interesting. Loyalty is a learned behavior, something each person is groomed for in its manifestation and its foundational ideologies.

Historian Edward Ayers highlights how the South is viewed from outside and from within in his essay, “What We Talk About When We Talk About the South.” “Polls tell us,” he points out, “that white Southerners are the Americans most satisfied with their home states.” It is a haven, or refuge, from Puritan Yankee tyranny and bad manners. The white Southerners in this dissertation

⁴⁴ Mary Emily Robertson Campbell, *The Attitude of Tennesseans Toward the Union, 1847-1861* (New York: Vantage Press, 1961), 150.

find satisfaction in their surroundings until they are pushed into demanding better of their nation, no matter which nation they recognize. Southern generals waged war to create an “improved” government built on the recognition of white supremacy. White East Tennesseans, Confederate and Union, already embraced that mantle and so their loyalties had to extend beyond the question of mastery. The men and women in this study lived in a geographical space and elevation that made large-scale plantation efforts all but impossible. Many lived on lands acquired generations beforehand with no real desire to move. Others moved to their adoptive communities deliberately before secession represented any real threat and defended their homes from enemies, North and South. Ayers argues that Reconstruction created a sense of solidarity and coherence among the people who experienced it.⁴⁵ I counter that the loyalties found in southern whites existed long before the outbreak of war and Reconstruction only further entrenched mindsets developed during the secession crisis.

John Moffett served in the Confederate Army and spent much of the war in prison camps. Hiram Fain prayed for a Confederate victory while his second cousin, John Anderson, delivered messages for the Union. Jonathan Hale and his family suffered from constant terrorism for their Union loyalties, losing their family fortune to Confederate bushwhackers and Klansmen. Andrew Johnson rejected Tennessee’s secession and reported to Washington DC to serve out his election as a US Senator, even though Congress refused to recognize him. All of them expressed different understandings of loyalty. Some loyalties waived through hardship, while others stood the test of time. Taken together, these subjects will strengthen the historiography of the Mountain South’s Civil War experience and integrate, as historians Kenneth Noe and Shannon Wilson called for, “Appalachian scholarship with the studies of the Civil War and vice versa.” When these East

⁴⁵ Edward Ayers, *What Caused the Civil War? Reflections on the South and Southern History* (New York: W.W. Norton & Company, 2005), 38, 40, 62, 159.

Tennessee highlanders discussed their fears, their hopes, and their concerns, it had more to do with vengeful locals than well-known generals. Noe and Wilson suggested that “there is room for new local community studies,” and this dissertation contributes to that call.⁴⁶

⁴⁶ Kenneth Noe and Shannon Wilson, ed., introduction to *The Civil War in Appalachia: Collected Essays* (Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press, 1997), xvi, xxvii.

CHAPTER 2

LOYALTY TO CLASS AND SOCIAL STATUS: THE MOFFETTS OF JEFFERSON COUNTY

The planter class never represented the typical white southern experience in the build up towards Civil War. While most enslaved laborers lived on large plantations, most slaveholders laid claims to ownership of fewer than five persons. The average slaveholder contributes to historians understanding of culture and social structures that existed in the Mountain South throughout the nineteenth century.¹ Inherited expectations informed John Moffett's loyalties before, during, and after the Civil War. The Moffett family of New Market, Tennessee, in Jefferson County represent typical slaveholders. In following their secession, Civil War, and Reconstruction experiences, the Moffetts highlight the parameters of loyalty. That loyalty, to a southern promise of the social status quo's steadfast perpetuation, could waiver or become strong. Moffett's commitment to the Confederacy grew out of an expectation of success within a newly formed nation that held his interests as paramount. When the Confederacy died, Moffett's loyalties transformed into an obstacle to the success he had always anticipated.

John Moffett's future had promise. He was born in New Market on May 31, 1834, not into exceptional wealth, but into guaranteed paths of opportunity. He came from an industrious and ambitious family. His father, William Moffett, worked as a merchant and was deeply involved in the development of the East Tennessee Virginia Railroad. William sat on his local school boards in

¹ Historian James Oakes addresses this concept in *Ruling Race: A History of American Slaveholders*, where he points out that typicality can become a concern. Still it was this typical slaveholder that "was molded by the same forces that shaped the nation, which fought America's wars and helped inspire its Revolution, a class which boasted of its patriotism, its devotion to freedom, its adherence to the major tenets of liberalism" and John Moffett belonged to it. That he also remained steadfast to his commitment to the southern system that he willingly defended secession is, as Oakes highlights, "a truly American dilemma." James Oakes, *Ruling Race: A History of American Slaveholders* (New York: W.W. Norton, 1998), x.

Jefferson County and held a vested interest in the education of his children. At the age of 21, he bought 320 acres of land on a mortgage for \$812. Six years later, in 1836, those same tracts of land were resold for \$2400. By the end of the 1830s, when his son John was a small child, William Moffett had established a comfortable life within a system designed for men like him.² He claimed ownership of five enslaved laborers in the 1860 census slave schedule: a fifty-year-old black woman named Sukey, her sixteen-year-old daughter Adelaide, a twenty-eight year old black man called Henry and an eighteen-year-old black man whose name is unknown. With a diverse income coming from investments, farming, and a mercantile business, the Moffetts belonged to their county's small slaveholding society.³

The documented movements of John Moffett's life as a young man raised in a slaveholding community by slaveholding parents of moderate wealth illustrate a life of expectations. In 1859, at the age twenty-five, John Moffett had marriage and finding an entry into the mercantile industry on his mind. Earlier in his youth he had resisted the pressures his father put on him for securing a financial foothold in the Mountain South economy and only repaired strained relations with his father as Tennesseans wrestled openly over secession. William Moffett wanted his son to join the family business. John Moffett did not want to answer to his father in a professional setting and rejected William's plea to work for him. Moffett's life before the war, however, show him reaching a level of maturity as he grew out of the habit of many young white men from prominent families who "swing around on old hinges," "sinking gradually into a petulant unhappy bachelorism." He met a young woman in 1859, Sallie McDowell, of Greeneville. He proposed to her months before he

² WPA records, Jefferson County, (Tennessee State Library and Archives, Record Group #107, Roll 39, 1 reel); Boundary of School District (1840), Scholastic Population (1841-1860), General Index to Deeds (1792-1846).

³ According to the 1860 Census, Jefferson County slaveholders made up six percent of the total population. Finding Aid for the W.H. and J.T. Moffett Papers, McClung Historical Collection, Knoxville, Tennessee; Deed, Bill of Sale, and Registrar's Office Certification from Sale at public auction, August 18, 24, 27, 1849, W.H. and J.T. Moffett Papers, McClung Historical Collection, Knoxville, Tennessee.

enlisted and returned home during the Christmas of 1862 to marry her. It is at that point she became pregnant with their first child. They would not see each other for many years and their son would spend the first few years of his life knowing his father through letters. Sallie and John Moffett began their new life in the shadow of an encroaching Civil War. They never even lived together before he left for military service. Neither of them knew what their future held but they both understood it would benefit if slavery were to perpetuate.

Both determined slavery would be safeguarded in a new country that built protection into its very framework. Neither John nor Sallie brought enslaved laborers into the marital union. That was something he would work towards after the war. John Moffett looked towards the future where professionals maintained a lifestyle and social position that closely resembled the planter class. Merchants catered to the planter class with the manufactured goods they sold and once Moffett could build an unpaid labor force similar to his father's or inherit the same enslaved laborers he grew up alongside, Moffett's merchant interests would allow him to live the comfortable life he desired.⁴ In his 2019 monograph, *Preserving the White Man's Republic*, historian Joshua Lynn outlines how nineteenth century conservatives forged a political order by "enshrining a modern conception of rights as equal, natural, and racially defined." In theory, white men stood on equal footing for political and social opportunities, "by virtue of their whiteness and manhood," and any threat of expanding these rights beyond the racial parameters established "would resurrect a social order in

⁴ Historian Fred Bailey situates merchants within the professional class in Tennessee society in *Class and Tennessee's Confederate Generation*, and highlights how merchants "relied heavily upon the planter's patronage." Owning even one enslaved laborer allowed professionals in a community to participate in upper class activities and live in relative comfort. John Moffett's experience parallels many young men born into the professional class with an expectation of social ascension. Robert M. Barton to Jonathan Moffett, July 16, 1859, Sallie McDowell Moffett Papers, McClung Historical Collection, Knoxville Tennessee; Fred Arthur Bailey, *Class and Tennessee's Confederate Generation* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1987), 33.

which their own rights were relative.”⁵ John Moffett, then, had everything to lose in a failed secession and everything to gain in a Confederate victory.

At the precipice of war, Jefferson County held the highest per capita wealth that existed within East Tennessee. It was a diminutive sum of only \$730, and it paled in comparison to the aggregate wealth of Middle and West Tennessee counties whose sums could reach anywhere between 27-70 percent higher. Still, compared to the remaining counties of East Tennessee, \$730 far outweighed the paltry average wealth claimed by its citizens of \$454 and opened up the possibility for a decidedly comfortable class structure to exist within Jefferson County. It was not a wealthy county, but Jefferson did stand out as being far better off when compared to its immediate surroundings. Perhaps this contributed to the voting results, then, in June of 1861 when counties throughout the state voted on the issue of secession. Out of the 2,590 votes cast, 603 voted in favor of leaving the Union, meaning that over 23% of the voting population actively sought disunion. Eleven counties had higher percentages of pro-Confederate sympathy and seventeen counties returned voting results with lower support for secession. These numbers speak to complicated loyalties and suggested Union support was tenuous at the start of war.⁶

Here, also, slaveholdings situated Jefferson County within a unique position because this rural, and comparatively wealthy, county boasted that more than six percent of its citizens were slaveholders. That statistic was only matched by one other county in East Tennessee, Knox County, home of the region’s largest city, Knoxville. Enslaved people made up over 12.5% of Knox County’s population. Enslaved laborers in both Knox and Jefferson Counties worked for professionals, families, and small-scale farmers, suggesting the merchant class had a strong incentive

⁵ Joshua A. Lynn, *Preserving the White Man’s Republic: Jacksonian Democracy, Race, and the Transformation of American Conservatism* (Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 2019), 2-3.

⁶ Noel Fisher, *War at Every Door*, 20, 188; W. Todd Groce, *Mountain Rebels: East Tennessee Confederates and the Civil War, 1860-1870* (Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press, 1999), 6.

to maintain the institution. By the start of the Civil War, East Tennessee had pushed free black people and native people to the fringes of society and the census of 1860 reflected so in Jefferson County. There were only 170 free black citizens and over 2,000 enslaved black people in a county with an aggregate population of just under 17,000. These statistics offer an overview of the economic and political conditions that existed within John Moffett's community. If Black men and women were visible, it was almost entirely within a working capacity. It would be entirely possible for a young man in Jefferson County to never have seen a free Black person in their community.⁷

Moffett's future would have to wait until after the war ended. His family supported the Confederacy and Tennessee's decision to secede. William Moffett stood out in New Market for his active support of Confederate military actions and was one of the first merchants to declare his loyalties and let them inform his business practices. John's father believed deeply in his new southern government and, as a merchant with active business contracts open at the start of war, William Moffett's business ledger denoted his southern allegiance. As early as November of 1861, Moffett received orders from local Confederate officers overseeing the appropriation of material goods from traitorous families and to collect outstanding debts from "alien enemies." Sullivan County Confederate, Matthew T. Haynes, worked as First Receiver for the Confederate government, and was tasked with acquiring the confiscated property of Union sympathizers. Haynes ordered William Moffett to sell his holdings of patent medicines "belonging to alien enemies" and forward his invoices as proof of compliance, "at once." He would later go on to charge Andrew Johnson with being an alien enemy and petitioned the Confederate States of America's court system to sequester all "the property, rights, and credits belonging to him." The Moffett family's eager

⁷ U.S. Bureau of the Census, "Population by Color and Condition, 1860," under "State of Tennessee," 466; Lacy K. Ford, "Making the 'White Man's Country' White: Race, Slavery, and State-building in the Jacksonian South," *Journal of the Early Republic* 19, no. 4 (Winter, 1999), 717.

compliance suggests a strong desire for Confederate success. William Moffett kept extensive receipts and his invoices demonstrated his determination to find, and acquire, every cent owed to him by Union men, upon which he turned over to Haynes. Ambitions relied upon a successful secession.⁸

New Market is nestled in the foothills of the Appalachian Mountains, between the Holston and French Broad Rivers. Loyalty transformed throughout Jefferson County and members of the white community during secession, war, and reconstruction recalled tensions when it came to social interactions, education, and access to opportunity. With twenty-five percent of the county on record in favor of secession from the June 1861 referendum on secession, a population existed in strong enough numbers to ensure hostile attitudes among neighbors and neighborhoods. Still, before the war, some recalled a “friendly feeling” between slaveholders and non-slaveholders. Confederate veterans from the area responded to the *Tennessee Civil War Veterans’ Questionnaire* with childhood memories of antebellum society. J.P. Funk, of Jefferson County, grew up on his father’s farm of 500 acres without a single enslaved laborer because their family was ideologically opposed to the institution. Funk’s father employed hired hands, instead. Still, he defended slaveholders against charges of idleness and pointed out “those who had slaves while not doing hard work themselves generally oversee [sic] their hands, planned all the work on the farm and saw to its execution.” He noted “that occasionally there was a slaveholder as in all other classes who was untrustworthy and he was condemned by public opinion, the same as the poor man, and the only advantage was what money gave him.” He ascribed any success a poor white man might find the direct result of “real manhood, dependability, honesty and ambition.” Young men like Funk and Moffett decided the only way to protect the world they knew was by fighting for the Confederacy. It might have just as

⁸ Matthew T. Haynes to William H. Moffett, November 1861, W.H. and J.T. Moffett Papers, McClung Historical Collection, Knoxville, Tennessee (Hereafter repeating writers and recipients of letters will be abbreviated to initials and dates with collections given as they change); “CSA v Estate of Andrew Johnson,” December 10, 1862, in *Papers of Andrew Johnson*, eds. Leroy P. Graf and Ralph W. Haskins, vol. 6 (Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press, 1983), 95-96.

easily been for the Union. Both white Union men and Confederate men in East Tennessee fought for the same future. They merely differed in their conclusions as to who would best safeguard their way of life. Ambition, and the ability to reap the benefits thereof, remained paramount to young white men and John Moffett's military experience highlights this impulse.

John Moffett's loyalty to his class and social status underscores a commitment to the white supremacy held in Confederate ambitions to preserve it. Historian Chandra Manning dismisses the theory of "unthinking" soldiers and uses the voices of ordinary men to convey "sharply articulated ideas" to determine the thoughts, concerns, and beliefs of those who served. In *What This Cruel War Was Over*, Manning provides a broad survey of soldier sentiment, offering room for expansion and a more intimate exploration of the communities that produced these soldiers. She points out that it is "patronizing and insulting to Confederate soldiers to pretend that they did not understand the war as a battle for slavery" and Moffett's loyalty, in action, upsets a traditional narrative of the East Tennessee Civil War experience and his understanding of where that loyalty was groomed warrants investigation.⁹

Twenty-six years old at the start of war, John had just begun negotiations with his father to join the mercantile trade when his state came calling for volunteers. Family and friends were his whole world; nothing else mattered. When he joined the Confederate army, John Moffett joined the 12th Tennessee Cavalry, a regiment filled with trusted friends. His commanding officer and close confidant, Captain James Lynch, made him a non-commissioned officer. His loyalties were personal and based almost entirely upon his hopes and designs for the future. A brief stint of military service seemed a good way to establish himself as someone whose voice mattered well outside of his father's realm of influence. In what historian Stephen Berry has called, "the spirit of *éclat*," John

⁹ Chandra Manning, *What This Cruel War Was Over: Soldiers, Slavery, and the Civil War* (New York: Vintage Civil War Library, 2007), 7, 9, 32, 144-5.

Moffett provided a prime example of a young white Appalachian merchant, ready to establish himself as a man of power and honor. It was also, as Chandra Manning has argued, a chance to preserve social order and exhibit loyalty to “the rightness of the South’s social order.” John Moffett’s letters to Sallie from his early days of service highlight his dreams for the future. “I trust and believe there are bright days in store for us,” he wrote her, and directed her to “be hopeful and happy while I am away.”¹⁰

John Moffett wrote to his new wife with purple prose and romance at the forefront. When she began a letter to him with the words “my dearest friend,” he responded with quick correction. “Ah! Dear Sallie, I am more than a friend. I am a devoted lover. I am a protector. Call me by some other name—some sweeter name—some name that will live in memory. Friend! Yes, I am a friend, but I am so with others. I am something else.” In between his proclamations of love, John continuously pointed to how bright their future would be once the South successfully seceded. “Think not of the past,” he directed her to instead “let your thoughts reach forever and grasp the glittering crown that adorns the bright dawn of the future.”¹¹

Social order provided the motivation for many in East Tennessee, regardless of the side they chose to serve and support. In the spring of 1862, Captain Lynch placed Sgt. Moffett on recruitment duty. As soon as Moffett swore in recruits and administered the Confederate Oath to them, they were to join Lynch and the rest of the company in Murfreesboro, some 200 miles west, just south of Nashville. One of Moffett’s recruits was the younger brother of East Tennessee powerbroker,

¹⁰ Stephen Berry, *All that Makes a Man: Love and Ambition in the Civil War South* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2002), 30; Chandra Manning, *What This Cruel War Was Over*, 144-5; John Moffett to Sallie Moffett, March 22, 1862, Sallie McDowell Moffett Papers, McClung Historical Collection, Knoxville, Tennessee (Hereafter repeating writers and recipients of letters will be abbreviated to initials and dates with collections given as they change).

¹¹ JM to SM, March 24th, 1862, Sallie McDowell Moffett Papers; Moffett’s tendency towards the romantic in his letters to Sallie Moffett follow a pattern defined by Stephen Berry where “all roads lead to Romance,” in an attempt to escape the hyper-masculine duties of his day-to-day activities. John Moffett’s voracious capacity for romance highlights an active effort to escape the “competitive drives and masculine pursuits” of his military experience. Stephen Berry, *All That Makes a Man: Love and Ambition in the Civil War South* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005), 103, 99.

Thomas A. R. Nelson. The Nelson family illustrated the divisive nature of the American Civil War within the mountains of East Tennessee. Two of Thomas's sons served the Union side and two fought for the Confederacy. Thomas's younger brother, James, left with John Moffett on a train destined for Knoxville on March 25th, 1862. Thomas Nelson remained forcibly silent throughout the war years, however his power and influence within politics proved useful to John Moffett after the war.¹²

Thomas Nelson, like Moffett, worked hard to earn the respect of those who knew him. Born in Roane County, educated in Knoxville, and finding a career in Jonesboro, Nelson represented the ideal East Tennessee gentleman. He was handsome, too. Friends commented on his earnest demeanor and his unending work ethic. A lawyer turned politician, Nelson won a congressional seat from his district in 1859 and in the first few days of session he made an impassioned speech supporting a unified nation that garnered the respect of his Whig peers and fed the ire of southern Democrats. He supported the Bell-Everett presidential ticket in 1860, when John Bell and John C. Breckinridge created a third-party alternative to Democratic candidate Stephen Douglas and Republican candidate Abraham Lincoln. Representing the Constitutional Union Party, Bell and Everett ran on a single-issue platform which rejected any political principle other than those that recognized Constitutional authority and the perpetuity of the Union. The party had broad appeal amongst southern Whigs and loyal southern Democrats. Nelson stumped on their behalf throughout East Tennessee, where citizens gathered to admire him as a hero. During his campaign travels, he often appeared at the side of Andrew Johnson. Both would speak to eager crowds where Johnson, "for once in his life," acted as a statesman instead of a partisan and Nelson "commanded their confidence" as an advocate for a perpetual Union.¹³

¹² Thomas B. Alexander, *Thomas A.R. Nelson of East Tennessee* (Nashville: Tennessee Historical Commission, 1956), 113.

¹³ Oliver P. Temple, *Notable Men of Tennessee* (New York: Cosmopolitan Press, 1912), 172.

In August of 1861, after Tennessee had announced secession in June, Nelson attempted to travel to Washington DC for the next session of Congress. Confederate forces arrested him in Lee County, Virginia for treasonous behavior towards the CSA. They let him free under “parole of honor” after Nelson drafted a letter to Jefferson Davis in which he maintained an ambiguous allegiance as a citizen. In the letter, Nelson began by asserting that he upheld the same commitment to social order and preservation of the southern status quo as the men who captured him. He claimed ignorance to reasons charges were raised against him, insisting he was “unadvised” and “conscious of no act” that supported or sustained accusations against the state. He focused his argument on preserving his personal interest of “peace and quiet” in East Tennessee. The intentions in the letter were apparent; Nelson told Davis in carefully crafted language where his allegiances lay without ever outright committing treason. Nelson offered, instead, neutrality. He vowed not to “council or advise others to thwart or cripple the Confederate States.” A superficial reading allowed Jefferson Davis to grant parole to Nelson without understanding that Nelson did not serve Confederate interests, only East Tennessee ones. With parole secured, Nelson’s ambitions for his future kept him silent until September of 1863, after General Ambrose Burnside entered and occupied East Tennessee.¹⁴

Nelson would eventually use the social equity he built before and during the war to advocate for men with whom he felt a kindred connection; men who believed in the same vision of society regardless of wartime loyalties. Loyalty to one side or the other did not matter as much to Nelson as much as their loyalty to class and a commitment to maintaining the social order. While he initially identified politically as a Whig, he held firmly to a conservative code of principles, “with reverence for existing forms.” When President Lincoln presented the nation with the Emancipation Proclamation, Nelson took offense at the very idea of even a limited and wartime exercised

¹⁴ Oliver P. Temple, *Notable Men of Tennessee*, 176.

abolition. He had sided with the Union because of the constitutional protections of slavery. He rejected the notion that an executive power held the authority to emancipate enslaved peoples, even as an act of war. Emancipation disrupted the class structure. It affected white men in the professional sphere who depended on free labor to establish a comfortable lifestyle. Lincoln's Emancipation Proclamation tipped the political scale for Nelson and transformed him into an anti-Republican conservative. The impulse towards preserving the status quo and rejecting a progressive political path in favor of maintaining traditional conservative values would eventually also include advocating for John Moffett.¹⁵

John possessed no fervor for the grand Confederate cause. His loyalties were more personal and based almost entirely upon his hopes and designs for the future. In his early letters home, Moffett expressed his homesickness. Barely out of the Jefferson County line, he begged his new bride, "write me a long letter tonight have it mailed in time for tomorrow's train...sing me the sweet music of your heart...too soon the time will come, when I must leave you, and go where duty calls." He had been tasked to wait behind his unit's movement to Knoxville and collect the late-comers. Between March 4th and March 14th, 1862, John attempted to increase regimental strength. Those early efforts of his to recruit good southern soldiers in a predominantly Unionist portion of the state proved a taxing exercise in frustration, and his love letters also described his sense of failure with his first official duty. Able men who had not already joined the Confederacy generally held reasons for not doing so and Moffett complained about the remaining men who were of "the poorest quality." When he joined Lynch's Battery outside of Knoxville, he took on the role of Quartermaster Sergeant. In this new role, Moffett's responsibilities included providing and distributing supplies and

¹⁵ Oliver P. Temple, *Notable Men of Tennessee*, 177; Thomas A. R. Nelson to Jefferson Davis, August 12, 1861, T.A.R. Nelson Papers, McClung Historical Collection, Knoxville, Tennessee.

provisions for soldiers. The son of a merchant with designs for expanding his influence saw one of his jobs in wartime service as creating a network for postwar wealth accumulation.¹⁶

Sallie Moffett was betrothed to John Moffett but remained with her family in Greeneville, fifty miles northeast of New Market, during her fiancé's deployment. Once they married in December of 1862, she continued to live with her family but took on the mantle of domestic duties expected of southern wives. She maintained correspondence and relationships on behalf of the family. Her brother, Charles McDowell, served alongside John Moffett as a private in Captain Lynch's company until his capture by Union forces while on scout duty in September of 1864. Her other brother, William, also served in Captain Lynch's company, mustering into service on September 27, 1862. He was twenty years old when he joined the Confederate army. Charles was only seventeen.¹⁷

Sallie Moffett, like her young husband, believed in heroism and loyalty. The Confederacy offered her and her new husband the opportunity to demonstrate their commitment to the conservative ideals by which they lived. Marrying a young professional with so much potential before the war, Sallie understood that she had married into Jefferson County's social order, much of which hinged on white supremacy. While many wives and daughters used the Civil War as an opportunity to break free from patriarchal confines and explore a world outside the domestic sphere, Sallie embraced her role as steadfast subservient. John Moffett's military service gave his wife a sense of importance and she encouraged him in her letters. "I would not have you anything else than a soldier," she confided in August of 1862 to her husband. "I feel that you are fighting for me," but wondered if his wartime realities fueled his dedication: "Does not Butler's villainous order in

¹⁶ JM to SM, March 4, 1862, Sallie McDowell Moffett Papers, McClung Historical Collection, Knoxville, Tennessee; William D. Taylor, *A Fit Representation of Pandemonium: East Tennessee Confederate Soldiers in the Campaign for Vicksburg* (Macon: Mercer University Press, 2008), 27.

¹⁷ National Park Service, *Soldier Details*, <https://www.geni.com/people/Pvt-Charles-McDowell-Sr/6000000067020296891> (accessed January 5, 2018).

New Orleans nerve your arms and steel your heart?” She kept abreast of the news outside of Tennessee and stories describing Union General Benjamin Butler’s treatment of the civilian population in the southern port city. She held Butler in contempt when he redefined the term “prostitute” to mean any woman who insulted or visibly demonstrated disdain towards Union soldiers. This sort of un-gentlemanly behavior made her “blood run cold and my heart grow faint.” Sallie’s words showed a commitment to her husband’s mastery and what historian Joshua Lynn has called “political legitimacy in the governance of household dependents.”¹⁸

Sallie did not judge all southern soldiers as respectable, either. It took more than service to make a man worthy of her attention. Beyond the brazen actions of men like Butler, Sallie Moffett also held conscripted soldiers in contempt. Men drafted into the military left to serve their country in near disgrace. Moffett saw honor in volunteer service, not in cowards being forced to serve by their community and their government. Moffett’s husband held honor, in part, because he joined the Confederate army on purpose and with deliberate speed.¹⁹

In an undated letter, early in John Moffett’s service, Sallie wrote of activities back home. She described numerous displays of loyalty where she and her cousin, Mollie, visited sick Confederate soldiers in a hospital in nearby Morristown. Mollie loved her “Cousin John” and to show her

¹⁸ SM to JM, August 23, 1862, Sallie McDowell Moffett Papers; Joshua Lynn, *Preserving the White Man’s Republic*, 57; Historian Alecia P. Long examines public commentary and memory of General Butler’s Order No. 28 in her contribution to *Occupied Women*, and argues that women in occupied areas like New Orleans demonstrate the early arrival of a “hard war” where they were forced to sign a loyalty oath or prepare for leaving the city under force. Butler pushed a wartime rhetoric where women who resisted Union forces were prostitutes and the only way to scour a community of traitors was through public shame and enforced allegiance. Sallie Moffett interpreted the news of Butler’s order as an act of warfare against women like herself and internalized John Moffett’s military service as a means of defending her honor and her loyalty despite of General Benjamin Butler’s assessment. Alecia P. Long, “(Mis)Remembering General Order No. 28” in *Occupied Women: Gender, Military Occupation, and the American Civil War* edited by LeeAnn Whites and Alecia P. Long (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 2009), 27.

¹⁹ SM to JM, August 23, 1862, Sallie McDowell Moffett Papers; Sallie Moffett’s views on conscripted soldiers mirrors what historian Kenneth Noe examines in *Reluctant Rebels*, where volunteer duty signals “southern honor culture” that embodied the traditional and masculine expectations of young men like John Moffett. Moffett “shaped his actions so that he would be acknowledged in the present and remembered in the future as brave and manly, a ferocious defender of hearth and home.” Kenneth Noe, *Reluctant Rebels: The Confederates Who Joined the Army after 1861* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2010), 38.

appreciation of his service to the “Cause,” she spent time with the injured. She sat at their sides and visited with young men far from home. She cooked meals for them and offered comfort as they fought off infections and healed from their wounds. Sallie watched the sick and invalid soldiers throughout her community and her mind transported to her own husband who had expressed feeling ill in his most recent letters. Why could he not take a furlough? “I cannot bear to think you are sick, chilling, you must get a furlough,” she implored him, “if not a discharge.” She had seen less sick men get discharged and reenlist when their health improved. She did not understand why John Moffett could not take this same route. She considered this an honorable path, because it provided time to heal and a fresh commitment to the Confederacy with a second enlistment. Unlike deserters and draft-dodgers, John Moffett’s reputation would not tarnish among those who mattered to him. The parameters of Sallie’s loyalty seemed centered on respectability and perceptions.²⁰

As the early days of his service passed with little movement, Moffett’s fearful excitement transformed into bored ambivalence. The long love letters he wrote so often transformed into tentative predictions about the length of his departure. “Let us hope,” he opined, “that we will be restored to each others embrace, let us hope that youth, beauty, and manhood will crown our brows with laurel wreaths. Life is sweet to me. It is sweet for your sake. For your sake, I wish to live.” The pages of his letters discussed a future for himself and his new family. His vision of the world required a Confederate victory and a dedication to the opportunities that existed prior to secession

²⁰ SM to JM, undated, Sallie McDowell Moffett Papers; As a representation of a middling class Mountain South white woman, Sallie Moffett’s opinions expressed in correspondence with her deployed husband seem to match archetype descriptions offered by Anne Firor Scott in *The Southern Lady: From Pedestal to Politics, 1830-1930*, who suggested that southern white women during the Civil War period eventually found value in exercising “women’s rights” to the extent that it reinforced southern conservative and traditional values. Sallie’s letters trend towards affirming her commitment her husband, specifically, but also to his role as a husband and southern white man of respectable heritage. Sallie Moffett held opinions and shared them with her husband at length. She abhorred the violence and occupation, resented neighbors who held different loyalties, and proselytized her ideals of masculinity and honor. She was, as Drew Gilpin Faust prefaced in *Mothers of Invention*, offering “evaluations of the southern government’s policies on conscription relief, home defense, economic production, and slavery” that contributed to larger conversations influencing and undermining support for a long and drawn out war. Anne Firor Scott, *The Southern Lady: From Pedestal to Politics, 1830-1930* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1970), 71; Drew Gilpin Faust, preface to *Mothers of Invention: Women of the Slaveholding South in the American Civil War* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1996), xiii.

and wartime. He would build a mercantile brand and use the connections he developed throughout his tenure in service to their new southern nation. He had a life to resume and successes to enjoy. John and Sallie Moffett both seemed to thrive in the romantic aspects of their enforced separation. While other men's letters presented throughout this dissertation reflect a reserved and simple approach to communicating with their loved ones and spouses, John Moffett maintained a tendency to explore romance and fashion, often letting his wife know how bonnets are tied in the communities he visits and what materials are being used in dresses and suits.²¹

John Moffett's loyalty to his family and his future fortune never wavered, although his loyalty to the side he served did. As early as April of 1862, Moffett's hesitation came across in his communications with family back home. Days after the Battle of Shiloh, Moffett wrote a letter to his family from Corinth, Mississippi. Where prior letters were composed and focused on the future, this letter after Shiloh stood out with its shaky handwriting and fragmented thoughts. He addressed it to his father, mother, and sisters; something he had never done previously. Earlier correspondence were addressed individually and with sentiments of love to be expressed to all those around. This letter was different, as was his mental state. He needed everyone to hear his words, but could only write it out once. In the opening lines he admitted "I forget which one (of you) I wrote to last. I scarcely know where to begin." From there he described his experiences. Shiloh's brutality had shaken him, but he maintained the wherewithal to assert his safety, for his mother's sake. About two-thirds of the way through this letter detailing the world around him, though, he seemed to forget who his audience was and he described in real time the scene unfolding just outside his tent.

²¹ JM to SM, March 24, 1862, Sallie McDowell Moffett Papers; Stephen Berry has argued that every "free white man had a personal empire to build, whether it was a private plot on a scrubby canebreak or a personal dominion on a vast tract of good earth." John's letters to Sallie at the precipice of experiencing true horrors of combat reflect a young man writing in a manner that portrays him as being prepared to act honorably out of romantic compulsion. Berry also points out that many of the stereotypes of southern men as fops and dandies are wildly exaggerated, however John Moffett's focus on the cut and fabric of those he encounters situates him firmly within the stereotype. Stephen Berry, *All That Makes a Man*, 96, 144.

“I look out my tent door to a sad sight,” he began, “a crowd of soldiers are gathered around a grave. A deserter from [54th TN Regt] is to be shot in a few moments, most of our boys have gone up to see him die.” Moffett remarked on his own reluctance to witness the scene and questioned those who seemed so eager to watch a man get executed. “It makes me sad to think that a fellow soldier has to die an ignominious death. Again I look out,” he described, “company after company file by, the hill is covered by thousands. Another regiment files by—the hills swarm with soldiers.” Moffett found the scene disturbing.

This had not been his motivating factor in joining the war effort. Moffett wanted to reap the rewards for fighting on the winning side of history. His ambitions informed his loyalty, but those ambitions never included bloodshed. Now, as he sat in the afternoon and watched from the safety of his tent, “officers on horseback are dashing to the right, then to the left. The heavens grow dark, clouds are thickening—the wind whistles, the tent flutters like sails. It is now 3 o’clock. At 4 o’clock a soldier will wing its flight from earth.” He reminded himself and his family that the man was a deserter, but this did not assuage his emotional reaction to the execution. Nor did he recognize the irony in questioning the death of one man, days after the largest casualty count since the Civil War’s start. For him, it was a matter of principle. As he stared at the thousands of soldiers gathering, and in doing so offering an explicit endorsement of the acts at hand, Moffett’s loyalty did not reside with the Confederacy. It resided with his commitment to conservative and traditional values, a self-interested loyalty to his future and becoming a southern gentleman. He ended his letter by remarking that his “heart grows sick at the sight. All around is excitement. Men are rushing forward from the various encampments to witness the execution. I will remain in my tent.”²²

²² JM to Moffett Family, April 2, 1862, William H. Moffett Papers; James McPherson has noted that “coming at the end of a year of war, Shiloh was the first battle on a scale that became commonplace during the next three years. The 20,000 killed and wounded at Shiloh (about equally distributed between the two sides) were nearly double the 12,000 battle casualties at Manassas, Wilson’s Creek, Fort Donelson, and Pea Ridge *combined*.” James McPherson, *Battle Cry of Freedom* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1988), 413.

Moffett was not alone in his wavering commitment after Shiloh. The fierce defeat of southern troops convinced many Confederates to defect. Historian Fred Bailey described Shiloh as a moment when Tennessee's youth "witnessed for the first time the cruel carnage of war and for hundreds that was enough." Many other Tennessee volunteers let their enlistment contracts expire after Shiloh. Moffett remained, but the sentiments he expressed to his loved ones back home suggest he did not stay for the cause. Days after Shiloh, on April 16th, 1862, the Confederate Congress approved a conscription bill that subjected all men between the ages of eighteen and thirty-five to military service regardless of political affiliations. East Tennessee's male population preemptively responded to the news of the coming bill with an attempt of five hundred men to flee Tennessee towards Union safety in Kentucky. Sallie and her cousin Mollie both referenced this in letters to John Moffett. "As to news there is none," Sallie wrote, "except a large number of Lincolmites left this [Greene] county last night for KY to keep from being drafted, they left without anyone expecting them, it is thought several boys from town have gone. I do not know who. I pray they may be caught and brought back." With only a small percentage of the group armed they assumed their large number would keep them safe. Within sight of the Cumberland Mountains, however, they were intercepted, captured, and forced to march to Knoxville by nearby occupying Confederate forces. From there, they were placed in overcrowded jails until transported to prison in Tuscaloosa, Alabama to be held for the duration of the war as political prisoners.²³

Sallie had no way of knowing that her husband would face a similar fate. Nine months later, though, Moffett and his unit were in Vicksburg. His memories of what he witnessed after Shiloh stayed with him and time passing had not strengthened his loyalty to any cause greater than his family and his own interests. In fact, doubts about what purpose they served and whose interests

²³ Fred Arthur Bailey, *Class and Tennessee's Confederate Generation* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1987), 100-101; SM to JM, August 15, 1862, Sallie McDowell Moffett Papers; Oliver P. Temple, *East Tennessee and the Civil War*, (Cincinnati: Robert Clarke Company Publishers, 1899), 424-425.

were being defended pervaded the minds of many of his comrades. Moffett described how he and other men from his country gathered around with their Bibles and read passages. The verses would inevitably lead to questions that concerned their immediate mission at hand. He recalled one soldier inquiring, “Have we anything in the Bible to justify us warring against our enemies?” Another worried if “punishment falls upon all alike” without consideration of the side.²⁴

By the time Moffett reached Vicksburg he had developed a healthy appreciation for the “feds” who occupied the Mississippi riverbanks across from him. He wondered at the technological advances that the federal navy developed and described, with awe, the USS *Conestoga* when it drifted past him and his men on its way down the river. “One battery struck her seven times,” he wrote, “it is believed thirty shots struck her. There are rumors she sank below here, but it is not believed.” He also recognized the futility in what they were doing in “their” war. He described a scene where the camp-life and battlefields in war, and its inherent violence, became the mundane. If anything, the enemy provided a source of mild amusement during his days in Mississippi. When Moffett mentioned loyalty directly in his letters, he did so as if it were born of duty. “I am performing my duty to my country,” he told his father, “a duty every loyal citizen owes his country and all should be willing to perform.” The sort of sentiment was expressed to a family back home which was depending on his success. Sallie Moffett’s understanding of southern honor and masculinity would have made her beam to hear John Moffett say this. These rote and rhetorical expressions paled, however, compared to the loyalty he demonstrated to the men with whom he served.²⁵

The network of comrades Moffett built as a recruiter, and then again as a supply sergeant, were extensively detailed to his family. He wrote lists of names: men who came with him from Jefferson County, men he met in his travels and combat, men who shared their stories and their time

²⁴ JM to WM, February 4, 1863, William H. Moffett Collection.

²⁵ JM to WM, February 4, 1863, William H. Moffett Collection.

with him. Ambition alone would not create a path to access opportunity. One needed a postwar network to fall into and John Moffett kept lists of men, where they lived, and who they called family. He always sent word back home, too, offering greetings to family acquaintances and salutations to the enslaved laborers his family kept.

The networking did not end in the summer of 1864, but was transformed when federal forces captured Moffett and sent him to prison, first in Knoxville. There he awaited transport north to a Union prisoner of war camp. He wrote his wife, some seventy miles away, while in Knoxville and in the four pages he assured her of his excellent health and fair treatment. He quoted poetry by Lord Byron, crafting a beautiful love letter in which he promised a happy future and recalled their cheerful past.²⁶ That the Civil War served as a war of letters has long been established in the historical narrative. Letters written between the battlefield and the home front kept the populations informed on a personal level that newsprint never quite captured. Letters are where fears were expressed, pain was explored, and dreams were conveyed. To restrict someone's word count in a prison camp, then, represented a new kind of pain. It must have hurt prisoners of war in ways not physically as disease or brutality, but left significant pain in what was unsaid. In July of 1862, the Commissary General of Prisoners sent out a circular to all northern prison camps limiting the length and content of prisoners' letters so they "not be permitted to write letters of more than one page of common paper, the matter to be strictly [sic] of a private nature, or the letter must be destroyed."²⁷ From November of 1864 through June of 1865, Moffett's literary flair for long letters filled with prose was sharply curtailed as he served a sentence for treasonous behavior in Camp Douglas, located outside of Chicago.

²⁶ JM to SM, September 10, 1864, Sallie McDowell Moffett Papers.

²⁷ William Hoffman, "Circular to all Northern Prisoner of War Camps," July 7, 1862 in Official Records of the Civil War, Series II, Vol. 4, pp 152-153.

Camp Douglas imposed further restraints on outgoing letters. Policy limited the number of letters prisoners could send. One side of one page to one person. One letter mailed out every twenty days. Nouns were shortened. Adverbs and adjectives disappeared. John instructed Sallie, “You will be allowed to write—two such pages in reply.” He then warned, “Write often dear Sallie but nothing imprudent or improper.” Union guards read the mail. Improper letters—those that spoke of ill treatment by Union forces or expressed pro-Confederate sympathies—were contraband. Soldiers did not get their mail if the outside authors did not follow the rules. His own letters focused on his health. He wrote of God and the future. He dreamed to see his infant son, Ned. He spoke of Shakespeare. He quoted the Bible. He remarked on his full stomach and fair treatment. John Moffett maintained a romantic relationship with his wife through abbreviated letters that left little room for anything but affection and concern. He warned Sallie because of her history of sharing political and wartime opinions. Sallie had criticized how military service exploited her young husband prone to sickness and hyperbole. None of her letters to him while imprisoned exist to examine, but John Moffett references getting letters that passed security checkpoints and so she must have curbed her enthusiasm.²⁸

It is difficult, then, to assess Moffett’s loyalty during his roughly two years spent in prison camps. He had no freedom to speak frankly. The eighteen letters he composed spoke of the personal. He begged his wife to remain cheerful, attempting to will happiness into reality through the brief page the federal government allotted. In March of 1865, Moffett came up for parole. Union forces transferred him to Point Lookout in Maryland where an exchange could take place within

²⁸ JM to SM, November 4, 1864, Sallie McDowell Moffett Papers; JM to SM, November 23 and December 26, 1864, Sallie McDowell Moffett Papers; Drew Gilpin Faust points to a late-war tendency for wives to encourage their husbands to desert rather than die for a losing side. Sallie’s letters never suggested he walk away from his commitment. For her it was not an option. However she did challenge the wisdom of his superior officers when it seemed so clear to her that John Moffett needed time off from service to recuperate from various sicknesses prior to his capture. With release no longer an option and John Moffett in prison, Sallie Moffett’s abbreviated letters would only have the space and allowance of emotional support for his condition. Faust, *Mothers of Invention*, 243.

weeks, Confederate POWs for Union POWs. Before Moffett could walk out of the prison confines a free man, however, General Lee surrendered to General Grant and then John Wilkes Booth murdered President Lincoln. Moffett found himself stuck in prison limbo as larger forces worked out the finer details. Prisons shut down as theories were investigated about Lincoln's assassination being the start of an orchestrated attacks. The first presidential assassination halted any momentum Lincoln had built in the weeks building towards southern surrender. Prisoner release and exchange were not a priority. Three more months passed and this time seemed to break what little optimism Moffett maintained. He had come so close to freedom and now he had no idea when or how he might ever get back home to Tennessee.²⁹

Frustration while at Point Lookout mounted. Moffett beseeched his father to seek a presidential pardon. Friends reached out to him and begged him to take an oath of loyalty, which he would have done but the bureaucratic nightmare created in the wake of Lincoln's assassination kept Moffett confined. A once cheerfully optimistic prisoner lashed out to the ones he loved. By late May of 1865, he chastised his father, and wondered if his family was "laboring under the delusions that we are to be released soon. If so, let me beg of you to go to work and get me out...Until I get out through the influences of friends, here I will have to remain for months, maybe years...For pity's sake, do something." Moffett's loyalty, born of ambition, had diminished alongside his weakened spirit, and he recognized that the glorious future he envisioned under a Confederacy with the network he developed had been replaced with uncertainty and economic anxiety.³⁰

Moffett's reference to the influences of friends reveals how pardons worked and the specific friend he needed was the silent Unionist conservative, Thomas Nelson. Appealing to men like Nelson was not an option afforded to just any Confederate prisoner, but a family of Moffett's means

²⁹ JM to SM, March 29, 1865, Sallie McDowell Moffett Papers.

³⁰ JM to WM, May 18, 1865 & May 30, 1865, William H. Moffett Papers.

and clout allowed this as an option. As historian Fred Bailey has suggested, “even in the pestilential prison camps, wealth and family influence often had their advantages.” Nelson, before he identified as a Unionist or an East Tennessean, remained true to his conservatism. In the postwar years, he criticized attempts to humiliate white southerners during Reconstruction and used his skills in the courtroom to defend former Confederates charged with treason. John Moffett begged his father to “get up a petition forthwith and see...Nelson, have him intimate (plea) with the President.”

Moffett’s family, worried for the sanity and health of their imprisoned John, made haste to Knoxville and crafted a petition to circulate for signatures under the guidance of Nelson. Together, Moffett’s father and Thomas Nelson found eight men, eight good Union men, to speak on John Moffett’s behalf. It is noteworthy they did not seek signatures of “good Union men” in New Market, but left the county to find networked connections willing to speak in behalf to William Moffett’s son. This deferral to more professional and impersonal character witnesses suggests the Moffett name lost its influence with Union victory. It also explains why John Moffett’s family would warn him against trying to come home to New Market with an expectation of safety or success.

Once the petition was organized and signed in the first of June, 1865, William Moffett passed the document along to Nelson, who had immediate access to the President of the United States. They extolled his virtues to President Johnson, recognizing that while Moffett was “decidedly southern in his sympathies and feelings” at the beginning of the rebellion, they had always regarded him “as being of good character” and did not hesitate to request a special pardon for immediate release. As they saw it, John Moffett embodied a “most orderly and inoffensive” rebel.³¹

Here the loyalty blurs and it no longer serves any purpose to think of it as something held for the North or the South, the Union and the Confederacy, or for Rebels and Yankees. Loyalty like

³¹ Bailey, *Class and Tennessee’s Confederate Generation*, 97; JM to WM, May 30, 1865, William H. Moffett Papers; Thomas Nelson and Sam Milligan et. al to Andrew Johnson, undated (approximately the first week of June, 1865), Sallie McDowell Moffett Papers.

John Moffett expressed it, or T.A.R. Nelson, held firm to perpetuating conservative traditions and preserving the status quo. Their loyalties were a patchwork of personal connections and motivations that used self-interest as a guiding force. Moffett's loyalty had required a decisive victory for southern society. He had belonged within that sweet spot where he was afforded opportunity because of his class privilege. Many East Tennessee Confederate veterans entered Reconstruction, not only as Rebel veterans, but also as prisoners of war. Thomas A. R. Nelson served as one of the most likely sympathetic ears to Confederate prisoners of war, and his collected papers contain multiple letters from southern soldiers sitting in prison camps requesting any "effort you may feel justified in making in our behalf" and sought his "assistance to procure our release from prison at earliest convenience." These former soldiers who noted that they "fared fairly well in prison" encountered violent threats and lacked opportunities to practice new definitions of citizenry upon their return home. To alleviate concerns of loyalty or allegiance, men often wrote letters to people in positions of power like Nelson and asked for help in facilitating their release from prison camps with the promise of a firm intention to "become peaceable citizens" who recognized their place within the Union. Nelson represented an East Tennessee elite who, although residing in a decidedly Whig county, fervently opposed abolition and, therefore, seemed to align himself ideologically with the men who sought his assistance.³²

Nelson, like most East Tennesseans, abhorred Lincoln's passage of the Emancipation Proclamation and that served in the favor of those imprisoned Confederates of good class who came to him seeking favors for parole. Nelson's Unionism never translated into abolitionism. His early support of Lincoln's presidency hinged on the assumption that he would never interfere with

³² George Buchanan, et. al to T.A.R. Nelson, May 16, 1865; Chas P. Alexander, John W. Crawford, Rich W. Dickson to T.A.R. Nelson April 25, 1865, T.A.R. Nelson Papers, The Calvin M. McClung Historical Collection, Knoxville, TN; George Buchanan, Walter Rhea, John Day, S. King, Jno Buchanan, John Saunders, R.F. Powell, and George Alexander to T.A.R. Nelson, May 16, 1865, T.A.R. Nelson Papers, The Calvin M. McClung Historical Collection, Knoxville, TN.

slavery. After receiving news of pending emancipation in September, Nelson published an address in October of 1862 in which he insisted that abolition was unconstitutional and warned of a possible insurrection by slaves should Emancipation be declared. Nevertheless, Nelson maintained that “one violation of the Constitution did not justify violation on the other side,” and he insisted that secession of his home state stood as an act of treason by good men. He offered a hopeful solution wherein the good and loyal men might “overthrow the revolutionary Lincoln government” during mid-term Congressional elections and the 1864 presidential election. Nelson knew what good men looked like within the Union and within the Confederacy and they were men who understood the necessity of slavery and expressed remorse at southern treason.³³

In light of this recognition, good and loyal Union men from a southern neighboring county complied with a request to petition the highest power in the land on behalf of Moffett, the Confederate prisoner in June of 1865. They recognized his treasonous affiliation but underscored his good character as sufficient reason for pardon. Moffett’s wife, Sallie, wrote her own separate letter to President Johnson. She insisted that “altho [sic] he sympathized with the South, he never gave a vote to help bring on this wicked war, as I have heard him often condemn many acts of the Rebel government.” Here is also the only real instance of Sallie Moffett’s empowerment through war. Primarily a passive recipient to her husband and family’s desires during the war, her letter to the president shows how the Civil War politicized wives on behalf of their husbands’ interests. Historian Stephanie McCurry traces the politicizing actions of lower-class women throughout the war as a means of building power structures that defiantly struck out against one of the major tenants of Confederate ideology, reverence to the patriarchy. With Sallie Moffett’s actions, class structures of the Mountain South were also expanded, and John Moffett found his freedom hinged upon the pleas of a middle-class dependent. While a wife may have said anything to secure the release of their

³³ Alexander, *Thomas A.R. Nelson of East Tennessee*, 98-99.

husband, Sallie's reference to the limits of southern loyalty demonstrates further Moffett's wavering commitment to forces larger than his family and the men with whom he served. She made clear the parameters of his loyalty stood firmly within the context of defending honorable self-interests. The letter also represents an evolved understanding of what her husband's contribution to the war effort meant in light of a southern loss. Now that the Confederacy had admitted defeat and failure, Sallie Moffett's commitments centered on her future and her husband's freedom. Earlier conversations about southern men joining the CSA as volunteers or as conscripts diminished in significance. Confederate victory had been soundly defeated and Sallie Moffett's postwar loyalties belonged to whoever would bring her husband home.³⁴

And it was the men John Moffett served next to that had his unwavering commitment and loyalty. His letters were filled with references to his comrades: how their health fared, how their families held up, their behavior in the quiet moments of service, their valor on the battlefield, and their sufferings during imprisonment. Even when his letters were restricted in size and content, Moffett found space for referencing his friends. He inquired after men who escaped capture. He listed friends he made from other units while living in Camp Douglas. With freedom and family deprived of him, Moffett's affinity for the men in his same condition saved his sanity.

He reached out to his closest support system, southern sympathizing merchants in Baltimore who were connected through his father and father-in-law's professional network, once his release from prison was finally procured on June 12, 1865. Going home was not an immediate option. He walked into freedom at midnight and made straight for Washington DC. Once he arrived on the morning of the 13th, he took the train to Baltimore that evening. There he met with Sallie's brother Charlie and another friend. They spent their first day of freedom together, shopping in downtown

³⁴ Sallie Moffett to Andrew Johnson, June 9, 1865, Sallie McDowell Moffett Papers; Stephanie McCurry, *Confederate Reckoning: Power and Politics in the Civil War South* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2010), 141; Drew Gilpin Faust, *Mothers of Invention*, 242.

Baltimore's stores. John bought a pair of shoes, new pants, and a coat. "I look today as if for Paris," he bragged to his wife in a letter on the 17th. He described his bath, a fresh shave and haircut, and bragged how "my friends compliment me on my handsome appearance." He went on in the letter to assure his wife "I have friends. They are more than money. I have influences. Influence is power. Power is money." He would soon discover it was no longer that simple for men in his situation. Especially when he expected his future to exist in Jefferson County.³⁵

Even while still in prison, Moffett received warnings from his family and friends on the dangerous state of East Tennessee for Confederate veterans returning home. His father-in-law urged him to "give up the idea of coming home...for the present," and thought it best that John seek employment either in Baltimore or somewhere else that offered safety for the losers of war. If he attempted an immediate reunion with wife and family he faced "insults and threats of violence," not only in New Market, but throughout the Union region of a former Confederate state. His father-in-law warned that no former Confederate soldier was "free from being insulted by some ruffian...indeed there have been so many acts of violence committed on soldiers" at Knoxville and New Market. Passive anonymity or outward remorse for Confederate allegiance represented the only legitimate paths for Rebel veterans in a region fraught with conflict. Jefferson County, and New Market specifically, had spent the war under various levels of occupation by both sides. Bands of guerrilla bushwhackers terrorized occupying forces and the community that housed and supplied them. Intimidation, threats, and violence sharpened pre-war divides. Since the summer of 1864, New Market citizens who supported the Confederacy were subjected to home seizures and robbed of their stored goods, crops, and wares. So Moffett looked elsewhere. He stayed in Baltimore, against his will but surrounded by sympathetic friends and fellow veterans and sought entry into the

³⁵ Underlining for emphasis provided by primary source. JM to SM, June 17, 1865, Sallie McDowell Moffett Papers

mercantile trade. He investigated prices on wholesale manufactured goods. He examined the latest fashions arriving from Europe, making reports to his wife on how to style her ribbons and bonnets, but also because he might bring Baltimore fashion trends back to Tennessee if given the chance. He considered moving to the Pacific Northwest where a fresh start in the timber industry might be possible. He investigated southern cities where new railroad development and old railroad improvements created new markets in a devastated southern economy in sore need of access to material goods. While he kept an optimistic tone in his letters to his wife, his communications with his father, father-in-law, and friends were decidedly realistic about his prospects and East Tennessee was not one of them.³⁶

Vigilante justice enacted against Confederate veterans highlight the lack of any measurable postwar reconciliation. The retribution in the years following the war constituted what historian W. Todd Groce has called “a campaign of both private and public terrorism and vengeance” launched against former rebels. Violence constituted a “reversal of conditions” for the southern men who believed their future fortunes existed within Confederate nation. The aged men who answered the *Tennessee Civil War Veterans Questionnaire* six decades after the war ended recalled their concerns of returning to East Tennessee felt at risk because “it might not be right healthy up here in these mountains;” some pursued careers in Texas, Georgia, Virginia, Kentucky, and the middle or western portions of Tennessee. Fear of physical violence while traveling home at war’s end was valid and former soldiers recalled those who were “beaten and whipped and otherwise maltreated,” in their attempt to return to their farms and families. One Jonathan Coffey remained outside East Tennessee for a short time while he earned wages in Ohio and waited for word it was safe to travel home. Coffey discharged from service in Ohio. On his way home, he encountered a man from Tennessee

³⁶ Jasper McDowell to John Moffett, June 13, 1865, Sallie McDowell Moffett Papers; Jasper McDowell to John Moffett, June 21, 1865, Sallie McDowell Moffett Papers; JM to SM, June 24th, 1865, Sallie McDowell Moffett Papers.

who warned him of the “ill treating” surviving rebels endured in his home state. Coffey worked in Ohio for seventeen months before walking over two hundred miles home in reasonable safety. Within New Market, Unionists plundered the homes of secessionists in the summer of 1864, threatening the occupants with death. George F. Eagleton, a minister, “was threatened and whipped, and he and his family eventually fled the town.” Eagleton could not call upon friends for help, for they were also afraid of violence should they attempt to assist anyone being actively called out and harassed by Unionists hellbent on revenge for the violence and cruel practices of Confederate occupation before 1863.³⁷

Moffett was not the only Confederate warned against returning home after the war. Veteran J.P. Funk recalled a “friendly feeling” in the community before the war, but upon his return home he found it “not being a healthy place” for rebels and he went on to move to Giles County, Tennessee, south of Nashville in Middle Tennessee and home to a more like-minded community. CSA veteran Thomas Hightower insisted his home of Jefferson County before the war was a place where poor industrious men fared better than boys born into wealth. As an example, he described how “the largest slaveholder in our county took a poor boy to clerk in his store,” educated him, gave him his daughter to wed and that young man eventually became a general in the Confederate army. After the war, though, his community divided and Hightower received word that coming home would not be an option. He had served the wrong side and Jefferson County made plain its desire to rid itself of the cause of all that they had suffered. Southern sympathizers had their homes and stores looted and ransacked. “Rebs lived hard” in East Tennessee after the war and before Hightower

³⁷ W. Todd Groce, *Mountain Rebels: East Tennessee Confederates and the Civil War, 1860-1870* (Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press, 1999), 127, 128; *TCWVQ*, vol. 1, 408; *TCWVQ*, vol. 3, 1235; *TCWVQ*, vol. 2, 531; Noel Fisher has appraised the actions of Unionist in post-war East Tennessee as “systematic and ruthless.” Wartime measures that imprisoned Unionist families on charges of acting as an alien enemy, stole crops and livestock and commandeered properties or razed them in flames by order of Confederate commanders and local Confederate officials fueled resentments so that the Union side of East Tennessee’s professional class hoped to “drive the friends of the Southern cause from their homes, confiscate their real estates, and shoot them down as wild beasts.” Fisher, *War at Every Door*, 84, 159.

attempted to travel home he heard “there were hot times...after the surrender and I did not care to take any more chances with my life.” He convinced an elderly couple in Virginia to adopt him. They “fed me and clothed me and they did it well to.” He lived, married and farmed in Virginia for the next forty-three years.

John Moffett eventually made his way back to New Market, temporarily, but found no fortunes. He traveled throughout the southeastern United States. He remained in Baltimore in search of opportunity until October of 1865. From there, he traveled to Winchester, Virginia, in hopes of settling there with his young family. He told Sallie that he believed “this place will suit us...the citizens seem glad to have me locate among them.”³⁸ By April of 1866, he wrote his wife letters from Louisville, Kentucky, still in search for merchants who would work with him and listening to Confederate refugees from East Tennessee about prospects of returning home. He looked for work and followed tips from sympathetic members of the mercantile industry. Sallie’s family found life difficult in Greeneville. She told her husband, “Pa writes very gloomy of the future for himself, he feels that he is ruined an exile.”³⁹

Sallie’s family moved to Rome, Georgia in 1866, having been pushed out of Greeneville for their southern support and Sallie moved with them until John Moffett collected her and their son, Ned. On November 24th, 1866, Sallie appealed to her husband: “My father, mother, brothers and sisters are no company for me anymore. I don’t seem to need or want their society, my life has changed, it has all, everything, submerged into your existence.”⁴⁰ She grew tired of waiting. She wanted to begin her life with her husband, regardless of his professional successes or failures. Still the letters between the two of them continued, as John Moffett spent weeks and months traveling through Kentucky and Tennessee exhausting potential business connections. His dream went

³⁸ JM to SM, November 11, 1865, Sallie McDowell Moffett Papers.

³⁹ SM to JM, October 16, 1866, Sallie McDowell Moffett Papers.

⁴⁰ SM to JM, November 24th, 1866, Sallie McDowell Moffett Papers.

unrealized. Not only did his hometown reject his efforts to enter the professional class, the abolition of slavery ensured he would never know a life where he benefited from the unpaid labor that had lifted the southern merchant class before the war. The 1870 census listed his occupation as a retired dry goods merchant with no real estate to his name; by 1880 the Moffett family had relocated to Knoxville. He never made the fortunes he envisioned in the long love letters to his wife. He ended up spending the last thirty-five years of his life working as a railroad clerk at the Knoxville Depot. Sallie Moffett worked as a house-keeper and their eldest son worked as a clerk in a storefront. They lived in a middle-class neighborhood, surrounded tanners and laborers, clerks and conductors.⁴¹ Their children, of which they had eleven over the span of twenty-one years, disappeared into relative obscurity and never married. They remained together under one roof until John Moffett's death. Only one of them, Frank Moffett, ever achieved any sort of fame with an incomplete baseball coaching career at the University of Tennessee in Knoxville. As he and his siblings passed away, they joined their parents in the family plot at the Old Gray Cemetery now located under an interstate overpass in downtown Knoxville.

John Moffett died in January of 1916. In his dying days he left a written record of his final allegiances. On the back of a receipt, Moffett scribbled his thoughts about what would come to be known as "The Great War." He reckoned "the most awful and horrible crime of the 19th Century was the assassination of Abraham Lincoln by J. Wilkes Booth at Fords Theater, Washington City on the night of April 14, 1865 at 8:20 pm. The greatest crime of the 20th Century was the declaration of war by European William of Germany against Belgium and France in August of 1914." Here was a man who fought for the Confederacy as a matter of self-interest and ambition. He mourned the

⁴¹ 1870 United States Federal Census, District 7, Jefferson, Tennessee, digital image s.v. "John Thomas Moffett, *Ancestry.com*; 1880 United States Federal Census, Knoxville, Knox, Tennessee, digital image s.v. "John Thomas Moffett, *Ancestry.com*; Sallie's postwar actions highlight what Drew Gilpin Faust has called the "necessity for growing numbers of respectable women to find employment" following emancipation. Faust, *Mothers of Invention*, 251.

murder of a president who led the armies that fought against and imprisoned him. By 1914, it was clear that Moffett considered himself an American. Newspaper clippings that recognized his faithful service to the railroad referred to him as a veteran without ever clarifying the side he served. Moffett was proud of the military service but did not advertise his youthful allegiance to the Confederacy.

Even more significant, though, Moffett's words on the Great War represent a combat veteran asserting that the largest crime of the twentieth century was the declaration of another war where lives would be lost and ruined, where disturbing and persisting memories would be created, and where POWs would suffer. This is an evolution of thought that illustrates Moffett's internalization of fighting on the losing side of war. He recognized the suffering that would take place and the lasting consequences of service. Moffett lived in a time and space where an act of loyalty was required. He weighed his prospects and his goals for the future and, for him and his new family, he determined that the future seemed a brighter place in a nation that recognized the supremacy of his race and the protection of his right to own property that included chattel slaves. Making that decision held long lasting consequences and when the Confederacy fell, so too did his aspirations of entering the merchant class. Even in his whitened hometown of New Market, Moffett acted out of a motivating force of maintaining his options for the future and those options required the preservation of white supremacy. As a supply sergeant for a Confederate unit, his belief in the southern cause waivered. After Shiloh and during Vicksburg, he questioned his superiors and lamented gratuitous violence. In prison he pushed a narrative of optimism to his wife back home who was rearing a son he had not yet met. Still, he used his position in the military to build relationships with other men who might, one day, help him achieve his professional goals. He created a network of other ambitious men. He maintained contact with the families of friends and encouraged his family to keep his name on their lips so that when he returned home he might enjoy

the fruits of his service and labor. His loyalty had been born of ambition and he chose the wrong side.

Choosing a side that meets one's own personal and financial interests is an act of faith and self-preservation. It would be derivative to suggest that Moffett and his family's postwar experience manifested out of nothing more than dedication to their prospects. Worldview and an understanding of where one fits into the American narrative also informs loyalties. Beyond a loyalty born of ambition and the future, loyalty might also reveal itself as a commitment to the past. Interpretations of the past, though, can alter with time and so while the Moffetts are instructive in lessons about ambition, the divided loyalties of the Fain family illustrate the power of history and rhetoric.

CHAPTER 3

DIVIDED LOYALTIES: THE FAIN FAMILY AND HISTORICAL LITERACY

In New Market and Jefferson County, John Moffett identified with a community that held expectations about the future that could ill afford the expanded avenues of privilege. His future, as he and his family saw it, depended upon the maintenance of the southern social order and his class ascension required recognition of white supremacy and building networks of people who possessed the same loyalty. At the same time another family saw distant relatives refer to historical literacy in their declarations of loyalty. For them, it was informed by their understanding of history. That historical framework could develop imagined communities with rhetoric that altered one's understanding of how the past informed the present. For two members of the Fain family, thoughts on secession, civil war, slavery and abolition all distilled down to how the Virginia slave-holder and first president of the United States approached his own life and politics.

During his own lifetime, George Washington's successes transformed him into an apocryphal legend. In the decades after his death, Washington's example of selfless service to a young nation inspired Americans to do better and be better citizens. He personified a noble cause as a revolutionary. He defined strength as the founding father of a perpetual union. The truth of George Washington's opinions, his humanity, and his physical and ideological legacies became less instructive. He became whatever was needed of him. The revolutionary excused actions that could be considered treasonous. On the other hand, the first president of a democracy and a lasting union inspired a citizenry to pick up arms and fight against rebellion. Both of these ideas contributed to his birthday becoming a holiday in the infant nation. Fabled stories about the "Cincinnatus of the West," appeared in newspapers and magazines throughout the continent and beyond. Historian

Emory Thomas's exploration of the southern Civil War experience argued that in the years building towards secession, "Southern politicians had raised the doctrine of states' rights to the level of an article of faith." Thomas's examples of Alexander H. Stephens and Jefferson Davis traced their intellectual origins to Thomas Jefferson. The Fains, however, informed their world and their loyalties according to their understanding of George Washington. He was either a revolutionary guide or the creator of a lasting union. The rhetoric used to shape ideology also shaped the communities who embraced the differing historical narratives that suited their ultimate goals.¹

To many Americans in subsequent generations, George Washington's *actual* thoughts about slavery and the parameters for rebellion did not matter. Washington's worshippers, however, used his example to defend their loyalties to the Union or the Confederacy. When he transformed into their intellectual godhead, powerful rhetoric in crafted historical narratives provided guidance to those faced with secession. The generational buildup of carefully crafted historical accounts could compel men and women in the same family to pledge loyalty to opposite sides of the same war.

When sectional divisions developed in the mid-nineteenth century in East Tennessee, the American Revolution as a moment that ushered in an unbreakable nation *and* the idea of resisting authority due to perceived exploitation became justifiable. Its topography and elevation were unsuited to large plantations, ensuring that the debate over slavery and secession stood on already uncertain ground. As communities split over these issues throughout the Mountain South, identity played a key role in determining loyalties. Learned histories of the American Revolutionary era allowed East Tennesseans to defend or attack secession based on historical perspective. For East

¹ In the preface of Emory Thomas's 1991 reprint of his 1971 *The Confederacy as a Revolutionary Experience*, Thomas offers an expanded bibliographic essay on how his approach towards southern history has evolved over the 20 years between the first and second printing of this work and offers an impressive reading list for students and scholars to consult in addition to his own work. The book grew out of graduate seminars on Civil War and Reconstruction and the essays are broad in scope and syntheses of conversations informed by current historiographies. Thomas explored southern ideologies in his Civil War studies and treated conflict as a war of ideas as much as a war of gunfire, canon or disease. His Civil War was an intellectual history. Emory Thomas, *The Confederacy As a Revolutionary Experience* 2nd Edition (Columbia: USC Press, 1991), 3.

Tennesseans who had experienced finding their needs and wants often ignored in favor of Middle and West Tennessee demands at the state level, looking back at the past was a natural move for a population that felt left behind.² Whichever narrative each man and woman internalized informed their worldview. Historical literacy held consequences when it informed political frameworks. The political zeitgeist fueled the secession crisis with rhetorical power throughout the antebellum South's dance with rebellion. Fire-eaters and secessionists crafted words deliberately to sell ideas of revolution to a white southern citizenry. By the 1830s, George Washington's birthday had been transformed into an informal, but national, holiday. Newspapers throughout the South spoke of parades hosted by "Volunteer Corps and Charitable Organizations" that promoted "the usual demonstrations of respect for the memory and services of that illustrious Patriot." Let no one mistake the devotion to George Washington in southern cities, for their observances proved "sufficiently evident that the 22nd of February did not pass unhonored."³

In 1840, the *Charleston Courier* published an opinion piece titled "Revolutionary Reminiscences: Tale of Truth." The author relayed a story about a young and forthright general who sought shelter from strangers on a rainy night during the Revolutionary War. The anonymous young man appeared "above the common rank" of men, possessing a "military air about him." By the time the stranger revealed his identity to the gracious couple who provided safe harbor in a storm, George Washington had already demonstrated his honor and "purpose of transmitting to posterity the treasures we now enjoy." The treasures were not defined, which allowed for contemporary interpretation. The article ended with a message: "Let us acknowledge the benefits received, by our

² Historian Tom Lee has highlighted this when he pointed out that by 1815, East Tennessee had only retained the capacity to shape state policies but did not possess the strength to use state government to advance interests focused on dismantling the obstacles they encountered in their economic development. Tom Lee, "The Lost Cause That Wasn't: East Tennessee and the Myth of Unionist Appalachia" in *Reconstructing Appalachia: The Civil War's Aftermath* edited by Andrew L. Slap (Lexington: University Press of Kentucky, 2010), 297.

³ "Washington's Birthday," *Charleston (SC) Courier*, February 24, 1830.

endeavors to preserve therein in their purity." Should the course be altered or the original intent lost, the purity must be preserved, by force if necessary. This sort of rhetoric, over the course of decades, taught a white southern population to honor rebellion in the name of defending their way of life. They could look to George Washington for confirmation that their reasons for wanting to start a new nation were legitimate.⁴

In East Tennessee, local newspapers did not wait for national holidays or benchmark anniversaries of Washington's life and achievements to extoll his virtues. An 1850 *Athens Post* front-page article on Washington's family ancestry traced the lineage of "our Cincinnatus of the West" revealing aristocratic blood that tied the founding to the English throne. Washington, the *Post* reminded its readers, did not require a pedigree of blue blood to ensure his place in history; he proved himself worthy as "the son of his own actions." Still, the language of the article attached to him a convenient truth: his familial connections and historical ties to his country were not enough to prevent his leading a revolt against tyranny. In 1853, the *Loudon Free Press* described Washington in a Revolutionary history as an "American Chief" that left the red coats "routed, defeated, crushed." Washington's legacy, on this view, endorsed rebellion and offered a precedent of success.⁵

The Fain family, descended from Nicholas the "emigrant," had options when it came to interpreting their history. Nicholas Fain, born in Ireland in 1730, immigrated to Chester County, Pennsylvania, with his wife, Elizabeth Taylor, in the early 1750s, and eventually settled in what is now Washington County, Tennessee in the 1770s. The Fains possessed a "remarkable military record," Nicholas holding the unusual distinction of having fought with the Patriots at King's

⁴ *Charleston (SC) Courier*, July 10, 1840.

⁵ *Athens (TN) Post*, November 22, 1850; *Loudon (TN) Free Press*, December 2, 1853.

Mountain with five of his sons and his only son-in-law. Fain and all seven of his sons ultimately served the fledgling nation during the Revolution.⁶

Family connections to the Battle of King's Mountain were a particular point of pride in a region that celebrated that battle so enthusiastically. In his 1899 history, *East Tennessee and the Civil War*, East Tennessee Unionist, attorney, and industrialist, Oliver P. Temple described the expedition as “unlike any other important military movement of the Revolution,” because “it had its origin and its execution entirely with volunteers” with no orders from a state or continental authority. “It grew out of the voluntary uprising of patriotic people in defense of their liberties.” Temple ended his chapter by acknowledging the descendants of the participants. These early families exerted “great influence” on society and “marked traits of character, such as courage, determination, eloquence, honor, stateliness and majesty of person, marvelous willpower, and the faculty to fascinate and lead—these, or some of these, are constantly appearing in the descendants of these old families.” Historian Tom Lee argues that the East Tennessean commitment to the Union was informed by a historical narrative of heroism and victimization borne at King's Mountain. This interpretation of history fueled discussions of Appalachian exceptionalism, but it also speaks to the power of historical literacy in inspiring loyalty to a cause.⁷

John Fain, son of Nicholas, a seasoned combat veteran who had participated in the Battle of Point Pleasant as a part of the Virginia militia in October 1774, arrived at King's Mountain in October 1780 to join his comrades and family in the fight for independence. As a marker for the focus and use of history to shape contemporary ideology, the Battle of King's Mountain presents its

⁶ Augusta Bradford, *Fain of Tennessee: Descendants of Nicholas Fain* (Chattanooga, TN: Lookout Publishing Company, 1930), 7; “A Statement of the Proceedings of the Western Army; Letter to General Gates,” *Tennesseans in the Revolutionary War*, www.tngenweb.org/revwar/kingsmountain/formal.html.

⁷ Oliver P. Temple, *East Tennessee and the Civil War* (Cincinnati: Robert Clarke Company, 1899), 19, 38; Tom Lee, “The Lost Cause That Wasn't: East Tennessee and the Myth of Unionist Appalachia” in *Reconstructing Appalachia: The Civil War's Aftermath* edited by Andrew L. Slap (Lexington: University Press of Kentucky, 2010), 295.

own fascinating development as a tool for instruction. Historian Michael Lynch has examined the phenomenon of how this specific battle that took place in South Carolina's Appalachian corner transformed into a regional history while other Revolutionary battles took on national importance. Lynch argues that East Tennesseans often used Kings Mountain to remind "indifferent Americans" that they owed the Appalachian white forebears a "debt of gratitude" for American victory over the British. In East Tennessee, secession shaped the southern view of Kings Mountain and "it was loyalty, rather than secessionism, that writers emphasized." The Unionist appropriation of King's Mountain as a demonstration of commitment to the United States illustrated the levels of interpretation at play and how historical literacy influenced the decision to support one side or the other.

A year after John Fain's patriot victory at King's Mountain, he married Nancy McMahon. Between 1782 and 1788, the Fains had four children in their home in Rogersville, Hawkins County. In the spring and summer of 1788, military forces ignored a Cherokee land treaty that had been in place since 1780 and the Native Americans inhabitants of an ancient Mississippian town in the Appalachian Mountains, Citico, aggressively defended their land. White settlers in the area requested more military aid for Citico, seeking federal approval of their invasion of a protected Cherokee town. Although Citico sat 150 miles south of Rogersville, on August 8, 1788, John Fain set out with a team of scouts to gather intelligence and, along the way, entered an apple orchard, "where carelessly they began to gather the fruit." The Cherokee were lying in wait. Fain and his men were surrounded, driven into the nearby Tennessee River, and sixteen of the twenty-one men were killed,

including John Fain.⁸ The youngest of his children never knew his father because John Fain died the year he was born.⁹

A later generation of Fains confronted a different type of revolution. The descendants of John Fain's sons lived through the American Civil War. These men faced difficult decisions about which side deserved their loyalties. Hiram Fain and John Fain Anderson were second cousins; the former lived in Hawkins County and the latter lived in Sullivan County. They did not know each other, but they both held strong convictions about their place in history. They chose different sides but both of them demonstrated a level of historical literacy that shaped their decisions. Their loyalties were defined by their understanding of Revolutionary history that offers a lens on how identity and historical perspective informed allegiances to either the Union or the Confederacy. The Fain family famously fought for both the Federal Union and the Confederate States. On both sides, the Revolution and subsequent formation of a lasting union were venerated and used to defend their respective loyalties.¹⁰

The community with which Hiram Fain identified developed during what historian George B. Forgie has called the "post-heroic generation." As years stretched out past the War for Independence, the actions of and precedents established by George Washington, and the crafting of

⁸ The massacre at Citico resulted in more military intervention. Captain Nathaniel Evans led a militia into the region where they discovered the disemboweled remains of John Fain's men. Evans and John Sevier ultimately forced the Cherokee responsible for the massacre out of the area and Citico remained a small village for Cherokee until their forced removal west in 1838. J. G. M. Ramsey, *The Annals of Tennessee to the End of the Eighteenth Century* (Knoxville: East Tennessee Historical Society Over Mountain Press, 1999), 421-22.

⁹ Michael Lynch, "Creating Regional Heroes: Traditional Interpretations of the Battle of King's Mountain," *Tennessee Historical Quarterly* 68, no. 3 (Fall 2009), 232.

¹⁰ The Fains are highlighted in Daniel W. Stowell's "A Family of Women and Children: The Fains of East Tennessee during Wartime," in *Southern Families at War*, edited by Catherine Clinton (New York: Oxford University, 2000), 155-73, and the University of Tennessee Press published *Sanctified Trial*, the diary of Eliza Rhea Anderson Fain in 2004. The Fain family women also offered substantive source material for Jennifer Brickey's "The Diary of Fannie Fain of Blountville: Defining Allegiance in Civil War Era East Tennessee" (honor's thesis, College of William and Mary, 2006). Earlier works like Goodspeed's *History of East Tennessee* (Nashville, TN: Goodspeed, 1887) dedicate multiple pages to the progeny of Nicholas Fain. Augusta Bradford's work is repeated without citation in many genealogy projects online. Hiram Fain's diary and the scrapbooks of John Fain Anderson, however, seem to have escaped critical scrutiny up to this point. The *Journal of East Tennessee History* printed excerpts from Hiram Fain's diary in their January 1997 publication, vol. 69.

a constitution and union, memory and agenda altered reality. Those born in the early nineteenth century were the recipients of an education where politics transformed the historical narrative. In other words, men like Hiram Fain became part of a discrete community that established dogma about intent. Hiram Fain identified with an ideology that reflected his historical literacy. This chapter captures him in the middle of a moment in American history when men like himself found themselves acting out their loyalties for forces larger than themselves. In East Tennessee, loyalty was an action and it held physical consequences. He lived in an unforgiving borderland where emotions ran high and loyalty to a cause later determined access to postwar opportunity. Forgie has suggested that those who were born after America's establishment deliberated on all important political, moral, and personal matters by referring to what the founders might have done or believed.¹¹

East Tennesseans experienced Civil War and Reconstruction in a way that required outward commitment to imagined communities. In the communities with which Hiram Fain and John Fain Anderson identified, loyalty fell on a spectrum. Historical literacy informed how one might decide to support or condemn the South's attempt at secession. It influenced people's daily decisions and interactions, their understanding of history, and their role within it.¹² These two descendants of the same Revolutionary War veteran looked to the first father of their country for direction. Complex histories merged with and informed political and moral beliefs. Benedict Anderson asserts that communities are conceived as a "deep, horizontal comradeship" regardless of demonstrable economic disparities, which certainly existed between the wealthier slaveholding pro-Confederates and poorer upland Unionists in East Tennessee.¹³ Even if the Fains did not know all the other

¹¹ George B. Forgie, *Patricide in the House Divided: A Psychological Interpretation of Lincoln and His Age* (New York: Norton, 1979), 8.

¹² David M. Potter, "The Historian's Use of Nationalism and Vice Versa," *American Historical Review* 67, no. 4 (1962): 925.

¹³ Benedict Anderson, *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism* (London: Verso, 1983), 6-7.

members of the communities with which they identified, they still certainly believed they were part of a national movement with immense consequences. If nothing else, history taught them that. While the Fains' experience in East Tennessee does fit easily within prevailing tropes of Appalachian exceptionalism, it also demonstrates how effective history can be in determining allegiances. How these two related men, Hiram and John, understood their history directly influenced their identity and their loyalties during both the war and Reconstruction.

Hiram Fain concerned himself, primarily, with the weather. A deliberate man, the pages of his diary plodded along with the steadfastness of an overworked mule. He wielded his pen as if it were any other tool, without romance or sentimentality. With proverbial blinders on, in January 1851, the forty-four-year-old Appalachian remarked, "A white heavy frost this morning, ice." The very next entry was similar: "Last night quite cold, a heavy frost this morning." For Fain, as for any farmer in the Appalachian foothills of Hawkins County, Tennessee, frost held the very real threat of financial hardship. He filled his diary with rainfall estimates and updates on his crops. Even in favorable weather, Hiram Fain kept a record of farming conditions. Sitting in the two-story, brick Federal-style home on the land he had inherited from his father, he could glance outside the window of his study and see the mountains. Behind his house, called Springvale, lay the acreage he plowed, and beyond those acres, just a few miles south, flowed the Holston River. The river and the railroad aided his financial interests. Beyond farming, Fain occasionally engaged in the slave trade in local markets with periodic trips to Charleston and Atlanta. In 1854, his community elected him cashier of the local bank, a position that supplemented his farming income and established his position in the social order of Rogersville, the seat of Hawkins County. He recorded these activities as well in

his diary. Pen and paper served a sensible purpose of cataloging the sort of diligence successful farming required.¹⁴

He made an exception in February. February 22, 1862, "This is the birthday of the great and good Washington," February 22, 1863, "This is the birthday of that greatest of all mortals—George Washington," February 22, 1869, "This is the birthday of the great good and patriotic George Washington." That date always stood out and elicited reflection, as that was the month George Washington was born in 1732. His birthday merited acknowledgment. For Hiram Fain, the land and George Washington were the warp and woof of his life. Revolutionary men laid the foundation of American government; they defined what it meant to be a citizen of a nation forged in combat and resistant to tyranny. Fain identified with the frontier revolutionaries who had supported rebellion against England. His grandfather, John Fain, had fought heroically as a patriot at the Battle of King's Mountain. Hiram belonged to the same "post-heroic" generation as Jefferson Davis; both men born within a year of each other, 1807 and 1808 respectively. They were united in being "born too late to experience the Revolution, but in time to be raised by the generation that had fought it." Such personal ties to the Revolutionary generation informed how they thought about themselves and their identity. They were both old enough to let younger men fight for them and support the Confederacy in ways other than militarily. Fain and Davis belonged to a community of shared ideologies; they did not know each other but they both held similar levels of historical literacy. They both interpreted their past based on a curated narrative. Both were men who read the documents penned by founding fathers like religious texts, reciting chapter and verse to validate their beliefs.¹⁵

¹⁴ Hiram Fain diary, January 1 and 14, 1851, April 11, 1851, March 2, 1854, Archives of Appalachia, East Tennessee State University, Johnson City, Tennessee (hereafter AA); John N. Fain, "The Diary of Hiram Fain of Rogersville: An East Tennessee Secessionist," *Journal of East Tennessee History* 69 (1997), 97.

¹⁵ Hiram Fain Diary, February 22, 1862, February 22, 1863, February 22, 1869, AA; Forgie, *Patricide in the House Divided*, 7.

Hiram Fain was the oldest of six brothers and sisters. All of them were born and raised in Rogersville, Hawkins County. Most were educated at prestigious universities and inheritors of hundreds of acres of family property. The siblings remained close to each other throughout their lives. They lived and died in Hawkins County, all living close to one another throughout secession, war, and Reconstruction. In 1851, Hiram Fain had his share of the family land appraised after the death of his father; 619 acres was valued at \$5,700. The year prior he reported to the census that he owned three enslaved: a fifty-year-old black woman, a twenty-seven-year-old black man, and a fifteen-year-old mulatto girl. These advantages gave him the means to become prosperous and he reaped the rewards involved in profiting off unpaid labor. In a historically austere region of the South where plantations filled with cotton crops were never a possibility, Hiram Fain lived comfortably on a smaller scale. Hawkins County wealth paled in comparison to wealth produced out of the Mississippi Delta, but Fain was a successful landowner. Fain's social and economic status may have been taken less seriously in the Lower South's cotton empire, but in the Mountain South, Fain's successes and prospects aligned him with men like Jefferson Davis.¹⁶

Hiram married Sarah Petty on April 5, 1842. Sarah gave birth to their first son in January of 1843. He died one month later. Ernest, Lucie, Nicholas, Ida, Sallie, Cornelia and Thomas Fain were all born to Hiram and Sarah between 1844 and 1861. The eldest living son, Ernest Fain, joined his Uncle Richard's Confederate regiment of local defense troops during the war. Richard Fain, Hiram's brother, commanded the 63rd Infantry Regiment, organized in July of 1862. Men joined this regiment from Claiborne, Roane, Washington, Knox, Hawkins, and Sullivan counties and the unit fought in regional battles including Chickamauga and the Knoxville Campaign. In the spring of

¹⁶ Hiram's brother Richard Gannon Fain attended West Point Military Academy, and some of Hiram's sisters attended all-female academies throughout East Tennessee. There is no evidence that Hiram was formally educated, but his nuclear family was more educated and possessed more networked wealth than the typical Hawkins County family (Anderson, *Imagined Communities*, 204).

1864, the regiment joined the Army of Northern Virginia and participated in the long Petersburg siege. The men in that regiment were in Appomattox when Lee surrendered.¹⁷

The 1860 census reveals a county with a white population dominating the social and cultural traditions. There were eleven Indians counted in Hawkins County that year. Of the roughly 2,000 black people counted, under two hundred of them were free. Hawkins County voters split almost evenly in the election of 1860. Democrat John C. Breckinridge earned 50 percent and Constitutional Unionist John Bell earned 46 percent of the total vote. In February 1861, the county voted against secession. Four months later, 62 percent of voters disapproved of Tennessee's secession again.¹⁸ The county population remained deeply divided on the eve of the Civil War with the mountain inhabitants favoring the Union position and the foothill farmland populations comprising what some have called "reluctant Confederates." A decidedly middle-class clan of educated merchants and slaveholding farmers, the Fain family "stood out as zealous Confederates" within their home county. Hiram Fain did not share the same historical context with over half of his physical and immediate community. His loyalty divided him from Unionists living nearby and his world grew smaller. His privileges were already being eroded under occupation and public scrutiny of his loyalties.¹⁹

Although Washington owned 317 slaves when he died in 1799, his attitudes had evolved, and by the end of his life he had privately concluded participating in the slave system constituted a moral failure. That did not stop him from rotating slaves from Mount Vernon through the Pennsylvania capital during his presidency. Before the Executive Mansion existed in the marshes on the Potomac, Philadelphia served as the nation's capital. Washington brought a cadre of enslaved

¹⁷ National Park Service, *U.S. Civil War Soldiers, 1861-1865* database. https://www.ancestry.com/mediaui-viewer/collection/1030/tree/3562163/person/270093108891/media/cf573b12-5eb3-4d03-a6ba-3fd5cb868831?_phsrc=TDF2&usePUBJs=true Accessed August 15, 2019.

¹⁸ 1860 United States Federal Census, "State of Tennessee, Table No. 1—Population by Age and Sex," 456-65; Noel Fisher, *War at Every Door: Partisan Politics and Guerrilla Violence in East Tennessee, 1860-1869* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1997), Appendix C, "Vote on Secession in Tennessee, June 1861," 188.

¹⁹ Stowell, "A Family of Women and Children," 156.

people from Mount Vernon to staff his new abode, but Pennsylvania had strict laws about slavery and an enslaved person could petition for emancipation if they remained in the state longer than six months. Washington's cadre rotated between Virginia and Pennsylvania every five months. He failed to promote a domestic policy of abolition. As president, Washington set the tone of the executive office and established precedents for subsequent generations.²⁰ As a founding father and slave owner, Washington helped instill racism into the nation's infrastructure and guiding principles. Hiram never revealed if he was aware of this aspect of George Washington. It might not have mattered to him.

What did matter to Fain was the George Washington he imagined, the one who came with powerful language that invited rebellion. In 1856, Hiram wrote how "those patriots that signed the declaration (of independence) have all passed away and are now in their graves leaving to their descendants the best government in the world." But Hiram feared that "wickedness of bigotry and fanaticism" elicited by northern politicians and abolitionists were destroying what the Founding Fathers had created. Fain lost and found himself in the Confederate fray that inspired so many men and women to defend their homes and property from invading enemy forces.²¹

He identified with residents of the Mountain South who learned apocryphal tales of George Washington's life. Fain joined this imagined community, leaving behind any memory-based identity that defined older Fain generations. He shared his attachment to Washington with his brother, Richard, and his wife, Eliza. They lived on a neighboring farm in Rogersville and shared a property line. Eliza and her husband felt strongly about the founding father, too. On February 22, 1861, Eliza Fain rejoiced, "The sun has risen brightly upon our distracted country, ushering in the 129th

²⁰ James P. Pfiffner, "George Washington's Character and Slavery," *White House Studies* 1, no. 4 (2001): 457; Erica Armstrong Dunbar, *Never Caught: The Washingtons' Relentless Pursuit of Their Runaway Slave, Ona Judge* (New York: Atria Books, 2017), xvi.

²¹ Hiram Fain Diary, July 4, 1856, AA.

anniversary of our illustrious Washington. . . . His name has been transmitted to posterity so familiarly. . . . It may be said of him more than any human being; he lives always in our midst." Just days before Jefferson Davis's first inauguration as president of the Confederate States of America on February 18, 1861, Eliza Fain recalled in her diary her version of American history. In it she likened Confederate men to Washington because they desired "that we be a free people; that each section of our country might enjoy undisturbed her peculiar institutions; that each should have an equal right in all things pertaining to our form of government and that we would love each other." A southern plantation owner and slaveholder who resisted colonization by a socially rigid monarchy that endorsed impenetrable hierarchies, Washington provided all the justification needed for southern secession as the means to champion social mobility. It went unsaid, but understood, that social mobility required the preservation of slavery. A southern white son could model his social and political aspirations on a man who led a successful rebellion.²²

Hiram Fain agreed with his sister-in-law. In January 1861, he took some time to reflect in his diary on southern secession and the future of the nation Washington helped craft. He expressed grief that "this mighty nation of ours, second to none while united, is now dissolved by that hydra-headed monster fanaticism," by which he meant the growing opposition to slavery in the free states. The "black Republican President" wielded a power deemed dangerous in the hands of tyrants, and Fain prayed for God to "save our country from awful calamity." Three days later, he suggested that the American Revolution provided a lesson in how to respond to tyrannical power that sought to destroy "our great American Republic." Secession provided a way to "unloose the shackles that have been put upon the people by tyrants," "the people" here, of course, being white southern slaveholders like himself and his family. One year later, in February of 1862, Hiram Fain noted,

²² Eliza Rhea Anderson Fain and John H. Fain, *Sanctified Trial: The Diary of Eliza Rhea Anderson Fain, a Confederate Woman in East Tennessee* (Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press, 2004), 5.

"This is the birthday of the great and good Washington it is also the day set apart for the inauguration of the President--Jefferson Davis of Mississippi having been unanimously elected he entered upon the duties of his office for six years." In one sentence, Fain tied the first president of the United States to the second inaugural of an unsanctioned office created by the openly rebellious southern states. His understanding of history shaped his worldview.²³

Jefferson Davis chose George Washington's birthday as the date for his second inauguration in 1862, honoring the founding father "most identified with the establishment of American independence." Davis stated that under his presidency, he hoped to "perpetuate the principles of our revolutionary fathers," and Washington's birthday, his memory, "and the purpose seem fitly associated" for the occasion. The Confederacy would be a new and southern form of revolutionary design. Davis recalled how the Revolutionary generation's demand for a representational government bestowed on future generations an obligation to keep the legislative process fair. Tyranny under an unbridled majority demanded action from the southern sons of revolution. Davis recognized the "inheritance bequeathed to us by the patriots of the Revolution" and argued that the Confederacy had to "emulate that heroic devotion" demonstrated by men like George Washington.²⁴

Hiram Fain declared his allegiance to his home state's decision to secede as a devout Confederate sympathizer. He did so privately, in his diary, but publicly, too, in his continued answer to local calls for help whenever Rogersville suffered under occupation or guerrilla violence. He routinely joined other local Confederate supporters in make-shift home guards. He described it as defending his land or strategic transportation routes from Union attempts to commandeer materials or blow up bridges.²⁵ His loyalty to the southern cause derived from a historical narrative that encouraged revolution. Washington's likely approval of southern rebellion was indisputable as far as

²³ Hiram Fain diary, January 1 and 4, 1861, February 22, 1862, AA.

²⁴ Jefferson Davis, second inaugural address," February 22, 1862, Richmond, Virginia.

²⁵ Hiram Fain diary, November 1862, November 1863, AA.

Fain was concerned. Fain's attachment to the land and his identity as a prosperous southern slaveholder led him to revere Washington as an icon of special significance for Confederate citizens. He went so far as to refer to Union politicians and their supporters as "English aristocracy" and to describe the shift in power to Republican northerners as akin to enslavement of white southerners. Predicting that war might be inevitable, in January of 1861 Hiram prayed that from the "present gloomy prospect you (God) may build up a more enlightened and Christian people in this our loved republic which shall by its influence on the nations of earth unloose the shackles that have been put upon the people by tyrants." The tyrants he referred to were abolitionists, Black Republicans, Yankee elitists, and anyone else who dared challenge the southern slave system and status quo.²⁶

White supremacy played a role in Hiram Fain's hero worship of George Washington, whom he hailed as "that greatest of all mortals." He referred to the Union troops passing through his region as the "Abolition Army." By February 1863, he swore that had Washington lived to see the day, he would have been "surprised and mortified" to witness "government making war on the other for the purpose of enslaving the white race to free the Negroes." Washington defined his government with southern characteristics that included mastery. Unionists were "Barbarians." Insults and injuries suffered by occupying "Yankees" led to recollections of the sympathetic Washington, who never would have stood for a "cruel and uncivilized" war as practiced by northern forces.²⁷

Fain followed the war through the newspapers, through letters from enlisted family members, and through town gossip and eyewitness accounts. Union forces and Confederate troops or home guards were constantly harassing each other and engaging in skirmishes throughout Hawkins County. Union soldiers attempted numerous bridge burnings throughout the immediate

²⁶ Hiram Fain diary, January 4, 1861, AA.

²⁷ Hiram Fain diary, February 22, 1863, AA.

region, some successful and many foiled by local residents. Fain commented on local events as they happened, but he also followed the war beyond the county lines. Whenever he referenced a particularly large battle, he used terms like "bloody fields" and remarked on how Confederates pushed Union forces back "with great slaughter." Though Washington did not take up many lines in Fain's diary prior to secession, the outbreak of civil war quickly transformed Hiram into a patriot, and the slaveholding revolutionary became his muse.²⁸

Hiram Fain rejected what historian Thomas Bender has called "a political impulse" toward a pure and homogenous community where national concerns trumped "personal local political units." As the nineteenth century progressed, the southern and northern historical narratives demonstrated a sharp divide in political ideology. In the South, men like Hiram Fain opted into a community in which both economic interest and his status as an educated member of the slaveholding class guided his actions. Fain's fervent support of the Confederacy represented his identification with a broader community more than with those living in his immediate proximity. Men like Jefferson Davis offered Fain the chance to participate in what Bender has called "new bonds of community" that reached beyond the Hawkins County lines and extended into southern regions more ardent in their desire to maintain the slave system.²⁹

Throughout the Civil War, Hiram Fain cursed the Union forces. He prayed for his "Southern soil" to be cleansed of northern barbarians who "pollute our soil or molest our homes." They were savages who "treated the pople [*sic*] very badly making a cruel and uncivilized war such as a civilized nation would not wage."³⁰ The Battle of Rogersville, which took place in Hiram's backyard on November 6, 1863, only strengthened his convictions. Hiram's diary details his

²⁸ Hiram Fain Diary, November 2, 1863, AA.

²⁹ Thomas Bender, *Community and Social Change in America* (New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 1978), 84, 71, 95.

³⁰ Hiram Fain diary, July 2, 1862, November 2, 1863, AA.

movements in the weeks building up to the battle. In an entry dated September-November of 1863, Fain describes moving through surrounding counties, spending days or weeks with fellow Confederates in nearby towns of Bristol and Blountville. He met with Confederate military leaders. He travelled with other members of the home guard. It was in Bristol that Fain learned of his fourteen-year-old son's death. Diphtheria had hit the Springvale home. His son Nicholas died first, on October 30th and his six-year-old daughter, Cornelia, died on November 15th. He lost two children in the span of two weeks while he was away serving Confederate interests. During his absence from Rogersville, a brigade of Yankee soldiers camped on his land, took his grain and his cattle, and burned much of his equipment.³¹ He placed all of his anger and despair in the blame directed at Yankee forces. They had "marauded all over" his country, "destroying the property of Southern men." He railed against Union forces in his county who "put a great many Southern men in jail and otherwise treated the people very badly making a cruel and uncivilized war such as a civilized nation could not wage." In the weeks after the Battle of Rogersville, a Confederate victory in a hard-fought contest to take back Rogersville residents supplies and the town's railroad storehouses, he lost a third child, his two-year-old son Thomas Cross, to diphtheria. The destruction of property, the occupation of hostile enemy forces, and the death of three children in such short order broke Fain. He penned his account in a rhetorical style that stressed how the American Civil War represented a fight between barbarians and the civilized South.

Hiram Fain leaned on nearby family, though, and when he visited his brother for dinner one night in February of 1864, his sister-in-law, Eliza Fain, wrote in her diary that she loved "so much to

³¹ At the age of 14, son Nicholas Fain died on October 30, 1863, in his bed at the Springvale home, after a brief but fierce bout with diphtheria. Hiram noted "He was in his right mind to the very last moments of his existence, and expressed a perfect willingness to die" and welcomed the idea of "no more sickness, pain or trouble...no more wars." Cornelia Fain, Hiram's six-year-old daughter, died of diphtheria on November 15th, 1863. Hiram's youngest child, "a noble boy" and "the pet of all" Thomas Cross Fain, died on December 10th, 1863. He was two years old. Hiram Fain diary, "Deaths," AA.

see brothers love each other.” Seven months later, Eliza’s husband, Richard, and Brother Hiram spent more night hours awake and patrolling for “yanks” and bushwhackers, than they did getting rest and Eliza mourned “what days of trial we are now having; our dear friends cannot come home and have one pleasant hour.”³²

Fain found his fortunes and prospects depleted as the Civil War ended, his land destroyed and the rails that connected him to the marketplace burned. He accepted work in the spring of 1865 as a clerk in a cousin’s cotton-thread mill. His cousin, and now boss, Sam N. Fain helped scrounge up the \$4 for railroad fare Hiram’s trip to Knoxville, where he signed the oath of allegiance on July 3, 1865. In the oath, he promised to “faithfully support and defend the constitution of the United States.” More pointedly, though, Fain swore in the oath to “support all Laws and Proclamations which have been made during the existing rebellion with reference to the emancipation of slavery.” In the months that followed, through October of 1865, Hiram’s work as a clerk kept him on the road, traveling to markets and merchants throughout northeastern Tennessee. By November, he rented out his farm and property to a local tenant and packed up his household goods. He and his surviving family moved to Memphis on a train “crowded with passengers moving away from violence and oppression” in East Tennessee. He had been charged by local officials that same month for crimes benefitting the “cause of the south.”³³

The move was meant to be temporary as Fain sought ways to recoup his lost wealth. By April of 1867, “after much disappointment and entire failure in my efforts to procure employment and finding those that promised most assistance did nothing to aid me I concluded to return home” from Memphis to Rogersville. As soon as he arrived, he discovered that the man who had rented the

³² Eliza Fain, *Sanctified Trial*, 151, 237.

³³ Hiram Fain diary, November 1, 1865, AA; In November of 1865, Hiram Fain was ordered to report to the federal courthouse in Knoxville, having been indicted on charges “to the cause of the south.” Hiram Fain diary, November 28, 1865, AA.

Springvale farm in Hiram's absence had done little to improve the land or the home. "Instead of finding my place improved as I expected, I found it more dilapidated than when I left," he lamented, and insisted "it is a sad reflection, that hordes of Northern Vandals should have come down upon us without cause, robbed and brought poverty and distress everywhere, leaving me like many others in extreme poverty and this in my time of life, when it is hardly possible for me to start again in life."³⁴ He also found himself subjected to civil and criminal lawsuits in east Tennessee as the Republican political elite hounded those who continued to voice support for the Confederacy after the Civil War. Historian Susanna Michele Lee argues that during Reconstruction, the Confederate society that had survived the war with their land and their names intact "successfully decoupled most aspects of postwar citizenship from wartime loyalty," which "signaled an official policy of forgetting." However, in a decidedly Unionist county, Hiram Fain did not receive the pardon and amnesty most other Confederates did. After the defeat of his community, there was no one to prop Fain up and come to his defense against charges of treason. Subjected to fines and fees, the courts drained Hiram Fain's finances.³⁵

While few of the lawsuits against him were successful (charges for supporting "the cause of the south" were deliberately vague and used by local Unionist governments to harass southern sympathizers throughout the region), the message behind them effectively taught Hiram Fain where his identity betrayed him.³⁶ George Washington provided Fain with comfort in a world of uncertainty, symbolizing a hopeful what might have been. Washington "did more than any other

³⁴ Hiram Fain Diary, April 9, 1867, AA.

³⁵ W. Todd Groce, *Mountain Rebels: East Tennessee Confederates, 1860-1870* (Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press, 1999), 181-214; Susanna Michele Lee, "The Antithesis of Union Men and Confederate Rebels: Loyal Citizenship in the Post-Civil War South," in *Creating Citizenship in the Nineteenth-Century South*, edited by William Link, David Brown, Brian Ward, and Martyn Bone (Gainesville: University Press of Florida, 2013), 151; Hiram Fain diary, November 28, 1865, AA.

³⁶ Historian Noel Fisher goes into this sort of postwar harassment at length. East Tennessee citizens, especially the Unionists and their supporters who were tormented during occupation with violence and intimidation, possessed a "distorted moral atmosphere" that fueled antagonizing former Confederates and encouraged partisan violence. Fisher, *War at Every Door*, 144-145.

man to free the American People from the tyranny of the British," and Fain lamented that "the Southern People who did more to sustain the government as formed by Washington and his compatriots are now enslaved by Northern Fanatics and the republic destroyed."³⁷ Fain looked back to a fledgling republic to reimagine and redeem his South and its place within a reconstructed nation.

According to Fain, it was not his cause that lost; it was rather Washington's intentions that had failed to be realized. Fain grew up in a generation that listened to oral tales about the strength of George Washington's character. The same generation read biographies and pamphlets and knew the legend of the revolutionary spirit of the founding fathers. This generation knew well how to spin a historical tale into something from which they might later profit. Eliza Fain summed up her family's commitment to Washington in a diary entry dated February 22, 1885. "This is the anniversary of the birth of our noble Washington whom God raised up to be a leader to our people in the establishment of a free government; and over which he our God has been watching; and upholding for more than a century permitted the development of a grand republic." She then insisted that her family, and her Confederate community, "passed through a severe civil struggle and the South having sustained herself as conquered, but not a crushed people." She held hope that Washington's vision of America had not disappeared forever.³⁸

John Inscoe has argued that antebellum East Tennessee inhabitants "perceived themselves and their region in relation to" the entire state and not just the mountain ranges that crossed multiple geopolitical boundaries. Like other communities throughout the United States, this one told its "own stories about the Revolution and emphasized new memories and meanings" until, by the start of the Civil War, a Confederate sympathizer remembered the actions of founding fathers in a meaningful way that allowed a second American Revolution. As historian Anna Sarah Rubin has

³⁷ Hiram Fain diary, February 22, 1869, AA.

³⁸ Eliza Rhea Fain, *Sanctified Trial*, 376.

posited that southern appropriation of the Revolution represented a generalized and impersonal interpretation of the intentions of the founding fathers, secessionists like Fain prayed for victory and rejected their personal connections to the creation of a new nation in favor of the narrative that endorsed rebellion. That Hiram Fain had direct ancestry to a Revolutionary soldier “was largely irrelevant” in his community; what mattered to him as a Confederate was that they were separate from the rest of the Union. They “othered” themselves as they connected to a history focused on rebellious and southern founding father narratives.³⁹

Hiram Fain had real family connections to Revolutionary soldiers and frontiersmen. From the very mountains on which Hiram Fain looked while he farmed and traded toward an honorable life, great marble slabs had been mined in Hawkins County and shipped northeast to the national capital. Andrew Jackson's words "The Federal Union it Must Be Preserved" were engraved and gilded on one block that was contributed in 1850 for the Washington Monument, construction of which had begun in 1848. A decade later, the same foundational landscape attempted to rip itself from the American terrain, and inhabitants of the Appalachian South revised their understanding of Revolutionary history to suit their personal needs. Fain joined the Confederate fray, and he brought George Washington's memory with him, but there was an alternative route he could have taken, a route exemplified in the case of John Fain Anderson.⁴⁰

³⁹ John Inscoc, *Race, War, and Remembrance in the Appalachian South* (Lexington: University Press of Kentucky, 2008), 111; Michael A. McDonnell, Clare Corbould, Frances Clarke, Fitzhugh Brundage, "The Revolution in American Life from 1776 to the Civil War," in *Remembering the Revolution: Memory, History, and Nation Making from Independence to the Civil War* (Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 2013), 2; Anne Sarah Rubin, "Seventy Six and Sixty One: Confederates Remember the American Revolution," in *Where These Memories Grow: History, Memory and Southern Identity*, edited by Fitzhugh Brundage (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2000), 86.

⁴⁰ National Register of Historic Places multiple property documentation form for the marble industry of east Tennessee, circa 1838-1963, spring 2014, submitted by Carroll Van West and Susan W. Knowles, www.nps.gov/nr/feature/places/pdfs/64501200.pdf, 4.

John Fain Anderson concerned himself, primarily, with historical accuracy. He was seventeen years old at the start of the Civil War, living with his parents in Blountville, Sullivan County. This branch of the Fain family did not support secession. The second cousin of Hiram Fain was an amateur historian, and the pages of his scrapbooks betray his interest in local and regional histories that he tied to larger national events like the Revolutionary War and the Civil War. His historical literacy compelled him to make a different decision when declaring loyalties during the crisis of secession, occupation, and war. The twenty-three scrapbooks he curated over the course of his later years span topics from the Battle of Kings Mountain, the Civil War, prominent families of East Tennessee, and local histories. The newspaper clippings, magazine articles, postcards and marginalia offer evidence of a former Unionist who had used George Washington's life as a guiding compass pointing towards loyalty. Washington built a nation that could not be undone. Any attempt to do so defied the intentions of the principal founding father. History taught John Fain Anderson to honor the perpetuity of what George Washington built.

Roughly thirty years younger than Hiram, by 1861, Americans in Anderson's generation learned a national history dominated by what historian Robert Cook calls "grand historical narratives of a country's past" that were carefully crafted by influential men who held a stake in creating "a particular and (they hope) broadly unifying interpretation of their country's history."⁴¹ Like secessionists, southern Unionists drew lessons from the Revolution and subsequent experiment in building a democratic republic. Anderson learned about the early history of the American republic from his family. Anderson was the third son born to Samuel Anderson and Hannah Crawford Fain in 1844 in Blountville, Sullivan County. Samuel died in 1849 and John did not stand to inherit much physical property as an adult. The 1860 census reveals that John and his mother were living with his

⁴¹ Robert J. Cook, William L. Barney, and Elizabeth R. Varon, *Secession Winter: When the Union Fell Apart* (Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2013), 71.

deceased father's parents. He received brief spurts of education at local schoolhouses in the years before and during the Civil War, and his grammar reflected this uneven schooling. His education came from learning his family history. This boy pushed into manhood by the secession of his home state would have to make his own way toward prosperity, and he found that path in his loyalty to preserving the Union his ancestry had defended.⁴²

Sullivan County's population makeup before and after the war offers a case study in the commitment to maintaining white supremacy. Between 1860 and 1870, the county's aggregate population shrank by over four hundred people. The white population which made up the majority of the people living in the county remained almost exactly the same. The noticeable exodus of the Black population suggests a cultural dynamic that preserved a conservative and traditional southern hierarchy where, even if the county did not experience great wealth, supremacy could always be given based on the color of one's skin.⁴³

Sullivan County stood out in East Tennessee as being one of the six counties that voted in favor of secession during the June 1861 referendum with 75% of the voters siding with the Confederacy. Along those lines, John Fain Anderson's decision to maintain loyalty to the nation built by his hero and defended by his ancestors, despite residing in a community known as the "Little Confederacy" within the Tennessee mountains, is a significant case in understanding how world views and rhetoric's influence on the historical narrative matters when building a personal ideology.

As the grandson of John Ruben Fain, and great-grandson of John Fain who fought in the legendary Battle of King's Mountain, Anderson worshiped the Revolutionary generation as much as

⁴² 1860 U.S. Census, *Sullivan, Tennessee*, "Civil District 5," Blountville, 76; *The Tennessee Civil War Veterans Questionnaires*, vol. 1, ed. Colleen M. Elliott and Louise A. Moxley (Easley, SC: Southern Historical Press, 1985), 5.

⁴³ U.S. Bureau of the Census, "Population by Color and Condition, 1860," under "State of Tennessee," 466; U.S. Bureau of the Census, "Population of Civil Divisions Less Than Counties" under "State of Tennessee," 268.

any other member of the Fain family. During the Civil War, Anderson served as a messenger boy for the Union and was stationed in both Knoxville and Loudon, Tennessee. When filling out his form for the *Tennessee Civil War Veterans' Questionnaire*, he included an addendum on his family's history. He described the family patriarch who moved the Fain family into the Appalachian foothills, Nicholas Fain, who came to "Washington county Tenn in early seventeys." Nicholas's son, John Fain, died in 1788 when leading a group of men into the Cherokee territory of Citico. He would never meet the son still growing inside his wife's belly at the time of his death. That unborn child grew up to be John Fain Anderson's grandfather. Like Hiram, John Fain Anderson could trace his family tree alongside the American historical narrative. This connection to Revolutionary service eventually facilitated his membership to the National Society of the Sons of the American Revolution.⁴⁴

He was only seventeen when the war started. At such a young age, John Anderson's Civil War experience was limited and close to home. While serving the Union, his family home burned to the ground during a "fight over town." The fight, called the Battle of Blountville, took place on September 22, 1863, the same night Anderson's family home burned. The Sullivan County courthouse also burned that night, catching fire during a shelling between Confederate and Union forces in an attempt to secure the roads and access to nearby saltworks in southwestern Virginia. These dates match up with Hiram Fain's account of travel leading up to the Battle of Rogersville. He traveled through Sullivan County during that week, and "stayed until the 19th (of September) and was there during the last fight at Blountville" before making his way to Virginia. There is no way of

⁴⁴ Dyer and Moore, *The Tennessee Civil War Veterans Questionnaires*, vol. 1, ed. Colleen M. Elliott and Louise A. Moxley (Easley, SC: Southern Historical Press, 1985), 4-8; "New Inductees," *Official Bulletin of the National Society of the Sons of the American Revolution* 18, no. 3 (Washington DC: December, 1923), 85.

knowing if Hiram played a hand in John Anderson's home arson. He was, however, in the area and working with Confederates in a home guard capacity.⁴⁵

Anderson returned to Sullivan County after the war and married Susan Florence Lady, also a native of his hometown. Throughout late 1860s and 1870s, John operated a mercantile shop in Brownsboro, Washington County. John Anderson built his scrapbook collection and his reputation as a historian. His postwar life provides insight into his understanding of American history in general and of George Washington in particular. He was considered throughout the region as being an able historian and would often use his scrapbooking hobby to "correct" history. Over the course of decades, he cut and pasted articles from local and national newspapers. He held an affinity for strange anecdotes throughout American history. Twenty-three large and comprehensive scrapbooks illustrated a life of historical curiosity.

His historical literacy only grew as he aged. Hindsight reinforced his Union loyalty. It also recognized the power of historical accuracy. For example, one scrapbook page featured a newspaper clipping entitled "Handsome New Courthouse for Ancient Town of Jonesboro." The 1912 article provided a brief history of Jonesboro, Tennessee, as the county seat and described the new courthouse. The paper's headline stated that the courthouse would "Be the Third Temple of Justice in That City Whose History Is So Rich in Historical Lore--The First Built in That Town, Older Than the American Revolution, Was the First Built in the 'New World' West of the Blue Ridge Mountains." The article included pictures of previous courthouses. However, the article placed the images of the courthouses in the wrong order. Anderson cut out the pictures and then renumbered them. The paper also neglected to mention a building used briefly in 1820 that served as a second

⁴⁵ Gustavus W. Dyer and John T. Moore, compilers, *The Tennessee Civil War Veterans Questionnaires*, vol. 1, ed. Colleen M. Elliott and Louise A. Moxley (Easley, SC: Southern Historical Press, 1985), 4-8; H. Fain Diary, Sept to Nov. of 1863.

courthouse. After rearranging the order of the photos, he left a blank space and drew the building that the newspaper left out on the scrapbook paper with a grease pencil. The margins of his scrapbook pages are filled with corrections to printed portrayals of any historical matter. Only then was history accurately depicted. His commitment to historical accuracy is important because it illustrates how his historical literacy diverged from that of his cousin, Hiram Fain.⁴⁶

An undated clipping entitled "States Rights" attempted to place the subject of prohibition into historical context, drawing connections to Patrick Henry's reservations about the wording of the U.S. Constitution, which he felt did not sufficiently safeguard the powers of the state. The article went on to highlight how the Civil War settled the question, putting "the federal government . . . over and above the governments of the states." In the margins of this entry, Anderson commented on states' rights. He was clear: no state had the right to secede, and laws should be formed only "to protect oranges in the South and cranberrys [sic] in the North." For Anderson, states were the sons of the father nation, and he argued in the margins of his scrapbooks that "no son has a write [sic] to set aside Fathers [sic] command."⁴⁷ The founding fathers laid the foundation of American government and, therein, the defining characteristics of what it meant to be a citizen of the republican experiment in democracy. Anderson's devotion to the Union during the Civil War mirrors both his devotion to his family heritage and the region in which he lived. His Unionism strengthened as time passed. His passion regarding his family's participation in America's creation and his passion for the Union worked in concert.

For Anderson, the strongest feature "in [Washington's] character was prudence." His written remarks on the pages of his scrapbooks highlighted how peers hailed Washington for never acting until "every circumstance, every consideration was maturely weighed." For Washington, the

⁴⁶ Scrapbook 10, 1913-14, John Fain Anderson Collection, AA.

⁴⁷ Scrapbook 10, 1913-14," John Fain Anderson Collection, AA.

Constitution was, as Jefferson reported, "an experiment on the practicality of republican government, and with what dose of liberty man could be trusted for his own good," and he "was determined the experiment should have a fair trial." He encouraged a strong central government in which the states would be subject to the designs of the federal level. In his dealings with the western Pennsylvania rebels during the Whiskey Rebellion, the sitting president donned his military uniform because while "men will not adopt and carry into execution measures the best calculated for their own good," a strong central government with a strong commander in chief could secure compliance. Washington suppressed rebellion in order to preserve the Union.⁴⁸

George Washington served as a player in a regional history of Revolutionary acts. Anderson glued clippings documenting the participation of east Tennesseans in the creation of a new nation next to Civil War biographies and postcards of Abraham Lincoln's grave. He wrote his personal recollections in the margins next to county histories and the obituaries of the dying Civil War generation. George Washington's portrait on a postcard lay underneath a clipping about Knox County's namesake, William Henry Knox, describing how the "hardy and capable pioneers" pushed the fledgling nation westward. On the pages of his scrapbook, John Fain Anderson crafted the history of his country and state as he knew it. He connected men and ideas on the blank pages of large leather-bound volumes and indexed them for future reference. He never gave any indication of his intentions with the scrapbooks, but it would have made sense for a man so curious and fastidious in their creation to intend for them to educate future generations. He was building on the stories of history that had been passed down to him. He wrote in the margins to ensure future

⁴⁸ *The Papers of Thomas Jefferson*, retirement series, vol. 7, 28 November 1813 to 30 September 1814, ed. J. Jefferson Looney (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2010), 100, 104; Richard Norton Smith, *Patriarch: George Washington and the New American Nation* (New York: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1993) 211-14.

readers had all the facts. Those facts endorsed a historical narrative that necessitated loyalty to Union.⁴⁹

An editorial dated November 14, 1911, called for a historical marker dedicated to a local Confederate soldier. The piece acknowledged the 50th anniversary of a key crossing of the Holston River that had only one Confederate soldier guarding it in November 1861. The anonymous author suggested that the brave actions of the soldier, James Keeler, in defending a bridge from a "whole company" of Union men seeking to commit arson and assault Confederate sympathizers in the community. In his scrapbook, Anderson had preserved another article, one entitled "A Story of a Happening at Strawberry Plains Over Fifty Years Ago," another anniversary piece, that offered a corrective to this grand Lost Cause recollection of the event. The author of the corrective, W. R. Carter, acknowledged that Keeler's actions forever defined him as a "brave fellow" who deserved credit for defending a bridge singlehandedly. Still, the description of the Union soldiers was inaccurate and needlessly barbaric. Carter explained how a simple and peaceable plan to ensure a route into East Tennessee for more Union troops resulted in a small group of Union men on a reconnaissance mission encountering a Confederate soldier ready to instigate small-arms fire. Anderson knew this story well and filled the margins of his scrapbook page with comments that agreed with the author and expanded on some issues raised. "This Story is correct," Anderson maintained. "The men who did this attemp[t] ware Good Men They ware Men who desired piece." He insisted they only intended to burn the bridge, "not kill any one." Anderson was pleased to see another defender of the Union cause and the soldiers who served it. He challenged the ever-expanding Lost Cause mythology taking over the Mountain South just as fervently as those more closely connected to the former slave economy endorsed it.⁵⁰

⁴⁹ Scrapbook 10, 1913-14, John Fain Anderson Collection, AA.

⁵⁰ Scrapbook 11, 1912-14, John Fain Anderson Collection, AA; Hiram Fain diary, November 17, 1861, AA.

Anderson found joy in broader great men histories. On February 22, 1920, he clipped out a newspaper feature titled "Lincoln's Tribute to Nation's Founding Father." The article celebrated the seventy-eighth anniversary of Lincoln's memorial speech on George Washington. For Lincoln, George Washington was "mightiest in the cause of civil liberty; still mightiest in moral reformation." Lincoln insisted that "to add brightness to the sun or glory to the name of Washington is alike impossible." Anderson admired Lincoln's assessment of Washington. "I regard Lincons Tribute to Washington," he inscribed next to the article, "greater than his Getysburg Speech. Greatest tribute made by Man to Man." The newspaper articles Anderson chose to preserve stressed the same core values over and over again. Loyalty was a solemn practice, and it called for dismissing hot-headed passions that ended with treasonous secession. In 1914, Anderson added a place card to his scrapbook, a piece of ephemera from a Fourth of July celebration. The wording on the card prayed that the holiday be celebrated "in a way befitting America and Americans--not in foolish frivolity and reckless pleasure--but as a sane people celebrating a national event." Anderson and the Unionists with whom he identified defined their understanding of perpetual union through their histories of Washington. His historical literacy contributed to his siding with the Union.⁵¹

Here are two members of the same American family with very different outlooks on what the founding fathers intended when they established a republican democracy. Hiram Fain, a member of the "nonheroic" generation, embraced and helped shape a well-crafted version of Revolutionary history commonly espoused by the slaveholding elite. He wanted access to the wealth and opportunity that Confederate politicians had promised. Fain's diary never referred to Nicholas Fain or the life his ancestors fought to preserve. Instead, it offered Fain's musings about what he

⁵¹ Abraham Lincoln gave a speech to the Springfield Washington Temperance Society on the 110th anniversary of George Washington's birth. Breaking a pattern where speakers normally berated and shamed drinkers to live a life of sobriety, Lincoln endorsed a more sympathetic efforts to cure alcoholism. He believed sobriety grew from conquering the one's mind and used George Washington as the model of self-control and moral clarity. Scrapbook 15, 1919-23, and scrapbook 11, 1912-1914, John Fain Anderson Collection, AA.

perceived to be a failed republic. He watched his interpretation of George Washington's America suffer. Family history diluted within a national narrative where broad strokes make compelling arguments and Fain drank from a well of apocryphal history that taught values similar to his own. In contrast, John Fain Anderson's scrapbooks not only contain a collection of articles on George Washington but also are filled with local history and stories about the Revolutionary War. Anderson revered his familial ties to the original heroes of this nation as much as he revered the first president and commander in chief. His identity helped integrate his family heritage with his interpretation of George Washington's intention. It was that blended identity that pushed him to side with the Union and preserving what his founding father had created.

Hiram Fain's and John Fain Anderson's understanding of history informed their opinions on secession, rebellion, and loyalty. Both of their interpretations can be backed by sound secondary scholarship if they are considered separately. If they are taken together, though, they only present more questions. One man revised his history and one carefully preserved it. One man embraced secession and one rejected it. One man offered his family and support to the Confederacy and one man delivered messages for the Union. One man experienced defeat and one found victory. One man crafted an interpretation of the past to suit his newfound misery and one held fast to the personal ties that defined his life's success. It is striking how the varied understandings of the American Revolution informed members of the same family such disparate views on society and politics. Lessons in the power of revisionist history and the importance of historical literacy can be found in both.

CHAPTER 4

DISGUISED AND UNDISGUISED LOYALTY: THE HALES OF FENTRESS COUNTY

Loyalty exposed itself in times of uncertainty and for the Hale Family of Fentress County it was no different. When tethered to an ideological attitude where *quid pro quo* is the feature of a social contract, loyalty transforms into an outward expression of resistance. It also brings with it an understanding that expressions of loyalty will be recognized and repaid. Even more, if loyalty is recognized, then so, too, must be treason. Loyalty ideally resulted in good fortune while treason carried with it ruinous consequences. Jonathan Hale believed the maxim, “be just before we are generous.” His lived experience, however, would see Hale’s loyalty to Union repaid in empty gestures and forgotten promises.

Through the Moffetts’ experience in chapter one, loyalty was manifested out of a sense of duty and an understood expectation. The family’s postwar experience illustrated how Confederate veterans and their families saw their opportunities disappear and their welcome worn out in a community that harbored ill will. In this chapter, the sides changed and the consequences remained the same. Where the Hales differ from the Moffetts is in how their postwar years were spent demanding recognition of their wartime deeds. Jonathan Hale’s wartime loyalty developed into a postwar self-centeredness that informed all of his actions. Where the Moffetts ultimately moved on with their lives and settled for a quiet life and unfulfilled dreams, the Hales blamed everyone but themselves for their postwar situation. Jonathan and Pheroba Hale, outwardly Unionist from the beginning of secession, suffered in Fentress County until that was no longer an option. Jonathan Hale became a Union spy who worked alongside General George Thomas throughout the war. Back

in Fentress County, Pheroba packed the children, the enslaved laborers, and as much of her property as she could in the middle of the night and ran north to Covington, Kentucky, hiding from guerrilla terrorists. From there, she and her husband took advantage of a community maintained via letter writing and used their extensive networks to provide materials, information, people, ammunition, and propaganda that supported resistance to the Confederacy in Middle and East Tennessee. They maintained records and receipts, counted their losses in both Union and Confederate currency, and obtained sworn statements from everyone they knew with an expectation of recompense once the war ended. That expectation went unfulfilled and their postwar lives offer a glimpse into the grudges carried by those who survived the war.¹

Nancy and Obed Hale welcomed Jonathan Davis Hale into the world in Stoddard, New Hampshire, on July 13, 1817. His parents came from modest means. Both were born in Massachusetts and started their married life in New Hampshire in financial comfort. In their home hung a pair of wedding portraits by War of 1812 chaplain-turned-portrait painter, Zedekiah Belknap. They had seven children; Jonathan was the second eldest son. This birth placement allowed him to pursue a career as a physician. Nancy Hale had worked as a schoolteacher before marriage and spent much of her time teaching all of her children to read and write. Jonathan studied medicine in Pennsylvania and then taught at Centre College in Danville, Kentucky, for eighteen months before moving to Tennessee after meeting Pheroba Chilton of Fentress County. They married in 1840. He was 23 years old when he married.²

¹ Brian D. McKnight, *Confederate Outlaw: Champ Ferguson and the Civil War in Appalachia* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 2011), 4.

² "New Hampshire Death Records, 1654–1947." Index. FamilySearch, Salt Lake City, Utah, 2010. New Hampshire Bureau of Vital Records. "Death Records, 1654–1947." Bureau of Vital Records, Concord, New Hampshire; "New Hampshire Marriage Records 1637–1947." Index. FamilySearch, Salt Lake City, Utah, 2011. "New Hampshire Statewide Marriage Records 1637–1947," database, FamilySearch, 2009; Dr. Calvin Dickinson and Charlene McClain, "Hale's Union Support Lead Him to Flee Upper Cumberland," *Cookeville Herald-Citizen* May 4, 2014.

Pheroba Hale was the tie to East Tennessee; it was the only home she knew until the Civil War pushed her further north. Sarah and William Chilton welcomed her arrival on February 2, 1826, while living in Overton, Tennessee, the western neighboring county to Fentress. The Chiltons named their daughter after an aunt who had passed away two years prior. Pheroba's mother died in 1837, her father died in 1838, and she married Jonathan in 1840. She made this happen when she proposed to Jonathan Hale while he rode a circuit providing medical care. While visiting a wealthy landowner during his rounds, "whether professionally or otherwise, we are not able to say," Hale engaged several young ladies in conversation and "he approached one of them and invited her to marry him." She said no, and as this took place Pheroba walked across the room and said "Doctor, I will marry you." She was fourteen when she married.³

Immediately after her world contracted and was made smaller by the death of her parents, it grew again with a husband and seven children. Marrying Jonathan Hale was her decision and is illustrative of making opportunity where none existed prior. She gave birth to her first child at the age of eighteen. She was thirty-seven when she gave birth to her seventh child. Pheroba started her life in a series of fits and starts with her being orphaned at such a critical moment in time, and yet she managed to defy the status quo and become a well-adjusted and literate woman. Her formal education is unknown, but her letters demonstrated a strong command of the written language. She also played piano and taught it to her children. When her brother, William, wrote her, which he rarely did, the letters dripped with dry humor and self-deprecation. His letter to Pheroba from January 29th, 1855 begins with an acknowledgement: "It has been so long since I wrote a letter, I have almost forgotten how to begin." He warned her that should the letter not meet her exacting requirements, she was still not allowed to "crease your brow or pout your lips."⁴ From there, he

³ "Reminiscences—Dr. Hale" Newspaper Clipping, 1898, Jonathan Hale Papers, Huntington Library.

⁴ William Chilton to Pheroba Hale, January 29, 1855, Jonathan Hale Papers, Huntington Library.

moved into more personal matters after enough of “this kind of foolishness.” William and Pheroba took their world seriously and stayed informed. But they also laughed at the political landscape that surrounded them. At least, they laughed before the war. The correspondence of Pheroba to her husband during and after the war, as this chapter will show, demonstrated her wit, a clear hand, and her ability to navigate the economic and material world independent of her husband, Jonathan. She kept herself informed on national and local matters. Pheroba Hale possessed a world view. She had opinions. Not only did she have them, but people asked her for them throughout the Civil War.

Prior to the American Civil War, Jonathan Hale knew people who knew people. In his later years, he described Fentress County of the 1850s as prosperous and the citizens of the county as “contented and happy.” He carried enough capital and social responsibility to know powerbrokers at the local, state, and national level. He housed a furniture manufacturing shop on his property. He was a physician, treating townsfolk, enslaved people, and neighbors. By 1851, Hale became a certified postmaster in his county. If you lived in Hale’s Mills, Fentress County, Tennessee, Hale handled your incoming and outgoing correspondence. In 1860, he owned 250 acres of land, only 100 of which he cultivated. He owned his own mill and that provided additional income from surrounding planters taking advantage of his resources. By 1861 he was forty-three years old and established. He knew people who knew people and had a network in place.⁵

Others, however, recalled tensions throughout the county as sharply divided. Alvin York biographer Sam K. Cowan described antebellum Fentress County as a place where established divisions only hardened during the war, making Reconstruction difficult for a region “on the border between the territory firmly held by the North and by the South” who “became a no-man’s land, subjected successively to marauding bands from each side, a land for plunder and revenge.” Zachary

⁵ U.S., Selected Federal Census Non-Population Schedules, 1860 Agriculture Schedule, Fentress County, Tennessee; U.S., Appointments of U.S. Postmaster, 1851, Tennessee, Anderson-Grainger Counties.

T. Crouch recalled this same divisive nature when he filled out his form for the *Tennessee Civil War Veterans Questionnaire*. Crouch, born in Fentress County, grew up on the family farm where he began plowing at the age of nine. He acknowledged that while he did not recall any specific instances of antagonism between the slaveholders and non-slaveholders, “at the time I was only a boy of 14 years.” He enlisted in the Confederate army, serving in Company I, 4th Tennessee Cavalry Regiment until May of 1865. When Crouch returned home to Fentress County, it would only be for a period of three months. “I left my home in East Tennessee,” he recalled, “on August 28, 1865—left home on account of the bitter feeling there was against the Confederacy, my people thinking my life would be in danger if I stayed there.”⁶

Before Tennessee seceded from the United States, the Hales worried about the future of their nation. They engaged in conversation with other southerners in other states who expressed similar concerns about what “rights” the Confederate people held within this stillborn attempt of nation building. Sam Long, a friend and confidante living in Paris, Texas, wrote to Jonathan Hale in April of 1861. The first half of his letter, written on April 4th, condemned secession, arguing that Texas politicians “dragged us out of the union without asking our consent and fasted down upon us a constitution, an army, taxation, and a horde of rascally, tyrannical, drunken, lousy, gambling and murderous traitors as officers, ministers, congressmen etc.” Long evoked the names of America’s founding fathers and lamented “thy works have all come to naught and a government founded on the idea that the people are the sovereigns is a fallacy.” He set down his pen and let his letter sit for three more weeks before he continued his correspondence with the head of the Hale family. Those three weeks educated Long on what a Confederate government looked like in practice and he

⁶ Sergeant Alvin York, world famous World War 1 soldier and conscientious objector, grew up in Fentress county and his biographer draws connections between the hostile living environment and his family’s strong pacifist tendencies. Sam K. Cowan, *Sergeant York and His People* (New York: Grosset & Dunlap, 1922), 125; Gustavus W. Dyer and John T. Moore, comps., *The Tennessee Civil War Veterans Questionnaires*, vol. 2, ed. Colleen M. Elliott and Louise A. Moxley (Easley, SC: Southern Historical Press, 1985), 601-603.

warned Hale of the “rights which you may expect to enjoy when Tennessee and KY secede.”

Among those rights were right to submit under fear of allegations of treason, the right to censor their conduct and speech, the right to keep their mouths shut, and the right to pay 24% tax on all goods manufactured in the United States, the right to see their schools closed and internal improvements ceased, and the right to have elected representatives “from the governor to the constable deposed or forsworn by taking a new oath unknown to our constitution, and our constitution itself defaced and polluted by some twenty-two amendments made by an irresponsible and overbearing body of men, contrary to constitutional provisions and in defiance of the public will.” They would *not* have the right to “say by our votes whether or not we will accept all these enactments.”⁷

With these warnings and “rights” explained in detail to the Hales from Unionists further south, Tennessee’s secession seemed untenable and a mistake worth fighting against. It made no sense to reject the constitutional rulebook that created a society crafted to provide opportunity and access to white men. Neither of them had been born into wealth. Both of them understood the limits of opportunity. But they also believed that should they continue on their course; the Constitution provided a social contract designed with them in mind. It’s been well documented that the Hale Family practiced performative patriotism for the Union. The Nashville paper, *Daily Patriot*, on July 19, 1861 reported the Hale daughters singing the Star-Spangled Banner on the steps of their home to celebrate Independence Day just weeks after Tennessee declared secession. They were joined by one thousand community members. Men, women, and children helped them celebrate and Pheroba Hale read the Declaration of Independence. *The Daily Patriot* also noted that Jonathan Hale seemed to be looking for local “Lincolnites” to fight the Union cause. They were not difficult to

⁷ Sam Long to Jonathan Hale, April 4th and April 27th, 1861, Paris, Texas, Jonathan Hale Papers, Huntington Library, San Marino, California.

find. Unionists in Fentress County were “eager to fight” and while they lacked the materials of war (guns, training, and leadership), they stood ready to impede Confederate authority.⁸

Three days later, on July 7th, 1861, Jonathan Hale, his wife and children, their five slaves, and what they could carry escaped Confederate ire under the cover of night. Local Confederates were not amused with the Hale Independence Day celebration. They considered it treason and planned to kill him. Earlier that year, the Hales were “in a very prosperous condition.” But the Hales voiced their support of the Union early and when he was approached by local leaders forming a Confederate regiment, Hale grew concerned they wanted him to join in their effort to “destroy the nation.” That statement earned Confederate scorn.⁹ When they celebrated the Fourth of July, they lost any hope of remaining home in safety. Their loyalty made them refugees.¹⁰ Husband and wife parted ways, headed towards different cities in Kentucky and both in service of the Union. Jonathan Hale made his way to Louisville to report on conditions in Tennessee. Pheroba Hale moved the family to Covington, Kentucky. She wrote her husband and family faithfully, educated her children, and managed to aid a Union spy throughout the entirety of the Civil War.

The Hale family’s eagerness to resist rebellion enraged Confederates and their sympathizers. The Hales paid for their undisguised loyalty during and after the Civil War. Where Ferguson saw loyalty as a clear-cut secession issue which carried grave consequences for those on the wrong side,

⁸ Noel Fisher, *War at Every Door: Partisan Politics and Guerrilla Violence in East Tennessee, 1860-1869* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1997), 33, 42; *Daily Nashville Patriot* Friday, July 19, 1861.

⁹ Jonathan Hale, “Biographical Sketch of Jonathan D. Hale,” 1898, The Jonathan Hale Papers, Huntington Library.

¹⁰ In David Silkenat’s *Driven from Home: North Carolina’s Civil War Refugee Crisis*, he highlights that one of the most important and distinctive features of the southern refugee crisis was the diversity of those forced to leave “as Southerners of all races, genders, classes, and political alliances chose or were forced to move as a consequence of the Civil War.” He explores refugees in North Carolina, focusing on five distinct groups: Black Americans escaping slavery, white Unionists, pro-Confederate whites seeking safety in southern interior, the enslaved they brought with them, and the refugee daughters who attended girls’ boarding schools. The Hales offer a new vantage point of white Unionists and their choice for what to do and where to go once home is no longer an option. Jonathan Hale’s instinct is to begin working in military intelligence. Pheroba Hale’s position in Covington puts her both out of harm’s way, but also in a key position to obtain goods and exchange information.

the Hale family understood that loyalty to the Union did not translate into a mandate for all Union actions. His support earned him a job with the United States Army as a scout and spy for the Army of the Cumberland where he reported directly to General George Thomas.

General Thomas employed a strategy of keeping informants close to the enemy. Jonathan Hale fit well within a command policy historian Brian Wills has described as where “extreme outposts are always exposed,” because “if we do not run risks we never shall know anything of the enemy.”¹¹ Hale’s primary role as a spy was to determine guerrilla and Confederate activities, especially those of men like John Hunt Morgan and Joseph Wheeler. Hale disguised himself as a rebel sympathizer willing to guide convoys of Confederate men through the occupied Appalachian Mountains. The tactic proved effective by two means: Hale could engage the enemy in conversation to discover Confederate plans and he could also use those conversations to analyze the mindset of the Confederacy’s most dedicated followers. He enjoyed the work and described it in his letters to Pheroba. Along the way, he reported details back to General Thomas at his command center, be it in Murfreesboro or Nashville.¹²

Hale described his encounters with Confederates to his wife in detailed letters. “These Tories now begin to learn war is war in earnest,” he promised Pheroba, “and if we stay here much longer there will not be a rail or ear of corn for miles.” He described his conversation with a farmer who fell victim to a “foraging campaign” where Rebel forces took all of his corn, hay fodder and oats. The farmer grumbled, but gave all of his supplies up willingly because it was for the South and

¹¹ Brian Steel Wills, *George Henry Thomas: As True As Steel* (Lawrence: University Press of Kansas, 2012), 251.

¹² Historian Yael A. Sternhell has used troop mobility and the physical act of moving large groups of people throughout a million square miles of land a lens for studying how “men and women, soldiers and civilians, enslaved and free, movement played multiple, shifting, and often contradictory roles.” As a guide through dangerous and rugged routes through the mountains, Hale learned about immediate military plans, but he also studied the men who consented and approved of those plans. Yael A. Sternhell, *Routes of War: The World of Movement in the Confederate South* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2012), 6.

perhaps his contribution would “stop the Yankees yet.”¹³ Conversations like this speak to Jonathan Hale’s world view. War was a punishment for foolish and ignorant traitors. Hale has right on his side. Less than a week after his conversation with the southern farmer, Hale described another conversation to his wife, this time with a Confederate army surgeon. “I still learn more and more how awfully the Tories were cut up here, the wounded must have been over 10,000. There is a Confederate surgeon boarding at the same home with me. Says his whole soul hates the Yankees and their kind. Means to help murder them anyway he can. Men women and children, he curses all the mothers that bore them.”¹⁴ The physician’s words described his internalization of war and trauma. Surrounded by the wounded and the dead, the Civil War veteran physician could not muster empathy for the enemy. Even the children of Yankees were evil. Hale always described these interactions in detail. He, a physician in his pre-war life, seemed convinced there was a diagnosis for the southern mind.

When not actively working towards General Thomas’s wartime agenda, Jonathan Hale collected eyewitness accounts for his own personal vendetta against Champ Ferguson. Ferguson was forty years old at the start of the war. Born to frontier parents in Clinton County, Kentucky, his Appalachian upbringing developed a passionate desire to participate in the southern slave system. Clinton County in the 1860 census reported a total population of 5,781 residents and an overwhelming 95% of the citizens were white. Only 20 free Black people lived in Clinton, accounting for .3% of the population. There were 258 enslaved people living there, which meant that enslaved people counted for just 4% of the population. This suggests that only the wealthiest and most successful residents laid claim to enslaved laborers and Clinton County. Young men

¹³ Jonathan Hale to Pheroba Hale, January 18, 1863, Murfreesboro, Tennessee, Jonathan Hale Papers, Huntington Library.

¹⁴ Jonathan Hale to Pheroba Hale, January 25, 1863, Murfreesboro, Tennessee, Johnathan Hale Papers, Huntington Library.

growing up there would have understood that the ownership of enslaved people was a key factor in economic prosperity.¹⁵ Ferguson's family remained committed to the Union throughout the war and openly admonished Champ's decision to use his horsemanship and knowledge of the mountains to wreak havoc and terror on Union sympathizers throughout the war. He spent the Civil War outside of the military and all the structured opportunities to kill that came with it. Instead, he chose to ride with a gang of men throughout the Kentucky and Tennessee border, killing those who disagreed with them. They preyed on communities where all the leaders and young men left in service to their country. Fentress County fell victim to his temper and tendency towards violence before secession ever took place when Champ Ferguson killed a county constable after a horse race there in 1858. The Fentress community knew his name and lived in constant fear of earning his attention. The Hales' public display of Unionist loyalty brought Champ Ferguson's attention right to their doorstep. When he ruined their livelihood with thievery, destruction and fire, the Hales spent the rest of their natural lives putting Ferguson's exploits on paper, using their wartime experience in an attempt to lift themselves back up to their pre-war position.¹⁶

Ferguson's reputation established in Kentucky preceded him throughout East Tennessee. There were stories about him and his men gratifying "their savage propensities" by thrusting sharpened wood splinters into the flesh of Unionist men and women and cutting the splinters "close to their bodies" so needling points could not be retrieved.¹⁷ In response to these "confederate outlaws" who held military authority to wreak havoc on known Unionists, the wartime actions of Jonathan Hale stand out for his meticulous nature. He traced the Confederate movements, predicted their actions, and provided information to General Thomas at critical points throughout the war. In

¹⁵ 1860 U.S. census, Clinton county, Kentucky, population schedule, p. 169-178; Brian D. McKnight, *Confederate Outlaw*, 17.

¹⁶ McKnight, *Confederate Outlaw*, 32, 20.

¹⁷ "A Brief History of the Cruelties and Atrocities of the Rebellion" ed. Thomas L. Wilson, August 1864, Jonathan Hale Papers, Huntington Library.

January of 1862 a report made it to General Thomas' Headquarters from someone other than Hale, that suggested approximately two thousand rebels "intended to attack the encampment," and were within two miles. The information gave Thomas pause and he sent Hale outside the protection of camp to investigate the accuracy of the report. No rebels existed within four miles and after reporting such, General Thomas learned that "Rebels had circulated the report in order to draw our troops away from camp," so they could capture it easily.¹⁸ General Thomas wrote generously on behalf of Hale for the rest of his life. It was through Hale "and those employed by him I was constantly informed of the movements of the enemy."¹⁹ Hale provided an important service to the Union Army.

Ferguson's attorney, Willis Scott Bledsoe, came from Fentress County and while he was only 23 years old when Tennessee seceded, he managed to raise a company of Confederate cavalry.²⁰ Confederates existed in Hale's adoptive hometown community but they were a minority. Fentress County had voted 651-128 against secession. The particular brand of bloodlust they seemed to carry with them into their Confederate service, though, was unsettling in its intimate nature. Galen Elliott, a Fentress County native, joined up with Henry Sublett, a leader in Ferguson's gang, in a raid on Hale's Mills in September of 1862. Elliot and Sublett both answered to Bledsoe, formally, but rode alongside and provided aid to Champ Ferguson. Men testified to knowing these men as "rober(s) & murderers" who dealt horrors to the neighborhood and "frequently engaged in murdering citizens"

¹⁸ Testimony of Jonathan D. Hale to the Headquarters Department of the Cumberland, 1898, Jonathan Hale Papers, Huntington Library.

¹⁹ George H. Thomas to Secretary of War, August 14, 1866, Nashville, TN, Jonathan Hale Papers, Huntington Library.

²⁰ Brian McKnight, *Confederate Outlaw*, 23.

who held Union sympathies. Jonathan Hale kept all of these testimonies in his leather notebook. They were the evidence he required so that he could submit them to proper authorities later.²¹

The raid on Hale's property in September of 1862 devastated the family, even from their safe distance in Covington. The raid also sent a strong message to the Unionists who remained in Fentress County. Pheroba maintained contact with several Unionist families who remained in her hometown and she filled her letters to Jonathan with updates on who Champ Ferguson had murdered, how he had most recently escaped capture, and all the physical and financial ruin he left in his wake. Pheroba and Jonathan kept each other updated on their property. "I hope it is true that Johny [their son] will get our piano," she wrote him in December of 1862, and warned Jonathan that "Ferguson was still at large." The land has been razed, the mill burned to the ground, the precious family piano stolen, and the home raided for anything left behind of value.²²

When writing to Pheroba, Jonathan tried to maintain a veneer of safety in his travels and his work. He focused on the mundane and mildly irritating when he wrote to his wife. He needed boots and warm clothes and blankets in the winter. He lamented being absent on anniversaries and holidays. He sent his love to the children. He relayed messages from General Thomas, who often thanked Pheroba for sending along notes or books or foodstuffs to him. He wrote about a future where he hoped "we shall live to share many a happy" day together once the war ended and Tennessee restored to the Union.²³ They would have to survive the war first, though, and that meant deciding where their loyalties lay and actively working towards seeing them preserved.

²¹ Jonathan Hale, Notebook, 1865-1869, "Testimony of CPT Rufus Dowdy, Comd Co D 1st Tenn Inf.," Jonathan Hale Papers, Huntington Library; Jonathan Hale, Notebook, 1865-1869, "Testimony of Shery C. Jackson," Jonathan Hale Papers, Huntington Library.

²² Pheroba Hale to Jonathan Hale, December 21, 1862, December 22, 1862, and December 26, 1862, Covington, Kentucky, Jonathan Hale Papers, Huntington Library.

²³ Jonathan Hale to Pheroba Hale, January 18, 1863, Murfreesboro, Tennessee, Jonathan Hale Papers, Huntington Library.

Pheroba seemed to have a more complicated understanding of loyalty. She was loyal to her husband. She showed it in the details and the care she took to ensure that her husband served the Union in as much comfort as she could muster under the circumstances. They were not newlyweds when he left the home, nor was he walking away from a peaceful homestead. Confederates were “Tories” and Ferguson’s guerrillas were “rascals” and she found life to be constant interaction with people for whom she did not care.²⁴

The use of the term “Torie” by both Jonathan and Pheroba Hale is illuminating, as the word ties their understanding of the world and their interpretation of their wartime experience in a historical context. The Hales called Confederates and their sympathizers the term in a manner that connoted them with the southern aristocratic loyalists of the American Revolution. Fellow East Tennessee Unionist scout and spy, Daniel Ellis, defined the Confederacy as the sons and faithful representatives of the “Old Tories of the first American Revolution, who fought against their own government at that day.” The sons and grandsons of the southern aristocracy wanted to build a “southern monarchy” that paid tribute to the defenders of class hierarchy. They were “chips off the old blocks” who sought to abridge the political rights of poor white southern citizens and extend the privileges of the slaveholding and landholding classes. Southern rebellion represented “their best energies to subvert and utterly destroy the proud temple of American freedom.”²⁵ Ellis and the Hales understood that within the Confederacy, their economic outlook was grim because they did not inherit a wealth that provided generational comforts.

While Pheroba belonged to this imagined community that shared a common worldview, her physical world contracted during the Civil War as she settled in Covington. Pheroba felt isolated.

²⁴ Pheroba Hale to Jonathan Hale, Covington, Kentucky, December 19, 1862, Jonathan Hale Papers, Huntington Library.

²⁵ Daniel Ellis, *Thrilling Adventures of Daniel Ellis: The Great Union Guide of East Tennessee For a Period of Nearly Four Years During the Great Southern Rebellion*, (New York: Harper & Brothers, Publishers, 1867) 84-85.

Her community existed in the networks that stretched for miles beyond her safe house in northern Kentucky. “This is a very lonesome place to live in” she explained to Jonathan and tried to explain it away with the town’s industrious nature. She engaged with the German population in the small Kentucky farm and walked away disappointed in their inhospitable character. “I think the Germans are a very peaceable industrious people but particularly selfish,” she noted, hoping “none of them may ever be treated as we have been.”²⁶ Her letters to him developed an abbreviated shorthand over time. Pronouns and adverbs were dropped. They were familiar with each other. They gossiped. The greatest demonstration of her loyalty to her husband, however, comes out of her sheer persistence in letter writing. Pheroba and Jonathan often wrote past each other. While they saved each letter they physically received from one another, much of the content discussed the letters they did *not* get and as a result, Jonathan developed a strong disdain for the United States Postal Service during the war.

Beyond her husband and the people who, like herself, engaged the social contract of good citizenship, Pheroba demonstrated her loyalty to a network of connections that resisted the Confederate state. Mr. and Mrs. Cheshire lived in Covington and provided Pheroba with gracious company on holidays. Pheroba depended on them when she could not cover the costs of supporting her family. The Cheshires supported Jonathan Hale’s espionage efforts and were some of the few who knew of his actions when they were taking place. A local merchant, Mr. Starbuck, kept Jonathan in warm wool coats and blankets in the winters and sent him the latest pro-Union pamphlets as a means of facilitating resistance in the Rebel portions of Tennessee.²⁷ Pheroba’s letters to her husband describe an intricate web of facilitators. Her isolation was purely geographical; her loyalties illustrated a lively and active network of people who recognized the value of remaining

²⁶ Pheroba Hale to Jonathan Hale, Covington, Kentucky, December 16, 1862, Jonathan Hale Papers, Huntington Library.

²⁷ Pheroba Hale to Jonathan Hale, Covington, Kentucky, December 27, 1862, Jonathan Hale Papers, Huntington Library.

under the protection of the United States Constitution. Others understood how the Constitution might be improved once the rebellion died and the Union was certainly preserved.

When this community witnessed atrocity against strong and wealthy Union men, their anger towards the Confederacy grew. Hale recalled a wealthy East Tennessee landowner, John Eldridge of Meigs County, who had been “taken prisoner for Union sentiments, carried South, badly treated and died of exhaustion in Macon, Georgia.” When his wife and children attempted to make arrangements for retrieval and interment of his remains, the Rebels refused access to the body. John Eldridge’s loyalty to Union made him “unworthy to be interred upon Tennessee soil.” Hale supposed Rebel torment of loyal Unionists perpetuated a war-time practice of “many tender females” working in the fields “half clad and hungry, in open fields under the scorching rays of a summer sun,” to grow sustenance for the children while “steel hearted Rebels” snatched their crops “without recompense or hope of reward.”²⁸ Jonathan Hale served his loyalty to order and decency when he signed on to provide information to General Thomas.

Pheroba and Jonathan Hale seemed to practice a loyalty born of social contract. Jonathan Hale remained loyal to the Union because it was under the Union’s protection that his path to success existed. He was the New England Yankee with ambitions further south and further west; his industrial spirit and work ethic created comfort. They both held an implicit understanding of white supremacy with internalized mastery in thought and action. They were slave-holders who appreciated whiggish ideologies. It takes resources and a tight-knit community of conspirers to successfully spy on Confederate movements and motivations while evading Champ Ferguson and his band of delinquents. In order for the Union to be successful in the Mountain South, they required accurate information. Accurate information came from capable spies with deep

²⁸ Jonathan Hale, “Notes on East Tennessee,” no date, The Jonathan Hale Papers, Huntington Library.

connections and a network of capable people. Those people, like the Cheshires and Mr. Starbuck, were as central to their experience as their own actions.

Jonathan and Pheroba identified as white landowners in the slave-holding south with ambition and an expectation of success. They were not virulently or violently racist, but unlike the East Tennesseans Fredrick Law Olmsted encountered in the Appalachian Mountains some seven years before the Civil War, the Hales had thought out their place in the American system and how slavery played a role. Where Olmsted insisted that East Tennesseans' "statements regarding slavery and slaveholders were rarely thought out and were usually based on little beyond their own limited experience," Pheroba and Jonathan Hale understood that secession from the protections of the federal government put their future ambitions in danger.²⁹ Pheroba had proposed marriage to a stranger at the age of 14 and Jonathan had moved away from his kith and kin to find opportunity southwest of New England. They had worked to be in their position, theirs was not a case of inherited wealth and easy access. They followed the rules of society. Historian Robert Tracy McKenzie has highlighted that East Tennessee Unionists understood where their protections existed and that if slavery were to survive, ensuring the maintenance of institutional white supremacy, they had to preserve the Union. Jonathan and Pheroba Hale forged their own path towards the lives they wanted and they both understood that the desires they held for the future belonged firmly under the protection of the United States Constitution.

In Jonathan's letters to his wife, he described the difficulties of running men, supplies, and information throughout the Appalachian South without raising suspicions were many and they were unending. Daniel Ellis provided a chilling description of navigating the mountains unnoticed in his 1867 autobiography, *The Thrilling Adventures of Daniel Ellis*. Ellis, like Hale, provided safe passage

²⁹ John Inscoe, "Olmsted in Appalachia: A Connecticut Yankee Encounters Slavery and Racism in the Southern Highlands, 1854" in *Appalachians and Race*, 163.

through the mountains throughout the duration of the Civil War. He had little choice in it; Rebels identified him as one of the East Tennessee bridge burners within days of his participation and he escaped capture by becoming a fugitive perpetually on the run. He described running into the mountains with no food, preparation, or thought. The geographic realities of living in the mountains meant constantly being aware of one's elevation and line of sight. With roads and paths and railroad tracks following a general trail of least resistance, scouts like Ellis and Hale depended upon their physical ability to travel those same routes off road. That meant climbing mountains and crossing rivers and crawling "under a knot of forest branches so completely intermixed and interwoven that a bird could not fly through them," to build an encampment they could only enter "crawling upon our hands and knees under thick branches."³⁰ In the winter, they froze. In the summer, they suffered dehydration and bug bites. A day of travel by road could easily double or triple in time when scouts moved a few meters off the beaten path and into the untamed mountain landscape. Even more dangerous than the woods, though, were the open fields. Climbing and descending treacherous terrain under the cover of night and the tree canopy provided means of movement unseen. There was no good time to cross fields or tree-less valleys. Even at night, movement could be perceived by a vigilant eye.

Geography also affected the way warfare was waged in the mountains. Men like Hale required dedicated surveillance, looking and listening for word of possible "stampedeers." They could be formally enlisted soldiers or a band of local militia. They could be locally sanctioned or part of an occupying force. They could be guerrilla bushwhackers. What defined them was their style of attack. Stampedeers understood that mountain warfare makes surprise attacks virtually impossible. Instead of attempting a covert operation, they depended on the power of gossip and word of mouth. They

³⁰ Daniel Ellis, *The Thrilling Adventures of Daniel Ellis*, 39.

premeditated their approach, but they did not try to catch their enemy off-guard. They wanted the opposition to fear them. They swarmed their enemy because the mountain landscape also prevented an easy retreat.³¹ Elevation, concealment, and terrain exasperated the missions of scouts and spies. Hale kept this part of his war away from Pheroba when he wrote her letters. She got grumbles and complaints or she got gossip from command or a review of the weather. He sent her shopping lists. He did not feed her fears with the physical dangers he encountered on top of his assigned mission.

While he collected intelligence for Union generals, Pheroba worked for the Union from her new home in Covington, Kentucky. The decision to leave her home in Hales Mills and keep her family in the relative safety of Kentucky might very well have saved her life. Women living under occupation often suffered at the hands of both legitimate Confederate soldiers and guerrilla rebel bushwhackers. Historian Stephanie McCurry has offered Sarah Thompson's wartime experience as an illustration of torment. Thompson, of Greeneville, stayed afraid in her hometown during the war. Her husband deployed with the Union and Sarah, like Pheroba, worked as a collaborator with a network community of Unionists. For her loyalty, though, Sarah Thompson endured harassment. She recalled other women in her network who faced being "threatened, plundered, burned out, knocked about, and abused" by resentful Confederate occupiers. Thompson worked with her network of Unionists, men and women, black and white, in concert to capture CSA General John Hunt Morgan, inclined towards criminal banditry, in September of 1864.³² Pheroba faced uncertainty and strained resources throughout the war, but her retreat into the relative safety of Covington seemed a sound choice when compared to other Unionist women's experiences.

³¹ Ellis, *The Thrilling Adventures of Daniel Ellis*, 75.

³² Stephanie McCurry, *Confederate Reckoning: Power and Politics in the Civil War South*, (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2010) 121-122.

Reports of Fentress County during the Civil War paint a picture of bloodshed and chaos. Sam Cowan's assessment of social divisions concluded that before the war, "the county had been sharply divided politically, and with few exceptions those alignments held." Unionists went north to enlist in the federal army. Proponents of secession enlisted in Confederate regiments forming around them. Those who could not or would not fight "were compelled by public sentiment to take sides, and the bitterest of feeling was engendered." Cowan has argued that Home Guards were a farce and a pretense for extralegal violence and thievery. Bands of men who either answered to Unionist "Tinker" Beaty or Secessionist Champ Ferguson strove for primacy and developed "into guerrillas of the worst type of war produced, and anarchy prevailed." Churches closed. Bushwhackers invaded their services to find men to kill or enlist. Houses burned. Courthouses fell empty and post offices were abandoned. Stores hid their goods and merchandise from guerrillas looking to commandeer supplies. Families followed the Hale's example and abandoned their homes; their fields were robbed and used as common land.³³

By 1865, Jonathan Hale was in regular contact and correspondence with military governor of Tennessee, Andrew Johnson. He drew maps and provided the latest intelligence of confederate movements. He provided reconnaissance on potential troop encampments and talked Johnson through the potential actions of guerrillas, explaining their tactics and deployment of the geographical features. Mountains and the rivers that ran through them were "special hiding places" for bushwhackers.³⁴ Pheroba negotiated agricultural futures on behalf of Jonathan and there were promises made from northern planters who wanted to take advantage of the Hale work ethic.

³³ Sam K. Cowan, *Sergeant York and His People*, 125-6.

³⁴ Jonathan Hale to Andrew Johnson, February 18, 1865, Carthage, TN, Jonathan Hale Papers, Huntington Library.

When the Civil War ended, the weary mountain landscape, social and physical, worked to mend itself in a preserved Union without slavery. That seemed to matter less to Jonathan Hale. The surrender at Appomattox did not indicate an end to Hale's search for justice. His loyalty was no longer simply tethered to the Constitution and its protections, it was a loyalty to vengeance and an obsession with recognition. Jonathan Hale wanted everyone to know what he had done, what his family had achieved and lost, in the name of the United States. The spy who never wore a Union uniform wanted his due for service, and part of that included retribution to the people who aided the efforts of Champ Ferguson. When the Tories' effort at rebellion failed, the men who tormented and tortured "Lincolnites" needed to pay for their sins: publicly, financially, and with their lives.

Shame seemed to be a powerful motivator in how the Hales dealt with postwar animosities. Hale maintained lists of disloyal citizens, in his county and the surrounding areas. In 1866, a J. J. Kelley of Hamilton County sent Jonathan Hale a detailed list of "very bad Tories" in his area. Divided by region, Kelley also placed asterisks next to the men who had sworn an oath of loyalty to the Union in order to resume their rights of citizenship.³⁵ He collected sworn testimonies of East Tennesseans who had suffered at the hand of Champ Ferguson. Pages and pages of handwritten statements made by women who recalled harrowing encounters with a quick-tempered man who eagerly took supplies and food and valuables away from families calling them "mine, now." In the pages of a notebook, Jonathan Hale collected indictments against guerrillas and bushwhackers. He created profiles of the men who helped Champ Ferguson terrorize loyal East Tennesseans. He recorded their faults with his ink. Oliver Hughes drank, swore and gambled. Lynch Huges held a reputation of being "charged with dishonesty in nearly all his dealings with coal & lumber men." Hale interviewed soldiers, too. Men who returned from federal service to find no work to be had

³⁵ J.J. Kelley, "Very Bad Tories of Hamilton, County, East Tennessee" 1866, Jonathan Hale Papers, Huntington Library.

because bushwhackers had taken a hold of Fentress County via guerrilla terrorism and intimidation.³⁶

In the opening pages of historian Brian McKnight's *Confederate Outlaw*, Hale is described "with a pen as his preferred weapon" and a man who preferred to chase Ferguson through sworn statements and affidavits. He used the governmental apparatus, the one he defended as a Unionist, to pressure federal and state agencies into hunting down and trying Ferguson and his gang in a court of law. This is true, but Hale was more than a writer. His wartime service as a spy indicates he was a man of direct action, too. This distinction is important because Hale believed deeply in a social and governmental order that recognized the efforts of loyalty. Pushing a pen would not have been enough for Jonathan Hale. His history of action attests to this. Dismantling the Confederacy through subterfuge and hunting Champ Ferguson down to stand trial was a critical point in Hale's postwar petitions for financial restitution.³⁷

Pheroba spent the first few weeks after the formal end of war getting her children in school and managing boarding arrangements with families nearby their lessons. The weather in Covington, Kentucky in April of 1865 was damp and left many "low with Scarlett fever." She wondered where her eldest son, Johny, was and worried about his safety. Too much time passed without word from her husband or her son.³⁸ Mail delivery slowed to a crawl after Lincoln's assassination and she described how the community woke up to "drape the whole city in mourning. They say it is a grand but sad sight to look at." Pheroba expressed anxiety about the future of the Union in the wake of Lincoln's death. "We can't tell," she wrote her husband, "what affect it will have. There are various opinions, some think the government will move on as it has been. Others, think differently. Time

³⁶ Jonathan Hale, "Notebook, bound volume "Boot C"" 1864-1888, Jonathan Hale Papers, Huntington Library, 78, 2.

³⁷ McKnight, *Confederate Outlaw*, 4.

³⁸ Pheroba Hale to Jonathan Hale, April 9, 1865, Covington, Kentucky, Jonathan Hale Papers, Huntington Library.

only will show.”³⁹ By the time Lincoln’s body traveled across the nation to his final resting place, Pheroba wondered how Rebels could still wear their uniforms in public spaces without dying of shame.

Returning to their home in Fentress County was not an immediate option. Pheroba lived in constant uncertainty about her husband’s whereabouts and safety. Johny, her son, had not written during most of the war and she grew frustrated at what his postwar life might look like after such a disrespectful display during his service. Most of Pheroba’s enslaved laborers left her employ when emancipation came, leaving her and her children short on labor and desperate for a successful season of crops.

Pheroba had a boarder who could not be compelled to pay rent in a timely manner when she came to collect. She had a corn crop that worried her with too much rain and then drought. The mud slowed down all the planting and then the harvesting. Downpours and storms bruised the orchard fruits. Pheroba sold some livestock. She kept the wagon and pony. In her letters to her husband, she asked him for instructions on when and how to move the family back to Tennessee. At one point, she mentioned in passing the possibility that they not move back to Fentress County. She imagined a clean slate, moving somewhere completely new where the neighbors did not have such a difficult shared history and they could begin a happy and unencumbered life. She argued that as long as they were together, it did not matter much where they lived. Fentress County had not been so irreplaceable. The land and the stuff could be found elsewhere and the people had failed her with their silence regarding Champ Ferguson. Fentress County was not home. Wherever Jonathan and Pheroba could be together would be her home.

³⁹ Pheroba Hale to Jonathan Hale, April 21, 1865, Covington, Kentucky, Jonathan Hale Papers, Huntington Library.

While not preserved, Jonathan's response to this dream must have established the plan. It was settled; they were moving back to Fentress County. Pheroba's inquiries became more logistical and the dreams of starting over went unwritten. Jonathan Hale drafted petitions for recognition of hardship in Fentress County because of the terrorism endured under Champ Ferguson. He petitioned for federal military occupation of his county. He petitioned for federal recognition of his service. He employed the routes preserved in his Constitutional social contract. He had followed the rules.

In the spring of 1866, Jonathan Hale returned to his land and made his intentions clear to the Post Office Department "of his readiness to assume the duties of his office" as postmaster for his portion of Fentress County. It was then he learned of being in default with the government. Hale denied the charge of default and proceeded to provide the government with evidence that "the Government was indebted to him in a considerable sum for moneys withdrawn."⁴⁰ In other words, Jonathan served in an unofficial capacity in the United States military and it was time for the federal government to pay him for his contribution to the war effort. Hale would spend the remainder of his life seeking payments for services rendered.

On the Fourth of July, 1867, Jonathan Hale gave a speech recognizing the six year anniversary of the Hale Family celebration of Independence Day in 1861. He recalled when "patriotism was a crime" and attendees of the event were later murdered by Tories and Ferguson's men. Hale reminded attendees that strength existed in the union and "eternal vigilance is the price of liberty."⁴¹ Because Tennessee was immune to many national and formal Reconstruction efforts, Hale and other unionists worried about hollow assertions of postwar loyalty where there had existed none

⁴⁰ Jonathan Hale, "Petition to the Senate and House of Representatives," January 20, 1888, Jonathan Hale Papers, Huntington Library.

⁴¹ Jonathan Hale, "Speech on the anniversary of the Fourth of July celebration of 1861," July 4, 1867, Jonathan Hale Papers, Huntington Library.

prior. Vigilance required a long memory. When lawyers and judges who had been “the first to preach to us treason” and advocates against the Union took their positions in the state courts again, the Hales’ Mill community petitioned to suspend their practice of the law. Those men “have used all their influence to destroy all laws both human & divine during the last four years” and did not possess the legitimacy to practice law within a system they actively sought to dismantle.⁴²

The Hale Family’s loyalty to Union made them targets for violence in the postwar Mountain South. When Jonathan heard that local militias were likely to be removed from Fentress County in early 1869, he beseeched officials to reconsider the plan because the “Ku Klux” forced out of Overton and Jackson Counties lay in wait along the edge of Kentucky, hoping for a withdrawal of troops. Jonathan Hale called the proposed removal foolish. He had spent the years since war’s end collecting sworn testimonies and affidavits against these southern terrorists. In April of 1868, Hale received a letter of warning signed from the “Ku Klux Klan Lodge No. 1007.” In it, the anonymous authors notified Hale that the “Spirit of Champ Ferguson still lives, and there are men living that are determined to avenge his death.” Without federal occupation of his home, the Hale Family would inevitably fall victim to Klan violence as punishment for their loyalty to the Union.⁴³ Hale wrote to the governor, a Democrat who took over the role of Tennessee governor after William Brownlow’s election to the United States Senate, who did not listen to Hale and would be consequently described as a “vilest and meanest” man who only appealed to those of rebel character.⁴⁴ By the end of 1869, Pheroba would once again begin a long-distance correspondence with her husband as he tried to chase down the guerrillas who tormented him via the legal system. She remarked, at one

⁴² Jonathan Hale, “Petition,” January, 1867, Jonathan Hale Papers, Huntington Library.

⁴³ Jonathan Hale to D.W. Senter, April 9, 1869, Hale’s Mill Fentress County, Tennessee, Jonathan Hale Papers, Huntington Library.

⁴⁴ Ku Klux Klan Lodge No. 1007 to Jonathan Hale, “Facsimile copy with letterhead ‘Law and Constitution,’” April 12, 1868, Jonathan Hale Papers, Huntington Library; A. Griffin to Jonathan Hale, June 1, 1869, Jonathan Hale Papers, Huntington Library.

point, how strange it seemed to her that “knowing what you all do about this country (or the people in it) you can’t be willing to leave it.” Pheroba had had enough of her home state and the suffering it offered. That Jonathan seemed so determined to remain amongst a hostile community baffled her and she decided it must be “fate.”⁴⁵

Jonathan and Pheroba’s “fate” and future did not exist in Fentress County in the end. He did not qualify for recompense or recognition by the Southern Claims Commission when it was established in 1871.⁴⁶ That organization existed to award financial compensation to loyal citizens living in the South who had their land and property appropriated by federal forces during the war. And while loyalty was an explicit and defining characteristic of the applicants who received payment, Hale’s Unionist loyalties had been more physical and undisguised at the beginning of the war. His property was destroyed by guerrilla terrorists and there was no commission to pay him back for that. Neither did Hale qualify for a federal pension. His work for General Thomas and the federal army was equivalent to espionage and it was a non-military contract job. They returned to Stoddard, New Hampshire, bankrupt and broken in the 1870s.⁴⁷

The social contract under which they lived had not been recognized by the governing body and so the late nineteenth century witnessed constant appeals by Hale and others on his behalf for mercy and charity. Jonathan Hale continued to write. He wrote about his financial ruin. He wrote about the nature of war. He wrote about losing everything at the hands of men like Champ Ferguson. He published pamphlets that gave personal accounts and thoughts about his actions during the Civil War, but he also printed the letters of federal officers who wrote on his behalf. He

⁴⁵ Pheroba Hale to Jonathan Hale, September 28, 1869, Hale’s Mill, Fentress County, Tennessee, Jonathan Hale Papers, Huntington Library.

⁴⁶ “Settled Case Files for Claims Approved by the Southern Claims Commission, 1871-1880,” National Archives Catalogue, <https://catalog.archives.gov/id/566157>, (accessed August 21, 2019).

⁴⁷ U.S. Federal Census 1880, “Stoddard, Cheshire, New Hampshire,” Page 3, Supervisor’s District no. 82, Enumeration District no. 64.

railed on behalf of veterans of the war, like himself and his family, who could not get the formal recognition they deserved but the president can get a salary raise that doubled his income:

“On the morning of the day Miss Nelly Grant was married, J.D. Hale occupied part of a small room at the rear of No. 246 8th street N.E., Washington D.C. His only money consisted of one three-cent silver coin, and two one-cent copper coins; his food supply was a little molasses. With the copper coins he purchased meal at Adam’s grovery on the opposite corner of the street, and cooked in his room, and that sweetened with molasses served for his breakfast. His wife and two of their daughters were seating chairs in the state of New Hampshire to procure means by which to purchase food for themselves, and keep him in Washington where he was trying to induce the U.S. authorities to pay him for services rendered during active war times, then unpaid.”⁴⁸

He petitioned the government with his case. He insisted he had, in fact, served his country and deserved a pension for it. His pamphlets and testimonies and letters of recommendations were printed over and over again. Hale died of “old age” in Stoddard, New Hampshire in 1886 and the death certificate listed his occupation simply as “farmer.”⁴⁹ Pheroba passed away a few years later in 1901, in her husband’s hometown of Stoddard. The 1900 United States Federal Census listed her as the widowed head of household; she shared her home with the daughter Pheroba and Jonathan conceived during the war. Her name was East Tennessee Hale.⁵⁰ As late as 1898, two years after Jonathan Hale’s death, his published narratives still actively sought recognition of his service to his country. It never came and his understanding of how loyalty worked, and what purpose it served, never materialized during his lifetime.

⁴⁸ Jonathan Hale, “Number Nine: No Sir, I can’t tell you, but I can show you,” printed pamphlet, (1898).

⁴⁹ “New Hampshire Death Records, 1654–1947.” Index. FamilySearch, Salt Lake City, Utah, 2010. New Hampshire Bureau of Vital Records. “Death Records, 1654–1947.” Bureau of Vital Records, Concord, New Hampshire.

⁵⁰ 1900 U.S. Census, Chesire Co., NH, pop.sch., ED 38, sheet 10, dwell 10, fam 134, Pheroba Hale.

CHAPTER 5

DEMANDING LOYALTY: GREENEVILLE AND ANDREW JOHNSON'S DRESS
REHEARSAL FOR RECONSTRUCTION

On a Saturday afternoon in August of 1868, William G. Moore walked into Andrew Johnson's bed chamber in the White House to a startling scene. The personal secretary had worked his way through the ranks as an enlisted man in the District of Columbia Volunteers at the onset of the Civil War. By May of 1865, Moore worked as assistant adjutant-general of the volunteers, holding the rank of major. By the time he called the president his supervisor, Moore was commissioned lieutenant-colonel. He listened to, and recorded, the words and actions of the seventeenth president.¹ Sometimes he offered interpretation of a look, a glance, or an emphasis where Johnson might be implying more than what he said. Mostly, though, Moore kept a written record of Johnson's presidency throughout the impeachment process.

On this particular day, August 1st, Andrew Johnson's impeachment fatigue showed plainly in his countenance. When Moore walked into his room, Johnson picked up a basket containing a package of flour. "Have you ever seen whiter flour?" he asked Moore, and then explained it had been produced at the mills on a piece of property Johnson owned near his hometown, Greeneville, Tennessee. Johnson then pointed to a corner of the package which had been nibbled away. He told Moore he was sitting, preparing for bed, when he saw a little mouse play around with the basket.

¹ St. George L. Sioussat, "Notes of Colonel W.G. Moore, Private Secretary to President Johnson, 1866-1868," *The American Historical Review* 19, no. 1 (October 1913): 98.

Johnson put the object of desire in the hearth, where the mouse lived, and let his little friend get its fill of the superior product. He planned on filling the hearth with more flour that night.²

Months earlier, Moore had commented on a very different scene. Johnson had exhibited a “morbid distress” over the black employees at the White House. In April of 1868 six “stout negroes” hauled a heavy stone roller across the grass of the White House grounds in order to create a pathway around the garden house. Johnson watched the men working from a window and grew visibly irritated. He turned to Moore and asked, “if all the white men had been discharged?”; when Moore did not immediately know the answer, Johnson turned to his doorkeeper and asked if any “white men were not yet employed about the building and grounds?” Johnson railed against the “evident discrimination made here in behalf of the negroes,” and turned away in disgust.³

Even those loyal to Andrew Johnson spoke freely about his paradoxical career and attitudes. His private secretary from 1869 through 1875, E.C. Reeves, described Johnson as a “scholar, without an alma mater” and a “logician, without ever having read a book on logic.” Johnson saw no issue in offering his expositions on constitutional law without being a lawyer, and while his presidency was “ushered in by a tragedy and functioned through a perpetual storm,” his home state of Tennessee vindicated his career by re-electing him to his Senate seat on March 4th, 1875, the only ex-president to ever hold that honor.⁴ Johnson valued loyalty, first to Union and then to himself and those like him, above all else throughout his political career.

General Ulysses S. Grant earned his nickname, “Unconditional Surrender” with the fall of Forts Henry and Donelson, mere months after Tennessee declared secession from the Union, and

² William G. Moore, “Large Diary: Beginning March 21st, 1866 To and Including April 6, 1868,” August 1st, 1868, *Andrew Johnson Papers*, Library of Congress, Washington D.C.

³ William G. Moore, “Large Diary” April 9, 1868, *Andrew Johnson Papers*, Washington D.C.

⁴ John Quincy Adams served as a Senator from Massachusetts *before* his presidential career and a congressman in the House of Representatives after his presidency, but Andrew Johnson remains the only president to hold an office in the Senate after his presidency. E.C. Reeves, “My Recollections of Andrew Johnson,” *Andrew Johnson Papers, 1846-1875*, Tennessee State Library and Archives, Nashville, Tennessee.

paved the way for General Don Carlos Buell to take the capital city of Nashville on February 25th, 1862. Days later, President Abraham Lincoln named Senator Andrew Johnson the first military governor of an occupied state. Johnson worked with federal troops in the first Rebel state capital to fall and it would be their mission, as outlined by the president, to respect “civil guarantees of Republican government” in the hopes of attracting Southerners back into the Union fold.⁵ Johnson had attended the East Tennessee Convention in Knoxville in June of 1861 where he gave a speech on the dangers of secession and co-signed an enumeration of rights that admonished Tennessee’s participation in a moment of American history he described as “a most deplorable condition.” In their “Declaration of Grievances,” the convention participants argued the state had, in its vote to secede, fallen victim to “fanaticism, passion and prejudice” and East Tennesseans, as a result, suffered the “penalties of treason” as well as threats of murder and assassination for their loyalty to the Union.⁶

These affronts to the loyal men and women of East Tennessee were not forgotten by Andrew Johnson upon his ascension to military governor. He crafted a loyalty oath as one of his first acts in office, and immediately emptied all the municipal offices in Nashville when incumbents refused to declare their allegiance to the Union. Johnson saw immediate value in drawing a line between treason and loyalty. With a government at war for its very existence, loyalty in Tennessee mattered. But where did Johnson acquire his interpretation of loyalty? What made this walking

⁵ In Stephen Engle’s 2016 book, *Gathering to Save a Nation*, he argues that the relationship between loyal-state leaders and Abraham Lincoln was more collaborative than previously thought. The work is a study of Union governors and the role they played in ensuring southern defeat. Engle questions how and why “the nature of the war—first defeating a rebellion and then liberating slaves—defined, limited, and intensified the partnership between governors and Lincoln.” However the first governor that Lincoln hand selected to take control of a defeated southern state does not enter the study, even though that was the governor that ended up being his running mate in 1864 and the seventeenth president of the United States. That governor did not fit within the framework Engle built. He’s unlike any other Civil War governor and for that reason, he deserves his own consideration here. Stephen D. Engle, *Gathering to Save a Nation: Lincoln and the Union’s War Governors*, (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2016) 7, 155.

⁶ “Proceedings of the E. T. Convention, 1861” McClung Historical Collection, Knox County Library, Knoxville, Tennessee, 10, 23.

paradox able to hold Tennesseans to strict standards of allegiance during war and then soften his approach during his presidency? This man who could empathize with the mice living in his White House bed-chamber more than he could for the black servants under his employ requires an examination into how he developed his world view.

Historian Brooks Simpson introduced his book on the presidents of Reconstruction by suggesting that, in lieu of passing judgment on a president's character and motivation, it is better "to understand a person in the context of his or her times and circumstances" as a means of providing a more informed assessment. Historian Eric Foner's study of presidential Reconstruction offered the most accurate appraisal of Johnson's failures in Washington D.C. "Hardly a political novice," Foner argues, "he found himself, as President, thrust into a role that required tact, flexibility, and sensitivity to the nuances of public opinion—qualities Lincoln possessed in abundance, but that Johnson lacked." What none of historiography adequately considers, however, is the community that informed Johnson's opinions and ego. Greeneville shaped Johnson's world view and that is where this chapter directs the focus of Johnson's political grooming.⁷

If nothing else, Andrew Johnson represented a product of his time, place, and circumstance and because of that, an examination into the community that shaped him can also explain him and his agenda during Reconstruction. Historian Annette Gordon-Reed has highlighted many of the frustrations that manifest themselves when investigating Andrew Johnson's inner thoughts. He did

⁷ A fairly obvious observation, but it bears repeating, Simpson follows a long tradition of historical tracts that attempt to situate Johnson within his time and space. Howard K. Beale offered the first attempt to contextualize Johnson's actions in his study, *The Critical Year: A Study of Andrew Johnson and Reconstruction*. A corrective to the Dunning school, Beale's 1930 book and subsequent 1958 edition highlight Johnson's ego as a part of the historical investigation into his failures as a Reconstruction president. Erick L. McKittrick's study of Johnson, published in 1960, asserts in the opening footnote that the first half of the twentieth century had historians racing to rehabilitate Johnson's legacy so that it became difficult to frame a study of Reconstruction without giving Johnson the benefit of the doubt once he took on the role of president. Brooks D. Simpson, *The Reconstruction Presidents* (Lawrence: University Press of Kansas, 2009), 6; Howard K. Beale, *That Critical Year: A Study of Andrew Johnson and Reconstruction* (New York: Frederick Ungar Publishing, 1958), 11; Erick L. McKittrick, *Andrew Johnson and Reconstruction* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1960), 3; Eric Foner, *Reconstruction: America's Unfinished Revolution, 1863-1877* (New York: Perennial Classics, 1988), 177.

not leave behind much insight in his own written hand. His late entry into the literate world (his education began at the age of seventeen when he met his wife) left him insecure about penning letters and so the correspondence to Johnson far outweigh any from him. Value exists, though, in these letters that washed over Andrew Johnson throughout his literate life. He knew the opinions, the hopes, and desires of others. And, as Gordon-Reed aptly points out, Johnson struggled in a manner that “went to the heart of his eventual failure as president.”⁸ His strong will and determination made him rigid to the point of failure, but it also made him strong enough to assert and demand loyalty to the Union in a Confederate state. This very strength made him an obvious choice when Lincoln looked for a military governor in the midst of an occupation. From the governor’s mansion, he demanded loyalty from citizens, newspapers, and captured Confederate soldiers. His ability to do so made him a useful prop for Abraham Lincoln’s run for re-election in 1864. But that same dependable rigidity made him, arguably, one of America’s worst presidents and a major contributor to the failure of Reconstruction.

Generational poverty haunted the Johnson family. The family legacy was a landless and illiterate one, making Andrew Johnson an early advocate for creating opportunity where none previously existed. Born in late 1808 in Raleigh, North Carolina, Johnson came of age at a point in American history where political parties took on forms that extended beyond the personalities that served them. Johnson’s father, Jacob, died in 1812 leaving Johnson’s mother, Polly, in a desperate situation financially.⁹ She sent both of her boys to apprentice under a local tailor, James Selby, where they were legally bound to serve until their twenty-first birthdays. In what can objectively be compared to indentured servitude, the Johnson boys learned a trade with an unrealized expectation

⁸ Gordon-Reed, Annette, *Andrew Johnson* (New York: Times Books/Henry Holt, 2011) 7.

⁹ Gordon-Reed, *Andrew Johnson*, 19.

of education in return. They lived this way within a slave society. Illiterate, poor, helpless and socially stigmatized sons of questionable lineage understood that little more than their whiteness made them superior to the enslaved people around them.¹⁰

By the time Andrew Johnson made Greeneville, Tennessee home in 1826, he was already seventeen years old and had learned the difficult lessons of what was not possible for a young man in his position. He had been on the run for two years beforehand, escaping servitude and violence while his indentured master, Selby, placed a financial reward on his capture. He took his mother and step-father in a one-horse cart across the state lines to start a new life in Tennessee. Greeneville opened a new world to him and his family. Johnson described his first impression of the small mountain village like a smitten young man just encountering true love's first kiss. "The scene was full of beauty and loveliness," he recalled, with an atmosphere "laden with the perfume of honeysuckles and wild roses" and a tidy row of gardens that "shed their fragrance on the soft air." The mountains that surrounded the sleepy town "presented a view of restful majesty rarely to be found."¹¹ Andrew Johnson adopted this East Tennessee village as his new home, a place where he might shed the dynasty of poverty.

Greeneville held its own storied past and Andrew Johnson's adoption of the mountain town made sense. Named in honor of Nathanael Greene, the Rhode Island hero of the Revolutionary War, Greeneville's first American settlers arrived fresh from the Battle of King's Mountain with founder Daniel Kennedy, who was awarded a seat on the Washington County Court for his "gallantry in action" during the decisive battle.¹² Initially the settlement fell within the North Carolina border, but on December 14th, 1784, Kennedy and his deputies established an independent

¹⁰ Gordon-Reed, *Andrew Johnson*, 23.

¹¹ Oliver P. Temple, *Notable Men of Tennessee From 1833 to 1875: Their Times and Their Contemporaries* (New York: The Cosmopolitan Press, 1912), 358-9.

¹² Richard Harrison Doughty, *Greeneville: One Hundred Year Portrait, 1775-1875* (Kingsport, TN: Kingsport Press, 1975), 6.

government and Greeneville was named the capital of the new state of Franklin. Between 1786 and 1787 Greeneville fell under two different jurisdictions, North Carolina and Franklin. Courts were held in Greene County under the Franklin and the North Carolina governments. Laws were passed by both state assemblies and taxes were extolled by authority of both states. Franklin's governor, John Sevier, found his most loyal inhabitants in Greene County up until May of 1788 when the State of Franklin was "officially ushered away into oblivion."¹³

The mountain town had actively worked towards a whitened population. Cherokee lived and hunted the area for generations before English settlement, but by the time Tennessee declared its statehood and participated in the 1790 census, only 40 free persons of color lived in Greene County. With only 454 enslaved people, the slave population in 1790 was a meager 5.8%. The free population of color constituted .5% of Greene County's population.¹⁴ By 1860, the numbers remained similar in proportion. The total population of Greene County grew to just over 19,000 inhabitants. Of them, 6% or 1,297 people were enslaved. The remarkable number, however, came in the percentage of free people of color in Greene County which had dropped to a mere .01% of the population with only 222 people who identified as free blacks.¹⁵ And while Indian people were counted in the 1860 census, none were reported in the adopted hometown of Andrew Johnson. This was a decidedly white man's country.

¹³ The concept of the state of Franklin began as an attempt at statehood, but with recognition denied, it worked more like a *de facto* independent republic, with Greeneville as its capital. The Franklin separatist movement represents one of America's earliest attempts of secession. Historian Kevin T. Barksdale has described it as a small backcountry state focused on defending their communities from Indian attacks and federal land grabs by building a market economy and eradicating Native American inhabitants. The disintegration of Franklin and its absorption back into North Carolina in 1789 was marked by violent partisan politics and "passionate responses from inside and outside of the Tennessee Valley." Violent and passionate partisan actions and reactions seem to be the methods and means of this region's community politik. Doughty, *Greeneville*, 19; Kevin T. Barksdale, *The Lost State of Franklin: America's First Secession* (Lexington: University Press of Kentucky, 2009), 4.

¹⁴ United States Bureau of the Census, *First Census of the United States: 1790*. Department of Commerce, Washington.

¹⁵ United States Bureau of the Census, *1860 Census: Population of the United States*, State of Tennessee, Greene County, p. 466.

Greeneville was not an isolated city. It served as a post-town and sat six miles northeast of Greeneville College, the oldest college in Tennessee. The region held natural resources worth exploiting and possessed rivers that facilitated commodification of them. The northeastern most branch of the Nolachucky River ran to the east of the town and citizens got their water from the Holston and Clinch Rivers. Early roads ran through Greeneville, connecting the town to Knoxville, Jonesboro, Rogersville and beyond.¹⁶ Stage lines ran regularly through Greeneville, establishing networks between small mountain cities and a weekly mail service was in place by the 1830s.¹⁷

Greeneville shaped the young Johnson, but it did so in ways that would highlight his shortcomings in later years. Oliver P. Temple, another Greeneville native and Johnson's contemporary, argued the town lacked "a single man of wide intelligence, who could become an example to young Johnson." No public libraries existed, and good books were rare. While Greeneville College held an extensive library of six thousand volumes, Johnson did not have the time, nor the inclination it would seem, to take advantage of it. Purchasing books were beyond his financial ability as a tailor. Greeneville also lacked a local newspaper. Instead, Johnson informed his worldview by engaging with customers and people traveling through town. Those that entered his shop "were drawn into argument" and debate. He honed his political skills amongst the people he ultimately served, and with little outside influence the town of Greeneville shaped his understanding of where potential for improvements existed and whose needs deserved attention. Throughout the late 1820s and 1830s, Johnson proved himself worthy of representing the people in his community as a town alderman and then as mayor of Greeneville. His common and plain style went over well with the laboring classes and he thought himself a natural inheritor of Andrew Jackson's legacy.¹⁸

¹⁶ Doughty, *Greeneville*, 27.

¹⁷ Noel Fisher, *The Civil War in the Smokies*, (Gatlinburg: Great Smoky Mountain Association, 2005), 27.

¹⁸ Temple, *Notable Men of Tennessee*, 362-3.

The first Congressional district in which Greeneville fell had, since 1836, been a decidedly Whig stronghold. With new lines drawn in 1843, however, Democratic voters outnumbered Whig citizens all but assuring victory for Andrew Johnson. The first District of Tennessee saw elections that were decided during the primaries. The Democrat candidate who took the vote then was assured the subsequent election and with Johnson's new district lines drawn the Whigs quickly found themselves struggling to find an opponent who might challenge his authority.¹⁹

With a campaign style that bullied potential opponents more than it addressed the concerns over much-needed internal improvements, Johnson pushed too hard when it came to adherence to his short-sighted political agenda. Johnson consistently voted against legislation that placed funding into internal improvements, including railroad improvements. He expressed fears that a railroad line that extended into his part of the state would put inns and taverns out of business and take money away from the citizens who moved their goods by wagon. His failure to handle Greeneville's access to the marketplace pushed the voting base to look for alternative candidates.²⁰ Area Whig leaders found a political adversary in 1847 who could teach Johnson a lesson in remaining loyal to the community that lifted him into his position of power. The Whig candidate for governor in 1847, Neill S. Brown, approached young Greeneville native, Oliver P. Temple, about becoming a candidate for Congress and running against Andrew Johnson. According to Temple, the intimate nature of early congressional politics meant that Johnson and Temple traveled the electoral circuit together. This practice had, prior to Temple, worked to Johnson's advantage. His temper achieved its own fame within East Tennessee circles and he hurled insults at political opponents, creating a widespread and generalized fear of incurring Johnson's wrath.²¹

¹⁹ Oliver P. Temple, *Notable Men*, 216-7.

²⁰ Gordon-Reed, *Andrew Johnson*, 40.

²¹ Temple, *Notable Men*, 217-8.

On the first day of public speeches, July 11th, Andrew Johnson stood in front of a crowd at Taylorville, the county seat of Johnson County. Temple stood amongst the townspeople. He was new to politics and his face was unknown in Taylorville. At the conclusion of Johnson's stump speech, Temple rose and made his first of many rousing indictments against the Democratic nominee. Temple charged Johnson with neglecting volunteer soldiers in the Army in Mexico. Johnson had recently voted against an increase in pay that would have pushed their monthly income from seven to ten dollars a month. Temple pointed out that while Johnson was receiving eight dollars "*per day*, and living in ease and luxury as a member of Congress at Washington, he was voting against paying the poor volunteer who was fighting our battles in a torrid climate as much *per month* as he was receiving *per day*."²² This charge had a great effect upon the East Tennessee audience. Johnson's humble upbringing made up a large part of his appeal in a region.

The Whig candidate charged the Democrat with not being Democratic *enough* to hold office. And it was a smart move in this region of East Tennessee, because while much of the population followed the Whig party line and voted for Henry Clay in the 1844 election, the counties of Johnson's district voted heavily for James K. Polk. Greene, Hawkins, Washington and Sullivan Counties overwhelmingly voted for Polk over Clay. Johnson's failure to recognize that the loyalty of his constituents could also extend to his contemporaries provided a teachable moment for him in 1847.²³ Temple continued the race and verbally assaulted him at every opportunity, the only opponent to ever fight Johnson with his own rules. Luckily for Johnson, a loss was not the objective of East Tennessee powerbrokers. He won the 1847 election with 314 votes to spare.²⁴

²² Temple, *Notable Men*, 219, emphasis is provided by Temple.

²³ Presidential Election in 1844: Official Vote, Susan H. Douglas Political Americana Collection, Cornell University Library Digital Collections. Accessed May 22, 2018. Web.
<https://digital.library.cornell.edu/catalog/ss:10637543>

²⁴ Temple, *Notable Men*, 229.

When Johnson had made Greeneville his home, he entered a society run by successful merchants. They were the Deadericks and the Dicksons, the Earnest family and the Broyles family, and others who had been there since Greeneville became a village and facilitated its growth into a town. These merchant families grew their wealth alongside their prominence and their political opposition came from “the mechanics and the laboring class,” whose leaders included Andrew Johnson and Blackston McDannel.²⁵ In personal letters to friends, Johnson revealed his frustrations with some of the elite in his adopted hometown. Blackston McDannel, Johnson’s junior in age by a few years, also made Greeneville his home after being born and raised in nearby Knoxville. The editors of the Andrew Johnson Papers describe McDannel as “one of a small number of Greeneville intimates” and the letters exchanged between the two men hold nothing back when discussing frustrations and irritations.²⁶

McDannel’s financial and property equity placed him in the same middling class as Johnson. He worked as a plasterer and census records indicate he held real property valued at \$800 in 1850. His loyalty to Johnson created opportunity to provide for his family. When Johnson entered Congress in 1843, McDannel’s professional pursuits expanded and in addition to plaster work, he also helped area citizens file pensioner claims for veterans of the Mexican American War. In reciprocal fashion, McDannel’s loyalty to Johnson’s political pursuits ensured McDannel always had a seat at Johnson’s table. He worked on Johnson campaigns and, in return, found employment at various levels of government.²⁷

²⁵ *Goodspeed’s History of Tennessee: Containing Historical and Biographical Sketches of Thirty East Tennessee Counties* (Nashville: The Goodspeed Publishing Co., 1887), 885.

²⁶ Andrew Johnson to Blackston McDannel, December 23, 1844, in *The Papers of Andrew Johnson, Vol. 1 1822-1851* (Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press, 1967), 184, footnote 1.

²⁷ Blackston McDannel to Andrew Johnson, January 28, 1848, in *The Papers of Andrew Johnson, Vol. 1 1822-1851* (Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press, 1967), 407.

The letters back and forth reflect dry wit and real ambition in both men. When discussing the actions of President Polk, Johnson reminded McDannel that he “never betrayed a *friend* or [was] *guilty of the black sin of ingratitude*,” and lamented that the same could not be said of Polk. To both men, Polk encapsulated the failures of the Democratic party. His capitulation to Whiggish desires indicated a lack of loyalty to party.²⁸ There was no greater sin and Polk was labeled a man “deficient in moral courage” who “signally failed” to keep the party, and its agenda, intact.²⁹ A year and a half later, Johnson called McDannel the “*one left that I dare call my friend*.” His troubles with the elite men of Greeneville were just beginning and before Oliver Temple began his campaign, Johnson had already grown disillusioned with the resistance he encountered. Johnson took political rhetoric personally, and when Greeneville natives approached him with anything other than gratitude, he grew to resent them. “When I sum up the many taunts, the jeers, the gotten up and intended slights to me and mine,” he complained to McDannel, “I wish from the bottom of my heart, that we were all blotted out of existence, and even the remembrance of things that were.” This melodrama continued and he likened his experience in Washington to being “confined in some loathsome dungeon(sic).” He wished for McDannel’s company; he found comfort in close proximity to loyal and devoted friends. The other men of Greeneville, the men who scorned Johnson’s decisions and efforts in Washington, the men who criticized him, were “god forsaken and hell deserving mony

²⁸ James K. Polk famously used his silence on whiggish issues as seen in his stance on the US Bank and a national currency. In an effort to maintain popularity amongst constituents, historian Paul Bergeron notes in his article “The Election of 1843: A Whig Triumph, in Tennessee,” Polk “generally abstained from making statements on the matter of currency, since his party was divided on the question and since there were widespread demands to put more money in circulation.” Still, Johnson’s criticism of Polk seems unwarranted when examining Polk’s presidential agenda. Former president, Andrew Jackson, heartily approved Polk’s nickname, “Young Hickory,” which reminded voters of his dedication to Democrats. The appropriation of California, Texas, and Oregon ensured an expansion of slavery and lower tariffs coupled with the development of a small and independent treasury thwarted Whig attempts at internal improvements. Still, Johnson saw Polk’s policies as the actions of a man with diminished powers and believed Polk’s interests did not align with those of East Tennessee. Paul H. Bergeron, “The Election of 1843: A Whig Triumph, in Tennessee” in *Tennessee Historical Quarterly* 22, no. 2 (June 1963), 129; David A. Smith, *Presidents from Adams through Polk, 1825-1849* (Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 2005), 109-111.

²⁹ Andrew Johnson to Blackston McDannel, July 22, 1846, in *The Papers of Andrew Johnson, Vol. 1 1822-1851* (Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press, 1967), 332.

(sic) loving, hypotcritical(sic), back bighting(sic), [S]undy (sic) praying scoundrels (sic)” who perpetually caused ire to the congressman.³⁰

During the Mexican-American War, McDannel enlisted with other East Tennessee volunteers. In 1847, with Johnson campaigning for reelection and McDannel stationed near Vera Cruz, they shared what news either of them had about home.³¹ Johnson caught his friend up on the local gossip and what he chose as noteworthy indicates what he felt most important about Greeneville and its future. A local man, named Carter Johnson (no relation), opened up a “dead fall” in the west part of town. Dead falls, gambling places where alcohol was available for purchase and racial divides blurred, presented a problem for a small Appalachian town whose greatest days seemed already behind it. Poor whites engaged in sinful behaviors, like drinking and gambling, alongside enslaved African Americans and free people of color. Dead falls held a reputation that endangered white supremacy.³² Andrew Johnson described Carter’s dead fall that catered to an element of society that he had escaped with his elevation in class and status. It did not fit within his party agenda. It did not reinforce white supremacy and so Carter Johnson needed to learn a lesson about demanded loyalty.

Greeneville officials charged Carter Johnson with “trading with his negroes with an infraudulent (sic) intent.” Andrew Johnson, in recounting this news to McDannel, then half-joked

³⁰ Andrew Johnson to Blackston McDannel, January 10, 1847, in *The Papers of Andrew Johnson, Vol. 1 1822-1851* (Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press, 1967), 369-370.

³¹ *Goodspeed’s History of Tennessee: Containing Historical and Biographical Sketches of Thirty East Tennessee Counties* (Nashville: The Goodspeed Publishing Co., 1887), 1253. Both McDaniel and Johnson supported Polk’s decision to start a war in the name of land accumulation and Johnson used the promise of an expanded frontier as the basis for his introduction of his Homestead Bill which granted 160 acres to Americans willing to settle the acquired lands.

³² In the Black Belt of Alabama, a dead fall did not have to be a place of gambling and alcohol, the term also encompassed any makeshift store or shop where a “white thief encouraged black people to steal all kinds of farm produce and exchange it for bad whiskey, bad candy,” or brass jewelry. According to Dunning School Reconstructionist, Walter Lynwood Fleming, a “thirsty negro” would, under the cover of darkness, steal a sack of cotton or a bushel of corn and then go to a dead fall located “in the woods or swamps on the edges of the large plantations” where the goods were exchanged for a glass of whiskey, “a plug of tobacco, or a dime.” Fleming, an Alabama native and Vanderbilt historian friendly with the Southern Agrarians, suggested strongly that dead falls represented the dark desires of radicals and black inhabitants. Walter L. Fleming, *Civil War and Reconstruction in Alabama* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1907), 769-770.

that perhaps McDannel might run into Carter Johnson in Mexico, as he “became alarmed and has fled to parts unknown” after the indictments came down from a grand jury. Andrew Johnson and his friend held the future reputation of Greeneville as paramount in importance. Their understanding of loyalty demanded diligence. Carter Johnson never returned.³³

During the 1850s, Andrew Johnson served as Tennessee’s governor and senator, during which he introduced ideas and legislation that reflected his understanding of loyalty. When elected to the governorship in August of 1853, his newfound responsibilities demanded he make a declaration regarding progressive legislation, internal improvements, and the future of the state. By mid-December, Johnson’s silence on the issues irked many Tennesseans who identified as Whigs. Newspaper editorials needled Johnson, asking when the public might expect a message from their governor. “Is it (the message) in your drawer? Is it in your pocket? Is it in your hat?—Or is it,” they wondered, “in your head?”³⁴ Four days later, on December 19th, 1853, Johnson presented his Biennial Legislative Message to the state legislators in Nashville. He did, in fact, have a message for the Whigs.

The most striking position Johnson held in this message, the one that illustrated his position on enemies of the state was manifested in his section on the future of penitentiaries. Johnson rejected a whiggish or progressive approach to penitentiaries that fueled ideas where imprisonment might lead to rehabilitation and reform. For him, prison was a punishment. Time behind bars ought to be painful, it ought to hurt. He argued that not “one in every thousand convicts” found their moral character or their condition improved by rehabilitative imprisonment. “On the contrary,” he pointed out, “most of them if not all, are made worse than they were before, and become more

³³ Andrew Johnson to Blackston McDannel, October 19, 1847, in *The Papers of Andrew Johnson, Vol. 1 1822-1851* (Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press, 1967), 391-393.

³⁴ Andrew Johnson, LeRoy P. Graf, Ralph W. Haskins, and Paul H. Bergeron, introduction to *The Papers of Andrew Johnson, Vol. 2 1852-1857* (Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press, 1967), xxi.

confirmed in crime.”³⁵ A rehabilitation program that trained prisoners for employment as a mechanic after time served especially irked the newly elected governor. This program stood out as a disservice to two groups: innocent mechanics and men who are interested in learning the trade but are not in a position to access the training. Innocent men who practiced mechanical trades without the “benefit” of state-sponsored training in prison might end up being forced to welcome these people into their shops. They might be expected to be companions. “Is it right,” Johnson asked, “that this description of our population should be thrown upon, and associated with, the honest and industrious mechanics of the State, either in person or profession?”³⁶

Johnson decried this rehabilitative program as a snub to the second group. If the state were to continue sponsoring a social welfare program that provided education, the admission requirements as they stood were judged wholly unfair. He snidely referred to the mechanic school as the “*State mechanic institute*,” funded by the treasury of the State, but before a candidate could obtain admission to such a prestigious program, “he must first commit the horrid crime of murder, arson, larceny, rape, or some other violation of the offences violative of law.”³⁷ Johnson’s loyalty to the law-abiding, poor, white man could not abide providing opportunities to criminals that were not also available to them. This social welfare did not benefit the people Andrew Johnson identified with, the people from which he came and the situation he escaped. He needed a route for those men. Historian Keri Leigh Merritt has argued that Johnson’s ascension to political power made him “ beholden to causes benefiting the white southern laborer, the plain folk, and the common man,” however the poor white men needed to meet certain respectability requirements.³⁸ Lawbreakers did

³⁵ Andrew Johnson, “Biennial Legislative Message,” December 19, 1853, in *The Papers of Andrew Johnson, Vol. 2 1852-1857*, 198.

³⁶ *Ibid.*, 200.

³⁷ *Ibid.*, 198.

³⁸ Keri Leah Merritt, *Masterless Men: Poor Whites and Slavery in the Antebellum South* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2017), 55-56.

not help promote the cause of white supremacy and Johnson's policies were always cognizant of how to promote poor whites as deserving of access to opportunity. He believed in a finite number of opportunities and so the poor white man must be worthy. Lawless men were no better than free Black men. Neither deserved elevation from poverty. Land grants and access to education for the poorer white population superseded any attempt to rehabilitate criminals.³⁹

This loyalty to poor white men is seen more clearly in a letter Johnson wrote to his son, Robert, the following spring in April of 1854. He began the note by congratulating his two boys on their progress in school. Robert, 20, and Charles, 24, were attending university where they studied law and medicine respectively. Johnson quickly reminded Robert that they had no alternative should their studies slacken "for it is all that you and him will have to rely upon in the future," because they did not have "ancestral honors to rely on nor fortunes to sustain" them outside of their own diligence. The governor made it clear that this was the preferred means of success, however, suggesting that "the family who lays its own foundation has much more to be proud of than the one that is content with merely living upon that of those who have gone before them." Johnson saw his own bootstrap story as a source of inspiration for his sons. Johnson married into slave-ownership. It never had seemed likely before he moved to Greeneville and married into financial stability. Johnson believed the citizens with which he identified, the non-slaveholders, would never have a chance to improve their economic condition until the power of slaveholders were weakened. Success did not come passively. One actively worked towards it. "The effort should be constantly making, while health permits, prompt, present and efficient *action*" with dreams of a better life.⁴⁰

³⁹ Land for the poor had long been a pet project for Andrew Johnson. As a Congressmen in 1846, Johnson asked for permission to introduce a bill that would authorize "every poor man in the United States who is the head of a family to enter one hundred and sixty acres of the public domain "without money and without price."" Permission was denied by several members and Johnson did not get a chance to propose the bill. "Latest News!: From Washington: Congress," *Nashville Tennessean*, March 20, 1846.

⁴⁰ Andrew Johnson to Robert Johnson, April 16th, 1854, in *The Papers of Andrew Johnson, Vol. 2 1852-1857*, 230.

Greeneville was never far from Governor Johnson's thoughts and his letter moved into questions and comments about local social and political activity. As governor he could put East Tennesseans into positions of power and he took pride in that. More than political dealings, though, Andrew Johnson remained loyal to Greeneville in ways that demonstrated a deep connection to the community that placed him in the governor's mansion. While tailors existed throughout Nashville and Middle Tennessee, Johnson ended his note to his son with a request. "Tell Mr Harold to be sure and have my coat done," he asked Robert, "for I Shall need it as soon as I get there." The tailor-turned-politician sourced his own tailoring needs to another Greeneville citizen's business. He paid his own good fortunes forward.⁴¹

Johnson's pet projects on a state platform worked towards creating a level playing field for poor whites and what Keri Leigh Merritt calls "masterless men." Johnson called for political representation based on "white population alone" and believed that any white man who worked the land ought to have a fair chance in also owning it. The opinion was not a novel one in the state of Tennessee, but Johnson made sure his constituents knew his thoughts on race as a matter of principle. His political career's purpose was extending the privileges of white supremacy beyond the master class. The "benefits of whiteness" were never secure to the non-slaveholding and non-landholding whites. His political agenda always included the means to uplift poor white men as seen in his advocacy for the Homestead Bill and legislation that provided state funding to public school programs. Antebellum East Tennessee found poor whites, Andrew Johnson's constituency, without the ability to exercise privilege based on their skin color. Johnson's political purpose was to correct what he saw as a miscarriage of justice and that stood as something to which he would always be loyal.⁴²

⁴¹ Ibid., 231.

⁴² Keri Leigh Merritt, *Masterless Men*, 56, 266.

Good fortune seemed to be the defining characteristic of Andrew Johnson's political career in the 1850s. Tennessee's governors had little actual power (they could propose legislation but could not veto it); however Johnson used his strengths while in office and he spent much of his time giving his opinions on political issues. He advocated for a state library system and initiated Tennessee's first public school system. Both of these reforms offered opportunity to lower classes and that was his goal. In October of 1857 the state legislature elected him U.S. senator and in December, he gave a Valedictory Address where he recognized the new governor, Isham G. Harris, and then traveled to Greeneville for a brief visit before making his way to Washington D.C.

Initial political attitudes towards Tennessee's secession were not favorable, especially in Andrew Johnson's East Tennessee. The very idea of secession compelled Senator Johnson to give the most popular and widely read speech of his career. In December of 1860, Johnson took the Senate floor and spoke on the issue of secession. Hailed by newspapers as "the greatest speech of his life," Johnson argued that the only power states possess exists within the confines of the Constitution.⁴³ Should secession successfully take place and "be carried out upon the mere whim of a State, this [federal] Government is at an end." He pointed to the history of land acquisition in the United States and suggested that South Carolina's attempt to secede established a precedent wherein a majority of states might one day come together and expel a state out of the Union. "They have no right," he argued; the compact between state and Union was reciprocal.⁴⁴ States could not exist outside of the nation, nor could the nation expel a state. On the topic of Lincoln's election, Johnson made his sentiments clear: "I voted against him; I spoke against him; I spent my money to defeat

⁴³ *Clarksville (TN) Jeffersonian*, January 2, 1861.

⁴⁴ Senator Andrew Johnson of Tennessee, speaking on Secession, on December 18-19, 36th Congress, 2nd session, *Congressional Globe*, in *The Papers of Andrew Johnson, Vol. 4 1860-1861* (Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press, 1967), 9.

him; but I still love my country; I love the Constitution; I intend to insist upon its guarantees.”⁴⁵

This would be impossible if Tennessee left the blanket protections afforded under the United States government. Slavery was only protected under the United States Constitution. Checks and balances did not exist outside of the Constitution, either. Legislation like the Homestead Act did not pertain to a supposed southern nation. Legislation that protected the poor white men who voted Andrew Johnson into office did not exist inside a Confederacy. Loyalty was not one-sided; it required action on both sides and Johnson intended to use his legislative powers to ensure the constitutional rights of his constituents were protected. That protection did not exist outside of the Union.

The speech made headlines and the first few weeks of 1861 were filled with letters of support to Johnson from across the country, as well as effigies burned of Johnson’s likeness. From Greeneville, the Senator received reports from his children. Charles Johnson, who turned thirty years old at the start of the war, informed his father that Greene County supported the Union and the Senator’s sentiments. Outliers existed, of course, and “the Palmetto flag was hoisted on the streets one day by some irresponsible boys,” Charles confirmed on January 1st, 1861, “but it was soon forced to be hauled down and now the Stars and Stripes wave across the streets.” He assured his father that he did not think that even “twenty men in Greene County to day” would vote for secession.⁴⁶ Robert Johnson, by then twenty-seven years old, concurred with his brother. “Your speech is well received by all that have read it,” he assured the Senator, but pressed him to get printed versions of the speech to the state with some urgency. “They are in great demand and ought to be circulated all over the State by thousands and at an early day,” because secessionist papers were condemning it “very bitterly and are trying to create a prejudice against it,” before it had even been

⁴⁵ Senator Andrew Johnson of Tennessee, speaking on Secession, on December 18-19, 36th Congress, 2nd session, *Congressional Globe*, in *The Papers of Andrew Johnson, Vol. 4 1860-1861* (Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press, 1967), 43.

⁴⁶ Charles Johnson to Andrew Johnson, January 1st, 1861 in *The Papers of Andrew Johnson, Vol. 4: 1860-1861* (Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press, 1967), 111.

read. Robert then moved on to the topic of effigies being burned in his father's name in Greeneville and other parts of East Tennessee. "I presume you've heard of the burning of your effigy," Robert wrote, and then immediately reminded his father of John Tyler's experience of having his likeness burned twenty years prior after vetoing a popular bill. "They merely give light for a man to walk by" he remarked, and dismissed them with a simple, "let them burn."⁴⁷

Beyond family, the constituents of the Senator overwhelmed him with letters and notes responding to Johnson's thoughts on secession. The ones he preserved were enthusiastically appreciative of Johnson's assessment on the Union's perpetuity. Citizens from Columbia, Memphis, Knoxville, Cleveland, Clarksville, and Winchester, Tennessee, reached out to thank him for rejecting secession. His speech inspired reactions from outside his state, as well, and one J. Warren Bell from Springfield, Illinois, praised Johnson for being "ever true to his country." Bell took time to defend Abraham Lincoln's ascension to the White House, too. Lincoln's administration would be "all that can be asked or desired by all good citizens, north and south," and promised "He is no abolitionist," but rather a "firm Republican," incapable of being swayed by secessionist or abolitionist agendas. Johnson's response to this letter, if it survived, did not make it into the collected papers. However Johnson replied to John Trimble around the same time and it did make it into his archives in Nashville, Tennessee.⁴⁸ Trimble, a career politician and Greeneville native, wrote Johnson about his great speech just days after it took place. Johnson immediately turned to the topic of secession, an act of "terror" he blamed entirely South Carolina. While slavery informed the move, it merely served "a pretext and not the real design." Johnson argued that secession intended to disrupt government,

⁴⁷ Robert Johnson to Andrew Johnson, January 1, 1861 in *The Papers of Andrew Johnson, Vol. 4: 1860-1861* (Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press, 1967), 112; In 1841, President John Tyler vetoed a bill that would have restored the United States bank. This unpopular move inspired men to burn effigies of Tyler's likeness within sight of the White House. Months after this took place, Tyler is said to have remarked that "the light of burning effigies has only helped me to make the path of duty more plain." Hugh R. Fraser, *Democracy in the Making: The Jackson and Tyler Era* (New York: Bobbs-Merrill Company, 1938) 188-189.

⁴⁸ J. Warren Bell to Andrew Johnson, January 2, 1861, in *The Papers of Andrew Johnson, Vol. 4: 1860-1861* (Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press, 1967), 115-116.

to physically move the government far away from the majority of the people so that the fringe may rule without fear of recompense. Johnson felt his role was to expose and rebuke “the vile miscreants who are engaged in the nefarious work.”⁴⁹ Traitors needed a lesson in loyalty. Johnson demanded it.

Johnson’s early life and political career provided him with a particular world view; one that he would take onto a national platform with the coming of the American Civil War. His time in Washington DC and in Nashville reaffirmed his desire to subvert planter class power by including the poor white man’s perspective in legislative language and policy formation. He kept himself informed on Greeneville politics and gossip through correspondence and newspapers. He learned loyalty to party, loyalty to community, and loyalty to purpose. His loyalty to Union came from his understanding that the poor white man’s prospects did not exist in a Confederate nation catering to the planter class. Poor white men only possessed the means to improve their situation within the framework of the United States Constitution. His purpose, as he saw it, was to lift the poor white man out of degradation. He sought to give them access to wealth, land, education and property. This could only happen if the Union were successfully preserved.

In 1860, the median farm size reached 75 improved acres in Greene County. None of these acres grew cotton and only 8.7 percent of the farming households laid claim to enslaved laborers. The borders of the county sit firmly in the Valley of East Tennessee where tree-filled hills and rich bottom-land soil pushes westward from the Smoky Mountains to the eastern limits of the Cumberland Plateau. Farmers and planters recognized the soil’s ability to produce grass and wheat, but for the 38 percent of landless citizens in the county, the fertility of the soil translated into a dependency upon landowners for income and livelihood. Thirty percent of farmers possessed the

⁴⁹ Andrew Johnson to John Trimble, January 13, 1861, published in *The Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography* Vol. XXVI, no. 102, July 1902, transcribed and photocopied in the Andrew Johnson Papers, 1846-1875, Nashville: Tennessee State Library and Archives.

land to sell a surplus of crops to a market and they did so, but Greene County residents who lived live of “subsistence” farming in the same county lived a life more comparable, materially, to their enslaved neighbors. They were dependent upon additional income earned by working odd jobs outside of their farming responsibilities, making time for education practically non-existent.⁵⁰

On May 30th, 1861, 462 delegates from twenty-nine counties gathered in Knoxville for the purpose of keeping Tennessee in the United States. Greeneville sent twenty-eight delegates, including Johnson’s sons, Charles and Robert. On the first day of the convention, the delegates elected T.A.R. Nelson as permanent president of the convention and all of its subsequent meetings Nelson identified as a Whig and a Unionist, and he had a long history of debating the Democrat Johnson. The Knoxville Convention, however, proved a meeting marked by “a general unity of thought and action.” Johnson’s political foes, Nelson and William G. Brownlow, forged an alliance that would last the duration of the Civil War; in the case of Nelson, it would encourage the move to the Democratic Party and become a lifelong ally for Johnson’s political career.⁵¹ Missing from the debates, resolutions, and speeches was any discussion about slavery and its future in Tennessee. Slaveholders participated in the convention and they believed that the institution only remained protected under the United States Constitution. The resolutions that came out of Knoxville’s convention focused on the illegitimacy of a Confederate government, “a result of the ruinous and heretical doctrine of secession” and that any legislation passed by the state in an effort to join the Confederacy went against the will of the people.⁵² Abraham Lincoln’s presidency did not present a real threat but ripping away from a republic threatened not only slavery, but solvency.

⁵⁰ Robert Tracy McKenzie, “Wealth and Income: The Preindustrial Structure of East Tennessee in 1860,” *Appalachian Journal* 21, no. 3 (Spring, 1994), 263, 262, 266, 272.

⁵¹ Bryan, “Gathering of Tories,” 37.

⁵² Westin A. Goodspeed, *Goodspeed’s General History of Tennessee* (Nashville: Charles and Randy Elder Booksellers, 1887), 480.

Andrew Johnson did not take center stage in these conventions. He was still in Tennessee, preparing to return to Washington D.C. and report to the Senate. He supported the speeches and actions, but deferred the spotlight to his once political opposition, Thomas A.R. Nelson of Washington County. Newspaperman William Brownlow, and local politicians Horace Maynard, Connolly F. Trigg, and William B. Carter carried the weight of the convention, crafting the language and ideas, of the adopted resolutions established in the first convention held in Knoxville on May 30-31st. In the days building up to the first meeting, Greeneville held a rally to garner support and spread information regarding East Tennessee's position on secession. Fifty American flags flew behind a brass band playing a rousing rendition of the "Star Spangled Banner"; throughout it all Greeneville Unionists condemned the actions of Governor Harris and passed resolutions that endorsed the pending Knoxville convention.⁵³ When Greene County voted this second time on June 8, 1861 on the issue of secession, the citizens responded with an anti-secession vote of 2,961 to 744.⁵⁴ The numbers overwhelmingly supported remaining in the United States.⁵⁵ Union sympathy would only grow in Greene County as Andrew Johnson's actions garnered national attention. At the same time, however, the issue of slavery pushed Unionists to abhor the thought of abolition. After Abraham Lincoln's election, members of the Greeneville community gathered in a public meeting to formally assert the right of white southerners to own enslaved laborers and travel with them throughout the United States and territories free from fears of abolition.⁵⁶ Unionism proved the means to salvaging the institution of slavery, and therein the tenants of white supremacy for Greene

⁵³ Bryan, "A Gathering of Tories," 31.

⁵⁴ Doughty, *Greeneville: One Hundred Year Portrait*, 205.

⁵⁵ In the 1860 census, Greene County reported 3,689 men living there between the ages of 20 and 100 years old. U.S. Bureau of the Census, "Population by Color and Condition, 1860," under "State of Tennessee," 456-7; ⁵⁵ Noel Fisher, *War at Every Door*, 20, 188.

⁵⁶ Thomas B. Alexander, *Thomas A. R. Nelson of East Tennessee* (Nashville: Tennessee Historical Commission, 1956), 67.

County citizens. Andrew Johnson's career and wartime practices reflected the hardline ideologies of his adopted hometown.

When the state legislature voted to secede, T.A.R. Nelson called for another meeting of the convention, this time in Greeneville, to be held on June 17th, 1861. Andrew Johnson, outed by Confederate papers and proponents of secession as an enemy and Lincolnite, escaped Tennessee into Kentucky and could not attend the Greeneville meeting, but both of his sons, again, attended and were this time joined by their brother-in-law, David Patterson. Less populated than the first convention due to threats of violence against Unionists by rebel sympathizers, those who managed to attend pushed forward with establishing a "Declaration of Grievances" that emphasized a hatred for secession and the "treacheries, falsehoods, violences and evil results" disunion would bring to the eastern portion of a state. Delegates feared retribution for their loyalty to the United States. The "bigoted, overbearing and intolerant spirit" had already infected the region and the loyal citizens suffered insult, interruption, intimidation, pillaging and assassination.⁵⁷

By the Autumn of 1861, a despondent Senator without a state went on a campaign circuit. He could not yet return to Tennessee with an expectation of safety. It was a small scale "swing around the circle" where Johnson visited crowds of Union supporters in Kentucky and Ohio and took on the role of "morale-builder" to Tennessee refugees. Johnson internalized East Tennessee's situation, interpreting the region as a hostage and unwilling participant in secession. He transformed the emotions this situation inspired and used them to motivate his new life's mission: he would redeem his state, save it from Confederate ruin, and use it as a starting point to reject Confederate

⁵⁷ Thomas William Humes, *The Loyal Mountaineers of Tennessee*, (Johnson City, Tennessee: The Overmountain Press, 1998), 117.

ideals.⁵⁸ Johnson warned the crowds that gathered to hear him that those ideals were the antithesis of what East Tennessee needed in 1861.

Greeneville sat in the part of Tennessee that earned whatever wealth it held claim to through small manufacturing. Most sites of production in East Tennessee found limitations based on the geography and climate. The small city processed the region's resources and provided services to the surrounding rural communities. Foundries and carriage shops, boot and shoe manufacturers, tailors and general stores kept the region in stock with artisans and goods. Commodities like timber generated moderate wealth, but never to the scale of the Cotton Kingdom.⁵⁹ Greeneville Unionists understood that Tennessee's secession meant they belonged to a new government that gave precedent and power to the wealthy and elite. Greeneville attorney and friend of the Johnson family, Robert A. Crawford warned that in the Confederacy, "liberty of the citizen is to be measured by his wealth and the amount of property he may happen to own" and the oppression of the poor "is to be according to his poverty."⁶⁰ Johnson knew that East Tennessee's future, as well as any hopes for its citizens to find prosperity, lived within the United States border. His entire career had been one built towards creating paths for poor white men. It was his singular focus of his political agenda and Confederate policies stood at odds with everything Johnson desired for his constituents and his country. Johnson believed the Confederacy endangered white supremacy when it endangered the institution of slavery. It situated wealthy white men against poor white men. Only when all white men found themselves limited only by their own imagination and drive, would the mantle of white

⁵⁸ Johnson, Andrew, LeRoy P. Graf, Ralph W. Haskins, and Paul H. Bergeron, *The Papers of Andrew Johnson, Vol. 5 1861-1862* (Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press, 1967), xxiii.

⁵⁹ Noel Fisher, *War at Every Door: Partisan Politics & Guerrilla Violence in East Tennessee, 1860-1869* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1997), 17.

⁶⁰ In January of 1861, Robert A. Crawford, of Greeneville, appealed to voters of the senatorial district composed of Blount, Sevier, Cocke, and Greene Counties on why Tennessee belonged with the Union. Throughout the appeal, he made it plain that East Tennessee was not equipped to find access to power or opportunity in a Confederate government that gave preference to the slaveholding society of the Cotton South. Doughty, *Greeneville: One Hundred Year Portrait*, 203.

supremacy be fully protected. This option did not exist in the Confederate States of America.

Johnson grew up poor, but he also grew up with pride. It may have been unwarranted pride, based solely on the color of his skin, but his skin color separated his servitude in Raleigh from the enslaved people with whom he worked alongside. Greeneville did not hold Johnson's background against him when the community welcomed him into their fold. His loyalty to poor white men gave him his career.

The Greeneville community learned hard lessons on active displays of loyalty only months after war broke out in East Tennessee. Johnson's eagerness to cooperate with Union military forces saw to that when Greeneville citizens participated in the bridge burnings in November of 1861. Johnson pressured President Lincoln to provide aid to East Tennessee by supporting William Blount Carter's plan to burn bridges as a calculated attack. The operation would be reinforced by the Union army under the direction of General George H. Thomas. Carter, a minister and staunch Unionist, received approval for an orchestrated guerrilla attack on Confederate controlled railroad bridges from President Lincoln, himself. Union General Thomas had intended to occupy Knoxville and, in so doing, cut railroad communications between Richmond and the southwest through East Tennessee. With Blount's assistance, General Thomas's plan for East Tennessee could have represented the first substantial Confederate land loss of the war.⁶¹ Carter, along with fellow Greeneville natives, Captain William Cross and Captain David Frye, designed a plan to burn the bridge over Lick Creek, fifteen miles west of their hometown.⁶² They carried out their mission, only learning afterwards of General Thomas's failure to convince his commander General William T. Sherman to approve an order following the bridge burnings with an immediate invasion and occupation of East Tennessee. On the night of November 8, 1861, Union men throughout East

⁶¹ Oliver P. Temple, *East Tennessee and the Civil War*, (Cincinnati: The Robert Clarke Company, 1899), 375.

⁶² Doughty, *Greeneville: One Hundred Year Portrait*, 210.

Tennessee followed directives of Carter under the assumption that Union forces from Kentucky were on their way to support the operation. They were not. Still, five of the nine targeted bridges were successfully destroyed, including the Lick Creek bridge in Greene County.⁶³ A string of partially successful missions did not win the war in East Tennessee and the Confederate response was swift and lethal. The “fiery vengeance of the Rebel horde” resulted in the roughest semblance of courtroom justice and two Greeneville citizens, Jacob Hensie and Henry Fry, were tried, convicted, and hung within view of the Greeneville railroad stop. They “swung from the projecting limb of a tree which stood North of the railroad and the depot,” for all to see for over twenty-four hours.⁶⁴ Swift martial law, the usurpation of the *writ of habeas corpus*, and the visual trauma of Unionists hanging from trees did not weaken the loyalty of Andrew Johnson or his community. In fact, it made it all the more imperative.

With Johnson in Washington DC acting as an advocate on the behalf of loyal Tennesseans, he depended upon information from his community. The news he received only highlighted the dire situation created with the failure of the US Army to successfully take over East Tennessee in a timely manner after the bridges burned. Hundreds of men were arrested on suspicion of helping facilitate the mission. One citizen, Robert L. Stanford, described the condition of the prisoners likening them to enslaved people as “they have striped the unionists of evrything (sic) down to the negros Blankets and Clothing,” as they made their way to prison camps in Nashville and Alabama. Johnson’s son, Robert, went into hiding, as did many Greeneville families as the Confederate military made life difficult for Unionists.⁶⁵ Union camps in Kentucky received bridge burning refugees who wrote to Johnson, lamenting how the rapid influx of these men and women illustrated

⁶³ Humes, *The Loyal Mountaineers*, 133.

⁶⁴ Leonidas C. Houk to Andrew Johnson, December 7, 1861, in *The Papers of Andrew Johnson, Vol. 5: 1861-1862* (Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press, 1967), 41; Temple, *East Tennessee and the Civil War*, 392.

⁶⁵ Robert L. Stanford to Andrew Johnson, December 13, 1861, in *The Papers of Andrew Johnson, Vol. 5: 1861-1862* (Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press, 1967), 49.

how the mission “was the worst step ever taken by our people in Tennessee for it has been ever since one continual step of oppression on our people by the Rebels.”⁶⁶ The targeted attack on railroad access struck a nerve with Confederate commanders and Johnson received intelligence of CSA General Felix Zollicoffer granting permission to his troops to arrest “old men of 70 or 80 years” for expressing “their opinions in favour of the government they have lived up through.”⁶⁷

All of these transgressions against Unionists in East Tennessee might have been forgiven, however, had the American government been able to negotiate a prisoner release or exchange. The men arrested did not wear a uniform and so Andrew Johnson attempted to wield his power to treat them as political prisoners, not subject to the rules of war. Confederate War Secretary Judah P. Benjamin, however, determined that the men imprisoned for actions related to the bridge burnings were prisoners of war and not subject to the rights of political prisoners. “In no case,” Benjamin directed military command, were these men “to be released on any pledge or oath of allegiance” for the duration of the war.⁶⁸ Benjamin did not approach the loyalty oath with pragmatism. He denied it as an option which taught Johnson a new lesson in demanded loyalty; it could be used as a punishment.

Outside Tennessee, citizens across the country recognized Andrew Johnson’s relationship with the Unionists in his state. Johnson and the term “loyalty” were consistently written together and it was his loyalty that made him so popular initially. Newspapers around the country noted Johnson’s assumption of military governor in March of 1862. “News from Nashville, dated yesterday, has been received,” *The Daily Journal* of Montpelier, Vermont reported. “The policy of the

⁶⁶ James T. Shelley to Andrew Johnson, December 28, 1861, in *The Papers of Andrew Johnson, Vol. 5: 1861-1862* (Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press, 1967), 84.

⁶⁷ Robert L. Stanford to Andrew Johnson, December 31, 1861, in *The Papers of Andrew Johnson, Vol. 5: 1861-1862* (Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press, 1967), 86.

⁶⁸ Judah P. Benjamin to Col. William B. Wood, November 25, 1861, *The War of the Rebellion: A Compilation of the Official Records of the Union and Confederate Armies*, Ser. 1, VII, 701.

government is energetically directed towards supporting the loyal feeling in all the Southern states,” and Andrew Johnson’s appointment indicated a “large loyal force of loyal Tennesseans will soon be under arms to assist the United States forces.” Johnson represented the beginning of a reconstructed country. The military provisional government he oversaw would inform the civil government actions once the Union ended the rebellion.⁶⁹ The *Chicago Tribune* considered Johnson’s new position “eminently proper,” because of his actions since secession and “his great popularity among all loyal people, besides his devotion to his own State.”⁷⁰ “Tennessee Almost Rescued” ran the headline in Brooklyn, New York, and Johnson’s new position promised “the restoration of Tennessee to the Union will cut the rebellion in two halves.”⁷¹ The *Evening Star* in Washington DC regarded Johnson’s return to Tennessee, “clothed with his new functions and powers,” held the potential to inspire a quick restoration of the state to the Union and considered the move as part of a larger series of “glorious victories” the Union had recently experienced in the border state.⁷² Nationally, Johnson was a Unionist celebrity; he was loyalty in corporeal form.

Within the Confederacy, Johnson’s loyalty to Union placed him squarely among abolitionists and Black Republicans. Historian Chandra Manning recounts a song, “Run, Yank, or Die,” written by an Alabama soldier, in which Johnson is mocked for standing with Abraham Lincoln. A verse makes it plain that “old Andy Johnson” remained with the Union “to set the negro free.” This was not so, but by repeating the lie in song and verse, the notion lived and forfeited any claims of being an honorable southerner.⁷³ Johnson wanted the exact opposite of abolition. He wanted slavery expanded as an opportunity for all white men to gain. For him the Civil War represented a rare

⁶⁹ *The Daily Journal* (Montpelier, Vermont), March 3, 1862.

⁷⁰ *Chicago Tribune*, March 5, 1862.

⁷¹ *The Brooklyn Daily Eagle*, March 3, 1862.

⁷² *Evening Star* (Washington D.C.), March 5, 1862.

⁷³ Chandra Manning, *What This Cruel War Was Over: Soldiers, Slavery, and the Civil War*, (New York: Random House, 2007), 33.

opportunity to unseat the master class from power. The Civil War “freed more whites than blacks” because poor white men no longer had to compete with slave labor and the Homestead Act and Emancipation Proclamation were examples of poor white men no longer being beholden to a slave society that refused them access to opportunity.⁷⁴ Confederate states also recognized the danger that East Tennessee posed beyond Andrew Johnson’s loyalty to Union. Historian Martin Crawford has argued the region held a “distinctive identity” during the Civil War, which outsiders noticed. Citizens who lived within “dangerous proximity of East Tennessee Unionism” struck fear into reluctant rebels living nearby through fear and intimidation.⁷⁵

The synonymous nature of Andrew Johnson’s public persona with Unionist loyalty must have left him feeling pressured to demand loyalty of others. Walking into a commissioned military governorship, the first of its kind and a chance to practice an embryonic reconstruction process, he felt an obligation to make loyalty a defining characteristic of his agenda. Lincoln’s choice for this position made sense to many but raised concern from some Tennesseans familiar with Johnson’s methods. General William Nelson warned Lincoln’s cabinet that Tennesseans might hold a grudge against Johnson, making it difficult to convince the women and men of the state to resume their loyalty to the Union. Johnson’s reputation for antagonization did not deter the appointment, however, and Lincoln tasked him with raising regiments of loyal Tennessee soldiers.⁷⁶

Loyal soldiers included Johnson’s son, Robert; the military governor practiced nepotism with little regard for outward appearances. Robert Johnson organized a Greeneville based infantry unit,

⁷⁴ Merritt, *Masterless Men*, 61.

⁷⁵ Martin Crawford, “The Dynamics of Mountain Unionism: Federal Volunteers of Ashe County, North Carolina” in *The Civil War in Appalachia* edited by Kenneth Noe and Shannon Wilson (Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press, 1997), 59-60.

⁷⁶ Richard Current, *Lincoln’s Loyalists: Union Soldiers from the Confederacy*, (Boston: Northeastern University Press, 1992), 43.

which his father approved despite the poaching of other East Tennessee troops from loyalists headquartered in Kentucky. Then Robert decided he wanted the infantry unit to transform into a cavalry unit despite objections from both General George Morgan and General Don Carlos Buell. “The son’s ambition and the father’s nepotism” found success when Robert became the commander of the First Tennessee Union Cavalry.⁷⁷ His propensity for alcohol consumption ensured the command position did not last; he ultimately “retired” from the cavalry and served as his father’s private secretary.⁷⁸ Despite the military governor’s questionable approach to determining who became commander and why, the push of Confederate conscription ensured that more East Tennesseans “felt like volunteering for the Union,” than the alternative.⁷⁹

Success in East Tennessee recruitment of Union troops caused concern among Confederate command and political leaders. General Kirby Smith, under the direction of CSA President Jefferson Davis, issued a statement to the “Disaffected People of East Tennessee,” in April of 1862, promising full amnesty to Unionist citizens if they returned to their homes, “acknowledge[d] his error,” and took the oath to support the Confederate States. In return for their loyalty, President Davis suspended conscription in East Tennessee for one year. Those that disregarded the announcement and crossed into the “Lincoln Government” would be forced to take their families with them, because “the women and children must be taken care of by husbands and fathers” and if that meant removing them by force to Kentucky, then Unionists would forfeit all property and protection within Tennessee’s border.⁸⁰ In Tennessee, loyalty held real and physical consequences.

⁷⁷ Richard Current, *Lincoln’s Loyalists*, 44.

⁷⁸ Elizabeth R. Varon, “Andrew Johnson: Family Life,” UVA Miller Center, <https://millercenter.org/president/johnson/family-life> accessed July 19, 2018.

⁷⁹ Current, *Lincoln’s Loyalists*, 47.

⁸⁰ W.M. Churchwell to “Disaffected People of East Tennessee,” April 23, 1862, *The War of the Rebellion: Official Records of the Civil War*, Ser. 011, Chapter 22, Page 641.

Loyalty oaths in all of their iterations were, first and foremost, a political tool deployed to ensure federal victory within the Confederacy. Andrew Johnson assumed his appointed role as military governor of Tennessee in March of 1862. In his appeal to his newly acquired constituents, Johnson harkened their recent memories when men, “carried away by excitement or overawed by seditious clamor,” organized a “treasonous power” called the Confederate States of America which only served to stifle and undermine authority maintained by the federal government. One of Johnson’s primary responsibilities included restoring his state “to the same condition as before the existing rebellion” and he promised to carry out this measure by welcoming the “erring and misguided” back into the fold once allegiance was certain.⁸¹ Beyond demanding loyalty from captured Confederate POWs and deserters, Johnson also expected Unionists to clarify their loyalties with an oath of allegiance. Historian Stephen Ash highlights the reverence given to oaths in nineteenth-century America. In the South, “where the cult of honor made a virtual fetish” of loyalty oaths, citizens understood the public and personal meaning behind swearing allegiance to a cause. Ash suggests that the oath of loyalty translated, for many, into a “sacred emblem” of conversion.⁸² Johnson’s deployment of oaths demonstrated a strategic move to place the Unionists in a position to verify their loyalty with a government issued receipt, or pay the consequences for non-compliance.

The weight of a loyalty oath when civil war encouraged occupation, resentment, and hostility suggests both sides interpreted it as an act of submission and a recognition of power. Historian Mark A. Weitz has suggested the oath swearing that took place in wartime Tennessee took on a very pragmatic purpose. Johnson recognized the value of releasing drafted and deserter Confederate prisoners of war so that they may return home to East Tennessee and join in the protection against

⁸¹ Andrew Johnson, “Appeal to the People of Tennessee,” March 18, 1862, in *The Papers of Andrew Johnson, Volume 5, 1861-1862* (Knoxville, University of Tennessee Press, 1979), 209-212.

⁸² Stephen V. Ash, *When the Yankees Came: Conflict and Chaos in the Occupied South, 1861-1865* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1995), 44-45.

occupying forces. Despite a lack of assurance that these men might end up back in the service of the Confederate military, Johnson believed firmly that reluctant rebels and those who had willingly deserted their original military units would find more interest in returning home and serving as a “silent fifth column and to provide what protection they could to home and family.”⁸³

Immediately after being named military governor, constituents reached out to Andrew Johnson looking for employment, assistance, or simply to share a story of loyalty. James Embry, of Richmond, Kentucky, wrote Johnson in search of a position in Nashville for his brother-in-law, Joseph Fowler. Fowler left Franklin, Tennessee and his position as a mathematics professor at Franklin College when the Confederacy demanded he swear an oath of allegiance. He moved himself and his family to Illinois “where the Stars and Stripes could still float over him,” but desired to return to the state he loved. Embry promised the governor that if Fowler were given a post that allowed him to safely return to Tennessee, “you will find him a true man & one faithful in after life to the high obligation you would impose upon him.”⁸⁴

Similarly, John Logan wrote to Johnson from Indiana, having moved there after suffering a “reign of terror” by the church that employed him in Sullivan County. He supported the Union but his congregation supported the Confederacy and they threatened him and his family with physical violence until Logan left his property. The cost of moving left him with no monetary means to sustain him and his family, “but I have not regretted the move. It is quiet here, and I have recently made arrangements to labour here as a Minister of the gospel, though on a very Small Salary.” Logan did not seek the funds to return. Instead, he wanted to secure a picture of the “loyal E. Tennessean,” and asked “a great favour upon me, by sending me yours, either Daguerreotype or

⁸³ Mark A. Weitz, “I Will Never Forget the Name of You”: The Home Front, Desertion, and Oath Swearing in Wartime Tennessee” *Tennessee Historical Quarterly* 59, no. 1 (Spring, 2000), 54.

⁸⁴ James H. Embry to Andrew Johnson, March 11, 1862, in *The Papers of Andrew Johnson, Vol. 5: 1861-1862* (Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press, 1967), 196.

Photograph, by mail,” so he could show his new community “the likeness of the man they have learned to so highly respect for his loyalty to country.”⁸⁵ Despite the fears of men like General William Nelson, the initial reception of Andrew Johnson as military governor proved popular among the refugee loyalists that had to find safe harbor behind Union lines.

Johnson’s popularity in Nashville, however, suffered as he imposed unprecedented demands upon constitutionally protected institutions. As a military governor, Johnson determined that he held authority to control the press. In March of 1862, he ordered that all Nashville newspapers “support the Unionist cause or cease publication.”⁸⁶ One newspaper closed down rather than comply and two papers promised their support. This promise did not appease Johnson; he pulled Samuel Mercer from Kentucky into the *Nashville Union* as its editor. That paper became the official mouthpiece of Andrew Johnson. Three months later, he demanded that all Nashville clergy take an oath of allegiance. They refused and Johnson sent five ministers to prison, limited their access to visitors, and defended his action from criticism by stating they were not punished for being priests, “but because they are traitors.”⁸⁷ Months later, he ordered the Provost-Marshal to deny the parole or release of any Confederate prisoners of war who admitted to taking the oath of allegiance to the Confederacy.⁸⁸ His interpretation of reconstructing the state valued loyalty over the First Amendment.

Historian Noel Fisher has argued, compellingly, about the loyalty oath and how it became the “centerpiece of Union policy” in East Tennessee.⁸⁹ Those who refused to take the oath not only proclaimed their disloyalty to the United States, but they opened themselves up for punishment in

⁸⁵ John B. Logan to Andrew Johnson, March 14, 1862, in *The Papers of Andrew Johnson, Vol. 5: 1861-1862* (Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press, 1967), 204-205.

⁸⁶ Paul H. Bergeron, *Andrew Johnson’s Civil War and Reconstruction* (Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press, 2011), 23.

⁸⁷ Bergeron, *Andrew Johnson’s Civil War and Reconstruction*, 24.

⁸⁸ W.M. Churchwell to James K. Simpson, June 7, 1862, *The War of the Rebellion: A Compilation of the Official Records of the Union and Confederate Armies*, Series II, Vol. 4, p. 826.

⁸⁹ Noel Fisher, *War at Every Door*, 136.

many forms. That punishment could be economic, with immediate sanctions placed upon them that prohibited access to legitimate marketplace points of entry. Exclusionary practices and government programs that made decisions based on loyalty pressured East Tennesseans already in precarious financial situations. It also brought about social punishment with ostracization and harassment from community members and neighbors. The worst-case scenario included imprisonment or banishment; this also proved the most common federal response in areas it occupied and controlled. Confederate sympathizers found the oath of allegiance a more difficult option as the war lagged on and Union authorities refused to administer the oath “to persons they suspected of desiring only to protect themselves or their property.” Johnson was a product of this world where grudges and loyalties informed access to opportunity.⁹⁰

Throughout the war, Andrew Johnson developed multiple means of demanding loyalty from the citizens placed under his charge. Foreigners living in Tennessee had to declare allegiance to the United States government, even if they held allegiances to their home of origin. The Memphis *Union Appeal* ran an announcement in July of 1862 that proffered an oath to ensure “Alien Loyalty,” where immigrants and visiting foreigners might maintain any “strict neutrality to which their Governments stand pledged,” but also “bind them to yield no comfort, aid, assistance or information” to the rebellion.⁹¹ In February of 1863, Johnson ordered a Confiscation Proclamation, whose language mirrored a similar Confederate policy passed in August of 1861. In it, he authorized federal agents to confiscate the land and monies of those who identified as Confederate citizens. The Sequestration Act of 1861 stated “that all and every lands, tenements and hereditaments, goods and chattels, rights and credits within these Confederate States,” that belongs to “alien enemies” would be seized, condemned and confiscated. The Union version did not have its intended effect. Rebel commands

⁹⁰ Ibid., 138.

⁹¹ *Memphis Daily Appeal*, “Foreigners and the Oath,” July 23, 1862.

in East Tennessee responded in kind and continued to practice their policy of seizing and destroying the property of Unionists as they had since the very beginning of the war.⁹²

By October of 1863 the Office of the Provost Marshal General in East Tennessee retaliated by issuing an order of equal measure. In an attempt to end “barbarous practices” of unlawful and unsubstantiated imprisonment and maltreatment of Unionist citizens, threats of violence, and destruction of property, the United States Army was granted “the severest retaliatory measures.” For every instance of a Unionist being arrested, a prominent sympathizer of the Rebel cause who lived in the same vicinity would also be arrested and held hostage. For all Union property destroyed by Rebels, the property of rebels, and “of citizens of rebel sympathies in the neighborhood where such destruction occurred,” would be taken and held as a means of retaliation and financial retribution of the Union citizens’ losses.⁹³

Beyond the compulsion of loyalty in East Tennessee, Johnson sought to demand loyalty in the state capital under threat of expulsion. In April of 1863, his orders demanded that all white residents over the age of eighteen and living within occupied Nashville must “subscribe to the oath of allegiance or non-combatants parole” or the must move south of the Tennessee line, relinquishing any rights to remain.⁹⁴ In reaction to this directive, the *Nashville Daily Press* printed an editorial that begged each citizen to comply with the orders, comparing any alignment with the Confederacy with their willing enslavement to a system that did not value the freedoms provided

⁹² Historian Noel Fisher details several accounts of Unionists being punished by Confederate forces for their loyalties. Knoxville CSA post commander, Colonel William B. Wood, believed Union loyalists were behind most public acts of resistance and threatened to burn “any building in which Unionists were found” after a drunken fight between citizens and soldiers. (43) would be seized, condemned, or confiscated. Fisher points out that East Tennessee secessionists “energetically used” the act against Unionists, prompting an overload of county court cases where Unionists lost their homes and property. Noel Fisher, *War at Every Door*, 50; “An Act for the sequestration of the estates, property, and effects of alien enemies, and for the indemnity of citizens of the Confederate States, and persons aiding the same in the existing war with the United States,” August 30, 1861, Chapter LXI, *The Statutes at Large of the Provisional Government of the Confederate States of America*.

⁹³ Knoxville *Daily Bulletin*, “Federal Policy of Retribution against Rebel Sympathizers in East Tennessee Announced,” October 13, 1863.

⁹⁴ *Nashville Daily Union*, “Consequences for Disloyalty in Nashville,” April 21, 1863.

under the United States model of democracy. “We conjure all to remain with us,” the newspaper opined, “Be freeman. Unloose yourselves from bondage, and defy the “authority” of the bogus Confederacy...Friday is the last day of grace...be thoughtful before it is too late.”⁹⁵ This directive had the desired effect. By the end of the grace period 7,344 Nashville residents including 731 parolees, somewhere between 67-81 percent of the population, committed their loyalty to the United States. The 1860 Census Population of Cities, Towns, &c for the state of Tennessee gives Nashville a total population of 16,988 people. Of that total, over 3,000 men and women were enslaved black people and not subject to the order. 719 of them were “free colored” and also not subject to the order. Under a reasonable assumption that most military-aged men were either deployed elsewhere as Union or Confederate troops, with a minimal amount of men remaining in Nashville as part of occupying forces or because of extenuating circumstances that prevented their entrance into service, it becomes clear that the free white population of Nashville in May of 1863 drops to somewhere between 9,000-11,000 citizens. By this rough estimation, to amass 7,344 declarations, oaths, and reaffirmations of loyalty to the United States is an impressive feat. While difficult to determine the population of the city three years past a census and one year into a military occupation, even when giving the advantage of the data to 1860 census data numbers, the order for loyalty produced a population where Unionists outnumbered Confederates.⁹⁶

Tennessee Unionists were determined to find their state back within the folds of federal protection as quickly as possible. On July 1, 1863, about two hundred men from forty counties sent delegates to the state capital, with Johnson’s blessing and encouragement, for what they called the Nashville Union State Convention. East Tennessee preacher, Knoxville newspaperman, politician and Unionist rabble-rouser William Brownlow chaired the organization of the event. Their goal: to

⁹⁵ *Nashville Daily Press*, “The Pen is Mightier than the Sword,” May 4, 1863.

⁹⁶ *Nashville Daily Press*, May 4, 1863; 1860 U.S. Census, “State of Tennessee, Population by Age and Sex,” Davidson County, p. 457.

reinstate a loyal Tennessee state government. Resolutions submitted for consideration on the first day included one that would officially nullify all laws, ordinances, resolutions, and changes to state government that had taken place since April 12, 1861. This complete reversal of momentum would create a “vacuum” of past legislation that required the second resolution which called for an immediate election of a valid and loyal state legislature. Delegates also put forth a resolution ordering that any office not filled by the military appointment of the US president must be vacated and filled anew. Military appointments “may be terminated at any time by the close of the war.” And finally, the fourth resolution ordered that the state recognize the value of an elected governor “for the better preservation of the rights of the people” in lieu of an appointed military governor. Before the battle in Gettysburg, Pennsylvania and before the fall of Vicksburg, on July 2, 1863, Tennessee Unionists gathered for the purpose of reconstructing their state. They prepared for the end of war and Union victory.⁹⁷

The second day of the convention ended early when word from Memphis alerted the delegates that more representatives were in route to Nashville to participate in Tennessee’s reconstruction.⁹⁸ On the third day, Shelby County, the largest county in the state by size and population and home to Memphis, and other western Tennessee communities added fifteen more men to the delegation once their loyalty had been assured and their credentials approved. They then unanimously passed a resolution that named Andrew Johnson the provisional governor of the state and then requested him to “issue writs of election” and appoint agents of infrastructure to enable an election for governor and state legislature. Johnson was not present; he was working from the Governors Mansion. He kept up with the convention, however, and welcomed the news. When the convention broke on that Friday, July 3rd, they agreed to reconvene after the holiday weekend.⁹⁹ The

⁹⁷ *Nashville Daily Press*, “First Day of the Nashville Union State Convention,” July 2, 1862.

⁹⁸ *Nashville Daily Press*, “Second Day of the Union State Convention,” July 3, 1863.

⁹⁹ *Nashville Daily Press*, “Third Day of the Union State Convention,” July 4, 1863.

fourth day of the Union Convention opened with exciting news and the morning session received word that “Lee’s army was utterly routed yesterday near Gettysburg...with news of Vicksburg” looked for hourly. This provisional script for Reconstruction, endorsed by the military governor, negotiated the meaning of loyalty. They clarified what loyalty offered for men in the future as far as access to opportunity. They embraced a swift return to Union status where black slavery was gone, but so was the “white slavery of the most revolting character” that degraded the white supremacy of poor and landless men.¹⁰⁰

The issue of arming of black Tennesseans took over the morning session of the fifth and final day of the convention, and the delegates protested the notion on the grounds that arming five hundred white Union men would prove a sounder decision. As for the fate of Rebel soldiers, William Brownlow recommended taking eighteen hundred barrels of salt recently commandeered from Confederate supplies south of Nashville and using it against rebellious “hellward” citizens. “I want them here to hang them, and then salt their carcasses in with this salt,” Brownlow bellowed, “I want them embalmed in this salt for monuments of the folly and wickedness of this hell-deserving and hell-tending rebellion.” This proposal did not find a vote, but it did go down in the records and illustrates the depth of acrimony Unionists in Tennessee held against the men who stole their state from the Union.¹⁰¹

Rebels and secessionists in East Tennessee found little comfort within their Unionist communities. In the eyes of loyal men, Confederates had made the war about abolition when they left the federal system that protected slavery. In doing so, they created a hostile environment where slavery quickly lost its protective footing. Andrew Johnson received a letter from a Marion County man in September of 1863, flummoxed by what to do with his enslaved laborers. W.J. Kelly of

¹⁰⁰ *Nashville Daily Press*, “Fourth Day of the Union State Convention,” July 7, 1863

¹⁰¹ *Nashville Daily Press*, “Fifth and Concluding Day of the State Union Convention,” July 8, 1863.

Jasper owned approximately forty enslaved laborers with his brother. Still in possession, “but their services are worthless,” Kelly beseeched Johnson for advice because even if the institution is preserved once the Union wins the war, it seemed that it might be years before his enslaved labor became profitable again. He considered emancipation; not because he cared for the welfare of the people he kept in bondage, but because they lived “in a state of confusion” and “were eating up our substance.” Kelly proposed a trade to Johnson. As military governor, Johnson might take it upon himself to direct the state to accept slaves for “something else that will be of more service to us and render us more comfortable and easy.” Cash, bonds, or a promise of supplies were preferred.¹⁰²

One hundred and fifty miles northeast of Jasper, the September 13th issue of the Knoxville *Daily Bulletin* railed against the Rebels because when they talked of Yankee tyranny and how Black Republicans like Abraham Lincoln wanted to emancipate enslaved workers, black people listened to their discussions and internalized them. “It is not surprising that the negroes have taken these pestilent agitators at their word,” the editorial argued, and with “chattels human having ears have heard it declared a thousand times that when the Yankees come they would be free, having tongues have consulted many a time among themselves as to the “Kingdom Comin,” and having legs, when the day actually comes when they have the soldiers of the Union in their midst, they naturally walk off.” This tendency for Black Tennesseans to believe in emancipation with the coming of Union troops failed to recognize how inconvenienced white Tennesseans were by it. “In the loyal portions of the South,” and especially in places like East Tennessee, “the army of the Union has a totally different mission.” That mission entailed liberating the poor white man from his second-class status. Instead of using the number of enslaved laborers as a metric for the worth of a man, it would be “loyalty, as a citizen,” that would determine their merit.¹⁰³

¹⁰² W. J. Kelly to Andrew Johnson, September 9, 1863, in *The Papers of Andrew Johnson, Vol. 6: 1862-1864* (Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press, 1967), 360.

¹⁰³ Knoxville *Daily Bulletin*, September 12, 1863.

This mentality was the wellspring from which Andrew Johnson informed his world. It also reflected what Reconstruction would look like under his command. Reconstruction, for Johnson and the Unionists of East Tennessee, required loyalty in action. It required opportunity for the white men who had never known mastery of a black laborer. Johnson's entire career demonstrated his commitment to the poor white population. It required the black citizenry to understand that even if slavery should be abolished, equality would never be an option in Andrew Johnson's state and, later, in his America. Loyalty to white supremacy engrained into Johnson what was possible and what was preferred in a salvaged Union. The oath of allegiance did not need a black man's fealty. It required the submission of the master class to Johnson's vision for a reconstructed country. It required a recognition that all white men were created equal.

On February 18, 1864, U.S. Assistant Adjunct General E.D. Townsend released General Order No. 64 by order of Lincoln's Secretary of War, Edwin Stanton. The order, regarding "Refugees and Rebel Deserters," decreed that should any deserter from rebellious armies or refugee from within rebel lines come forward to Union camps or posts, they will be judged by the content of their character and offered the opportunity to take the oath of allegiance. The oath, crafted and distributed by President Lincoln two months earlier, required the men who took it to "henceforth faithfully support, protect, and defend the Constitution of the United States," and recognize "and faithfully support all proclamations of the President made during the existing rebellion having reference to slaves, so long and so far as not modified or declared void by decision of the Supreme Court."¹⁰⁴ At its very core, the loyalty oath administered to East Tennesseans was transformed into a form of psychological punishment. The February 1864 version ended with the threat of death, ensuring that those who took it would think twice before going against the Union.

¹⁰⁴ E.D. Townsend, "General Order No. 64" (Washington DC: War Department, February 18, 1864), Thomas A.R. Nelson Papers, McClung Historical Collection, Knoxville, Tennessee.

The severe nature of the evolved oath, as Fisher has pointed out, was in part a reflection of the growing harshness of the war throughout the country.¹⁰⁵ Andrew Johnson received constant requests for relief from loyal Union citizens throughout the state. When Lincoln chose him for the Vice-Presidential nominee on the Union ticket in 1864, those loyal citizens reminded him of the voting power of his constituency. Families “exposed to the Rebels, and suffering from their tyrannical rule” demanded regiments to relieve the suffering of “being robed & murdered daily” by the enemy. They reminded Johnson that “all in our State would probably vote” for Johnson and Lincoln “with pleasure,” but only if he sent aid. Otherwise, “*Your* name will be struck from thousands of tickets in this end of the State.” East Tennesseans explained that Johnson could only blame himself for “the Mortification” of being written off the ticket of his own home state, and signed the plea from the “Many Many Very Many Voters of Upper East Tennessee.”¹⁰⁶

In preparation for the 1864 presidential election, Johnson amended the loyalty oath requirements as a means of assuring election results by resolving that Tennessee voters swear that they “ardently desire the suppression of the present rebellion,” and that they “sincerely rejoice in the triumph of the armies” of the federal government and in the defeat of the treasonous army of rebellion in the “so called Confederate States.”¹⁰⁷ This meticulous attention to detail, the continued revisiting and revision of oaths, bills, speeches, speak to the nature of Johnson’s approach to leadership. Historian Howard Beale points to Johnson as the model of “orderliness and administrative efficiency” when he arrived in Washington DC in March of 1865 as the elected vice president on Lincoln’s Union Party ticket.¹⁰⁸ But Johnson had been rehearsing for this position for

¹⁰⁵ Noel Fisher, *War at Every Door*, 139.

¹⁰⁶ “Voters of East Tennessee” to Andrew Johnson, June 12, 1864, in *The Papers of Andrew Johnson, Vol. 6: 1861-1862* (Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press, 1967), 734.

¹⁰⁷ Andrew Johnson, “Proclamation re Presidential Election,” September 30, 1864, in *The Papers of Andrew Johnson, Volume 7, 1864-1865* (Knoxville, University of Tennessee Press, 1979), 203-4.

¹⁰⁸ Howard K. Beale, *The Critical Year: A Study of Andrew Johnson and Reconstruction* (New York: Frederick Ungar Publishing Co., 1958), 20.

decades, and when John Wilkes Booth made Andrew Johnson the most important man in America, he drew on his time as military governor of Tennessee to inform his Reconstruction agenda. Beale has argued that Johnson's program for Reconstruction "was based upon conviction that kindness and generosity alone would restore the Union," and that Americans' faith in democracy, "even in times of crisis," would ensure a successful reunion and reconstruction.¹⁰⁹ The language Beale employed in his appraisal of Johnson clouds the issue of the seventeenth president's loyalty. In Johnson's mind, a successful reunion and reconstruction would require the United States to follow the same path he forged for the state of Tennessee. Black Americans could not expect legal protections or assurances of equality. Poor white Americans could expect paths to land ownership, educational opportunities, and an expectation of preference in wage-earning hires; these were the kindnesses Johnson promised.

When Abraham Lincoln issued the Emancipation Proclamation in September of 1862, he exempted Tennessee, which historian Brooks Simpson has called a coup for Andrew Johnson, as Johnson wanted to manage the slavery issue from the state level.¹¹⁰ Johnson's presidency highlights this tendency towards allowing southern states to maintain white supremacy despite a constitutional amendment that seemed to abolish it. Lincoln might have recognized the warning signs of what a Johnson presidency could do to Reconstruction. Johnson's role as military governor predicted the issues to which he gave precedence. Johnson valued loyalty above all else, but it was loyalty to poor whites and his racism that informed his decision-making process. It always had. Even if Lincoln had recognized this, though, he could not have known about the madman in Ford's Theater. His

¹⁰⁹ Howard K. Beale, *The Critical Year: A Study of Andrew Johnson and Reconstruction* (New York: Frederick Ungar Publishing Co., 1958), 27.

¹¹⁰ Brooks Simpson, *The Reconstruction Presidents*, 33.

decision to pull Johnson onto the Union Party ticket, then, was based on Johnson's demonstrated loyalty throughout the Civil War. It never mattered, and no one ever thought to question, what that loyalty was based upon.

Greeneville came under scrutiny during Johnson's time in the White House. Up until his presidency, Johnson's presence as the Vice President was seen primarily as a symbolic gesture of reunion. When the Lincoln family moved out, Johnson moved his entire family to Washington. Eliza Johnson arrived at the White House on August 6, 1865. She brought with her their four grown children, their respective spouses, and their children. Previously, when Johnson had represented Tennessee as a congressman, he left his family home in Greeneville. Johnson's oldest daughter, Martha Johnson Patterson, took over many First Lady's official duties as Eliza suffered from tuberculosis. From the beginning, Greeneville's first family insisted they were "plain people from the mountains of East Tennessee" who tried at all times to "maintain the high standard of social *regime*" established by preceding inhabitants.¹¹¹ Watching the family from afar, the citizens of Greeneville looked forward to an attempt to return to normalcy. They read about the Johnson family's living and working conditions in the editorial space of Greeneville's newest papers, the *New Era* and the *National Union*. Started in 1866, the *New Era* initially praised the actions of the hometown president.¹¹² "Who would be content to see him pursue the bloody course of the tyrant, Nero" the paper wondered in 1866, "or imitate the unmitigated cruelty of Caligula" when a critical moment in American history demanded an even-handed and forgiving leader to push forth a reconciliation between North and South.¹¹³ Within a year, however, the praise for Johnson turned

¹¹¹ Reverend James S. Jones, *Life of Andrew Johnson* (Greeneville: East Tennessee Publishing Co., 1901), 332.

¹¹² The *Greeneville New Era* (1865-1886) and the *National Union* (1866-1875) joined a healthy body of newspapers available in the region by the mid-nineteenth century. The small Appalachian town with few books and no newspapers Johnson moved to when he was seventeen, had become a haven for newspaper publishing by the time Johnson became president.

¹¹³ *Greeneville New Era*, September 8, 1866.

into critical scrutiny of his practices and policies. By August of 1867, *The New Era* argued that Johnson's unending leniency towards Johnny Reb during his first year in office had put Greeneville's balance sheet in the red.¹¹⁴ The editors embraced a Radical and Republican position, creating a space for the 1867 *National Union* to fill as the official local mouthpiece for Johnson's agenda.

The agenda of Johnson's first year as president proved a continuation of his efforts as military governor of Tennessee. He demanded loyalty. He, then, immediately set out to get land and opportunity into the hands of poor white Americans. His proclamations of May 29, 1865 illustrate this desire. First, in Johnson's Amnesty Proclamation, he vowed to restore "all rights of property, except as to slaves" to persons who engaged in rebellion after "every such person" subscribed to an oath that would be recorded and registered "for permanent preservation." The final oath that granted amnesty had rebel citizens swear that they would "abide by and faithfully support all laws and proclamations which have been made during the existing rebellion with reference to the emancipation of slaves." The fourteen exceptions to this amnesty process set the tenor for Johnson's administration. Spies were, of course, exempt from the process. More telling, though, were the class distinctions of those Johnson denied amnesty. Congressmen and judges were denied, as were military officers and persons who had an estimated value of taxable property over twenty thousand dollars. Johnson used this proclamation to punish the wealthy white southern class, the slaveholders who sought to deny white supremacy to poor, landless and slaveless, white men.¹¹⁵ But it was not enough to punish the wealthy slaveholders; he also used this same logic when defending his veto of the Civil Rights Bill. Throughout it all, Johnson admitted that his actions were informed by the principles he carried into office. "There is nothing," he told his secretary, "like starting out on principle...I have, during all my political life, been guided by certain fixed principles. I am guided by

¹¹⁴ *New Era*, "The Balance Sheet," August 8, 1867.

¹¹⁵ Andrew Johnson, "President Johnson's Amnesty Proclamation" May 29, 1865 in *The Papers of Andrew Johnson, Volume 8, 1864-1865* (Knoxville, University of Tennessee Press, 1979), 128-30.

them still. They are the principles of the early founders of the Republic and I cannot certainly go far wrong if I adhere to them, as I intend to do.”¹¹⁶

Johnson understood his presidency did not carry with it any sort of mandate. Immediately after swearing his oath of allegiance to his country as president of the United States, he gave an address to the men present in his Kirkwood House apartment in DC, where the ceremony took place. “The only assurance that I can now give of the future,” he told them, “is by reference of the past.” He pointed to “my past public life,” which he described as “long and laborious” but also always attempting to “ameliorate and alleviate the condition of the great mass of the American people.”¹¹⁷ Johnson would use his political motivations and actions in the past to inform his presidency.

In order to act with full faith that the voting base stood behind him, Johnson would have to read the mid-term election results and discover if the nation stood behind a man only elected to stand behind Abraham Lincoln. He encountered a frustrated constituency on the heels of a bloody New Orleans riot on July 30, 1866, perpetrated by supporters of his Reconstruction policies. Louisiana Unionists and Black delegates suffered the worst of a riot meant to prohibit a state convention from taking place. Johnson sided with the former Confederates who called for police and military force to intimidate convention attendees via hostility and threats of violence. Just three years earlier, as military governor, Johnson endorsed a state convention in Tennessee with similar goals: to hold fair elections for Union men which favored loyalty to country and refused those who aided rebellion. But those Union men had also been protectors of white supremacy, and even the non-slaveholding Republicans present understood that Black voters had no place in Tennessee’s

¹¹⁶ William G. Moore, “*Small Diary*” 1866, *Andrew Johnson Papers*, Washington D.C., 15.

¹¹⁷ Andrew Johnson, “Speech at his Inauguration as President, April 15, 1865,” in *Speeches of Andrew Johnson, President of the United States, with a Biographical Introduction* edited by Frank Moore (New York: Burt Franklin Publishers, 1865), reprinted 1970, xlvii-xlviii.

political process. As president, Johnson chose the former Rebels of Louisiana and gave tacit endorsement of a New Orleans massacre if it meant denying an election in which African Americans could take part.¹¹⁸

Johnson's ability to speak to large crowds effectively, to humiliate his opponents and ingratiate himself to potential voters, had carried him far throughout his political career. At the local, state, and national level, Johnson understood how to turn a crowd in his favor and how to embarrass any man daring enough to run against him. That had been his life story, part of his bootstrap origin story. It played a key role in him being chosen by Lincoln to take on the Reconstruction of Tennessee as military governor. Greeneville had played a role in shaping this gift by training him in stump speaking and debate. His hometown carried him as far as they could and encouraged him to aim for higher offices once as the popularity of his message grew. But, as historian Eric McKittrick has pointed out, Johnson was a stump speaker and not a polished orator.¹¹⁹ The issues on the ballot of 1866 required an understanding of nuance and a politician with finesse. And presidents, of which there had only been sixteen before, had established the precedent of speaking in a manner that inspired populations to think of issues bigger than themselves. Presidents exhibited dignity and forethought. They argued a case with acumen. They abhorred vulgarity.

Johnson's "Swing around the Circle," an eighteen-day speaking tour (August 27-September 15, 1866) intended to sell his Reconstruction agenda to northern audiences, failed miserably because of all of issues listed above. He was crude, returning serious questions from the crowd about the possibility of hanging Jefferson Davis with joking questions about hanging Thaddeus Stevens.¹²⁰ That one man presided over a traitorous rebellion in an effort to preserve a slave labor system, while the other tirelessly pushed an agenda of abolishing the institution through Congress should not go

¹¹⁸ Eric L. McKittrick, *Andrew Johnson and Reconstruction* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1960), 422-424.

¹¹⁹ Eric L. McKittrick, *Andrew Johnson and Reconstruction*, 429.

¹²⁰ Eric Foner, *Reconstruction: America's Unfinished Revolution, 1863-1877* (New York: Harper & Row, 1998), 265.

unnoticed. His vulgar speech, his attacks on loyal Union men, his self-comparisons to Jesus Christ on the alter, his abrasive and acerbic defense of pardoning former Confederates, and his unrelenting frenzied denouncements of Republican Congressmen cost him any hope for a mandate.

Johnson stalled on the Reconstruction bill in March of 1867, which immediately placed him in a position to use his commander-in-chief status to ensure any attempts to divide the southern states into military districts would be slowed down by lengthy Supreme Court cases. The Tenure of Office Act, coming immediately after the bill, stood as an attempt to tie Johnson's hands by forcing the government to recognize the legitimacy of the sixteenth president's cabinet and office selections even when the seventeenth president took the oath after an assassination. Lincoln may have been dead, but the citizens had voted for his ideas and his decisions. Simply put, the cabinet should have been left in place. Congressmen discussed impeachment proceedings if they were pushed to "yield to one stubborn, narrow-minded man."¹²¹

Congress vehemently opposed Johnson's version of Reconstruction. Union supporters throughout the nation, and especially along his campaign route of 1866, stood in wonder at Johnson's seemingly immediate desire to forgive and forget secession. Had he not rallied support for the Union in the earliest discussions of secession? Had he not branded himself a Loyal Union man and cursed secessionists as traitors? Why then, would Johnson take on the duties of the American presidency and seem to reverse his political course? Greeneville citizens knew. So did the East Tennessee region in general. Andrew Johnson said what needed to be said, when it needed to be said, in order to keep the priorities clear. His priorities were abolishing the "enslavement" of poor white men to wealthy white men's interests. They were establishing opportunities for poor white families where none existed previously, either because enslaved labor excluded them from wage

¹²¹ W.E.B. DuBois, *Black Reconstruction in America, 1860-1880*, introduction by David Levering Lewis (New York: The Free Press, 1998) 334.

labor or because elite white southerners denied them any recognition of their supremacy. In close elections early in his career and in letters from his constituents, the citizens of his hometown made it clear to Johnson that his political career came from their support and threatened it could end with their rejection. In turn, Johnson demanded a version of loyalty that maintained felicity to white supremacy for all men regardless of economic status.

To his secretary, President Johnson confided his thoughts on the impeachment process that loomed over his term in office. He railed against accusations that he violated the Constitution, telling Moore that he had “been struggling ever since I have been in this chair to uphold the Constitution which they trample underfoot.”¹²² Historian Annette Gordon-Reed has highlighted how the American people have approached the impeachment of presidents with skepticism. There was, in fact, no reliable way to know how most Americans felt about the process. Beyond editorials and speeches made by politicians and special interest groups, the vote of the people is always the clearest depiction of popular sentiment. That never happened with Andrew Johnson. He was a Unionist celebrity from the seceded state of Tennessee: a spectacle on the Union Party ticket in 1864. He was the vice-presidential nominee with the sole purpose of ingratiating Union Democrats and border-state voters to follow Lincoln into a victorious end of the war. But the war ended and Lincoln died too soon and Andrew Johnson fell into a position he rehearsed in Tennessee, but never grew to fill.

What is clear is that Andrew Johnson knew to whom he was loyal, and he knew that most in Greeneville remained loyal to him. East Tennessee lawyer Thomas A.R. Nelson sat on his defense team during Johnson’s impeachment trial. The senators from Tennessee, one of them his own son-in-law David T. Patterson, voted him not guilty. Though ultimately found not guilty of an impeachable offense by one vote short of the 2/3 majority needed, Johnson’s remainder of time in the White House was ineffectual and, politically, the president had lost his footing. He irritated

¹²² William G. Moore, “Small Diary” February 29, 1868, *Andrew Johnson Papers*, Washington D.C., 104.

Radical Republicans on Christmas of 1868, issuing amnesty to all Confederates including Jefferson Davis. He pardoned Confederate men being held in federal prisons. These actions could easily be interpreted as a failure to remain loyal to his constituents. When the 14th Amendment was ratified on July 9th, 1868, Andrew Johnson knew that the issue of suffrage would soon follow. Without “negro suffrage” the passage of the 14th Amendment created a large population of southern black men, new citizens, that could not expect representation in Congress. The language of the amendment ordered that the new citizens “should not be counted in the apportionment of representatives in Congress, and in choosing electors for President and Vice-President, unless the right of suffrage was conferred.” This sticking point built the framework for an argument that suffrage would need to be provided and protected through constitutional amendment. Before that could happen, On December 25, 1868, one of Johnson’s final acts as president took the inevitable extension of voting rights to Black men and undercut it with a full pardon, amnesty, and restoration of voting rights to “every person who directly or indirectly participated in the late insurrection or rebellion.” Two months later the 15th Amendment was ratified on February 26th, 1869, enfranchising Black men. Greeneville, Tennessee, would never know “Radical Republican” rule. The newly enfranchised poor white population guaranteed the maintenance of white supremacy. Poor white men, were the population Andrew Johnson served as long as he remained in an elected office.¹²³

Johnson refused to attend the inauguration of the incoming eighteenth president, Ulysses S. Grant. And throughout it all, he collected newspaper articles for a series of scrapbooks that aligned with his ideological framework. He favored the newspaper articles from Tennessee newspapers, specifically, with the odd assortment of other papers which saw no harm in publishing pieces that defended Andrew Johnson as a president and a white man. He saved articles that disparaged William

¹²³ Oliver P. Temple, *Notable Men of Tennessee*, 430-431; Andrew Johnson, “President Johnson’s Amnesty Proclamation” December 25, 1868 in *The Papers of Andrew Johnson, Volume 15, September 1868-April 1869* (Knoxville, University of Tennessee Press, 1979), 186.

G. Brownlow who, once the war ended, transformed back into a political enemy as the elected Radical Republican governor of Tennessee who dragged Johnson's home state into ruin and "oligarchy."¹²⁴ The articles Johnson collected were consumed with concern about the possibility of African American autonomy. One undated article described how two hundred black women and men exited their church in Knoxville after shots were fired at two black men at a political rally and a riot narrowly avoided. Southern rebels armed themselves "for the purpose of supporting Andrew Johnson," suggesting that Johnson supporters were, by 1868, "Southern rebels and Northern Copperheads." These articles cut and pasted into scrapbooks reflected Johnson's own thoughts and agreed with his agenda.¹²⁵

And then Andrew Johnson became the first president in American history to be elected Senator. He came home to Greeneville in March of 1869 and immediately found warm welcome and support from his constituents. His ambitions were not quelled by his brief and castrated rise to power. He ran for the Senate, first, in 1869, and lost by four votes in the state legislature because "Republicans in the state never forgot his actions as president, and the ex-Confederates remembered with great bitterness his time as military governor."¹²⁶ In 1872, he switched his goal to the House of Representatives, which all states elected via the popular vote and not through the state legislature. He lost this election in an East Tennessee district, no less, but there was enough of an optimistic impulse that everyone believed he would sit in some sort of elected office again soon. In January of 1875, the state legislature elected him to the United States Senate and he took the oath of office in March.

Shortly after the election, Johnson sat with a correspondent of the *New York Herald* and answered questions about how his presidency might affect his actions in the Senate. "I do not

¹²⁴ *Andrew Johnson Papers*, Series 11, "Scrapbooks," Volume 3, p. 151.

¹²⁵ *Andrew Johnson Papers*, Series 11, "Scrapbooks," Volume 9, p. 178-180.

¹²⁶ Gordon-Reed, *Andrew Johnson*, 142.

represent myself, but Tennessee,” he answered, going on to explain that he would forget any lingering frustrations or grudges with Republican congressmen. Partisan politics worried him and he made a point about voting his conscience, and not being beholden to a party line. He would not be “bound to vote for a measure that my judgment tells me is wrong.” When he took the Senate floor on March 22nd, Johnson used his experience as military governor to explain his actions as a Reconstruction president and made a case for ending military occupation of the South. Party factions divided white voters on issues where Johnson believed they should fall on the same side where “organic law” compelled people, “who are the source of all power,” to revive a government that did not require a military state with imposed unnatural laws. Military Reconstruction did not facilitate poor white men in finding success. In his conclusion he called for all Americans to stand equal in the Union, “all upon an equality.” But he did not mean all men. He wanted Congress to move on from a state-imposed agenda that enforced true social equality and allow the southern states to reconcile comfortably without fear of competition with the black race.¹²⁷ He demanded equality for all white men. Three months later, in July of 1875, he suffered a stroke and lapsed into a coma. Andrew Johnson died shortly thereafter. Under his request, Johnson’s body was wrapped in an American flag and his head rested on his personal copy of the Constitution as a pillow in his coffin. He was buried in Greeneville.

Greeneville’s loyalty to Andrew Johnson would bend from time to time but never break. Johnson’s popularity often transcended party lines within his community and he always knew he served at their pleasure. When other parts of the country and the world admitted Johnson’s failures as a Reconstruction president, East Tennessee pushed a narrative that focused on his loyalty to Union. The Greeneville paper, the *National Union*, continued to serve as an unofficial mouthpiece for

¹²⁷ *The Papers of Andrew Johnson, Volume 16, May 1869-July 1875* (Knoxville, University of Tennessee Press, 1979), 709, 707, 739, 745.

Andrew Johnson in the years after his presidency. Republicanism looked lily-white in Greene County; even though Grant took the ballot in 1872, it was a marginal win in a whitened space and Andrew Johnson was not on the ballot. The community still supported Johnson's Reconstruction approach.¹²⁸

Greeneville native and former political opponent Oliver P. Temple recollected in his book, *Notable Men of Tennessee*, that Johnson's time in the White House stood out for his determination to win over the electoral votes of southern states and, at the same time, "it was a pleasant reflection to him, no doubt, that by a humane policy he might also win the good opinion and respect of a class of persons among whom he was born and had lived, and who had always looked down upon him." Johnson had successfully represented the poor white voters. His ambition to "triumph over all opposition" *and* create paths for poor white men, at the cost of any paths for the recently emancipated, that did not exist prior to emancipation and civil war stood as the basis for every decision he made, first as military governor and then again as a happenstance president. Temple placed the ultimate failures of Johnson's presidency squarely with the white southerners who rejected Johnson's 1866 plan to bring the states back into the fold of the United States with an oath of loyalty and the passage of the Fourteenth Amendment. "If these two things had been done cheerfully and in good faith," Temple suggested, "that can scarcely exist a doubt that in twenty months after the surrender of General Lee, the Southern States would all have been restored to their old places in the Union."¹²⁹ What stopped this course of action, according to Temple, was the pride of the slaveholding class and their rejection to recognize the citizenship of their former chattel laborers. Any grievances regarding the harsh treatment southerners might have experienced at the

¹²⁸ Greeneville *National Union*, December 3, 1874.

¹²⁹ Oliver P. Temple, *Notable Men of Tennessee*, 420, 422, 424.

hands of Military Reconstruction were the sole blame of those who stood in Johnson's way.

Johnson's Reconstruction would continue, if only for him and his supporters.

In his "Biographical Introduction" to the speeches of Andrew Johnson, published in 1865, Civil War journalist Frank Moore concluded that Johnson was "emphatically a representative of the people." Born into poverty, his early lessons on building networks and resources taught him that the men and women he grew up alongside held their own aspirations. But the lesson only acknowledged the poor whites with whom he identified. As late as 1860, he remained consistent in his course to guarantee the perpetuity of slavery, telling Congress "it is an institution local in its character and peculiar to the States where it exists, and no other power has the right to control it." Only if slavery survived under constitutional protection would poor white men be able to one day own their own chattel and ascend their class status. When he accepted his nomination as the candidate for the Vice-Presidency of the United States in front of the National Union Convention in Baltimore, Maryland on June 6, 1864, Johnson acknowledged emancipation and offered his thoughts on how abolition might also benefit the poor white men. He embraced emancipation because it broke down "an odious and dangerous aristocracy." Because abolition hurt the economic futures of southern elite white men, he suggested "I think that we are freeing more whites than blacks in Tennessee." The loyalty demanded of Johnson, which he in turn demanded of everyone else, was always to the future ascension of the poor white man.¹³⁰

¹³⁰ Frank Moore, *Speeches of Andrew Johnson* (New York: Burt Franklin Publishers, 1865), reprinted 1970, xi, xvi, xxxi.

CONCLUSION

In the Fall of 2012, I worked as an intern for the Florida Atlantic University's Wimberley Library Special Collections. Throughout the semester I sat in a room across from a vault and worked my way through thousands of pamphlets. The Marvin and Sybil Weiner *Spirit of America* Collection "is comparable in scope and content to the collections of the American Antiquarian Society and the Library Company of Philadelphia." My job was to read each pamphlet. I had to identify the author, where it was published, its contents and historical context. Once I knew everything there was to know about a pamphlet on temperance or secession or manifest destiny, I distilled the information down into a three-sentence description for the archive finding aid. It was solitary work. It could have been tedious. My supervisor for the work, now the director of Special Collections at FAU, Victoria Thur, made a point early in my internship. I asked her what was her favorite part of the collection and Ms. Thur told me she liked finding the patterns. She had earned her M.A. in history from Florida Atlantic University in 2006 and wrote a beautiful thesis exploring material culture, embroidery, and immigration at the turn of the twentieth century.¹ Patterns were an entry into historical research that reveal a person's value and belief system. Patterns can betray a person or vindicate them.

Geo-political borders in northeastern Tennessee illustrate divisions that invited scrutiny and populations existed in significant enough numbers of people who supported both sides of secession and war. Any attempt to establish patterns based solely on election results and op-eds in newspapers discount the thoughts that went unsaid and unwritten. To carry archivist and librarian Victoria

¹ Victoria Thur earned her M.A. in history at Florida Atlantic University in 2006, where she wrote her thesis, *Gifts From Home: Material Culture and American Immigrant Women in the 20th Century*.

Thur's analogy to embroidery one step further, this dissertation recognized that rigorous design and persistent tactics were difficult to discern in a border war that experienced various occupations and guerrilla campaigns. Communities closed ranks on either side and participated in active expressions of loyalty. Loyalty to either side could garner support or harassment. Mountain warfare tactics and partisan politics created more of a patchwork quilt than an organized and highly patterned work of embroidery. Unionists and Confederates were stitched next to each other. Different worldviews, different understandings of history, different expectations of where their successes existed, all of these patches varied in color and consistency. It was the common threads and underlying patterns that made those patches fit together into a story of secession, war, and reconstruction.

It would have been so much easier to find the patterns had the evidence supported "Holy Appalachia" tropes of the exceptional East Tennessee Civil War experience. But the region does not conform to what early historians of Appalachia's Civil War have argued. The brisk mountain air did not, in fact, imbibe the Southern Highlanders to remain true to the nation that embraced their Scots-Irish King's Mountain descendants. That is not what the patterns told me. As a historian, I had an obligation to engage primary source material. Most came in the form of scraps of paper: letters, newspapers, diaries and ledgers. A life lived, however, existed beyond paper ephemera. Patterns, as primary sources, came in actions. Lessons learned over time informed their movements, their connections, their motivations and ambitions and as years passed, they betrayed a person's patterns. As a storyteller, I had an obligation to put these patterns into context and share the intimate motivations that informed one's loyalty.

Earlier historians of East Tennessee, the men who introduced this dissertation like Felix Reeve, focused on Unionism as a distinct feature. Reeve, Oliver P. Temple, Thomas Hume and James Patton, focused on the military service of East Tennesseans without scrutiny into the loyalties held by the men who served. They were petty loyalties. They were self-interested loyalties that always

deferred ultimately to a loyalty to white supremacy. Case studies do not illustrate commitments to larger causes. They highlight a loyalty to self-preservation. Nothing about that is exceptional. The studies presented in the previous chapters make the American Civil War smaller and more manageable to understand. Where intellectual explorations of history generally seek to complicate a reader's understanding of why or how people made decisions that fundamentally altered their world, this dissertation explores the immediate actions and the persisting patterns of thought that informed the larger loyalties demanded of them. Historian David Warren Bowen has introduced his book, *Andrew Johnson and the Negro*, with the simple recognition that "an examination of the human context of an idea is clearly within the province of traditional historical methodology."

The case studies presented in this dissertation have attempted to trace how ideas informed patterns and what those patterns can teach us about the true nature of loyalty. Loyalty to the Union or to the Confederacy always meant more than the carefully crafted larger narratives and vague definitions. Historian Shannon H. Wilson has argued that the people living in Southern Appalachia remembered a different Civil War because they experienced the war differently from other parts of the South. "Rather than the national Armageddon at Gettysburg," Wilson has concluded "guerrilla raids and skirmishes with partisan rangers were the archetypal highland battles."² Historian Tom Lee has argued that the economic development that took place in the decades after the Civil War "trumped the potential for conflict over the meaning of the past." East Tennessee exceptionalism during the war, as branded by Unionist politicians in the years that followed, obscured ideological realities in favor of exploitable commodification of a resource-rich region where Unionism could be veiled in rhetoric stressing opportunity. Earlier scholarship like Thomas Humes "Loyal

² David Warren Bowen, *Andrew Johnson and the Negro* (Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press, 1989), xii; Shannon H. Wilson, "Lincoln's Sons and Daughters: Berea College, Lincoln Memorial University, and the Myth of Unionist Appalachia, 1866-1910" in *The Civil War in Appalachia: Collected Essays* edited by Kenneth W. Noe and Shannon H. Wilson (Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press, 1997), 243-4.

Mountaineers” never scratched the surface of what they were loyal to, only that they rejected secession and defended the United States. Tom Lee highlights how loyalty transformed into legend and legend transformed into a narrative of history that white-washed the role of slavery and the racism that informed Tennessee Unionism.³

Much like today, during the American Civil War, history mattered. Historian Karen Cox’s *Dixie’s Daughters: The United Daughters of the Confederacy and the Preservation of Confederate Culture* has argued that late-19th-century organizations crafted a historical narrative of the Civil War that vindicated the Confederacy through memorialization efforts that highlighted the Lost Cause. They understood that whoever controlled public spaces and classroom curriculum controlled the narrative of the Civil War. “Dixie’s Daughters,” however, did not invent the practice of appropriating history to serve one’s interests. Truth in the depiction of history was never so much the priority of its creators. Apocryphal legends and historical mythmaking have always been powerful tools.⁴

The historical literacy of the Fain family represented a persistent pattern in how they justified their loyalties. Nor is it surprising that historical legend meant so much to the residents of East Tennessee. The regard the Fains held for George Washington reached the similar hero status of Andrew Jackson and Davy Crockett. More than a form of entertainment or the fodder for celebration, the historical understanding of what George Washington stood for, and how best to honor him, motivated second cousins to choose separate sides in war. Both of them deferred to Washington’s desires for the country when defending or explaining their loyalties.

One continuous thread throughout this patchwork of case studies are the personal reactions to occupation and violence. John and Sallie Moffett, Hiram Fain and his family, the Hale family, and

³ Tom Lee, “The Lost Cause That Wasn’t: East Tennessee and the Myth of Unionist Appalachia,” in *Reconstructing Appalachia: The Civil War’s Aftermath* edited by Andrew L. Slap (Lexington: University Press of Kentucky, 2010), 312-315.

⁴ Karen Cox, *Dixie’s Daughters: The United Daughters of the Confederacy and the Preservation of Confederate Culture* (Gainesville: University Press of Florida, 2003).

Andrew Johnson's family all, at some point during the war and its immediate aftermath, felt threatened enough to move their families to safety outside of their hometowns. John and Sallie moved to a new city, permanently, once years passed without John finding access to the merchanting professional class. Hiram Fain put his family on a train to Memphis in an attempt to start over in a community that would not punish his loyalty to the South. His move was temporary, but he felt justified in doing it. The Hale family left their home and property in Fentress County in the middle of the night as they escaped a real threat of physical harm from Confederate vigilantes. Once the war ended, the Fains attempted to recoup what had been lost to fire and looting and moved back to their home. It would be temporary; they moved to Jonathan's place of birth in New Hampshire once it became clear no one was listening to their pleas for safety and restored financial security. Andrew Johnson's family, who tended to remain in Greeneville when his political service took him away from home, witnessed the family home and Johnson's private office downtown commandeered by occupying forces once he took residence in Nashville as the military governor of the state. Even young John Fain Anderson suffered a forced removal, when his family home burned to the ground during the Battle of Blountville. War in these communities did not disappear once the men went off to fight for whatever side they chose. Occupation ensured the war crept into every aspect of the lives discussed in these case studies. For them, it was a total war.

Women provided opinions and intelligence to these case studies, but more importantly they provided insight into how integral they were to the men's survival while the women took on responsibilities and lived in fear. Wars of occupation were wars where women were the first line of defense. Their homes and their neighborhoods, their communities and streets, constituted the front lines. The only East Tennessee Civil War military park north of Chattanooga is a 91-acre park

overlooking downtown Knoxville.⁵ The large sprawling battlefield parks throughout the South mirror a historical narrative about war that places it *somewhere else*. Were national parks put into place near border wars and wars where occupation changed sides throughout, those parks would envelope cities and neighborhoods, surrounding small mountain towns. They would be in the backyards. Ultimately, those parks would be wherever women were. Historian Stephanie McCurry's book, *Women's War: Fighting and Surviving the American Civil War*, has argued that women were always more than witnesses to war. "When wars broke out," women are "swept into the same raging currents of history as the men in their families and communities."⁶ Sallie Moffett was 21 years old when war broke out. When Tennessee seceded and her husband left to serve in the Confederate Army, she lived with her parents in her hometown of Greeneville, Tennessee. That county, also home to Andrew Johnson and his family, experienced both a Confederate occupation and then a Union one. Her family's support of the South eventually led to their move to Rome, Georgia, taking Sallie and her young son, Ned, with them. By the time Sallie wrote a letter to Andrew Johnson, seeking a pardon and parole of her husband who was stuck in Point Lookout prison in Maryland after Lincoln's assassination, she wrote to a man who facilitated and approved the hostile Union occupational tactics that made her family move further south. Not only had she been removed from her home in Greeneville; she would remain without her husband for two more years as John Moffett looked for opportunity where none existed for him.

Hiram Fain's sister-in-law, Eliza Rhea Anderson Fain, spent the entire war detailing her interactions and injustices with occupying forces who harassed, threatened, took food and supplies,

⁵ The City of Knoxville's Parks and Recreation website describes Fort Dickerson as an "earthen fort from the Civil War era" that "rests on a knob just across the river from downtown." "History buffs will enjoy wandering over to the historic Civil War fort to stroll around its interpretive trail." City of Knoxville Parks and Recreation Department, "Fort Dickerson Park," <http://www.knoxvilletn.gov/cms/one.aspx?portalId=109562&pageId=209647> (accessed October 5, 2019).

⁶ Stephanie McCurry, *Women's War: Fighting and Surviving the American Civil War* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2019), 2.

and commandeered fields to set up camp. She engaged in conversation with local commanders, Union and Confederate, and recorded her impressions of them. “From here I went back to Nancys and sent for Capt. Colwell,” she relayed in a May 1865 entry. “He seemed to be very respectful in his demeanor,” but she discovered “he had a heart rankling with bitter hatred towards all who bore the name Rebel.” She then described how she tried to keep conversation light and amiable. She knew she could never express how she really felt. Her diary detailed a war that silenced her publicly and radicalized the private thoughts she recorded.⁷ Pheroba Hale’s wartime experience provided the most extensive participation to her husband’s service. In her letters to her husband, she often referred to correspondence she received from their son, their neighbors back in Fentress County, his family in Stoddard, New Hampshire, and General George Thomas. She coordinated the acquisition of goods and supplies for her husband and the men around him. She negotiated prices and deals from her primary supplier, Mr. Starbuck, in Covington. She procured large quantities of pamphlets and Union newspapers for her husband to distribute to Confederate-occupied regions where small resistance groups of ladies could stay informed of national issues when their local papers turned into Confederate mouthpieces. While the case study focused on Jonathan Hale’s trouble getting federal acknowledgement and recompense for his service to his country, Pheroba’s actions during the Civil War clearly made a case for her own recognition and claim for pension. Neither of them acknowledged this.

Smaller threads persist throughout these stories of how families expressed their understanding of loyalty. They are evident in the scrapbooks kept by John Fain Anderson and Andrew Johnson. Both men combed the newspapers looking for either an article with which they agreed, or for inaccurate information they could correct in their personal records. These were small

⁷ Eliza Rhea Anderson Fain, *Sanctified Trial: The Diary of Eliza Rhea Anderson Fain, a Confederate Woman in East Tennessee* edited by John N. Fain (Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press, 2004), 332.

actions that demonstrated a commitment to the truths they held personally. Hiram Fain maintained a diary that only featured what mattered most to him; the entries painted a portrait of a middle-aged man who cared about his family, his farm, and his Revolutionary hero. He expressed manageable loyalties that offer insight into his value system. They were simple illustrations of how historical literacy played a role in his loyalty to the Confederacy. John Moffett and Jonathan Hale revealed loyalties to eventual recognition and reward for service. Moffett collected the names of Confederate men who might help him in the future while Hale collected testimonies from citizens who witnessed guerrillas destroy what he had built in the past. They served different sides, but their personal interests remained the same. And both of them ended up suffering for these loyalties informed by ambition.

What were their personal Civil Wars over? White supremacy played a role in every case study's decision to support the North or the South. Bowen has compared his historical study of Johnson and the idea of racism to a novelist's character development without having control of the narrative or access to the inner thoughts. What historians do control is the ability to witness a life reduced to the letters, diaries, and documents they produced and interpret the man who created them. In antebellum East Tennessee, Bowen has pointed out "whether scientist, theologian, or backwoodsman, the white American, with few exceptions, usually viewed mankind as a hierarchy—with himself at the top or at least intrinsically capable of being there. The black could fit only at the bottom." Whitelaw Reid, a northern journalist who spent his Civil War career sending reports to newspapers from frontlines and occupied cities, recalled East Tennessee's wartime experience in his 1866 book, *After the War: A Southern Tour, May 1, 1865-May 1, 1866*. With regards to race and how it related to loyalty in the region, Reid dispelled rumors of racial "radicalism." "Every few nights, I was told a negro was shot in some of the back streets." Black East Tennesseans possessed little value and "nobody likes 'em enough to have any affair of the sort investigated." White men in East Tennessee

could just shoot him and “put an end to it.” East Tennessee Loyalists, Reid recalled, held “no public sentiment in favor of negro suffrage, and scarcely any in favor of negro education.”⁸

John and Sallie Moffett lived their lives before and during the war in a manner that honored mastery as a skill and held expectations of privilege and success proportionate to their proximity to slave-ownership. While waiting for parole from Point Lookout in Maryland, John warned Sallie about a future he feared not that his side had lost. “You must not be too optimistic of the future,” he cautioned her, “We have fallen upon evil times. I can promise nothing at present in the way of a home for my wife and boy.” His loyalty to the social order that would have provided financial success and professional stability withered away as he sat in a prison camp and watched men go free who provided the proper credentials from social networks of their own. “Some of my comrades are getting out on petitions,” but John knew “not what my friends, if any I have, are doing for me.” The South’s failure was his failure and he felt “I am a burden at times.” His actions in the following years tell the story of a man who paid for his decision to back the wrong side in war when the privileges of legislated white supremacy were denied to him for it.

Within the Fain family, both Hiram and John Fain Anderson provided glimpses into their sentiment towards slavery, black people, and white supremacy. Hiram agreed to facilitate the sale of two enslaved laborers belonging to “Franklins and Blevis” on January 20, 1862. He drove the two black men to auction at Morristown, Tennessee, where they sold “at very high prices.”⁹ This was the social order he expected and when Northern troops invaded his community and his land, they were “barbarians” who sought to “pollute our soil or molest our homes.”¹⁰ These “abolitionist forces” occupied his world and he wanted them to suffer for invading and upsetting a system in which he

⁸ David Warren Bowen, *Andrew Johnson and the Negro*, 22; Whitelaw Reid, *After the War: A Southern Tour, May 1, 1865 to May 1, 1866* (New York: Moore, Wiltach and Baldwin, 1866), 339.

⁹ Hiram Fain diary, January 20 and 21, 1862, Archives of Appalachia, East Tennessee State University, Johnson City, Tennessee (hereafter AA).

¹⁰ Hiram Fain diary, July 2, 1862, AA.

benefitted.¹¹ John Fain Anderson never owned slaves, but his postwar scrapbooking provided clues to his curiosity of race. As an example, he cut and pasted an article from *The Journal and Tribune* of Knoxville from May 3, 1914 entitled “East Tennessean spends Years in Africa in the Study of the Negro Problem: Tells of His Journey Afoot through the Heart of the Continent, with Fever, Treacherous Natives and all kinds of Dangers to Surmount.” The content of the article supported scientific racism and used early sociological arguments that compared African men and women to the wild beasts found in the same continent. And while most articles of this size and substance elicited some sort of marginalia inserted to correct or further explain a topic, John Fain Anderson seemingly accepted the account as truth.¹²

The Hales, slaveowners and Unionists, lost all of their material wealth during the Civil War and their white supremacy manifested in their interactions with two of their own enslaved laborers. Lavendar Hale, the eighteen-year-old black man in the 1860 Slave Schedule, spent much of the war working alongside Jonathan as a scout and guide for General Thomas. When the Hales escaped Fentress County on July 7, 1861, Lavender was kidnapped by Confederate guerrillas and sold to a slave dealer. He managed to escape and returned to the Hale family. He was literate and held strong opinions which he shared with his Master and Mistress. When Jonathan railed against the black race as a people “destitute of knowledge” and “despised by all the world alike,” Lavender approached him and insisted that a man “being black and a slave was not his fault, he not having colored his skin or enslaved himself.”¹³ His literacy is known because Pheroba refers to letters she received from him in the one letter that remains that she wrote to him in May of 1863.

Her letter reinforced his inferior status throughout. She thanked him for his continued correspondence. “We like to have you write us as often as you can and let us hear that you are safe

¹¹ Hiram Fain diary, December 30, 1862, AA.

¹² Scrapbook 11, 1912-1914, John Fain Anderson Collection, AA

¹³ Jonathan Hale, “Note re: Lavender Hale” ca. 1890, Jonathan Hale Papers, Huntington Library.

and well.” This could be interpreted as someone expressing genuine care for Lavender’s well-being. Surely, that must have been a part of why she wrote it in the opening lines. But she also maintained a strict line between their roles. She referred to John as “your master.” She ended her letter with “your friend and mistress.” Most telling, though, was when she concluded her letter with a reminder that he “be a good boy and do as Gen. Thomas wishes until your master comes to you.” Pheroba felt compelled to remind him to remember his subservience. He represented the grooming the Hales had provided and she did not want him to ruin their good name. Even in casual conversation, Pheroba reminded Lavender he was inferior.¹⁴

Pheroba also provided a prime example of white supremacy as an instrument to terrorize enslaved Black people. Louise worked as a domestic enslaved laborer for the Hales. The 1860 Slave Schedule for Fentress County described her as either a 19-year-old black woman slave or a 17-year-old mulatto women slave; it is not clear which one was her. Either way, she was a young woman of color keeping house in a small rental property in northern Kentucky with freedom just across the river in Cincinnati, Ohio. She also infuriated Pheroba Hale hourly. In December of 1862, Pheroba wondered if her husband realized that she had “one of the most aggravating negroes to live with that every anybody was blest with,” and then suggested a solution. She wanted to send her further south for free. “I would rather somebody had her for nothing,” she justified to Jonathan, “than to keep her about me.”¹⁵ On the surface, her comment meant something cruel; whatever strained and hostile tensions existed in that house, this proposed solution seemed hyperbolic. However, the cruelty deepened when considered against what was known about cheap and free enslaved laborers and the

¹⁴ Pheroba Ann Hale to Lavender Hale, May 9, 1863, Covington, Kentucky, The Jonathan Hale Papers, Huntington Library.

¹⁵ Pheroba Ann Hale to Jonathan Hale, December 27, 1862, Covington, Kentucky, The Jonathan Hale Papers, Huntington Library.

death sentences they received on the auction block. Pheroba did not want Louise removed from the house; she expressed a desire to send her domestic laborer into a dangerous and deadly final sale.

Andrew Johnson offers the most explicit material with his opinions on white supremacy. When defending his proposed Homestead Bill in May of 1858, he addressed rumors that opponents of offering land to every man in the country had suggested an amendment to provide every man with a slave. He turned the issue of slavery back onto the opponents and related it the class system that developed when a man had the boost of unpaid labor. “So far as I am concerned,” he responded to his opponents in Congress, “if it suited him, and his inclination led him that way, I wish to God every head of a family in the United States had one [a slave] to take the drudgery and menial service off his family.”¹⁶ His form of white supremacy required its recognition that poor white men were also supreme and deserved associated privileges.

Johnson negotiated the preservation of slavery in Tennessee as military governor of an occupied state. Had his loyalty to the Union been interpreted as a signal that he endorsed abolition, this single act rejects the notion. Poor white men would never know the benefit of enslaved labor if the institution were dismantled. In February of 1866, Johnson was reminded of his words regarding race from a friend writing to discuss the recent passage of the 13th Amendment and the rumors of voting rights to be extended. “You said to me then,” his friend described, “that every one would, and *must* admit that the white race was superior to the black.” Should suffrage be extended, he warned, “a fire brand is cast among the people that cannot be extinguished until it is quenched in the blood of hostile factions.”¹⁷ Bloody and hostile factions; those had been the hallmark of East Tennessee throughout the war and Johnson had rehearsed how to deal with them. In the last

¹⁶ Andrew Johnson, “Speech on the Homestead Bill,” May 20, 1858, in *The Papers of Andrew Johnson, Vol. 3, 1858-1860* edited by LeRoy P. Graf and Ralph W. Haskins (Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press, 1972), 165.

¹⁷ Benjamin B. French to Andrew Johnson, Washington D.C., February 8, 1866, in *The Papers of Andrew Johnson, Vol. 10, February-July, 1866* edited by LeRoy P. Graf and Ralph W. Haskins (Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press, 1972), 57.

December of his lame duck presidency, Johnson gave the annual State of the Union and reminded Congress of the toll Radical Reconstruction had taken on the South. “The attempt to place the white population under the domination of persons of color in the South has impaired, if not destroyed the kindly relations that had previously existed between them,” he charged, “and mutual distrust has engendered a feeling of animosity which, leading in some instances to collision and bloodshed, has prevented that cooperation between the two races so essential to the success of industrial enterprise in the Southern States.”¹⁸ Slavery had preserved Andrew Johnson’s social order as a legitimate racial hierarchy. Its only failure, as far as he could see, was that benefiting from the slave system required wealth and access to opportunities that created it. Once slavery was abolished, Johnson continued a political agenda to elevate the status of poor white men, only now he saw class *and* race as potential interferences to that mission.

Taken together, the case studies followed secession, war, and reunification and offered a spectrum in loyalty and motivations based on community identity. The individual patches, made of mistress dresses, a former tailor’s fraying vest, Lavender Hale’s woolen coat; they tell a story about the individuals who lived through a war and spent their remaining years explaining how and why they did so. Author Alice Walker’s short story, “Everyday Use” offers various interpretations of how a such quilt might be used. The matriarch of the story, “Mama,” faced a decision of where her family quilts would be best served: with the formally educated daughter who called them art and intended to hang them in display, Dee, or with the daughter who remained home and lived a hardscrabble life in her community, Maggie. Ultimately, Mama kept the nicest and oldest quilts for Maggie and only allowed her “enlightened” daughter to take a couple of the newer, less meaningful ones. Mama gave Maggie the quilts built from her family history because she knew Maggie would wear them. She

¹⁸ Andrew Johnson, “Fourth Annual Message,” December 9, 1868, *The Papers of Andrew Johnson, Vol. 15, September 1868–April 1869* edited by LeRoy P. Graf and Ralph W. Haskins (Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press, 1972), 282.

would use them and her life would be a continuation of these “everyday use” items.¹⁹ The stories offered in these case studies are not intended to stand alone as portraits to display.

As a contribution to the field of Appalachian history, the value of patchwork quilts seems an especially nuanced analogy. The historiography of Appalachian history is strongest in examinations of the intimate. It is also a field that exhibits the power of collected essays and community studies. Civil War in Appalachia could never be a tightly patterned work of embroidery. It requires individual stories that contribute texture and color in their experience. They require use and engagement, to be incorporated into a broader tapestry that understands how patterns shape a worldview. When searching for answers to the questions that guided his book, *Mountain Rebels*, W. Todd Groce employed a similar approach to East Tennessee history. Patchwork storytelling has provided an effective means of investigation in Appalachian History. Kenneth Noe and Shannon Wilson’s edited collection of essays, *The Civil War in Appalachia: Collected Essays*, John Inscoe and Robert Kenzer’s *Enemies of the Country: New Perspectives on Unionists in the Civil War South*, John Inscoe’s *Appalachians and Race: The Mountain South from Slavery to Segregation*, Andrew Slap’s edited collection of essays in *Reconstructing Appalachia: The Civil War’s Aftermath*, and Bruce Stewart and Steve Nash’s edited collection *Southern Communities: Identity, Conflict, and Memory in the American South* represent just a small part in an extensive catalogue where individual chapters describe intimate stories and demanding situations. The stories of violence and long-harbored ill will are stitched next to stories of redemption. The abolitionists are stitched next to the slaveholding aristocracy, the Mountain Masters. As case studies in loyalty, the chapters in this dissertation have attempted to contribute to this ongoing project.

¹⁹ Alice Walker, “Everyday Use,” in *In Love and Trouble: Stories of Black Women* (New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1973).

BILBIOGRAPHY

Primary Sources*Unpublished Manuscript Collections*

John Fain Anderson Papers, Archives of Appalachia, Johnson City, TN.
 Civil War Collection, 1861-1865, Tennessee State Archives, Nashville, TN.
 Hiram Fain Diary, Archives of Appalachia, Johnson City, TN.
 Johnathan Davis Hale Papers, 1859-1894, Huntington Library, San Marino, CA.
 Andrew Johnson Papers, 1846-1875, Tennessee State Archives, Nashville, TN.
 Andrew Johnson Governor Papers, 1853-1857, Tennessee State Archives, Nashville, TN.
 Andrew Johnson Military Governor Papers, 1862-1864, Tennessee State Archives, Nashville, TN.
 Andrew Johnson Papers, Manuscript Division, Library of Congress, Washington DC.
 Sallie McDowell Moffett Papers, Calvin M. McClung Collection, Knoxville, TN.
 William H. Moffett Papers, Calvin M. McClung Collection, Knoxville, TN.
 Miscellaneous Manuscripts, Calvin M. McClung Collection, Knoxville, TN.
 William G. Moore Small Diary, 1866-1867, Andrew Johnson Papers, Library of Congress, Washington DC.
 William G. Moore Large Diary, 1868-1870, Andrew Johnson Papers, Library of Congress, Washington DC.
 Thomas A.R. Nelson Papers, Calvin M. McClung Collection, Knoxville, TN.
 Oliver P. Temple Papers, Special Collections Library, University of Tennessee at Knoxville.

Published Primary Documents

Advice after Appomattox: Letters to Andrew Johnson, 1865-1866. Miller Learning Center, University of Virginia at Charlottesville.
 Cutcheon, Byron M. *Recollections of Burnside's East Tennessee Campaign of 1863.* Washington DC: Companion, 1902.
 Davis, Jefferson. "Second Inaugural Address." February 22, 1862. Richmond, VA
 Dyer, Gustavus W., and John Trotwood Moore, comps. *The Tennessee Civil War Veterans Questionnaires.* 5 vols. Easley, SC: Southern Historical Press, 1985.
 Ellis, Daniel. *Thrilling Adventures of Daniel Ellis: The Great Union Guide of East Tennessee For a Period of Nearly Four Years During the Great Southern Rebellion.* New York: Harper & Brothers, Publishers, 1867.
 Fain, Eliza Rhea Anderson and John. H. Fain. *Sanctified Trial: The Diary of Eliza Rhea Anderson Fain, a Confederate Woman in East Tennessee.* Knoxville: University of Tennessee, 2004.
Goodspeed's General History of Tennessee: Containing Historical and Biographical Sketches of Thirty East Tennessee Counties. Nashville: Goodspeed Publishing Company, 1887.
 Graf, Leroy P. and Ralph W. Haskins. *Papers of Andrew Johnson.* Sixteen Volumes. Knoxville:

- University of Tennessee Press, 1983.
- Humes, Thomas W. *The Loyal Mountaineers of Tennessee*. Knoxville: Ogden Brothers & Co., 1888.
- Looney, J. Jefferson. *The Papers of Thomas Jefferson*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2010.
- McBride, Stephen. "The Civil War in the Upper Cumberland Plateau, Including Effects on The Local Population: A Guide of the major events and themes, for teachers and interested Citizens of the Upper Cumberland Plateau of Tennessee and Kentucky." Big South Fork National River and Recreation Area, *Kentucky Archeological Survey Report 236*.
- National Park Service. *Soldier Details*.
- "New Inductees." *Official Bulletin of the National Society of the Sons of the American Revolution* 18 (December 1923): 85.
- Official Records of the Civil War*.
- Poe, Orlando M. *Occupation of East Tennessee and the Defense of Knoxville*. Knoxville: East Tennessee Historical Society, 1888.
- The Statutes at Large of the Provisional Government of the Confederate States of America*.
- Temple, Oliver P. *East Tennessee and the Civil War*. Johnson City: Overmountain Press, 1995.
- Temple, Oliver P. *Notable Men of Tennessee: From 1833 to 1875, Their Times and Their Contemporaries*. New York: Cosmopolitan Press, 1912.
- U.S. Bureau of the Census.
- West, Carroll Van and Susan Knowles. *Marble Industry of East Tennessee, CA 1838-1963*. Report for the United States Department of the Interior, National Parks Service, 2014.
- WPA Records, Jefferson County, Tennessee.

Newspapers

The Athens Post
The Brooklyn Daily Eagle
The Charleston Courier
Chicago Tribune
Clarksville Jeffersonian
Cookeville Herald-Citizen
The Daily Journal, Montpelier, Vermont
Evening Star, Washington D.C.
Greeneville Sun
Greeneville National Union
Greeneville New Era
The Knoxville Daily Bulletin
Loudon Free Press
Memphis Daily Appeal
Nashville Daily Union
Nashville Daily Press
Nashville Tennessean
New York Times

Secondary Sources

Alexander, Thomas B. *Thomas A.R. Nelson of East Tennessee*. Nashville: Tennessee Historical Commission, 1956.

-----, "Whiggery and Reconstruction in Tennessee." *Journal of Southern History* 16 (August 1950): 291-305.

Anderson, Benedict. *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*. Rev. ed. London: Verso, 1991.

Ash, Stephen. *When the Yankees Came: Conflict and Chaos in the Occupied South*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2002.

Ayers, Edward. *What Caused the Civil War? Reflections on the South and Southern History*. New York: W.W. Norton & Co., 2005.

Bailey, Fred Arthur. *Class and Tennessee's Confederate Generation*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1987.

Barksdale, Kevin T. *The Lost State of Franklin: America's First Secession*. Lexington: University Press Of Kentucky, 2009.

Beale, Howard. *That Critical Year: A Study of Andrew Johnson and Reconstruction*. New York: Harcourt, Brace and Company, 1930.

Bender, Thomas. *Community and Social Change in America*. Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press, 1978.

Bergeron, Paul H. *Andrew Johnson's Civil War and Reconstruction*. Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press, 2011.

-----, "The Election of 1843: A Whig Triumph in Tennessee." *Tennessee Historical Quarterly* 22 (June 1963): 123-136.

Berry, Stephen. *All That Makes A Man: Love and Ambition in the Civil War South*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003.

-----, *House of Abraham: Lincoln & the Todds, a Family Divided by War*. Boston: Mariner Books, 2007.

Blair, William. *With Malice Towards Some: Treason and Loyalty in the Civil War Era*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2015.

Bowen, David Warren. *Andrew Johnson and the Negro*. Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press, 1989.

Bradford, Augusta. *Fain of Tennessee: Descendants of Nicholas Fain*. Chattanooga: Lookout Publishing Company, 1930.

Brickey, Jennifer. "The Diary of Fannie Fain of Blountville: Defining Allegiance in Civil War Era East Tennessee." Honors Thesis. College of William and Mary, 2006.

- Brundage, Fitzhugh. *Where These Memories Grow: History, Memory, and Southern Identity*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2000.
- Bryan, Charles F. Jr. "A Gathering of Tories: The East Tennessee Convention of 1861." *Tennessee Historical Quarterly* 39 (Spring 1980): 27-48.
- Campbell, Mary Emily Robertson. *The Attitude of Tennesseans Toward the Union, 1847-1861*. New York: Vantage Press, 1961.
- Carroon, Robert G. and Dana B. Shoaf. *Union Blue: The History of the Military Order of the Loyal Legion Of the United States*. Shippensburg, PA: White Mane Books, 2001.
- Clinton, Catherine, Ed. *Southern Families at War: Loyalty and Conflict in the Civil War South*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2000.
- Cook, Robert J., William L. Barney and Elizabeth R. Varon, eds. *Secession Winter: When the Union Fell Apart*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2013.
- Cowan, Sam K. *Sergeant York and His People*. New York: Grosset & Dunlap, 1922.
- Cox, Karen. *Dixie's Daughters: The United Daughters of the Confederacy and the Preservation of Confederate Culture*. Gainesville: University Press of Florida, 2003.
- Current, Richard Nelson. *Lincoln's Loyalists: Union Soldiers from the Confederacy*. Boston: Northeastern University Press, 1992.
- Dahlstrand, Kate. "Temporary Triumphs: The Carpetbagger President of the Knoxville Industrial Association." *The Journal of East Tennessee History* 86 (Spring 2014): 41-56.
- Doughty, Richard Harrison. *Greeneville: One Hundred Year Portrait, 1775-1875*. Kingsport, TN: Kingsport Press, 1975.
- DuBois, W.E.B. *Black Reconstruction in America, 1860-1880*. New York: The Free Press, 1998.
- Dunbar, Erica Armstrong. *Never Caught: The Washingtons' Relentless Pursuit of Their Runaway Slave, Ona Judge*. New York: Atria Books, 2017.
- Dunn, Durwood. *An Abolitionist in the Appalachian South: Ezekiel Birdseye on Slavery, Capitalism, And Separate Statehood in East Tennessee, 1841-1846*. Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press, 1997.
- Cades Cove: The Life and Death of a Southern Appalachian Community, 1818-1937*. Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press, 1988.
- The Civil War in Southern Appalachian Methodism*. Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press, 2013.
- Dyer, Thomas G. *Secret Yankees: The Union Circle in Confederate Atlanta*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1999.

Engle, Stephen. *Gathering to Save a Nation: Lincoln and the Union's War Governors*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2016.

-----, "Mountaineer Reconstruction: Blacks in the Political Reconstruction of West Virginia." *The Journal of Negro History* 78 (Summer, 1993): 137-165.

Fain, John N. "The Diary of Hiram Fain of Rogersville: An East Tennessee Secessionist." *The Journal of East Tennessee History* 69 (1997): 97-114.

Faust, Drew Gilpin. *Mothers of Invention: Women of the Slaveholding South in the American Civil War*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1996.

-----, *This Republic of Suffering: Death and the American Civil War*. New York: Vintage Civil War Library, 2009.

Fisher, Noel. *The Civil War in the Smokies*. Gatlinburg: Great Smoky Mountain Association, 2005.

-----, *War at Every Door: Partisan Politics and Guerrilla Violence in East Tennessee, 1860-1870*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1997.

Fleming, Walter L. *Civil War and Reconstruction in Alabama*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1907.

Foner, Eric. *Reconstruction: America's Unfinished Revolution, 1863-1877*. New York: Harper & Row, 1988.

Ford, Lacy K. Jr. "Making the 'White Man's Country' White: Race Slavery, and State-building in the Jacksonian South." *Journal of the Early Republic* 19 (Winter, 1999): 713-737.

Forgie, George B. *Patricide in the House Divided: A Psychological Interpretation of Lincoln in His Age*. New York: W.W. Norton and Company, 1979.

Fraser, Hugh R. *Democracy in the Making: The Jackson and Tyler Era*. New York: Bobbs-Merrill Company, 1938.

Glymph, Thavolia. *Out of the House of Bondage: The Transformation of the Plantation Household*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008.

Gordon-Reed, Annette. *Andrew Johnson*. New York: Times Books, 2011.

Groce, W. Todd. *Mountain Rebels: East Tennessee Confederates and the Civil War, 1860-1870*. Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press, 1999.

Hoffman, Ronald. *Through a Glass Darkly: Reflections on Personal Identity in Early America*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1997.

Hyman, Harold M. *To Try Men's Souls: Loyalty Tests in American History*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1959.

- , *Era of the Oath: Northern Loyalty Tests During the Civil War and Reconstruction*. Philadelphia: University of Philadelphia Press, 1954.
- Inscoc, John C., ed. *Appalachians and Race: The Mountain South from Slavery to Segregation*. Lexington: University Press of Kentucky, 2001.
- , *Mountain Masters: Slavery and the Sectional Crisis in Western North Carolina*. Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press, 1996.
- , *Race, War, and Remembrance in the Appalachian South*. Lexington: University Press of Kentucky, 2008.
- Inscoc, John and Robert Kenzer. *Enemies of the Country: New Perspectives on Unionists in the Civil War South*. Athens: University of Georgia Press, 2001.
- Jones, James S. *Life of Andrew Johnson*. Greeneville: East Tennessee Publishing Co., 1901.
- Lee Susanna Michele. *Claiming the Union: Citizenship in the Post-Civil War South*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2014.
- Link, William, David Brown, Brian Ward, and Martyn Bone, ed. *Creating Citizenship in the Nineteenth-Century South*. Gainesville: University Press of Florida, 2013.
- Lynch, Michael. "Creating Regional Heroes: Traditional Interpretations of the Battle of King's Mountain." *Tennessee Historical Quarterly* 68 (Fall 2009): 224-249.
- Lynn, Joshua A. *Preserving the White Man's Republic: Jacksonian Democracy, Race, and the Transformation of American Conservatism*. Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 2019.
- Manning, Channing. *What This Cruel War Was Over: Soldiers, Slavery, and the Civil War*. New York: Knopf Publishers, 2007.
- McCurry, Stephanie. *Confederate Reckoning: Power and Politics in the Civil War South*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2010.
- , *Women's War: Fighting and Surviving the American Civil War*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2019.
- McDonnell, Michael, Clare Corbould, Frances Clark, Fitzhugh Brundage, eds. *Remembering the Revolution: Memory, History, and Nation Making from Independence to the Civil War*. Boston: University of Massachusetts Press, 2013.
- McKenzie, Robert Tracy. *Lincolmites and Rebels: A Divided Town in the American Civil War*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2006.
- , "Wealth and Income: The Preindustrial Structure of East Tennessee in 1860." *Appalachian Journal* 21 (Spring 1994): 260-279.

- McKinney, Gordon B. *Southern Mountain Republicans, 1865-1900: Politics and the Appalachian Community*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1979.
- McKittrick, Eric L. *Andrew Johnson and Reconstruction*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1960.
- McKnight, Brian D. *Confederate Outlaw: Champ Ferguson and the Civil War in Appalachia*. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 2011.
- , *Contested Borderlands: The Civil War in Appalachian Kentucky and Virginia*. Lexington: University Press of Kentucky, 2006.
- McPherson, James M. *Battle Cry of Freedom: The Civil War Era*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1988.
- Merritt, Keri Leigh. *Masterless Men: Poor Whites and Slavery in the Antebellum South*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2017.
- Moore, Frank. *Speeches of Andrew Johnson, President of the United States, with a Biographical Introduction*. New York: Burt Franklin Publishers, 1865.
- Nash, Steven E. and Bruce E. Stewart, eds. *Southern Communities: Identity, Conflict, and Memory in the American South*. Athens: University of Georgia Press, 2019.
- Noe, Kenneth. *Reluctant Rebels: The Confederates Who Joined the Army after 1861*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2010.
- Noe, Kenneth and Shannon Wilson. *The Civil War in Appalachia: Collected Essays*. Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press, 1997.
- Oakes, James. *Ruling Race: A History of American Slaveholders*. New York: W. W. Norton, 1998.
- Paludan, Philip Shaw. *Victims: A True Story of the Civil War*. Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press, 1981.
- Patton, James Welch. *Unionism and Reconstruction in Tennessee, 1860-1869*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1934.
- Pfiffner, James P. "George Washington's Character and Slavery." *White House Studies* 1(2001): 451-461.
- Potter, David M. "The Historian's Use of Nationalism and Vice Versa." *American Historical Review* 67 (1962): 924-950.
- Ramsey, James Gettys McGready. *The Annals of Tennessee to the end of the Eighteenth Century*. Reprint. Knoxville: East Tennessee Historical Society Over Mountain Press, 1999.

- Reeve, Felix A. "East Tennessee in the War of the Rebellion." Edited by the Military Order of the Loyal Legion of the United States. Vol. 43 of *War Papers of the Loyal Legion of the United States*. Wilmington, North Carolina: Broadfoot Pub. Co, 1993.
- , "The South in the Union Army." *The North American Review* 143 (1886): 515-517.
- Scott, Anne Firor. *The Southern Lady: From Pedestal to Politics, 1830-1930*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1970.
- Scott, James C. "Protest and Profanation: Agrarian Revolt and the Little Tradition, Part 1." *Theory And Society* 4 (Spring 1977): 1-38.
- Silkenat, David. *Driven From Home: North Carolina's Civil War Refugee Crisis*. Athens: University of Georgia Press, 2013.
- Simpson, Brooks D. *The Reconstruction Presidents*. Lawrence: University Press of Kansas, 1998.
- Sioussat, St. George L. "Notes of Colonel W.G. Moore, Private Secretary to President Johnson, 1866-1868." *American Historical Review* 19 (October 1913): 98-132.
- Slap, Andrew L. ed. *Reconstructing Appalachia: The Civil War's Aftermath*. Lexington: University Press of Kentucky, 2010.
- Smith, David A. *Presidents from Adams through Polk, 1825-1849*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 2005.
- Smith, Richard Norton. *Patriarch: George Washington and the New American System*. New York: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1993.
- Sternhell, Yael A. *Routes of War: The World of Movement in the Confederate South*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2012.
- Straw, Richard A. and H. Tyler Blethen, eds. *High Mountains Rising: Appalachia in Time and Space*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 2004.
- Taylor, William D. "A Fit Representation of Pandemonium." *East Tennessee Confederate Soldiers in the Campaign for Vicksburg*. Macon: Mercer University Press, 2008.
- Thomas, Emory M. *The Confederacy as a Revolutionary Experience*. Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 1971.
- Varon, Elizabeth R. "Andrew Johnson Family Life." UVA Miller Center.
- Walker, Alice. *In Love and Trouble: Stories of Black Women*. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1973.
- Weitz, Mark A. "I Will Never Forget the Name of You: The Home Front, Desertion, and Oath Swearing in Wartime Tennessee." *Tennessee Historical Quarterly* 59 (Spring 2000): 38-59.

Whites, LeeAnn and Alecia P. Long. eds. *Occupied Women: Gender, Military Occupation, and the American Civil War*. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 2012.

Williams, Samuel C. "John Mitchel, The Irish Patriot, Resident of Tennessee." *East Tennessee Historical Society* 10 (1938): 44-56.

Wills, Brian Steel. *George Henry Thomas: As True as Steel*. Lawrence: University Press of Kansas, 2012.