In Memory

This undated postcard shows the Fitchburg Civil War Soldiers’ Monument, with the armory (left) and a U.S. post office behind it.
Abstract: The Civil War Soldiers’ Monument in Fitchburg, Massachusetts, erected in 1874, represented an anomaly of postwar commemoration: fewer than five percent of all Civil War monuments overtly proclaimed the abolition of slavery as a Northern war goal. Although many leading historians have argued that the war’s abolitionist and “emancipationist” memories were quickly overpowered by a romanticized “reconciliationist” view of the conflict in the decades after the Civil War, the Fitchburg Soldiers’ Monument proudly proclaimed the town’s commitment to a war fought for both the preservation of the Union and the emancipation of the nation’s four million slaves.

In this thought-provoking article, author Darren Barry explores how and why Fitchburg continued to embrace and champion an unabashedly emancipationist Civil War memory in spite of the nation’s widespread and deliberate whitewashing of the war’s fundamental issues of slavery and racial equality. This article is drawn from Barry’s master’s thesis, titled “Union and Emancipation — Conflating Revolutionary Heritage with Abolitionist Practice: Civil War Collective Memory in Fitchburg, Massachusetts, 1861–1930.”
Public monuments have always served as powerful symbols in American culture. Indeed, as historian Kathryn Jacob points out, the significance of public statues in this country dates back to the American Revolution, when colonists in Manhattan violently toppled the monument of King George III. Jacob also argues that public monuments wield considerable influence over a community’s collective memory: “They weave an intricate web of remembrance in which certain threads are highlighted, or validated, while others are dropped or disappear.” Nowhere is this type of historical editing more evident than in the deluge of monuments erected to commemorate the Civil War.¹

Well before the war was over, and even before anyone realized the full magnitude of the conflict, Northerners and Southerners were busy etching their interpretation of events into America’s landscape. Both sides were aware of the power that public monuments and their inscriptions had to shape the collective memory of a community, region, or even the entire nation. Public statues would serve as permanent teachers for decades—if not centuries—and could mold history into whatever either side wanted it to be.²

Although historian David Blight does not dedicate many pages of his award-winning book, *Race and Reunion: The Civil War in American Memory*, to the subject of monument building, he argues that the construction of Northern Civil War memorials emphasized reconciliation above all other messages. Supporting his main thesis that the Civil War’s legacy of emancipation and racial equality was essentially forgotten by the turn of the twentieth century, Blight maintains that small-town soldiers’ monuments downplayed the divisive nature of the conflict. He argues that their dedication ceremonies usually celebrated reunification rather than blame or declared any validity in the war’s abolitionist purpose. Even at places like Gettysburg, where monuments to the thousands of men who fought and died sprouted up continuously, Blight argues “dedication speeches and tourist guidebooks portrayed the site as the Mecca of American Reconciliation.”³

**FITCHBURG’S REVOLUTIONARY LENS**

The *Soldiers’ Monument* in Fitchburg, Massachusetts, was the very antithesis of reconciliatory monument building in postbellum America. Although fewer than five percent of all Northern monuments unequivocally proclaimed the abolition of slavery as a Union war goal, the Fitchburg Soldiers’ Monument undeniably asserted a Unionist and “emancipationist”
Civil War memory. This small New England town—and by 1872 small city—had profound connections to both its Revolutionary ancestry and its long tradition of abolitionism.

When the Civil War broke out in 1861, townspeople took great pride in the sacrifices their patriotic forefathers had made to win American independence and forge the new nation. They relied heavily on their Revolutionary heritage for inspiration. The community’s deep engagement with the abolitionist movement in the mid-nineteenth century caused Fitchburg to translate the revolutionary mantra “all men are created equal” into a distinctly “emancipationist” understanding of the Civil War (1861–1865). Whereas the vast majority of Northerners at the start of the war endorsed only the narrow war aim of “preserving the union,” Fitchburg residents embraced a much broader objective that included the abolition of slavery in their emancipationist vision. The Soldiers’ Monument, erected in 1874, served as a physical manifestation of collective memory that anchored Fitchburg’s Unionist and emancipationist Civil War vision for decades.

Beginning in May of 1861, nine companies from Fitchburg would volunteer for service. They saw action in such major battles as Ball’s Bluff (1861), Antietam (1862), Gettysburg (1863), and the Wilderness Campaign of 1864—to name only a few. In total, nearly one thousand volunteers imperiled their lives in the nation’s deadliest conflict and 156 died in combat, from disease, or in Confederate prison camps. The Fitchburg community at large ardently supported these men and their cause.

Given the town’s notable Civil War history, it is not surprising that, in April of 1862, residents had already begun plans to construct a proper memorial to honor the “fallen heroes” who perished in the conflict. A committee of citizens was formed and tasked with preparing proposals for a commemoration worthy of those exalted soldiers who had already sacrificed their lives for abolition and preservation of the Union. Furthermore, it was imperative that the Civil War shrine—whether a statue, memorial hall, park, or other design—also embody the distinguished supporting role that all people of Fitchburg were playing in the Northern war effort.

Regrettably, intense debate over what type of memorial would best serve the memory of Fitchburg’s Civil War veterans delayed the monument’s construction for many years. In April of 1868, land for a memorial site was finally purchased at a downtown location and Fitchburg ultimately accepted plans to erect a soldiers’ monument in October of 1871. It is important to note that the vast majority of funding for the Civil War memorial came from public money. Of the roughly $77,000 it cost to complete the project,
nearly $69,000 emanated from town coffers, demonstrating the community’s steadfast commitment to the preservation of Fitchburg’s Civil War memory.  

Irish immigrant and sculptor Martin Milmore (1844–83) was selected to design the monument. A resident of Boston, Milmore had designed the Roxbury Soldiers’ Monument (Citizen Soldier) at Forest Hills Cemetery (1867), which won wide acclaim. It depicted a single soldier. He would go on to design several other Civil War monuments similar to the one unveiled in Fitchburg, including the Soldiers’ and Sailors’ Monument in Charlestown (1872), the Soldiers’ and Sailors’ Monument in Worcester (1875), and the Soldiers’ and Sailors’ Monument on the Boston Common (1877). He is also known for the American Sphinx monument in Mount Auburn Cemetery.

In Fitchburg, after two and a half years of planning and delays, it was decided that the monument’s dedication would take place on June 17, 1874—the ninety-ninth anniversary of the country’s “first substantial blow . . . for American Liberty” at the Battle of Bunker Hill. Although one final delay postponed the dedication for yet another week, the Soldiers’ Monument was finally unveiled on June 24, 1874—more than twelve years after its inception. The imposing statuary and its inscription left no doubt about the Unionist and emancipationist memory of the Civil War in Fitchburg.

FITCHBURG
ERECTS THIS MONUMENT
IN MEMORY OF HER
BRAVE SONS WHO FELL
AND IN HONOR OF
ALL HER LOYAL CITIZENS WHO PERILED
THEIR LIVES IN THE GREAT STRUGGLE
WHICH SECURED THE UNITY OF THE REPUBLIC,
AND THE FREEDOM OF AN OPPRESSED RACE
1861–1865

“For these are deeds which should not pass away,
And names that must not wither.”
1873

Located in Monument Park on Main Street, Fitchburg’s Civil War memorial stands more than twenty-five feet high and is the centerpiece of a quadrangle green enclosed with a sturdy iron railing. Atop a granite superstructure that includes a tapered platform of three broad steps, a majestic female statue made of bronze represents the Goddess of Liberty. Situated
on each side below her, two smaller bronze statues stand on pedestals, one of a Civil War soldier and the other of a Civil War sailor. The Goddess holds a myrtle wreath in each hand and appears to be crowning the soldier who is to her right. Imbedded on all four sides of the granite base are large recessed rectangular tablets. The first tablet, which faces Main Street, is inscribed with the monument’s aforementioned dedication to the memory of Fitchburg’s patriotic sons who sacrificed their lives for a “just cause” and the loyal citizens who supported them. Each of the three remaining plaques is engraved with the 135 names of those “who perished in the ‘War of the Rebellion’ and whom Fitchburg claimed as belonging to her Roll of Honor.”

At the long awaited dedication ceremony, Civil War veteran and Fitchburg native Eugene T. Miles (1826–76) encapsulated what the towering memorial meant to Fitchburg’s collective memory. It was “a day ever hereafter,” he thundered, “to be looked back upon, as the most glorious day in Fitchburg’s history—made so by the services today, enacted upon this spot.” Judging from the celebration that accompanied the monument’s unveiling, it is apparent that the community agreed with Miles’ declaration. At 11:00 a.m. on Wednesday, June 24, a parade consisting of ten divisions and roughly fifteen hundred people marched through town before reaching its destination at Monument Park. Highlighted by Fitchburg’s many veterans and Civil War heroes, the procession also included a multitude of local dignitaries, members of the business community, a police and fire department brigade, every class from the Fitchburg public school system, and a host of citizens in carriages. Patriotic music from eight marching bands reverberated for miles as waves of delegates from numerous religious organizations, Masonic Lodges, fraternal orders, and various social societies made their way to the dedication.

When they arrived at Monument Park, the vast contingent of Fitchburg representatives was met by a host of people eagerly anticipating the day’s celebratory exercises. Typical of all of Fitchburg’s Civil War commemorations, the dedication service was loaded with speeches that paid solemn attention
Last Man Standing

In this photo from around 1930, George C. Jewett, Fitchburg’s last surviving Civil War veteran, poses at the city’s Civil War Soldiers’ Monument. Courtesy of the Fitchburg Historical Society.
to the martyrdom of soldiers, poems that glorified the town’s patriotism, and hymns that praised the community’s commitment to the Northern war cause. Also reflected in all speeches was a bitter condemnation of the treacherous actions of the South and their abhorrent institution of human slavery. In addition to embodying a distinct Unionist and emancipationist Civil War memory, some orators reminded the audience that the Soldiers’ Monument represented a link to both Fitchburg’s past and future. With the perpetuation of a dual Civil War memory, they suggested, the community could together redeem the unfulfilled Revolutionary War promise of universal liberty and equality as well as instruct coming generations of Fitchburg’s eighteenth-century abolitionist convictions.

Although Fitchburg’s mayor, Amasa Norcross (1824–98), was one of many featured speakers at the dedication ceremony, his time at the podium was exceptionally brief. Despite the fact that the mayor’s speech was the shortest address of the afternoon, it may have said the most. Had anyone in the audience still questioned what the Soldiers’ Monument meant to Fitchburg’s Civil War memory, Norcross made sure to leave no doubt. After thanking the Monument Committee for their perseverance and congratulating them for bringing forth a memorial that was second to none, he simply confirmed what most everyone there already believed: that this was a war about emancipation as much as it was about preserving the Union. Upon accepting the stunning monument on the city’s behalf, Norcross did not mince words:

> Mr. Chairman, with an undoubting trust, that so long as the principles of a free government shall be preferred to the demands of despotic power; so long as liberty shall attract and slavery repel; … [The Soldiers’ Monument] and the names of the heroic dead it bears, shall be held in affectionate veneration.14

Norcross was equally direct when he spoke of the many soldiers who were fortunate enough to make it back from the bloody war and the countless number of Fitchburg citizens who supported their “sacred cause.” The Soldiers’ Monument was not only a tribute to Fitchburg’s martyred dead, the mayor stressed, it also paid homage “to the living heroes who have survived the perils of war, who pledged their lives and their all to the cause of their country.” In addition, it celebrated the steadfast commitment of Fitchburg’s civilian community in “the great struggle” in the war for freedom and unity. The Soldiers’ Monument was “the expression of our people,” Norcross declared. But even more significantly, it was an investment in the future of Civil War
memory in Fitchburg. The mayor punctuated his brief speech by reiterating the very same principles that motivated residents from the onset of the war and how they insisted it be remembered. With the Soldiers’ Monument, he affirmed:

We transmit by enduring memorial to those who shall follow us some intimation of our estimate of the services of our contemporaries, the honored survivors and the heroic dead, who upheld the cause of country, of liberty, and of mankind.

This glorious statuary, Norcross promised, “shall be held sacred, and sacredly guarded, so long as the love of country shall survive and the Republic endure.”

Norcross was one of Fitchburg’s most distinguished politicians during the Civil War era, and the community wholeheartedly endorsed his abolitionist principles. In 1858 and 1862, he had served in the Massachusetts House of Representatives as an antislavery Republican. Norcross was also an ardent supporter of Abraham Lincoln’s presidential campaign in 1860. Along with other influential town politicians, he formed the Fitchburg Lincoln Club to help rally support for the Republican nominee. The club diligently held demonstrations, marches, town hall meetings, and went door-to-door campaigning for Lincoln’s election. Their efforts paid off as Fitchburg voters cast 927 ballots for Lincoln and just 231 for the Democratic candidate Stephen A. Douglas. Perhaps as a reward for his loyal and effective support, President Lincoln appointed Norcross the United States Assessor of Internal Revenue for the Ninth Congressional District of Massachusetts, a position he held for ten years. Norcross later served two terms as mayor of the city of Fitchburg in 1873 and 1874, and was elected three times to the United States House of Representatives in the late 1870s and early 1880s.

Fitchburg’s mayor gave a short, powerful address during the dedication of the monument.
Superintendent of Schools E. A. Hubbard followed the mayor’s address with the reading of an epic poem written by Fitchburg native Herbert Ingalls. In no uncertain terms, the narrative echoed everything that was said from the pulpit that afternoon. Summoning the spirit of Fitchburg’s fallen heroes and the memories of her dedicated citizenry, it honored the deeds of those courageous patriots who reestablished the nation as “one people and free.” An ode to those who suffered and died, it consecrated the Soldiers’ Monument on behalf of everyone who “offered their lives at the altar of liberty, union, and God.” Again confirming the Civil War’s dual cause, Ingalls’ poem spoke of vanquishing Southern insurrection and celebrated universal freedom “secure and triumphant she comes!” The poem’s last verse fully captured how the Soldiers’ Monument was meant to symbolize Fitchburg’s Unionist and emancipationist memory on that day and always:

May this monument stand as a token
Of peace that was won by the sword,
Of millions of manacles broken,
Of Union redeemed and restored!
Though the form of the soldier may perish
And low in the dust may go down,
The people his record shall cherish
And lift him to fadeless renown

By referring to the Soldiers’ Monument as a representation of the “millions of manacles broken” and a “Union redeemed and restored,” Ingalls’s poem articulated Fitchburg’s view of the Civil War as a deliverance of the liberty and equality promised in the Declaration of Independence. The North’s triumph over Southern secession and the destruction of slavery legitimized the idea that “all men are created equal,” and showed that the Union was in fact unbreakable. It was proof that the principles of liberty and a united nation — the very ideals that their great country was founded upon — were real. Immortalizing the heroic men who fought and died in that victory with such a brilliant monument ensured that no one would forget that the Civil War was about both Union and emancipation.

UNIONIST AND EMANCIPATIONIST MEMORY

Former Massachusetts governor, one-time speaker of the United States House of Representatives, and antislavery Civil War general, Nathaniel P. Banks (1816–94) continued invoking the ceremony’s Unionist and emancipationist theme. Like Ingalls, Banks also underscored the redemptive characteristics of the Northern Civil War victory: “Fellow citizens, we have
vindicated the integrity and the honor of the Republic,” Banks declared. “Before that time,” he said, “in all other civilized countries, we were looked upon with suspicion and contempt, because, claiming to be free, we still recognized and sheltered human slavery.” Northern society, however, stood together “to wipe out the stain” that marred the glorious Union flag. It was Southern aggression, Banks proclaimed, “not only for maintenance of their institution [of slavery], but for its extension, perpetuation and national recognition,” that caused the disastrous war. If not for the fortitude, endurance, and willingness of Northern soldiers to stand against such treachery and oppression, the nation’s founding principles would forever be lost. Validated in their victory, the General professed, “We did all we could for peace, and in war we did all that was necessary to secure the object we had in our view.”

That object, of course, was to restore unification to the United States of America and to emancipate four million Southern slaves from bondage—precisely what the Soldiers’ Monument in Fitchburg epitomized.

But building monuments alone, “however generous,” was not enough to honor the men who laid down their lives for the Northern Civil War cause. “We owe it to the history of our country,” Banks asserted, “and to the life and perpetuation of civil liberty in the world, now and for all time, that we should make and perfect a careful and just analysis of the American volunteer soldier.” If the Union war aims were to be everlasting, he contended, it was up to historians, philosophers, poets, and most importantly individual citizens to preserve “this chapter of that glorious soldier record.” Never before in human history had militias volunteered so readily, so dutifully, and so completely for such a noble cause. In so doing, General Banks maintained, their deeds and spirit had become part of the very fabric of American life. When their wisdom was discovered and their history written, he said assuredly, “all doubt of the perfection of our popular liberty will vanish, and there will be no further question as [to] its perpetuity.”

General Banks insisted it was their obligation as Americans to sustain the invaluable lessons learned from the valor of Northern Civil War soldiers. For that to happen, he believed “every man should feel that military duty is a sacrifice which he must accept.” Banks urged schools to teach military history and military training as a routine part of their instruction. “Young men should learn to defend themselves and their country,” he said. He spoke of the vulnerability of Free states when the war broke out and the honorable volunteers who stepped forward to save the Union and rescue the slaves. Those “many patriotic men who . . . learned their duty on the field of battle” personified the true greatness of the American Republic, and their actions offered essential lessons. Indeed, Banks declared, if the nation and its
“popular liberty” were to survive, those lessons must be handed down to all generations to come.20

Met with rousing applause, General Banks continued to praise the volunteer soldiers and municipalities who answered Abraham Lincoln’s call when the country was in a “struggle for its life.” Filling the ranks of the Northern army, it was cities and towns like Fitchburg, he pronounced, that fueled the Union war effort. Along with many other small communities, said Banks, they did “all that was to be done,” and because of their loyalty, “the North was always ready to reinforce with money or men, to the end.” According to General Banks, town militias and local governments were the country’s two most important institutions when it came to protecting the United States and maintaining what it stood for. “Let no man speak of a citizen soldiery as unnecessary in a free country,” he uttered with caution. Along with town governments, they should be preserved “as the core of life” and “apple of the eye” of the nation. “Speak no word to weaken or discredit them,” Banks warned, “for through these two agencies liberty will be preserved.”21

To a great extent, Banks’ strong emphasis on the importance of municipalities and volunteerism in the Union victory—as well as in preserving what that victory signified—encapsulated the very essence of Fitchburg’s understanding of the Union cause. After all, this was a war fought over community values. Soldiers from many small Northern towns went off to war believing they were representing the communities from which they came, and by extension what was best for the entire country. The relationship between community, soldier, and the Northern war cause was explicit in Fitchburg. Through town meetings, newspaper editorials, public rallies, and church sermons, young men were encouraged to enlist and fight for their county. They were sent into the bloody fray with great fanfare and exalted as heroes upon their death or, if they were lucky, upon their return home. With letters, newspaper reports, and even visits to the battlefield, close communication was kept between soldiers and their loved ones at home.22

Fitchburg soldiers were constantly reminded of what they were fighting for: democracy, universal freedom, and the Constitution. These embodied the core values they had grown up with. Thus, fully believing they were volunteering to save their very way of life, the young men eagerly marched off to war to emancipate Southern slaves and preserve the Union that their Revolutionary forefathers had created.23 After the war was over, as General Banks so eloquently asserted, it was essential that the spirit of the volunteer soldier and the town governments that supported them remain alive in the nation’s memory forever. Nowhere else in the entire country could he have
found a more appropriate place to illustrate that assertion than the very spot from which he stood.

In the long shadow of Fitchburg’s Soldiers’ Monument, the structure that now manifested the names of the town’s war dead, General Banks discussed the “grave responsibilities” they all had “to preserve that for which they died.” In sacrificing their lives for the principles of Union and universal freedom, he remarked, Fitchburg’s fallen soldiers had demanded that the people protect and perpetuate the memory of their noble cause. He castigated the immoral, shameful, and criminal conduct of the Southern states. He lauded the “one in ten” of Fitchburg’s citizenry who volunteered for war, “and one in ten of these [who] gave his life.” They were the most ethical men who had ever walked the face of the earth, Banks assured his audience. Their “incorruptible” character and the purity of their purpose is what saved the country. In sacrificing their lives for Union and emancipation, Banks maintained, the names inscribed on the Soldiers’ Monument represented all people of this country. It was now the duty of those who remained to see that it never be forgotten. This is what the people owed to their memory, he demanded, to every generation that came before them, and more importantly, to everyone that followed.24

General Banks concluded his substantial time at the podium by urging everyone to make certain that no future generations would question the Civil War’s purpose or why so many of Fitchburg’s men had died. It was a war to preserve the only government in the world, he asserted, that protected and respected its entire people.25

Civil War Captain Eugene T. Miles was tasked with reading the Soldiers’ Monument Committee’s final report. A lengthy and detailed account of the group’s history, the report also painstakingly described each and every item that was placed in a time capsule and “formally consigned to posterity” inside the monument. Naturally the archive included a copy of Fitchburg in the War of the Rebellion by abolitionist and Civil War veteran Henry Willis (1830–1918) as well as the bylaws and membership rolls of Fitchburg’s Grand Army of the Republic Post 19. Among the many other artifacts that expressed the city’s rich Civil War history, the collection also incorporated a record of every company and regiment that organized from Fitchburg, various battle flags, and a copy of the very report from which Miles had read. The one item that perhaps spoke the loudest with regards to the Civil War’s meaning and memory in Fitchburg was an essay written and signed by members of the Soldiers’ Monument Committee.26

Much more than a restatement of the war’s dual purpose or formal record of the town’s exploits to help win it, the document exemplified what the Soldiers’ Monument meant to Fitchburg’s Civil War memory: “In the lapse
of time, hundreds of years hence perhaps,” the authors asserted, “the statues may fall, the granite crumble and these papers come to light . . . it is the hope of the Soldiers’ Monument Committee, that these names of our fallen brothers, may be preserved and handed down to future generations.” The essay continued with a declaration that expressed the everlasting and unique status that Fitchburg’s Civil War dead would hold in the town’s collective memory: “the memories of those brave men, who placed their lives as a sacrifice, upon the altar of our Country, may be cherished in the bosom of every true lover of the principles for which they so freely gave up their lives.”

In addition to reading through the committee’s final report, Captain Miles again reminded the audience of what Fitchburg’s four years of Civil War suffering and loss had been about. Speaking for the committee as well as the city collectively, he offered the four tablets imbedded in the Soldiers’ Monument as “a tribute from a grateful public to the memory of those who fell on the battle field” and “the sacrificing service of thousands now
in our midst, who fought so bravely for the just cause.” Miles reaffirmed Fitchburg’s Unionist and emancipationist Civil War aims when he proudly acknowledged, “this vast concourse of citizens assembled here to-day, to witness and partake in the exercises of this occasion, testifies how truly they appreciate sacrifices ‘even unto death,’ made in behalf of human liberty.” Those in attendance needed to look no further than the glorious flag of the Union, he affirmed, “that emblem which protects the rights and liberties of our citizens everywhere, so many of which are waving over us here to-day,” to see why the men from Fitchburg had fought and died.28

EQUALITY? COLLECTIVE MEMORY VERSUS BEHAVIOR

Yet the flag was not waving over a land of genuine egalitarianism. While Reconstruction was still in place in 1874, the equality promised by the Fourteenth Amendment was not realized for the vast majority of former slaves. By the early 1870s, violence against African Americans was rampant, the structural changes needed to transform their socioeconomic conditions, in large part, were not complete, and the seeds of the Dunning School that saw Reconstruction as a failure were well planted. Named after Columbia University historian William A. Dunning (1857–1922), the “Dunning School” refers to a body of scholarship that analyzed Reconstruction in the late-nineteenth and early-twentieth centuries. Produced by graduate students under Dunning’s supervision, the essays, dissertations, and monographs were highly critical of Radical Reconstruction policies that granted African Americans political and social equality. Grounded in racist ideology, this school of thought dictated future research and shaped public opinion for decades.29

Although these issues were perhaps somewhat muted in the North, this context reveals the crucial disconnect between behavior and collective memory. In other words, the flag was not waving over a land of true freedom and equality for all. Fitchburg’s collective memory may have viewed the war effort as an act of emancipation, but, unlike the exhortations of continuing military duty and good local governance, the memory did not invoke direct action to fulfill the promises of post-emancipation. This observation is significant as the celebrations were about collective memory that had distinct connections to identity, and not necessarily to behavior.

While the difference between memory and behavior is critical to understanding how residents identified with the Civil War—and although it is true that no one at the dedication ceremony espoused any specific actions to improve the standing of African Americans—it does not mean
that the people of Fitchburg abandoned the mission of emancipation and racial equality altogether. A July 7, 1876, article in the *Fitchburg Sentinel*, for example, vehemently denounced the failed policies and crooked politics of Reconstruction: “The fact cannot be disputed,” the paper decried, “that the lives of colored men and their rights in general are in jeopardy in more than one of the Southern states.”

Accusing white Southerners and former President Andrew Johnson of facilitating oppressive Reconstruction schemes that did little more than maintain the status quo, the *Sentinel* declared that the circumstances of newly emancipated African Americans were now “worse than that of slaves.” Although Congress eventually put a stop to the South’s corrupt tactics, the Fitchburg newspaper disparaged Southern whites for resorting to the terroristic methods of the Ku Klux Klan to regain their political power. So determined to secure the rights and protections guaranteed to African Americans by the Reconstruction Acts of the 1860s and 1870s, the *Sentinel* threatened that Northerners would once again be more than willing to volunteer for a war aimed at “protecting those who cannot protect themselves.”

Indeed, Fitchburg’s idea of emancipation had always meant more than merely setting slaves free. Just two months after the Civil War ended, townspeople were clamoring for radical legislation that would grant African Americans due process and political equality in addition to their freedom. As a June 8, 1865 article in *The Fitchburg Reveille* demonstrated, residents ardently demanded that the country “give blacks citizenship and voting rights immediately.”

Additionally, the Fitchburg Ladies Freedmen’s Aid Society and Fitchburg’s branch of the New England Freedmen’s Aid Society were functioning well before the Civil War ended. Dedicated to raising the status of African Americans, both local organizations were part of the Boston-based society’s mission to establish programs that would prepare newly freed slaves in the “habits of self-reliance.” Far more than a charitable organization, the Freedmen’s Aid Society was fully committed to the long-term cause of helping “the emancipated slave to live and make progress in the condition of freedom, a process much slower and more expensive than clothing his nakedness and giving him a few meals.” To that end, the people of Fitchburg made significant contributions. Giving regular monetary aid and providing a steady source of much needed supplies, as well as furnishing teachers who went south “to repair the wrongs done to the colored race for a century,” both of the town’s Freedmen’s Aid Societies remained viable organizations for decades. Furthermore, when Fitchburg’s abolitionist Trinitarian Church disbanded in 1871, the Congregation donated the more than $12,000
they received from the sale of their building to the local Freedmen’s Aid Society.  

**FITCHBURG, GEORGE BANCROFT, AND THE DECLARATION OF INDEPENDENCE**

It appears Monument Committee Chairman and stalwart Fitchburg politician Alvah Crocker (1801–74) understood the limits of celebratory speeches when he delivered his address at the *Soldiers’ Monument* dedication. Instead of relying on rhetoric and Fitchburg’s “exceptionalist” ethos to promote the city’s Civil War collective memory, Crocker reached back to the tradition of the American Revolution and incorporated the work of George Bancroft (1800–91), one of the nation’s preeminent historical scholars. Comparing the fall of Fort Sumter to the Battles of Lexington and Bunker Hill, Crocker affirmed that “the war of the Rebellion” was caused “by the work of traitors” who all were too willing to leave “our Star Spangled banner . . . trailing in the dust.”

Speaking of the more than one thousand men from Fitchburg who risked their lives in the Civil War, he said they acted with the same patriotic vigor that inspired their forefathers to create the nation back in April of 1775. Indicative of Fitchburg’s deep regard for their Revolutionary heritage, Crocker continued to accentuate the town’s distinguished contributions to American independence. Referring to George Bancroft’s recognition of Fitchburg’s role in the Boston Tea Party, Crocker boldly claimed that the town had “furnished the germ (in her letters to Boston) of the immortal Declaration of Independence.”

Considered a formative work in historical scholarship, Bancroft’s *History of the United States* cites a December 15, 1773, letter from Fitchburg’s branch of the Committees of Correspondence to the organization’s headquarters in Boston. The message unequivocally pledged Fitchburg’s support of an outright protest against all British tea as well as the town’s “ambition to be known to the world and to posterity as friends to liberty.” While Bancroft uses only a short quote from the Fitchburg letter, further analysis of the communication explains what Crocker meant when he brazenly claimed that Fitchburg was an original source of the Declaration of Independence.

With language that bears a striking resemblance to some used in Thomas Jefferson’s famed 1776 Declaration, the letter from Fitchburg to Boston also professed:
We are fully persuaded that liberty is the most precious gift of God, our Creator, to all mankind, and is of such a nature that no person or community can justly part with it, and consequently that no men . . . can have a right to exercise despotism or tyranny over their fellow creatures.

In what was surely a radical assertion for that time, the 1773 correspondence went on to announce, “We think it our indispensable duty as men . . . to make the most public declaration in our power on the side of liberty.” While it is yet to be determined if the Fitchburg letter ever made it into the hands of John Adams (who was a member of the Committees of Correspondence in Boston, and who later helped Thomas Jefferson draft the Declaration of Independence), it is clear that Alvah Crocker believed it did. Hence, Crocker was not only conveying Fitchburg’s firm commitment to the American Revolution, but he was also asserting the town’s role in its inception.

But Crocker’s mention of the Bancroft essay and Fitchburg letter was not merely an unabashed effort to grandstand; rather, it was a reference to the more authentic understanding of freedom and equality brought about by a Northern Civil War victory. Moreover, by tying Fitchburg’s Revolutionary heritage and Civil War vision to Bancroft’s work, Crocker connected the community’s collective memory to the historian’s well-known conviction that the fundamental principles of the Declaration of Independence should apply literally to “all men.” Although his emancipationist convictions evolved from his earlier, less progressive views, Bancroft’s claim that “every man is in substance equal to his fellow man,” and that the future of the United States would “rest on the basis of equality and freedom” is precisely how Fitchburg remembered the Civil War. Echoing what Fitchburg residents believed their loved ones had fought and died for, Bancroft’s assertion that the “mighty strides” taken by Northerners to abolish slavery proved that unity and freedom were guaranteed to everyone in the human race and further reflected Fitchburg’s Civil War memory.

Unlike some speakers at the Soldiers’ Monument dedication, Crocker outstripped the celebratory rhetoric by linking Fitchburg’s Revolutionary heritage and Civil War collective memory to the dispassionate historical analysis of George Bancroft. It is apparent that Bancroft was a well-respected historian in Fitchburg who not only legitimized the community’s contributions to the founding of the nation, but, to Crocker and perhaps to the people in the audience, he also validated their Unionist and emancipationist vision of the Civil War. Crocker’s strong reference to Bancroft’s work, along
with offering a verifiable claim that Fitchburg played a role in authoring the Declaration of Independence, demonstrates a vivid link between the nation’s founding principles of freedom and equality and the city’s collective memory of the Civil War.

Crocker went on to draw further parallels between Fitchburg’s minutemen of the American Revolution and his contemporaries who sprang to the Northern cause. In the struggle for independence, he declared, Fitchburg furnished “one-fourth of her population or, as in the Rebellion about a moiety of all her able bodied men.” Boastfully, Crocker remarked, “the little blood she then had she scattered upon every battle field of the Revolution.” From “Concord and Lexington . . . from Bunker Hill to Bennington and Stillwater,” he asserted, Fitchburg men died willingly and thus “settled practically our war for Independence.”

As for those who perished in the bloody war, Crocker offered “a dirge like requiem” that clearly affirmed Fitchburg’s emancipationist vision as well as how her dead heroes would eternally be remembered. The elegy paid homage to those from Fitchburg who sacrificed their lives for the abolition of slavery in every Confederate state: “From where the Mississippi now, in freedom proudly rolls, to waves that sigh on Georgia’s isles, a death hymn for their souls.” All who fought and died gallantly for emancipation, the requiem proclaimed, would wear a “fadeless . . . martyr’s crown.” Their legacy kept “fresh and green” as it was passed down to Fitchburg’s “coming sons, who are yet unborn.”

**CROCKER AND KIMBALL’S ANTISLAVERY COMMENTS**

Given Fitchburg’s powerful Unionist, abolitionist, and emancipationist understanding of the Civil War, it is no wonder that Alvah Crocker served as chairman of the Soldiers’ Monument Committee. One of Fitchburg’s most outspoken politicians and businessmen, his fiery abolitionist convictions were well known to everyone. For decades Crocker had campaigned for the destruction of what he called the “pestilential” and “licentious” institution of Southern slavery. In his sixties when the Civil War broke out, Crocker did all he could, save shouldering a rifle himself, to aid in the struggle to preserve the Union and free four million slaves from the horrors of servitude. Giving generously of his wealth and unremittingly of his time, Crocker made it a top priority to support all Fitchburg soldiers who risked their lives for the Northern cause. In 1862, he traveled to London with the express purpose of persuading Parliament to forgo any notion of backing the Southern war effort. Moreover, while there, he investigated the likelihood that England
was building warships on behalf of the Confederacy. Steadfast in his moral opposition to slavery, Crocker was a towering figure in Fitchburg’s “sacred regard for the unfettered, untrammeled freedom of mankind.”

Local Civil War hero and fervent abolitionist General John W. Kimball (1828–1910) was asked to close the Soldiers’ Monument dedicatory exercises. Although he did little more than order his men to give a hearty salute to General Banks for his speech, Kimball’s appointment as chief marshal of ceremonies was especially telling of Fitchburg’s emancipationist Civil War memory. Supporting antislavery presidential candidate John C. Fremont in the election of 1856, Kimball worked tirelessly for the eradication of slavery in the tense prewar years. By organizing several rallies that drew national attention and tens of thousands of people to Fitchburg, he managed to put the community’s long tradition of abolitionism at the core of the sectional crisis over slavery.

In July and August of 1856, people from all over the country gathered in Fitchburg to celebrate Fremont’s unflinching commitment to “human freedom and equal rights.” Huddled beneath mammoth tents, conventioneers listened to speeches that lauded Fremont as the only man in the race who was not a “tool” of “slave power.” Some compared his election and the abolition of slavery to the “liberty . . . strength and beauty” of the Massachusetts ‘Spirit of ’76.’ Others warned “should the country now fail to perform its duty to elect Fremont,” then “the chains of slavery would clank over our fair country, and freedom [would] turn with saddened eye upon the spectacle of a ruined land.”

Like many of the men from Fitchburg who marched off to war, Kimball was a disciple of the town’s antislavery Calvinistic Congregational Church. Condemning the abhorrent practice of human bondage in March of 1843, the congregation resolved: “that the institution of slavery is an evil of great magnitude, alike cruel, unjust and oppressive to the slaves.” The resolution further denounced slavery as an “abominable sin against God; and as such, ought speedily to be abolished.” Confirming the sincerity of their commitment to the abolitionist cause, the church pledged all of its influence
and undertakings to the eradication of slavery in the United States. A second resolution declared that the congregation would “have no connection with this unfruitful work of darkness” and officially excommunicated “any person who is guilty of the sin of slave-holding.” Armed with their muskets and a staunch commitment to their country and emancipation, Kimball and others from Fitchburg’s Calvinistic Congregation readily went to battle “for the freedom of the slave” and “the perpetuation of the Union.”

Given his unyielding stance against slavery, there is no doubt that John W. Kimball took his abolitionist vision to the battlefield when the Civil War broke out in April of 1861. Further, he was also one of several local veterans who escorted fugitive slaves back to Fitchburg when they mustered out of service from the Union Army. When Kimball returned from his Southern campaign with the 53rd Massachusetts Regiment in 1863, he brought with him John Lewis, a twenty-five-year-old slave from Louisiana. As his appointment as chief marshal of Fitchburg’s Soldiers’ Monument dedication exercises in 1874 attests, it is evident that the community remembered the Civil War with the same ardent emancipationist purpose that Kimball had always epitomized.

After official observances at the Soldiers’ Monument dedication were concluded, thousands of citizens, veterans, and esteemed guests continued to celebrate the unveiling of Fitchburg’s Civil War shrine well into the evening. In church basements, ballrooms, and private homes, residents joined together to reflect on the town’s collective role in the war and what it meant. At a reception for veteran officers and others, Chaplin George Ball offered an opening blessing that put the emancipationist vision at the forefront of Fitchburg’s Civil War memory. While Ball lamented each death, he urged citizens to guide the way in perpetuating the memory of the cause for which Fitchburg soldiers had died. He concluded that they should inspire those now living to continue the town’s rich tradition of powerful leadership in social causes.

In the coming months, four Civil War cannons were positioned in each corner of Monument Park. Rosebushes were planted, flower beds nurtured, and a meticulously manicured lawn maintained. Final bills were settled, loose ends tied, and the Soldiers’ Monument Committee was disbanded. Thus culminated a twelve-year effort to honor Fitchburg’s sacrifice and commitment to the Northern war cause—a cause that, to them, not only preserved the United States of America, but also finally delivered an authentic version of the egalitarian ideals espoused in the Declaration of Independence. Through an “intimate connection” with the monument’s history and meaning, it was
expected that future generations would “ever cherish a lively interest in all that pertains to its preservation and perpetuity.”

Most historians argue that in many Northern locales the war’s emancipationist memory was quickly overtaken by a romanticized reconciliationist view. However, the construction and intent of Fitchburg’s Soldiers’ Monument does not support such arguments. Of course, this is not a repudiation of the work of David Blight and other distinguished historians who assert that a sentimental reunion predicated on white supremacy took hold in both the North and South by the late 1880s. Rather, it demonstrates that Fitchburg perpetuated a Unionist and emancipationist Civil War memory in spite of the nation’s deliberate whitewashing of the war’s fundamental issues of slavery and racial equality.

General John W. Kimball

Kimball, shown here mounted on his warhorse, Prince, was a Fitchburg civil war hero and staunch abolitionist. Photo circa 1862. Courtesy of the Fitchburg Historical Society.
The Monument Today

Fitchburg’s Soldiers’ Monument today memorializes not just the great conflict but also the city’s Unionist and emancipationist commitment, in contrast to the many Northern monuments playing to reconciliationist views.
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