

Commemorating the Charleston Riot: Memory, Memorial, and Monetary Modernity*

Alex Scalise

Commemoration is a difficult task for public historians because it is tied to broader American cultural values and beliefs. Yet, with an abundance of so many different races, ethnicities, and ideologies, whose collective history should be remembered and memorialized? Historian David Thelen attempts to make clear the relationship between memory and history in “Memory and American History.” In the article, he connects historical study to individual and collective memory. He believes “the social dimensions of memory are more important than the need to verify accuracy.” But, whose historical interpretation is accurate? In a survey conducted with historian Roy Rosenzweig, concerning the uneasy link between memory and historical accuracy, Thelen states that, “in each construction of a memory, people...reorganize details from the past in an active and subjective way.” Individuals tend to recall their memories as truths, pitting them against the recollections of others. Also, most respondents preferred an interactive and collaborative approach to history. Particularly, the respondents prefer “to see history making as a more

Alex Scalise, from Mokena, Illinois, earned his BA in history with a minor in anthropology in spring 2014. “Commemoration of the Charleston Riot: Memory, Memorial, and Monetary Modernity” was written for Dr. Debra Reid’s Public History: Meaning and Method course in the fall of 2013. His paper was also featured in the Charleston Riot commemorations on campus this year.

*This article contains no footnotes, as it was designed to use an annotated bibliography of the works central to its argument, and to discuss those works within the text, without using citations. The original bibliography, therefore, is included at the end of this article.

democratic activity that allows amateurs and professionals to learn from each other.” Instead though, a power struggle over historical interpretation and accuracy persists in memorials, museums, monuments, and reenactments.

Content and Direction

Public historians use an applied methodology intended to garner the interest of civilians and experts. Historian Michael Frisch explains the impact of “shared authority” on public history and commemoration. Frisch believes that an acceptance of non-professional viewpoints by traditional institutions of historical authority during the 1990s became the norm, but he did not believe this was affecting the field. Instead, Frisch asserts that public historians should accept the audience’s authority, even if it is grounded in culture and experience because exhibits can become meaningfully engaged with history.

In Charleston and the surrounding communities, twenty-nine people were asked about their knowledge of the 1864 Charleston Riot. Nearly sixty percent of those surveyed had never heard of the Riot. Those that had heard of the Riot did not know substantive information about it. The Riot is a relatively unfamiliar and unstudied incident that occurred near the end of the Civil War. The fighting took place outside of the Charleston Courthouse between Southern sympathizers known as Copperheads and Union soldiers on furlough. By the time gunshots subsided, nine were dead and twelve were injured. Out of this assault, only two Copperheads were killed. The rest fled Charleston, including the Copperhead leader, and Coles County sheriff, John O’Hair who went to Canada. This attack between two partisan groups became known as a “bloody affair,” a “Copperhead conspiracy,” and even a “riot.” Journalists and scholars from the late 19th century through the 20th century were very conscientious of ways to evoke the interest of readers. Prescribing the deadly quarrel between Union soldiers and Copperheads as a “riot” is not so much a misnomer as it is a pro-Union interpretation.

I intend to unpack ways in which the Coles County community remembered the Riot. Specifically, my research

discusses the memory and memorial process of the Charleston Riot in accordance with the rise of public history and local tourism ventures. By reviewing the Riot's commemoration during the second half of the 20th century, one very plain truth became clear: people in the community actively attempted to remember and symbolize the Riot, even though most had never heard of it. Over time, economic planners coupled the Riot with anniversary dates and other commemorative projects. Additionally, the Riot seemingly became a nostalgic memory representative of what people considered to be their "identity." But there are difficulties in understanding the commemorative process of the Civil War era.

Commemorating the Civil War Era

The Charleston Riot has importance beyond a simple scuffle between drunken neighbors; it exemplifies the factional nature of American politics and civil rights during the period. However, attributing an accurate meaning to the incident is difficult because it is a part of the daunting Civil War era of American history. Historian David W. Blight discusses the imprint of the Civil War on America's collective memory in his book *Race and Reunion: The Civil War in American Memory*. Blight's work in chapter ten, "Fifty Years of Freedom and Reunion" expresses his personal belief that American culture failed to remember the Civil War "beyond manly valor." Essentially, American culture during the process of reconstruction (post-1865) glossed over racial causes of the war. As a result, following the Civil War, African Americans became "alienated from the national community's remembrance of its most defining event." In fact, by the early 20th century, major media outlets only gave recognition to important battles and the nobleness of soldiers from the North and South. By sweeping over slavery and the freedom African Americans gained from emancipation, white culture altered the collective memory of the Civil War.

The Charleston Riot falls into the complex grey area of Civil War commemoration. Political factionalism lay at the Riot's heart, but it is difficult to separate political issues from racial ones. Although all participants in the Riot were white, the issue of race persisted. Copperheads were outraged by the war and abolitionist

policies of Abraham Lincoln. Also, Republicans and Union soldiers forced Democrats and Copperhead extremists to swear allegiance to the Union cause and “subjected [Copperheads] to various indignities.” Republican and Copperhead conflict made it difficult for the commemorative process after the Civil War. Nancy Easter-Shick’s *Round the Square: Life in Downtown Charleston, IL 1830-1998* mentions a verbal quarrel between George E. Mason, editor of *The Cumberland Democrat*, and Captain William E. Adams, Civil War soldier and Charleston native, ten years after the Riot. Adams, a Republican, wrote an article detailing his involvement and perspective on the Riot in the *Charleston Plaindealer*. However, his interpretation offended Mason, a Democrat. In return, Mason took to his newspaper, arguing against the validity of Adam’s article. As the county and the country continued to deal with post-Civil War disaffection and bitterness, attempts to preserve historic locations and events began to popularize moving into the twentieth century.

In *Lincoln’s New Salem: Or, The Trigonometric Theorem of Vernacular Restoration* by Patricia Burlison Mooney, the development of the Civilian Conservation Corps (CCC) is discussed. As a part of a national movement to delineate specific areas as memorial locations and create jobs, the CCC took over site reconstruction of New Salem, Illinois in 1933. Joseph F. Booton, chief draftsmen in the State’s Division of Architecture, implemented the CCC’s site reconstruction theory: modernity and standardization. Further, “rationalized, efficient output was valued more than historic accuracy” Mooney states. The CCC did memorialize locations, but Illinois’ commemorative process was rationalized through the need to attract visitors. Thus, quickly and systematically building sites to entice tourists popularized throughout the 20th century. In the case of New Salem, state funding looked to open the historic site in time for the commemorative 100-year anniversary of President Abraham Lincoln living in the town. As the CCC expanded, many towns, communities, and states began to recognize the value in connecting historical commemorations and anniversaries to tourism plans and economic development programs.

Tourism and Commemoration

Before evaluating the commemoration of the Charleston Riot, inquiry into the development and impact of tourism on culture is useful. Priscilla Boniface, author of *Managing Quality Cultural Tourism*, states that, “culture is very much [a part of] tourism’s main attraction.” She continues, “without different cultural heritages, places around the world would have little to offer that would attract for purposes of tourism.” Tourism is often linked to the preservation and history of specific societies. In the case of Charleston, economic planners intended to capitalize on the interest of those seeking to remember the Riot, historically and symbolically.

While tourism serves as an economic boom, the public history movement also contributes to the commemorative efforts of the Charleston Riot. Public history, according to the National Council on Public History (NCPH), started as a movement during the 1960s and 70s. Essentially, NCPH argues that the movement gained “visibility and influence through the establishment of public and applied history programs at universities.” Furthermore, “while public history can promote popular understanding of history, the goal of many projects may not be explicitly educational at all.” For instance, towns, such as Charleston, often encourage historic preservation by promoting tourism as a part of their economic development. Public history promotes an increase in living history activities, such as historic sites, historical interpreters, and reenactment groups. In accordance with the public history movement, the first reenactments of the Charleston Riot began in the late 1960s in the Charleston Square. Also, as a part of economic planning and development, Charleston began to denote specific areas, such as the county fairgrounds and Charleston Square, as places of symbolic meaning. Both locations became perfect locations for Riot reenactments. However, the fairgrounds became unanimously popular for Riot reenactments and for town and country anniversary celebrations by the 1980s. Boniface extends an understanding on site locations. Specifically, she states that “if a site is to attract visitors, and therefore, potential sources of income, it must represent a more desirable location for leisure activity.” (102)

Thus, the county's fairgrounds offer a valuable location for visitors to watch the reenactments without feeling alienated from the historical accuracy of the Riot.

1950s Memory on the Charleston Riot

In 1951, Charleston native Nancy Funkhouser wrote an article titled "The Charleston Riot." For years following the Riot, newspapers reported a very partisan retelling of the incident. However, Funkhouser's article provides an objective interpretation by mentioning that Nelson Wells, a Copperhead, or Oliver Sallee, a Union soldier, may have started the Riot. Yet, she does not prescribe her entire body of work to finding out the instigator as earlier newspapers reported. Nor does Funkhouser provide an explanation of the Riot beyond the parameters of Coles County. Instead, she defined the Copperheads as southern sympathizers and highlighted the Union's role in making Copperheads "swear to oath for support to the Union." Funkhouser detailed the daily progressions on the day of the Riot, starting with the Democratic rally, the involvement of Union soldiers on furlough from the C and G companies, and the chaos that ensued at 3 p.m. Furthermore, she discussed Dennis Hanks' involvement in freeing the 15 Copperhead prisoners from Fort Delaware.

Funkhouser's article was published in the *Illinois Junior Historian Magazine*. The magazine was established in the mid-20th century as a part of the junior historian movement. In "What About Teaching the History of Illinois in our Public Schools?" Fritiof Ander explains the movement and mission of the *Junior Historian*. Essentially, it started as a history club for high school students in public schools. Therefore, the magazine that published Funkhouser's work consists of contributions from locally interested students. Ander mentioned that the magazine's goal was to "promote special and shared interests of the students" that teachers could then employ in their future curriculum. Ander's article provides insight on the possible roots of Funkhouser's article in the *Junior Historian*.

1960s Remembrance and Reenactments

The 1960s experienced an increase in Riot coverage and commemoration, attributed to the public history movement during the decade. The first reenactment did not occur on the 100th year anniversary of the Riot. Instead, atop *The Charleston Courier-News* on March 28, 1964 read a column titled “This Afternoon a Dreadful Affair Took Place in Our Town.” The title paid homage to an article written in 1864 detailing the occurrences following the attack. The opening line states, “this page of Charleston’s history for March 28, 1864—100 years ago today—was written in blood.” Clearly, it was a highly dramatized retelling of the incident. Although the article did not provide new evidence about the Riot, a definitive stance regarding the instigators was taken. To the point, the column noted, “Wells fired at Sallee but missed. Sallee was shot by someone else, but before he died he pulled a pistol and fatally wounded Wells.” After briefly describing the event, the article provides an account from an unmentioned newspaper covering the Riot. In addition, an image of the Coles County Courthouse was given center page attention. No further mention of the Riot occurred throughout the rest of the 100th year anniversary newspaper. Regardless, front-page news and the sensationalized editing left readers interested.

Charleston’s first reenactment of the Riot occurred on March 31, 1967. Commemorators, self-aware of the prospects in tourism money, held the event on a weekend seeking to garner as many visitors as possible. *The Charleston Courier News* covered the first Riot reenactment with an article titled “Riot Re-Enactment Set Saturday to Open Tourism Season in City.” The retelling involved more than thirty participants. Additionally, Reverend Cliff Rust “who [was] active for several years in tourism in Charleston” served as the narrator of the battle. Referring to the Riot as a battle seems to be an attempt to, again, dramatize the actual occurrence. This is especially true considering the fact that Union soldiers were weaponless during the Copperhead attack in 1864. In hopes of drawing a big crowd, the reenactment was coupled with “the formal opening of the new museum in the basement of the courthouse.” Charleston’s Tourism Committee set

up both the museum, which includes a manikin of Lincoln and antique furniture, and the reenactment.

The following year, a second annual reenactment of the Riot was held as a part of a Charleston Tourism Committee event. “Reenactment of Charleston Riot Set for March 30th by Volunteer Units” read the title in *The Charleston Courier News*. Instead of celebrating on the actual anniversary date, the committee held the event on Saturday March 29, 1968. Twenty-five men of the 104th Volunteer Infantry Regiment and the 54th Regiment of Decatur, Illinois participated as volunteers for the program. The ceremony was to “include a 45-minute marching drill program.” Militarily, the 104th regiment was involved in the Civil War, including the Battle of Chickamauga and General Sherman’s “march to the sea.” After the war, the regiment was reestablished in 1960 to “help commemorate Illinois’s participation in the Civil War.” Members of the volunteer unit participated in the reenactment of authentic historic events in Springfield, Lincoln, New Salem, Libertyville, and other cities in Illinois. The reenactment was paired with the state’s sesquicentennial celebration. According to the *Chicago Tribune*, a 1968 calendar listing of celebratory events marked the date of 29 March as the “official opening of the Charleston museum.” Again, the commemorative process was tied to the opening of other historic locations for economic purposes and visitor enticement.

In the 1960s, the Charleston Chamber Tourism Council published a brochure highlighting the Riot and the individuals involved. Although the date of publication remains unclear, it is likely the brochure was used to promote the story behind the reenactments of the late 1960s. The title read “Civil War Tensions Explode into Riot at Charleston!” Print of the 1864 Copperhead bounty was published on the front page the pamphlet, including an image of Copperheads shooting down fleeing Union soldiers near the courthouse. On the back page an article from the *Charleston Plain Dealer* chronicled the Riot. The editorial mentions culprits involved, the altercation, and Copperhead withdrawal shortly thereafter. Conclusively, the brochure says, “rumors concerning movement of the Copperheads continued for four or five days after the Riot.” According to Nancy Funkhouser, the quarrel between

the soldiers and Copperheads led to a volatile outbreak of over 100 bullets being fired in just a couple minutes. An event that lasted only “a couple [of] minutes” garners the interest of re-enactors across the state of Illinois and serves as a launching pad for tourism in Charleston.

1970s Commemoration and Plaque Installment

1976 marked the bicentennial year of America. Nancy Easter-Shick insists that the country’s celebration “brought with it a display of hometown pride.” Charleston celebrated by installing a replica of the Liberty Bell in Morton Park. Also, *Coles County History, 1876-1976*, by Betty Boyer and Robert Kovac, was released with the intention of presenting the compiled history of the county’s past 100 years. The bicentennial celebrations were held in Charleston’s Square and included a 4th of July parade. Although Easter-Shick reflects on the bicentennial year as one full of “hometown pride,” no mention of the Riot is made by any local newspapers. In fact, many reports express a certain disillusionment felt by many Charleston locals preparing for bicentennial celebrations.

The Charleston Courier News prints an article by Bob Corn titled “Who Will Remember July 4, 1976?” Corn cites a United Press International poll for his inquiry of celebratory plans for the bicentennial year. However, the findings show that not many Americans had any special plans for the day. Also, according to Corn, “a brief sample of the Charleston area residents shows them to be right in line with the nationwide trend.” Corn’s article mentions discontent with the marketing agenda of community economic planners in Charleston. Lois Kloker, a Charleston local, is quoted as saying that the town and country was becoming “terribly commercialized.” Another Charleston local states that he “like everyone is getting sick and tired of the fact that it is becoming virtually a ‘buy-centennial.’”

The *Daily Eastern News* covered the 4th of July festivities in Charleston. First, an editorial titled “Bicentennial Feat may be city’s biggest parade” anticipated a large turnout for the parade festivities. Bill Browning, executive vice president of the Charleston Area Chamber of Commerce and chairman of the Bicentennial parade committee, said “the parade may be the biggest ever in Charleston.”

The July 5th, 1976 *Charleston Courier News* produced another article by Corn entitled “City Celebrates America’s 200th.” Although there was a large turnout for the parade on the Fourth of July, Charleston Police Detective Sergeant Ed Kallis noted that the rest of the events had “the worst crowd we’ve ever had.” Events for the day included a police and firemen breakfast, country music performances, a community tug of war, running races for children, and a dog show. Even though committee leaders were hoping for large crowds, it appears that many Charleston locals were disinterested in the city’s celebrations.

In 1977, the Coles County Historical Society and the Illinois State Historical Society established a plaque commemorating the Charleston Riot. The marker is located in downtown Charleston outside the Coles County Courthouse. The description mentions atrocities experienced by Copperheads during the Civil War, including “a highly controversial trial of Union deserters in March, 1863.” Members of the historical societies chose the words for the marker carefully, hoping to retell the Riot in an objective manner.

Historian Jim Weeks writes about memory and commemoration in his book *Gettysburg: Memory, Market, and an American Shrine*. Monuments and commemorations of America’s past are connected to national marketing strategies and patriotism, according to Weeks. Specifically, he states, “monuments provided a permanent solution to preserving memory, evoking reminders of a debt the present owed the past.” Comparatively, the marker in downtown Charleston seeks to preserve the memory of the Riot. Weeks further suggests, “monuments [stake] out a sacred environment of thoughtful repose.” Thus, the installation of the Riot marker symbolizes the county’s “Civil War tensions” that exploded into a Riot, as popularly endorsed by the Charleston Chamber Tourism Council. But as Weeks suggests, tension between commercial and historical commemoration persists. Nevertheless, he believes commemoration of “Civil War battlefields boosted the monument industry significantly and stimulated new techniques for manufacturing memorials.” Whether Civil War memorials seek historical accuracy or not, they reflect the collective

memory of people from all over the country. In Charleston, city officials and surrounding citizens sought to symbolize the Riot as a Civil War memento.

1980s Sesquicentennial Celebration(s)

Nancy Easter-Shick discussed a sesquicentennial pageant that was performed on July 31st, 1980. The pageant celebrated the 150-year existence of Coles County. Festivities were held on the county fairgrounds in which “more than 400 participants” witnessed or took part in the “reenactments of the Charleston Riot and also, a Civil War battle.” The sesquicentennial celebration was a part of a weekend full of attractions, including a Trade Fair and a second annual Fall Festival.

The 1980s experienced an increase in town and county festivities. Heading the marketable direction was the Charleston Chamber Tourism Council, the sesquicentennial committee, and Carl McSparin, chairman of the steering committee that oversaw a number of celebrations and special events. 1985 marked the city of Charleston’s sesquicentennial year of celebration. Easter-Shick states that the town was unable to celebrate its 100th year anniversary due to the hardships of the Depression in the 1930s. But in 1985, the town celebrated with a three-day long extravaganza on July 5th through the 7th. In addition to the 4th of July celebrations, Charleston’s sesquicentennial festivities commemorated the Riot and the city in several different ways. A *Charleston Courier News* article describes the establishment of a time capsule that will be presented during Charleston’s 200th year bicentennial celebration in 2035. The time capsule is said to include yearbooks from various schools around the community, such as Charleston Junior High, Charleston High School, and Eastern Illinois University. Richard Dobkins, president of the sesquicentennial committee, accepted additional suggestions from the community “about items to be placed in the capsule.” Festivities were also set to consist of photographs of the event, a sesquicentennial quilt, special T-shirts, stickers, maps, and historic films. Clearly, there was an attempt to market the event’s festivities.

July 5th, 1985, started a three-day long celebration and commemoration of Charleston’s 150th anniversary. Maureen

Foertsch, staff writer for the *Charleston Courier News*, led coverage on the events. Foertsch noted that a part of the festivities was a living history program in which “participants reenact[ed] the events leading up to the Charleston Riot.” Also included in the celebrations were an antique car show, a magic show, artistic paintings, a carnival, and a fireworks display. A reenactment of the Riot was also held on July 6th, 1985. Again, the remembrance covered events leading up to the Riot. The sesquicentennial celebration aimed at honoring the Civil War and endorsing local history.

As a part of the community’s collective memory, the Lincoln-Douglas debate and the Riot commemorations were conflated into one weekend. Thus, Charleston’s economic planning enabled visitors to buy into two separate pieces of history. The purposes of historic remembrances during the three-day festivities of 1985 was not strictly to promote educational knowledge. In fact, Charleston’s historical commemoration over the 4th of July weekend may not have been to promote any sort of additional knowledge regarding the Civil War era. Rather, the sesquicentennial celebration was, more than likely, about promoting the profitable attraction that is collective memory and living history.

By the end of the sesquicentennial celebration, Charleston had attracted 30,000 to 40,000 visitors. Foertsch wrote an editorial that included Dobkins’ final remarks on the success. He stated, “I think we convinced Charleston it can have a good time in a big way – and it doesn’t have to be bad or conservative.” Further, Dobkins mentioned that he and the committee officials “are grinning from ear to ear.” Charleston’s celebration drew so many people that it actually led to power outages throughout the event due to electrical exhaustion. When asked if the festivities should be held annually, Dobkins stated “I don’t think it should be annual. It’s like a movie sequel – when you have a success the sequel is never as good.” The three-day event increased sales in all facets of Charleston’s economy. Commemoration was not only organized to boost the economy, but also to pay homage to the roots of Charleston’s identity. Clearly, with the large number of visitors, it was an

identity many people, not just in Charleston, had interest in reliving and remembering.

Final Thoughts

A trend in remembering the Charleston Riot as a part of major town, county, and country anniversaries characterized the commemorative process of the late 20th century. Accordingly, during the 1980s, committee board members established tourism councils to help bolster sales and memories of the anniversary celebrations. Tourism councils were very interested in promoting Riot remembrances during the biggest money making times of the year. Although reenactments represent the collective memory of Charleston inhabitants, it is also the combined interest of the community that placed monetary value on the historical remembrance of the Riot.

The public history movement brought new ways to present history to the general public. The community was not participating in history to learn necessarily, they were visiting reenactments to take a part in a celebration of their identity. Further, they were witnessing the representation of their collective memory. However, the bicentennial celebration of 1976 seems to have lost the interest of many Charleston citizens. Residents seemed disinterested in the event and even more disinterested in the commercialized aspects of the festivities. The plaque installment in 1977 was a low-scale way in promoting living history amongst the community, but residents were at least able to recognize a part of their history on display.

For those living in and near the town, the Charleston Riot has symbolic meaning beyond a “dreadful affair” that took place between two neighboring towns. David Thelen uses the conclusion of Maurice Halbwach, a French scholar, in helping explain the ramifications of collective memory. Halbwach stated that, “individuals require the testimony and evidence of others to validate their interpretations of their own experiences.” When Coles County citizens participated in the Riot reenactments and remembrances, a nostalgic reaffirmation of their identity and memory occurred.

ANNOTATED BIBLIOGRAPHY

Primary

- "1968 Calendar," *The Chicago Tribune*, February, 1968, 9.
- "Bicentennial feat may be city's biggest parade," *Daily Eastern News*, July 3, 1985, 2.
- "City's 200th birthday will feature time in a capsule," *Charleston Times-Courier*, July 4, 1985, 3.
- Corn, Bob. "Who Will Remember July 4, 1976?" *Charleston Courier News*, July 3, 1985, 3.
- Corn, Bob. "City Celebrates America's 200th," *Charleston Courier News*, July 5, 1985, 3.
- Foertsch, Maureen. "Sesquicentennial events to continue this weekend," *Charleston Times Courier*, July 5, 1985, 3.
- Foertsch, Maureen. "Charleston's celebrations end but memories are saved," *Charleston Times Courier*, July 8, 1985, 3.
- Funkhouser, , Nancy. "The Charleston Riot." *[Illinois] Junior Historian Magazine* Vol.4 (1952): 109.
- "Reenactment of Charleston Riot Set March 30 by Volunteer Unit," *Charleston Courier*, March 20, 1968, 1.
- "Riot Re-Enactment Set Saturday to Open Tourism Season in City," *Charleston Courier*, March 31, 1967, 1.
- The Charleston Riot Plaque, downtown Charleston. Erected by *Coles County Historical Society and Illinois State Historical Society*, 1977.
- "This Afternoon a Dreadful Affair Took Place in Our Town," *The Charleston Courier-News*, March 28, 1964, 1.

Secondary

- Ander, Fritiof O. "What about Teaching the History of Illinois in our Public Schools?" *Journal of the Illinois State Historical Society* Vol.39, no. 2 (June 1946): 202.

Ander's article discussed the roots of the *Junior Historian* magazine movement and how it allowed interested history students from high schools in Illinois bring up talking points of interest. His work provides an understanding and explanation for the roots of the magazine and how Nancy Funkhouser's article got published.

Barry, Peter J. *The Charleston, Illinois Riot: March 28, 1864*. Urbana: Peter J. Barry, 2007.

Peter J. Barry's, "The Charleston Riot and Its Aftermath: Civil, Military, and Presidential Responses," discusses events and societal tensions of Coles County immediately before, during, and after the Charleston Riot. Specifically, Barry covers the reasons for the Copperhead movement during the American Civil War. I used Barry to show the different directions the Charleston riot had been studied.

Blight, David W. *Race and Reunion: The Civil War in American Memory*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2001.

Race and Reunion is a history of how the unity of white America was purchased through the increasing segregation of black and white memory of the Civil War. Blight delves deeply into the shifting meanings of death and sacrifice, Reconstruction, the romanticized South of literature, soldiers' reminiscences of battle, the idea of the Lost Cause, and the ritual of Memorial Day. Blight's chapter provided extra knowledge to the difficulties in remembering the Civil War era and presenting those remembrances to the public.

Boniface, Priscilla. *Managing Quality Cultural Tourism*. New York, NY: TJ Press Ltd, 1995.

The book takes a look at how to manage cultural tourist sites to best meet the needs of the visitors, the presenters, and the site itself. It provides background knowledge on cultural tourism and then focuses on some of the important issues involved with managing a heritage site. Specifically, I used Boniface's book as a means to express the connection between tourism and historical remembrances.

Burlison Mooney, Patricia. "Lincoln's New Salem: Or, The Trigonometric Theorem of Vernacular Restoration," *Perspectives in Vernacular Architecture* Vol. 11 (2004): 19-39.

Mooney focuses on reconstruction of New Salem and how it represents the ideals of the designers and personnel doing the remodeling. She hoped to identify Joseph Booton's restoration theory and the abstract principles that guided his architectural actions. Further, she hoped to look into how Booton's recreation reflected social and intellectual values, but also how they contradicted them. Eventually, Mooney came to the conclusion that the Civilian Conservation Corps (CCC) promoted Booton's style of restoration: systematic standardization and modernity. The article reflects upon the nature and quality of how events, like the riot, are remembered.

Coleman, Charles H., and Paul H. Spence. "The Charleston Riot, March 28, 1864." *Journal of the Illinois State Historical Society* 37, no. 1 (March 1940): 78-112.

The article begins with an introduction on the creation and belief system of the Copperhead movement. Following the reasoning as to why the Copperheads disapproved of the Civil War, the authors then chronicle information written in Republican and Democrat newspapers. Following the contextual introduction, the article then discusses in very fine detail the elements that contributed to the riot between the 54th Illinois Infantry soldiers and Peace Democrats outside of the Charleston Court House. I used the Coleman and Spence article to delineate yet another example of how historians have covered the riot.

Easter-Schick, Nancy and Bonnie Brooks Clark. *Round the Square: Life in Downtown Charleston, Illinois 1830-1998*. Charleston, Illinois: Easter-Chick Publishing, 1999.

The book is a 160 year telling of changes of the city landscape, economy, and society of Charleston, Illinois. The authors discuss the altering Charleston culture during the Civil War years, the Gilded Age, the technological revolutions of the early 20th century, and up and down economic times during the mid-to-late century. I

used the book because it provided added insight into the celebrations of the riot and as a means to help locate added primary sources.

Thelen, David. "Memory and American History." *The Journal of American History* Vol.

75, No. 4 (Mar. 1989): 1117-1129.

Thelen discusses the importance of historical study on collective memory. Through research, he deduces that collective memory seems to be more important to historians and influential over individual memory. As support, Thelen uses the conclusion of Maurice Halbwach, stating that individuals require the testimony and evidence of others to validate their interpretations of their own experiences. I used Thelen as a means to showcase the collective knowledge about the riot came in forms of reenactments, plaques, paintings, festival celebrations, and story telling through academic speeches.

Weeks, Jim. "A Memorial of the Whole Struggle," *Gettysburg: Memory, Market, and an American Shrine*, 57-83. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2003.

In chapter three of his book, Weeks discussed the memorialized process of Gettysburg, following tumultuous civil relations amongst the races in America. He namely discusses the impact that monuments have on collective memory. As memory of the Civil War gradually changed, so does commemoration.