One summer night in 1868, nineteen-year-old Laura Cooke attended a production of *The Drummer Boy, or the Battle of Shiloh* in Sandusky, Ohio. Her father, Jay Cooke, referred to as “the financier of the Civil War,” was behind a wartime bond program that greatly increased the Union’s coffers and allowed him to build the family a summer home—Cooke Castle—on nearby Gibraltar Island in Lake Erie.1 Samuel Muscroft, a veteran as well as the author of the evening’s production, appeared in the lead role as the hero Mart Howard, while Sandusky residents and veterans took on the majority of the other roles. Laura Cooke noted her reactions in the margins of a program during the show.2 After writing about her frustration that they only got a few minutes of music before the curtain (as well as jotting down when she took a nap during act 2), she also recorded her reaction to the violence depicted on the stage at Norman Hall that June evening.3 In act 4, on the corpse-strewn battlefield of Shiloh, a Southern patriarch dies and renounces his loyalty to the Confederacy as his ex-slave Uncle Joe (played by a local white veteran in blackface) bemoans “Massa” Rutledge’s fate: “He done turned rebel, but he was a good Massa to me” (fig. 1).4 Closing the act is a tableau of the decoration of soldiers’ graves, which would become a major rite of mourning in the United States. It is here that Cooke responded to the production in an intriguing (and problematic) way. She scribbled in the space available at the close of the act’s program listing: “Too awfully sad + true to life—heart breaking,” and then noted later that her theatre companions (including her brother Jay Jr.) began to cry upon the death of the drummer boy.
at the hands of the rabid Confederate villain in Andersonville Prison in act 5 (figs. 2 and 3). This reaction raises several questions. What did Laura Cooke, the daughter of a wealthy financier, a mere twelve years old at the war’s outbreak, know of the “truth” behind war? What battlefield scenes had she witnessed firsthand to attest to the authenticity of this tragedy? And, assuming that she had not actually witnessed the overwhelming carnage of the war—the bodies piled at Shiloh, the conditions in the squalid prison camps—what had she seen and heard that led her to believe that this dramatic representation of battle was indeed “true to life”?

Figure 1. (Left to right) Uncle Joe (played by Capt. Harry McMullen) and Frank Rutledge Jr. (W. D. Jobson) before the war. Junior turns out to be the villain of this play, The Drummer Boy, or the Battle of Shiloh. These images were taken at a studio (thought to be Gordon & Wilson’s Indianapolis Photographic Temple of Art), presumably during (or immediately before or after) playwright Samuel Muscroft’s visit to Indianapolis to direct his play with the local Grand Army of the Republic (GAR) organization and other citizens at the Metropolitan Theatre, June 10–20, 1868. (All images accompanying this essay were originally in sepia tint and are from the Robert Gordon Album, c. 1868, 1906, Manuscript and Visual Collections Department, P0474, William Henry Smith Memorial Library, Indiana Historical Society, Indianapolis.) Courtesy of the Indiana Historical Society.
The Drummer Boy was one of many amateur plays written by/for Union veterans and the Grand Army of the Republic (GAR) organization in the decades following the war. Some theatre historians have provided important insights into these amateur plays. Rosemary Cullen refers to these texts as “chronicle plays” that were “virtually indistinguishable retellings of the events of the Civil War” with “a number of obligatory scenes.” Jeffrey Mason calls the authors “professional or semiprofessional hacks” and the products “formulaic,” though he goes on to show that there is more to the texts than the seeming “ludicrous naiveté and clumsiness of dramaturgy.” He further claims that these
plays worked with melodrama conventions and “tended towards reduction and simplification,” with “a point of view presented as northern or as generically American, a strategy that appropriated the South and denied the history of sectionalism.” David Mayer examines these amateur plays in the context of D. W. Griffith’s theatrical influences and the Civil War on the popular stage, calling the plays “simplistic and partisan” and “clumsy melodrama,” as well as “boastful and crude.” These scholars situate the GAR plays in a progressive model that moves from amateur to professional, rightly linking some tropes from the texts (such
as intersectional romances and spy narratives) with later commercial hits—William Gillette’s *Held by the Enemy* (1886) and *Secret Service* (1895), Bronson Howard’s *Shenandoah* (1888), or David Belasco’s *The Heart of Maryland* (1895).

While Mason in particular devotes a substantive amount of pages to unpacking the mythology of the common soldier and outlining the general tendencies of the GAR plays, the ubiquity and importance of amateur drama in the formation of Civil War memories has yet to be given ample consideration. Prior to the touring circuitry of the Syndicate and the mass commercial hits of the late nineteenth century, amateur theatrical productions staged by/or Grand Army of the Republic posts and other amateur associations were the primary consumption points of Civil War memories on the theatrical stage. These plays, as suggested above, are indeed redundant: there is an intersectional complication (within or among families or between lovers), a celebration of masculine honor and loyalty, a strong Union agenda, and fairly predictable plot lines. One critic’s summary of an 1873 production of *The Color Guard* could be applied to the entire genre: “The plot of the play, for such it must be called, is very slight.” These aesthetic caveats aside, the practice and performance of these plays have been overlooked and not fully contextualized within the GAR’s function and status throughout the late nineteenth century.

In this essay, I describe how the “business” of remembering the war on the amateur stage created multiple sites of memories for local audiences, where hegemonic and exclusionary tactics were infused into Civil War narratives. In calling performances “sites of memories,” I argue that these performances are akin to Pierre Nora’s *lieux de mémoire* and are invested with ideology, political capital, and power. Though there are nearly forty Civil War–related texts languishing in various archives that might have been performed by GAR and amateur groups, I make reference to only twenty plays with confirmed performances. It is only via performance that these texts become “sites of memories,” actively produced, invested with time and representational practices and ideology, and consumed as part of larger cultural processes of remembering the war. Furthermore, I argue that the claims to “authenticity” embedded in these productions and in the very structure of melodrama held real juridical consequences in shaping popular mental conceptions on a local level, as an onslaught of legislation throughout the late nineteenth century buttressed the privileges of white citizenship.
A Charitable Business

Theatre was part of the overall “incorporation of America” in the postwar years, and the business of Civil War memory and the amateur theatre market intertwined robustly throughout the late nineteenth century.13 The Grand Army of the Republic actively participated in the business of remembering the war and creating sites of memories. The GAR was one of many fraternal organizations in the postwar era, but was notable for holding great political sway during various moments prior to the turn of the century—and for staging plays as part of its many charitable projects.14 Theatrical activities appear to have been clustered around and marketed to specific localities, which reflected the structure both of the Civil War-era Union army and the GAR posts.15

Because so many of these productions were staged under the auspices of charity, amateur theatricals allowed performers “to engage in morally question-able behavior while maintaining an outward display of propriety,” as Eileen Curley points out.16 She believes that postwar charity productions had a “dual purpose for participants—fund-raising and leisure entertainment.”17 The casting of amateur participants as bourgeois philanthropists also allowed them to indulge in theatre, a previously suspect leisure activity; thus, amateur theatre became an emergent form of socially sanctioned performance.18 With nearly 7,000 GAR posts appearing throughout the former Union states during the postwar decades, there were ample opportunities for veterans and residents to reinforce or claim bourgeois status by performing charitable deeds in a historically disreputable form.19

While major metropolitan posts had a better chance of drawing in larger audiences, many of these plays were written under the auspices of a smaller regional post (often in the Midwest) before becoming part of a circuit of amateur performance and/or text publication.20 Publishers sensed a market and created various series of affordable dramatic texts, such as Ames’s Series of Standard and Minor Drama or French’s Standard Drama. These series not only offered detailed instructions (including elaborate stage diagrams for the amateur player confused by the designation “stage left,” costume notes, and scenic plots), but also included general guidebooks as theatre moved out of living room parlors and onto community stages. Clearly authors and publishers hoped that these plays would become popular among GAR and amateur producers: for example, the author of the nine-character *Midnight Charge* promises readers that the play “might be rendered on a small stage, with only a few actors, with pleasing effect.”21 The materials further assure the players that many of the more spectacular scenes (with live horses and elaborate drills, etc.) could be omitted, in
hopes that “our efforts may meet the wants of the G.A.R. and the public in general.” To appeal to particular communities, some playwrights, such as A. D. Ames and C. G. Bartley of *The Spy of Atlanta*, left references to merchants blank so that the actors could insert local names.

In the case of authors Ames and Bartley, O. W. Cornish (*Foiled*), Edwin A. Lewis (*Newbern; or, the Old Flag*), George T. Ulmer (*The Volunteer*), W. Hector Gale (*The Loyal Heart of 1861*), and Samuel Muscroft, the playwrights appeared in and/or directed their own plays. While there is no immediate evidence that other playwrights did the same, it seems safe to say that GAR plays provided opportunities for amateur playwrights and for itinerant actors seeking to capitalize on the market. In a set of reminiscences published in the *New York Times* in 1934, Harry Miller—a seventy-year-old owner of an agency in Manhattan that “sends out directors and costumes for the presentation of amateur shows” at the time of the interview and a “survivor of those ancient days”—specifically recalled the ubiquity of *The Drummer Boy* in terms of the economics of amateur productions: “The smart actors usually carried with them a package of plays, just to be safe. If they were stranded they put on an amateur performance under the auspices of some local groups and raised enough cash to go home. They’d have…’Ten Nights in a Bar-Room’ for the W.C.T.U., ‘The Drummer Boy of Shiloh’ for the G.A.R.” Thus, even staging plays for charity could provide lucrative business opportunities, especially for those catering to a market created by a powerful political organization.

The cast was most often amateur—a mix of both veterans and other local amateur actors, with an occasional professional actor or two appearing in some productions. Since almost every GAR play includes a romance and features tableaux where the women of the town present the flag to the recruits, the female members of the local theatre societies would have been necessary to fill out these obligatory scenes, as women were excluded from the GAR. The *carte de visite* scrapbook of 36th Indiana Infantry veteran Robert Gordon lends further insight into aspects of GAR performances. The photos and newspaper articles included in his scrapbook give a sense of the local investment in such productions (it merited a visit to the local photography studio to document the occasion [figs. 4–10]), the tableaux presented, and the popularity of such entertainments.
“Why do you waste your time lounging in the streets?” demanded the missionary-minded gentleman of the hobo. “Don’t you know time is money?”

“Don’t you believe it, boss,” came the answer. “I’ve done time enough to be a millionaire.”

Figure 4. Robert Gordon, Union veteran. Courtesy of the Indiana Historical Society.
Figure 5. Robert Gordon as Tom Elliot, a farmer “going to town to enlist.” Many of the GAR plays presented “common men” of the land and farmers’ sons as the heroes; recruitment scenes were standard. Courtesy of the Indiana Historical Society.
Figure 6. Robert Gordon as Tom Elliot in his Union soldier garb. Courtesy of the Indiana Historical Society.
Figure 7. Robert Gordon as Tom Elliot, wounded at Shiloh. The only representation of Shiloh is actually in act 3 (not act 4, as is handwritten on this print), and Tom Elliot’s character had no speaking lines, nor was he mentioned in the stage directions. It is plausible that the stage was littered with bodies for affect during a battle tableau, often mentioned in newspaper reviews and scripts. Courtesy of the Indiana Historical Society.
Figure 8. Robert Gordon as Tom Elliot in Andersonville Prison (act 4 in the playtext). Courtesy of the Indiana Historical Society.
Figure 9. Robert Gordon as Tom Elliot, returned home on furlough (presumably at the end of the war, as it is in "act 6"). His friend Mart Howard (played by Sam Muscroft) did not make out as well, having lost an arm upon their return home in the play. Courtesy of the Indiana Historical Society.

Figure 10. At no point does a masquerade appear in the script, nor was it mentioned in the reviews of this Indianapolis production. It is unclear if this was part of the show at all, or if Mr. Gordon was taking advantage of his time in a studio. Courtesy of the Indiana Historical Society.
Gordon played Tom Elliot in Samuel Muscroft’s *The Drummer Boy* at the Metropolitan Theatre in Indianapolis, June 10–20, 1868. Laura Cooke had seen *The Drummer Boy* only days earlier in Sandusky. Muscroft appeared as the hero Mart Howard in both productions, as did the child actor “Master” Eugene Taylor, playing the drummer boy, suggesting a rather quick rehearsal period with the Indianapolis group. Memories of the production published in a local newspaper in 1906 confirm that all the participants other than Muscroft and Taylor were residents of Indianapolis. The ticket prices for the Muscroft production were within the means of most middle-class households: though these productions clearly did not cater to the lower income bracket (as did the later “ten-twent’-thirt’ shows”), prices were not so high as to prohibit entrance to many middling sorts. Newspaper ads for later GAR productions in the late nineteenth century suggest that these tickets continued to be affordable for the middle class.

The writer of the 1906 reminiscence claims that “200 veterans of the Grand Army of the Republic, assisted by over 100 ladies of the city” staged the 1868 Indiana production “for the benefit of the widows and orphans of deceased soldiers.” The Ohio production lists around fifty cast members, with other residents appearing in tableaux and providing music—clearly a large production as well. Such large casts seem to have been common for most productions staged by GAR posts with “fifty or a hundred familiar townsmen” and “ladies who composed the tableaux.” Tableaux were included in every extant script of GAR dramas and, considering the repetition of “obligatory scenes” mentioned by Cullen, the sorts of scenes and tableaux depicted in Gordon’s album would have been familiar to audiences by the mid-1870s, when such shows had become common in local communities and larger cities. When *Newbern* appeared at the Concordia Opera House in Baltimore in 1887 under one of the co-author’s direction, it included “50 Young Ladies in Beautiful Tableaux,” as well as a “Chorus of 100 Voices,” accompanied by “scenes in camp and on the march.” When *Allatoona* was staged at New Yorks’ Eagle Theatre in 1877, the ad for the show boasted that there would be 300 soldiers appearing, between the GAR and the New York State National Guard. While it is conceivable that the ads might have exaggerated the numbers participating, it is clear that many GAR posts and residents invested significant time and interest into these events, regardless of the post’s size or the area’s population density.

When piecing together the scraps of evidence, it is apparent that the GAR plays were popular sites of war memories within a booming amateur market. Due to the unique nature of the GAR plays—they were staged by/for veterans
of the very war being represented—the “real” history of the war factors greatly into the business of remembering and historicizing the conflict.

Sites of the Allegory and Real War History

Laura Cooke, with her observation of The Drummer Boy being “true to life,” demonstrates her fascination in the “culture of imitation” that Miles Orvell identifies as emerging in the United States of the late nineteenth century. Each amateur production, with silent or explicit claims to veracity, entered the fray over the war’s cause(s) and meaning(s), as the battle to determine what the war was actually about was in its formative years; while also catering to the “culture of imitation” and the public desire for realistic-seeming constructions of the war. Mason tends to focus solely on the allegorical elements of these plays in his rendering of the amateur dramas, claiming that these “crude attempts” at plays “were in fact endeavors to create completely unequivocal allegory.” He goes on to argue that “realism trades on its ambiguity, but those designing the veterans’ myth sought absolute clarity in their (re)construction of events and participants, and the meaning they hoped to impart. A realistic technique would have confused the message, so the playmakers, like the temperance dramatists before them, employed exegetical representation to deliver the most explicit possible message.”

These amateur dramas were indeed often described as allegories in titles or in reviews, and were part of a larger trend in popular depictions of the war in newspapers, illustrations, monuments, and novels that represented the Union triumph within the rubric of allegorical Christianity.

The GAR amateur dramas were cobbled from elements of allegory and melodrama, and even if the playwrights were not strictly deploying “realistic techniques” in a dramaturgical and structural sense, the playwright, producers, and marketers of these texts repeatedly lauded the narrative realism of the plays’ contents and incorporated realistic elements. These attempts at authenticity—particularly the claims to staging the “real” history of the war—cannot be ignored. By claiming that the dramatic representations on stage represent a real, authentic, and true depiction of wartime events, the political and ideological investments in these sites of memories are implicitly endorsed by the performers and the audience alike.

The players would read testaments of veracity in the first few pages of the play-texts, where there is often some kind of dedication or an explicitly stated link between the author and the war that “authenticates” that particular representation. Some ads highlight the role of GAR posts in the production, or,
as one for *The Union Spy* appearing in San Francisco in 1891 claimed, the performance was “a most wonderful experience unanimously indorsed by the G.A.R.” Others are simply dedicated to a GAR post, as if this dedication in and of itself were confirmation of the “truth” presented in the play text. In addition, some of the scenes—particularly battle scenes, drill scenes as the recruits are prepared, camp life, or the filthy conditions of the Confederate prison—fed into the need for “lifelike imitation,” allowing the audience a glimpse into military life and the veterans a chance to reenact their past experiences. A review for an amateur benefit production of *The Drummer Boy* at Chicago’s Opera House suggests that it is “based upon familiar scenes in the life of a soldier,” and these “familiar scenes” crop up in the GAR plays consistently. There are camp songs, orders, detailed battle maneuvers, sign/countersign rituals, among other realistic elements. The amateurs in this same production were said to have “very neat and skillful [sic] military” drills. Militia and guards were sometimes included to bestow a more pronounced authentic experience. When *In the Enemy’s Camp* appeared at the Holiday Street Theatre in Baltimore in June 1895, a reviewer was thrilled by the 4th Regiment of the Baltimore National Guard, which “marched upon the stage in great shape last night during the third act.” This “novel spectacle of real militia upon the stage” made the audience demand that they “march back again, even though it interrupted the progress of the play.” *Newbern, or the Old Flag*, produced by the Dushane GAR Post in 1887, featured “an exhibition drill by Dushane Post Guard” that “elicited much applause.” Every night during the week-long run, various companies from Maryland regiments would compete for a fifty-dollar prize for the best execution of military drills. The occasional appearance of historical figures like General Lee, General Grant, and a host of other military leaders gave audiences the thrill of seeing war heroes impersonated onstage, while suggesting that a historical rendition was underway. Many more plays incorporate actual battles or physical sites related to the war. Imprisonment in Libby or Andersonville—the notorious Confederate prisons, where 30,000 Union soldiers died—is a fairly regular feature.

The realistic elements, narrative techniques, and assertions of authenticity make implicit claims to the war’s causes and “meaning(s).” The refrain of “preserving the Union” is the primary motivation for the war in GAR dramas. The Union cause places the concept of nation and the inviolability of the nation-state as the central motivating factor of the war. In *Allatoona* secession is a “monster,” and the hero of *The Dutch Recruit* says he will “defy you or any force you can bring to force me to raise a hand against the glorious old Stars and Stripes.” The patriarch of *The Drummer Boy* tells his Southern visitors that “our only hope is in the perpetuation of our Union. A division or secession, call it by what name...
the South Carolina Unionist hero and *The Loyal Heart of 1861* calls secessionists “traitors,” and secession the “act of a viper that poisons with its venomous sting the hand that has nourished it.” The Union cause even acquires divine providence, as a Southern loyalist in *Our Heroes* declares: “This country ain’t going to be divided, no how—for God has made it the grandest country on the face of the earth!” While he speaks, a tableau of the goddess of liberty, with the US flag, children, and loyal Union soldiers, opens before the Confederate recruits.

The view of republicanism that the GAR proposed was that of a “virtuous nation” that had “come through the war purified of the blot of slavery and ready to lead the rest of the world into the sunshine of universal democracy.” In the GAR plays the abolition of slavery was an added bonus of the war’s conclusion, not the primary motivating factor. In fact, slavery is not directly cited as a cause of the war: tableaux repeatedly allegorize “liberty” or “democracy” as a goddess, rarely featuring those who would be emancipated by the war’s close. In *Allatoona*, the Southern heroine invokes slavery and asks if the Northern hero will do “the bidding of a lot of fanatical abolitionists” who “want only to slay her people.” She asks, “is it natural we should like a people who inaugurate expeditions like John Brown’s, and send them among us to incite our slaves to murder and to deeds far worse?” The hero can only offer his patriotism as rebuttal, side-stepping the topic at the heart of her accusations: “Helen, I have always endeavored to avoid this subject when speaking with you. A true soldier knows but one people, one government, and one flag.” The Southerner in the first scene of *Lights and Shadows*, leaving his New York sweetheart to go fight, says that he will “assist my people in chastising these insolent abolitionists.” The Yankee who looks to take his place says that his “sentiments…are to defend the old flag, and to assist in putting down the rebellion.” Even in postwar representations, it is implied that abolitionists were radicals, since the heroes rarely adopt antislavery rhetoric.

When slavery does enter the dialogue, it is often part of a jab at Southern “honor” or masculinity. John Brown is invoked again at the opening of *The Union Spy* as a Southern student accuses his Northern colleagues of being “Northern abolitionists and John Brownites.” When his Northern counterpart says it was a “fair election” and they should honor the outcome, a more heated argument ensues. The Northern Sleeper argues for a country “not…blighted with the black curse of slavery,” saying that slavery allows “chivalrous Southerners” to “debauch your servants and sell your own children. What chivalry!” The enraged villain can only counter that the Yankees used slaves “as long as it would pay, and when it wouldn’t, you sold them to us.” As the encounter leads to blows, vows of
revenge, and stomping on the Confederate flag, the Northerners lapse back into saying that the “bleeding country needs our help” to restore the Union.55

Within the many calls for national preservation and such patriotic/alle-
gorical displays, the exclusionary tactics of the GAR are implied. In the GAR plays, the performances of black and ethnic characters have more serious repercussions, bound up in the local and national movements to reify the privilege of white middle-class masculinity in a fractured and—moving into the Progressive Era—expanding US empire.

CIVIL WAR MEMORIES

Melodrama and Nostalgic Spaces

It is fitting that these GAR playwrights used melodrama to depict a nation in peril on stage, since—as Peter Brooks argues—melodrama “reenacts the menace of evil and the eventual triumph of morality made operative and evident.”56 Linda Williams expands on Brooks’s formulation of melodrama, noting that it “begins, and wants to end, in a 'space of innocence,'” whether this is an actual space of innocence or a “nostalgia for a virtuous place.”57 The space of nostalgia pursued in the GAR dramas is not necessarily just the idyllic Northern village in which most of the plays begin and end, but it is instead the reunited country that is the ultimate utopian space of innocence.

This reunited country is distinctly masculine and the main impediments to achieving the space of innocence are the Southern elites and their sympathizers. John A. Logan, a politician and veteran instrumental in crafting the GAR and its ideology, determined that the “main threat to this yeoman’s paradise was ‘class distinction,’ both in the slaveholding South and at ‘aristocratic’ West Point”—not slavery.58 Though not always depicted onstage, the reenfolding of the white middle-class Southerner into the embrace of the unified nation is the key to achieving this space of innocence.

Even when the melodramatic villains (copperheads or Southerners) came from a lineage of patriotic service, their judgment was clouded by their antiab-
olitionism. The Confederates are consistently characterized as impulsive and overly passionate, displaying the most unmanly excesses of anger and illogical-
ity: with or without the aristocratic implications, all the Confederate villains are indicted on this charge of steroidal emotions. Even one of the Southerners in the opening West Point scene in Allatoona admits that those from “the South are by nature an impulsive people.”59 Deploying distinctly dishonorable conduct within the perceived codes of acceptable war behavior, the Confederates often display dishonesty, malice, and maniacal hatred toward their helpless captives.
by torturing or shooting them. Conversely, the Confederate villains are spared, jailed in comparatively agreeable conditions (compared, that is, to the conditions depicted in Confederate prison camps), and treated with justice and benevolence (even if that same justice dictated a death sentence). Worse yet, the villains at times have to be saved by the hands of a woman.60

Unlike popular melodramas where romance is foregrounded, the women in these amateur plays—whether Southern women ultimately conquered by their Northern sweethearts (as in most cases), or Northerners who eschew their Confederate lovers/husbands for the Union cause—mostly serve as a sort of measuring mechanism alongside which the depravity of the Confederate villain can be compared. For this reason, the women in the amateur plays are given a certain amount of agency in their devotion to the Union cause, but ultimately remain ancillary to the military focus. These female characters eventually acknowledge the errors of their—and, by extension, the Confederacy’s—ways and recognize the superiority of the Union cause. The villain of The Color Guard, for example, causes the heroine to make a statement that highlights the political devaluation of women occurring in many of these plays. Though he is a “Southern man in feeling….a yes from your lips would lead me to fight in any cause. The faintest hope of your love would make me respond to-morrow to Lincoln’s call.” This egregious declaration of intent is countered by the livid Lucy: “No, sir, I despise you. Your words confirm my worst fears of your utter want of principle. I can respect the Southern people who act honestly out of their errors; but a man whose sword hangs upon a woman’s word, when great principles are at stake, should not be trusted even by his friends.”61 Other amateur texts replay similar scenes wherein the villain lacks agency, honor, and emotional control—the hallmarks of masculinity.62

Once this emasculated villain is disposed of, the space of innocence can be achieved. The “nostalgic” aspect of this GAR space is perhaps most clearly articulated in representations of nonwhite and/or ethnic characters. Every extant play features at least one Dutch, Irish, or African American character, and these players perform a greater function than simply letting an actor try his hand at a comic type. The ethnic and racial representations in these plays also take on different connotations than the complex “fear and fascination,” class fomentation, and cultural borrowing that Eric Lott reads in blackface minstrelsy. These instances of cross-ethnic or cross-racial performance are set within wartime narratives of incredible violence and nation rebuilding. Within this context, the GAR sites of memory make implicit claims about who is worthy to participate in citizenship.63 Considering the demographic makeup of the GAR and of the plays, it is possible to read the texts as a sort of white male nostalgia for the time
when African Americans were still slaves or were blindly loyal to the Union emancipators, and when thick-accented Germans and drink-loving Irishmen provided reliable ethnic humor—in contrast to the new wave of Eastern European immigrants entering the United States in the 1880s.

While Stuart McConnell claims that the GAR was one of the most progressive organizations of the nineteenth century due to its color-blind policy of admission—and this is true in comparison to other U.S. organizations—the GAR was by no means an all-inclusive, desegregated, democratic fraternal group. The status and treatment of African American veterans varied from post to post in the GAR, at times denying black men an important platform for juridical and social acceptance. Donald Shaffer reveals the gap between the policy on paper and the actual practice of the GAR, noting that many African American veterans were blackballed by admissions voting policies. Whites-only posts were established in some Southern states, and black veterans were not allowed to establish their own posts there. There were debates among black and white veterans as to whether or not posts should be segregated: in reality, most posts experience de facto segregation regardless of the official policy. In addition, though the GAR had members of German and Irish extraction, such groups were often contained within urban posts, geographically limited due to the “residential segregation in the American metropolis” throughout the postwar decades. Since the GAR never allowed veterans of later US wars to join its ranks, the organization remained locked in a demographic stasis: there was a veritable explosion of immigration toward the end of the nineteenth century, but GAR plays performed in the 1880s and beyond represented the more limited diversity of decades past.

The exclusionary tendencies of the GAR reflect larger national juridical processes. Immediately after the war and in anticipation/protest of the passage of the Thirteenth, Fourteenth, and Fifteenth Amendments, Southern state legislatures passed Black Codes severely curtailing the basic rights of the newly emancipated population—in what legal scholar Ian Haney López would see as the beginnings of a “self-perpetuating pattern” where “race becomes law becomes race.” Socially endorsed segregation and the imposition of racial categories in everyday practice eventually became legislated inequality—thus reifying such categories. Further attempts at equality on a federal level—such as the passage of the Civil Rights Act of 1875 that tried to enforce equality in the public sphere, which was then overturned by the Supreme Court in 1883—were swiftly dismantled or blocked by states or courts. Likewise, immigration laws were enacted throughout the postwar decades to try to define what it meant to be “white” and a “citizen” of the country. Haney López argues that “racial categories exist only as a function of what people believe;” and it is here that
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the danger embedded in the representations of the “Other” in popular culture becomes clearer. Popular depictions of ethnic and racial characters as inferior systematically deny the humanity of the real person, thus protecting and reinforcing whiteness via social and legal exclusion.

In amateur performed sites of memory, examples abound to suggest that many nonwhite/nonnative people should be excluded or have limited participation in the reunited nation. These stage types often fight among each other in the plays—precluding any sort of solidarity. Many deploy violence in “unsuitable” ways (like Confederate villains), but they cannot expend such energy in actual defense of the Union. Although, as mentioned above, slavery is rarely invoked as a cause of the war, the Irish and Dutch characters mention it in a comic vein to mask cowardice: “I wouldn’t go down dere and vight mit dose niggers of you vould gife me der whole Goffermant,” according to Sockery Schneidlebecker in The Confederate Spy.70 Several of the Irish and German stage characters are fond of drink, they bumble military maneuvers (an ethnic character ineffectively leading a drill is featured in several plays), and many—particularly Herr Sockery—are quite obsessed with food. Barney of The Volunteers tells his Irish sweetheart Bridget, “Oi’m going to die foighting for the nagurs,” then repeatedly proceeds to run and hide or find some reason to return to camp as battle begins.71 Fritz, one of Our Country’s Defenders!, is assured by another enlistee that he is “fearfully brave, especially where there is a charge to be made on pretzels and lager.”72

The most credible evidence that nonwhite and ethnic characters are not truly enfolded into the Union cause is that many do not show an inherent loyalty to either side but—in the case of the Irish and German—can be bought as mercenary soldiers, like those in The Color Guard or in The Rebel’s Last Shot, among others. Often these characters, and especially African Americans, base loyalty on a personal sense of obligation or servitude to a single character and reinforce their represented inferiority. The rare ethnic characters who express patriotism in the GAR plays, such as Dietrich in The Dutch Recruit, are routinely emasculated in other ways: Dietrich falls asleep and lets a Confederate soldier escape, has to dress like a woman to aid the hero, and even his killing of the villain Frank Duncan, who is attempting to rape the heroine Maude, is rendered dishonorable. “How you like dot, Misdur Guerrillas?” Dietrich asks the dying man; and Maude tells the hero Harry, late to the scene, that she is “thankful that you did not stain your hands with his blood.”73 Thus, the rare heroic feat is often framed as a happy accident rather than the outcome of a truly masculine endeavor. Clearly, all the behaviors exhibited by the ethnic types fall well outside of the realm of acceptable, masculine behavior: they ascribe the war to
simplistic causes like fighting for the “nagurs” rather than the Union, thus failing to adopt the preservationist mission of the GAR. Cowardly, prone to excess of appetite (lust, drink, or food), with a lack of loyalty to the Union, the Bradys, Barneys, and Sockerys are viable targets for comedy in the midst of the trauma and tragedy of war.

Whether depicted as loyal Uncle Toms, comic minstrels, or a mixture of the two, no political agency is afforded to African American characters when they appear. Ultimately these characters reiterate the supposed superiority of white identity and antebellum racial codes. It is telling that three of the plays contain an almost identical scene, wherein African American characters discuss their involvement in the war. In *The Dutch Recruit*, Uncle Ned asks another slave, Sam, if he’s going to “fite” for “your massa, missus, and de old plantation.”

SAM: Look heh, Uncle, you’ve seen two dogs fitin’ ober a bone?
UNCLE NED: Yes
SAM: Dat’s de Nof an’ Souf fitin’ ober us. Now Uncle, did you eber see de bone fite?75

A similar dialogue appears in *Harry Allen*, but the hero Harry asks Sam, the slave of their Southern guests, if he’ll enlist. Sam has inexplicably covered himself in flour in order to hide, asking, “Me go for a soger? I guess not.” When Harry asks why Sam will not enlist, he replies with a query:

SAM: Now, look a here, Massa Harry, did you ebber see two dogs fighten ober a bone?
HARRY: But what’s that got to do with it?
SAM: Well, Massa Harry, did—you—ebber—see—de bone get up and fight?
HARRY: I don’t remember that I ever did.
SAM: I guess not. Now you boys can be dogs and I’ll be de bone, dat am de innocent cause of all dis fuss.76

An even closer rendition of this dialogue occurs between Zeb and the Irish Ike in *Lights and Shadows of the Great Rebellion*. Shortly after this exchange, Zeb and Ike share a comic exchange trying to lay claim to a bottle of booze, until Dutchey shows up and also tries to steal it. The “Sams” and “Zebs” (and other young African American male characters) who could possibly be involved in the war’s causes or its battles declare their innocence and absolution: as mere objects that dogs are fighting over, all the black characters are literally devoid of life and agency. The “Sams” and “Zebs” make a declaration that the whites in these plays routinely discount: that slavery is somehow at the root of “all dis fuss.” This notion is regularly cast aside in the amateur plays, and it becomes clear that only
the misinformed minstrel characters have this “distorted” perception. They cannot begin to grasp the complexities of the matter at hand.

The comic stage types who appear often display the sort of humor and physicality typical of minstrel shows. These characters fight, participate in comic business, and often exhibit the dialect and malapropisms of stump speeches. For instance, Jumbo in *The Midnight Charge* steals chickens, plays the banjo, brawls with Confederate villains and ethnic characters alike, and promotes his singing group the Pumpkin Blossom Club in the Union camp. Jeff in *Our Heroes* feigns readiness to participate in the war, since his “gran’-fadder fell fightin’ in the reb’lutionary struggle”; but Jeff fell more recently (and clearly not in keeping with his heroic lineage) “when I had de row wit dat odder nigger.” Instead, Jeff’s participation in the war is relegated to “malufactrer of hard tack chowder for de troops.” Other African American characters are likewise granted limited participation in the war through emasculating or dehumanizing depictions. For example, Clay in *The Confederate Spy* overhears a Confederate plot while hiding under the sofa in a Southern parlor, but the Union general struggles to understand Clay’s convoluted minstrel meanderings, declaring Clay is “getting things mixed.”

The GAR’s limited corroboration of African American masculinity is crystallized in the few scenes where blacks are allowed to bear arms—and do not prove to be up to the task. Zeb in *Lights and Shadows* fights both the German and Irish characters for booze, holding them at gunpoint to procure a bottle. The same happens when Sam/Zeb captures the Confederate villain, who encourages him to drink and seizes Zeb’s weapon. The inebriated Zeb gives up, deciding instead to steal some poultry, since “Niga know more about chickens, dan dey do about war.” Pete in *Allatoona* exposes a Confederate plot to the Union general and saves the young hero. The general tells the hero that “you owe your life to this faithful negro.” His ex-master swears, “Curse the infernal niggers!” “Cuss away, massa, cuss away,” Pete replies, “but it won’t do no good, massa.” The appellation of faithful is of particular importance here: still denied a name in his heroism, Pete is relegated to a “faithful negro,” who has correctly transferred his loyalty to the Union. It is only once he is deemed a “faithful negro” that he is given a weapon; he appears to be a poor soldier, merely mimicking the movements of those surrounding him.

The pathos-inducing, Uncle Tom–derived, emasculated elderly slave often displays the most pronounced kind of loyalty. As a contraband—one of those nebulous designations given to fugitive or freed slaves during wartime—Pete fights at the close of the play, serving as a foil to Uncle Ben, who waits on General Corse. Ben is a contraband too, preparing food and singing spirituals for the
Union general, his “massa,” while informing the good General that “de bondman must be free” when Corse asks if he ever grows discouraged. Ben is passive, taking a bullet while he scouts for sharpshooters unarmad at the play’s close, loyal to the general’s orders until his death: his freedom is circumscribed and ultimately denied within the rubric of black subservience. Old Joe in *The Union Spy* shares Topsy’s genealogy, having “no brudder, no sister, no fader, no mudder, no nothin’ but Joe. When you see Joe, you see all there is of us.”81 At one point, Joe holds his Confederate ex-master at gunpoint and demands dispatches from General Lee. Instead of receiving any credit for this heroic action, Old Joe utters a string of malapropisms while attempting to acquire the dispatches, and his new “massa,” the Union spy Sleeper, hands the dispatches to Grant without any mention of Joe’s role. When Sleeper is wounded and captured on the battlefield, Old Joe can only weep.

On the rare occasion when African American characters are depicted without minstrel trappings, there are still serious impediments to their advancement in the world of these amateur plays. Jim in *The Old Flag* represents the ignorant minstrel type, believing his master’s claims that the Yankee generals subject all the blacks they capture to execution—they are “roasted alive—burned to a crisp.”82 Jim’s misconceptions are corrected by Sam, a fugitive slave (not scripted in dialect) who aids his ex-master Union spy with elaborate plans, and is crucial in a direct and tangible way to the Union’s success. When Sam is captured by the Confederates and they attempt to execute him so others will “see how niggers are served when they aid our enemies,” a white woman intercedes and deflects the gun-wielding arm, saving the life of the African American man much as she saves the disgraced and emasculated Confederate soldier in other GAR plays.83

The stage Irish, German, and minstrel types in the GAR plays were nothing new to the US theatre. What is more interesting is how those nonwhite or nonnative persons who contributed to the war effort are so easily marred by the application of comic stage traditions and ultimately marked as being unfit for citizenship. Attempts to define and limit citizenship were part of larger national developments, led by the dominant Anglo-Saxon population to “establish white supremacy” with “a systematic and effective drive…that mirrored developments in the South” after Reconstruction.84 The gendered, racial, and ethnic play’s repercussions on the amateur stage invested the Anglo-Saxon intersectional masculine reunion with power and value on a local level—contributing to a nationwide exclusionary project and white hegemony.
Laura Cooke’s emotive notations in the margins of her program in June 1868 capture the early process of a nation trying to heal. The “awfully sad” and “true to life” deaths and the tableaux of patriotism and freedom would become an exercise in national mourning—by the close of the nineteenth century, such memories were no longer circumscribed by sectionalist loyalties. In fact, the politics of the GAR plays fell somewhat out of vogue by the 1880s. In anticipation of William Gillette and his company performing *Held by the Enemy* below the Mason-Dixon line in November 1890, the *Atlanta Constitution* printed a Northern critic’s thoughts on the production: “Dramas founded upon the events of the late civil war, of the character of ‘The Color Guard,’ ‘The Drummer Boy of Shiloh,’ and others of a similar type, have lost their drawing quality. They appealed too much to sectionalism and kept alive the bitter feelings engendered by the war, painted the horrors of prison pens and lost sight of the fact that there were heroes on both sides—men brave and good, women pure and patriotic…. The author…[has] so equally divided the honors between the ‘blue and the gray’ that, whether in New Orleans or Boston, the play is certain of a hearty reception.”85 Even if the GAR by and large opposed the memorialization of the Lost Cause, ex-Confederate soldiers were welcomed to the Blue-Gray reunions of the 1880s as part of the dulling of these “bitter feelings,” leading to what McConnell calls a “love feast of reconciliation.”86

However, GAR plays continued to be staged into the twentieth century, even as the veterans grew wizened and some critics declared the rhetoric of the texts shrill. With the ruling of *Plessy v. Ferguson* in 1896, “separate but equal” became the law of the land, and the earlier attempts by Radical Republicans to establish an equal citizenry were quashed. With the passage of legalized segregation laws throughout the nation, the limits to mental conceptions of democracy were demarcated. As new immigrant populations entered the country and were encountered via imperial pursuits like the Spanish-American War, courts scrambled to fix and protect that fickle construct of “whiteness” throughout the Gilded Age and Progressive Era. In the midst of the civic and legal upheaval of the postbellum years, there was a nostalgic desire for a fictional space of innocence, a perfect union, and a world that no longer existed. The melodramatic mechanisms of GAR plays ensured that sectionalism was ultimately eliminated, and that the common white soldier was welcomed home. Indeed, even if some critics could not see the political work being done beyond the resuscitation of “bitter feelings,” the GAR plays had already begun to set the table for the “love feast” well before the Blue-Gray reunions and commercial war plays of the
1880s. The inner workings of the GAR and the amateur sites of war memories that its veterans performed—with the investments in class representations, the allegorical and thrilling realistic elements, and the rendering of nonwhite and nonnative peoples as comic types rather than participants in the war’s history or American citizenship—allowed performers and audiences to create and consume war memories that ultimately celebrated a whitewashed space of nostalgic innocence, presented within a comforting world of hierarchies past.
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