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This issue of the *Historical Studies Journal* marks the twenty-fifth year of publishing papers written by University of Colorado Denver students. History Department faculty members submit those papers they consider the best to the editorial staff, which then makes its selections based on a number of criteria, including strength of writing, research, and readability. This year’s papers are indicative of the variety of topics that intrigue UCD students.

Rosemary Lewis undertakes the task of determining whether a home a family owns is a Sears, Roebuck and Company kit house. Incorporating family history and the results of research in primary source material, Rosemary presents her findings on the probability of a mail-order home in Douglas County.

Kevin Lord analyzes the impact of increased leisure time and holidays with pay, initiated in the 1930s, on the working class. The adoption of a forty-hour workweek and paid holidays serve as legacies of the French Popular Front.

The Boettcher Mansion, built by Charles Boettcher and summer home for three generations of the Boettcher family, sits on Lookout Mountain near Golden, Colorado. Gayla McGoldrick writes about its transformation from a private residence to a public venue. Listed on the National Register of Historic Places, the Mansion now functions as an event center, conference center and home for the Colorado Arts and Crafts Society.

Jennifer Provizer follows the path of the Golda Meir House along its journey from its site in a nearby neighborhood to its final destination on the Auraria Campus, where it is now one of the buildings in the Auraria Ninth Street Historic District. An example of adaptive reuse, the former home of Golda Meir now houses both the Golda Meir House Museum and the Golda Meir Center for Political Leadership.

Evelyn Waldron discusses George Catlin, a nineteenth-century artist who documented the American Indian at a crucial time in history and presented his work to the public in the United States and Europe. She describes Catlin’s efforts to have his collections preserved for the American public.

Lance Westfall examines songs written during the Civil War to determine their impact on the civilian and military audience. Whether entertaining or inspirational, the songs convey a sense of the time as well as exemplify the ideologies of those who wrote and performed them.

On behalf of the editorial staff, I would like to thank the UCD History Department for continuing to support the *Journal*, Dr. Thomas Noel for his encouragement and oversight of the process, and Dr. Rebecca Hunt for reading page proofs. Once again, Shannon Fluckey, graphic designer with Clicks! Copy & Printing Services, contributes her creative talent and expertise. I would also like to thank the authors and my fellow student editors who worked to write and refine the manuscripts in preparation for publication. For the authors and editors this is an invaluable learning experience.

ANNETTE GRAY
Editor
WHY A KIT HOUSE?

The History of a Ranch House and its Restoration Along the Plum Creek

Rosemary Lewis

Introduction

South of Sedalia, Colorado, in the pastoral valley of the western fork of a deceptive little stream known as Plum Creek, a small, tight-knit community exists just off the well-beaten Front Range path. Today, driving down Perry Park Road on a clear late spring morning, the green rolling hills and pastures seem to be stopped in time. This valley is so close to the metropolitan Denver-to-Colorado Springs corridor yet a century removed from Interstate 25 only a few scant miles to the east, just beyond the ridgeline. Progress, in the form of development, has come to this valley as five- to forty-acre ranchettes replace the old spreads.

The stretch of Perry Park Road between Jarre Canyon Road in Sedalia south to Jackson Creek Road runs through the Bear Cañon Agricultural District, listed on the National Register of Historic Places in recognition of the integrity of the ranch buildings and the continued family ownership of the holdings. The nomination identified seven contributing properties including the Beeman Ranch House, the Clay Homestead, the Cramer Homestead, the Curtis Ranch, the Oaklands Schoolhouse, St. Philip-in-the-Field Episcopal Church (also listed separately on the National Register), and the Allis Ranch with the Bear Cañon Post Office.1

---

Rosemary Lewis is a graduate student in the Historic Preservation certificate program. Her interests in historical study include vernacular architecture, infrastructure, and water and natural resource development, complimenting her background as a professional civil engineer. This paper, written for Dr. Tom Noel’s Western Art and Architecture class, is the result of the homeowner’s request to research the house history for potential historic designation in Douglas County.
The Allis family owned several thousand acres in this part of Douglas County. The subject of this investigation is not one of the listed properties, however, but a parcel located at the far southern end of the district.

Although not named as a contributing property, the Stevens-Kouba-Allis Ranch has a history extending back to the earliest Anglo settlement in the area. Relics in the form of a cabin, log barn, and a modest clapboard house are the remainders of what was once a nearly 3,000-acre ranch. These three buildings comprise a common enough group of rural structures, but upon closer inspection it is the ranch house that merits a deeper look. It is in this house, and thousands of others like it, that American vernacular architecture met the mass production efficiency of the Progressive Era, all packaged up for delivery in the Sears Modern Home.

**Stevens Family**

The earliest Anglo settler recorded on this property was Lewis G. Stevens, born in Pennsylvania and a veteran of the Civil War, having served in the 6th Minnesota Infantry. In 1868 Stevens, along with his family, settled in Douglas County near what was then called Round Corral, now Sedalia. Two years later he purchased the first of several land patents for 160 acres of the west half of the east half of Section 14, Township 8 South (T8S), Range 68 West (R68W), located north of present-day Jackson Creek Road and primarily on the west side of Perry Park Road. Stevens eventually acquired approximately six quarter-sections of land located within two miles of the original purchase. The Stevens family included Lewis (also listed as Loyd), his wife Lucinda (also listed as Sarah), and four children: Thomas (or Aristides or A.H.M.), born in 1860 in Minnesota, Mary born in 1862 also in Minnesota, Frederick, born in 1865 in Iowa, and Lewis born in 1870 in Colorado. Another daughter, Laura, was born about 1871.

The Stevens Ranch consisted of 1,771 acres at the time Dr. W.A. Palmer of Castle Rock purchased it for $17,000, including horses, implements, and one hundred head of cattle, in 1907. The listed features included several reservoirs, the largest of nineteen acres, and water rights to both West Plum Creek and Jackson Creek. Dr. Palmer hired R.S. McDonald to manage the ranch, who within a year had moved into Castle Rock with his family. By the time Stevens sold the ranch, he had outlived four of his children and his wife, all buried at the Bear Cañon Cemetery, and had remarried in 1906 to Elizabeth Veil. Shortly after the marriage the couple set off on a trip to California and at one point the Record Journal of Douglas County went to press with the story that the couple had met with foul play. These fears were short-lived, however, and the couple returned to Colorado and settled in Englewood in 1908. Lewis Stevens died in April 1916 and was buried at the Littleton Cemetery.

**Kouba Family**

Joseph D. Kouba began life in Denison, Texas in 1874. According to an account by his grand-daughter, Kouba traveled and worked across the west and beyond, homesteading with his family in Indian Territory (Oklahoma), working as a ranch hand in Argentina, and eventually ending up homesteading on the eastern plains of Colorado.
where he met Helen A. Lawver. They married in 1913. According to General Land Office records, Helen Lawver received title on a 320-acre homestead on September 23, 1916 in Yuma County, Colorado. Joseph D. Kouba received title on 320 acres in several sections nearby on November 16, 1916. The Koubas added to their family with the birth of a daughter, Leota, born in 1914, and a son, Earl, born in 1918.

In the summer of 1917, the Record Journal of Douglas County announced that the 1,300-acre Stevens Ranch in West Plum Creek had been sold to a “Mr. A. Cuba” [sic] of Ramah, Colorado for $17,000, who intended “to make this one of the largest cattle producing ranches in the country.” Later editions corrected the name to “Kouba.” According to the family account, Kouba hired a carpenter, Leo Grout, to build the family home. Possibly Kouba hired Grout to refurbish the existing house, which may have stood vacant in the years since Palmer’s ranch manager moved into town. During this time Helen Kouba, pregnant with Earl, and daughter Leota lived in Illinois. The family moved to the ranch in March 1918, when little Earl was less than two months old.

According to the unpublished account of the ranch history by Andree Allis Powers and Margaret Rhyne, Helen Kouba purchased a Sears kit house, unbeknownst to her husband, using the proceeds of a $3,000 inheritance. Upgrades included the interior wood trim, kitchen wood floor, cross-bar windows, wiring and plumbing. The family stored the dismantled house in the barn for years until an itinerant German man and his son assembled the building in exchange for room and board, using the pictures in the catalog as guide since the directions were lost.

Several small pieces of evidence indicated that the family legend has grown over the decades. According to a small community notice published in the Record Journal in the spring of 1923, “Mr. Kouba is hauling a carload of lumber from Sedalia. Ed Wolfensberger is helping him.” By itself, this notice does not necessarily indicate that this material was for a house. However, the placement of such a notice and the mention of a carload (that is a train boxcar load) of lumber delivered to the closest rail station together indicated an unusual event worthy of public notice. Sears typically used rail transportation to ship kit houses to remote locations. Also, if the Koubas needed milled lumber typical in ranch construction, purchasing it from a local mill may have been more common. Again, these are not definitive indications, but when considered with additional evidence presented later on, one could make a case for a 1922 to 1923 purchase date and a 1923 construction date.

As the years wore on, Joseph Kouba expanded his operation from dairy into Hereford beef cattle and cow ponies, and constructed additional ranch buildings. Kouba diverted West Plum Creek water to a small lake north of the house and undertook further improvements to the water supply with the addition of ditches. The lake also provided recreational opportunities for community boys. Kouba planted cottonwood, Chinese elm, and other trees along the Highway 105 ditches (Perry Park Road), and a grove of cedar trees to the east of the house that survive today. After Helen Kouba’s death in 1961, their son, Earl, and his family moved into the old house until relocating to Minnesota in 1966, shortly after the historic 1965 flood along Plum Creek destroyed so much of central Douglas County. Joseph moved with
his son and died in Minnesota in 1967. He was buried with his wife down the road at Bear Cañon Cemetery.13

The ranch remained in the family until the mid-1990s. Leota Kouba married a Douglas County man, Fred Allis of Greenland, in 1944. They moved to a nearby ranch in 1946 and worked both properties. Leota, a graduate of Colorado Women’s College, taught school as well being a rancher and mother. After Fred Allis’ death in 1986, his widow began dismantling the ranch, now 3,000 acres consisting of both the older Stevens-Kouba ranch and the property the Allises moved into after their marriage. The property became ranchettes and preserved open space. She passed on in 1997 and was buried with her parents and husband at Bear Cañon Cemetery. 14

Until 1970, when the third generation of the family, Pat and Andree Allis, moved into the ranch house, no contemporaneous records of changes to the structure have come to light. By this time, the little ranch house was nearly a half-century old and showing its age. At first glance, it did not appear to be unique among the thousands of small ranch houses that dot the west. Except for family legend, little evidence existed that this house was a Sears kit house. So why would Helen Kouba have bought a kit house? No doubt the Sears, Roebuck and Company catalog occupied a handy place in the house, when a few minutes between chores allowed a ranch wife and mother to dream. Sears brought Chicago’s Michigan Avenue to distant farmsteads across the nation. With the introduction of the Modern Homes Division in 1908, a house, complete with windows, doors, paint, nails, and furnishings, could be delivered right to your address. Perhaps instead of asking why Mrs. Kouba decided to purchase a kit house, the question should be why were not more of these houses built in the far reaches of the country?

**Sears Houses**

The Sears kit house would have been impossible without the development of the balloon frame construction method and the simple wire nail. Balloon frame construction, the lightweight framing method, used standardized, pre-cut, dimensional pieces of lumber, generally eight to ten feet in length with cross-section nominal dimensions of two inches by four inches, commonly called the “2-by-4.” The upright pieces (the “studs”) were nailed on the top and bottom by other dimensioned pieces at a constant spacing, such as sixteen inches on center, to produce the frame. The term “balloon frame” can be interpreted as a positive reference to lightness of the construction, or the perceived fragility, like a balloon, of the overall strength of the structure. Sheathing with wood, lath and plaster, or other available material added stability and a finish to the frame.

Historians William Cronon and Sigfried Giedion both acknowledged the construction of Chicago’s St. Mary’s Catholic Church in 1833 as the first true balloon-frame structure. Cronon identified this type of construction as “…the quintessential building form of the age.”15 With the invention of the balloon frame method, timber construction no longer required specialized knowledge of mortise-and-tenon methods. Unskilled labor could construct a house with a minimal amount of instruction.
These interpretations of the invention of the balloon frame as a revolutionary construction method traceable to a single event can be misleading, however. As with many building methods, evolution rather than revolution may provide a more appropriate context in understanding the role of lightweight framing as compared to the older heavy framing methods. Material availability and carpentry skills determined the form of many vernacular structures. In some cases, a rudimentary form of the lightweight frame may have been used for construction when sufficient heavy timber was unavailable, necessitating replacement with several lighter pieces. As applied to residential construction, Fred W. Peterson traced lightweight framing techniques to mid-1830s farmhouses, contemporaneous with the construction of St. Mary’s Church.16 The changes in available materials and improvements to the transportation network from forest to mill to building site together account for the dominance of balloon-frame construction through the Midwest and West in the nineteenth and into the twentieth centuries.

Increased industrialization in the nineteenth century converted raw products to commodities and specialized crafts into efficient mass production lines. Cronon’s examination of this process, in Nature’s Metropolis: Chicago and the Great West, illuminated the development of the lumber industry from a local seasonal operation, of individual sawmills along the rivers and lakeshore, to a year-round cooperative concern centered along the Chicago railyards and shoreline. The system’s efficiency quickly exhausted the northern white pine forests on which the Chicago lumber trade depended. As Chicago’s domination of the lumber market broke with the loss of the northern forests, suppliers shifted to the Pacific Northwest and southern yellow pine forests in the search for first-growth wood.17 These remote locations applied and refined the methods pioneered in Chicago into the twentieth century. Chicago retained regional dominance in railroad transportation, and therefore its ties to the hinterland as an entrepot between lumber supply and demand. The pieces were in place: balloon framing techniques allowed the common person to build a quality domicile, a network of rails delivered the product from widely scattered sources, and a growing market of new homeowners chaffed to live the American Dream. Sears, Roebuck, with its established mail-order business for everything for the house, expanded the business to include the house itself. Efficiency, economy, and quality were Sears’ bywords in their advertising, and they stood by their product with full warranties.

Sears was not the only manufacturer of kit homes. Aladdin Company and Montgomery Ward & Company also sold similar products, but Sears dominated the market. Sears offered three classes of houses: the “Honor Bilt” group with larger plans and the highest grades of wood, the “Standard Built” series with less expensive plans and materials, and the cottage-type series designed for use in warm climates since they were not equipped with many conveniences or even insulation. Sears maintained factories for their Modern Homes Division in Ohio, New Jersey, and Illinois, connected by rail to the country. The 1926 catalog included testimonials as to the quality of the materials. One example from a satisfied customer from Washington, DC: “The lumber was far superior, so carpenters said, to any that could be obtained here.”18 Sears advertised the use of select, clear, high-grade woods for framing and finish
work and guaranteed satisfaction. Douglas fir and Pacific Coast hemlock provided the framing members. Oak, birch, Douglas fir and yellow pine became floors, cabinets, and trim. Cypress, “the wood that lasts for centuries,” became window frames and exterior finishes. Red cedar shingles covered the roof.19

Sears sold approximately 75,000 to 100,000 of their kit homes, in 370 to 447 styles, between 1908 and 1940 in the lower 48 states. The majority of these appeared to be located east of the Mississippi and north of the Mason-Dixon Line, where Sears maintained sales offices.20 Some fifty years after the sale of the last kit home, the public rediscovered these houses as an emblem of the middle-class American experience. Rosemary Thornton, perhaps the most well-known author on the subject, published several books and lectured extensively during her travels in search of Sears homes. The sales records have been lost, so the effort to track down and identify true kit homes generally requires the discovery of a set of plans in the attic, a notation in the building permit records, comparison of dimensions or proportions with known designs, or finding a part number stamp on a piece of wood.

In a few instances, company records identified clusters of these houses as factory-sponsored construction tracts. The 1926 catalog included photographs of developments in Carlinville and Wood River, Illinois, sold to Standard Oil Company; in Plymouth Meeting, Pennsylvania, sold to American Magnesia Company; and in Akron, Ohio, sold to an unnamed construction company.21 Standard Oil bought 192 kits in 1918 for $1,000,000 to house coal miners and administrative staff. Closure of the mines less than a decade later resulted in the tenants moving out, leaving the houses vacant until they were sold again for $350 to $500 in 1935, ten percent of their original price less than twenty years before. In 1987, the Carlinville Chamber of Commerce held its first historic tour of the homes of the Standard Addition, now a source of tourism dollars to the community. The Chicago suburb of Aurora, which had a Modern Homes sales office in the center of town, contained a significant number of Sears houses. The city’s Preservation Commission published a self-guided walking tour of thirty houses scattered through the city, representing the best preserved of 136 identified properties.22

The published literature identifies a few Sears homes in Colorado. In Denver, historian Thomas Noel lists one house, at 3401 Stuart St., as one of the few known Sears, Roebuck houses in the area. This house is a four-square design, constructed of concrete blocks manufactured onsite. The owners, a brother and sister, built the house while living in what is now the garage.23 Buena Vista (the “Westly” plan), Colorado Springs (“Palmyra”), Colorado City (“Clarrissa” and “Concord”), Greeley (“Avondale”), Ordway (“The Silverdale”), Brush (“No. 175”), and Lima (“Matoka”) also contain Sears houses.24

Formation of the Allis Ranch Preserve and the House Restoration

In 1970 Pat Allis and his new wife, Andree, moved into the house and began their effort to clean up the ranch. They tore down old barns and sheds dating to the early 1900s, including an ice house south of the ranch house. By this time, the family had already implemented several alterations to the house. The original screened porch (or
sun porch) on the rear of the house had been closed in, indicated by the existing roof line. Windows added to this back porch differed from the rest of the house. The Allises installed a wood-burning stove in the dining room, paneled the walls, and added beams to the ceiling to cover cracks in the original horsehair plaster. They installed tile over the wood floors, dug window wells and repaired the basement windows to keep out water, rodents, and snakes. In 1988, the Allises installed new cabinets and linoleum in the kitchen, carpeted the bedrooms, and replaced wood on the front porch.25

After Pat’s death in 1991 and his mother’s death in 1997, the family sold portions of the 3,000-acre ranch for development, except 830 acres, which became the Allis Ranch Preserve under the stewardship of Colorado Open Lands, a non-profit organization.26 In Lewis Stevens’ original 160-acre parcel, an enclave of exclusive homes curved along the eastern side of West Plum Creek in a subdivision called the Allis Ranch Preserve. Helen Kouba’s house, and the Stevens home and barn, remained on a commonly-held parcel near Highway 105.

By 2004, the Kouba house was in complete disrepair. It had stood empty for years. Owners of the adjacent parcel of land in the Allis Ranch Preserve, Margaret and David Rhyne, swapped a portion of their land in exchange for the land on which the ranch house stood, intending to use the house as a place for caregivers of their handicapped daughter, Alexis. As part of the agreement, the other homeowners in the Allis Ranch Preserve stipulated that the house could not be rented to other than caregivers or sold.27

On Thanksgiving weekend of 2004, they started renovating the house by gutting the interior, removing the improvements made by the Allis family, stripping the lathe-and-plaster walls and ceilings down to the studs and joists, and exposing the original wood floors from under layers of linoleum and carpet. The Rhynes found Douglas fir floors throughout the house, except in the kitchen, which had oak flooring. They sanded, repaired and sealed the floors with a clear-coat finish. They found 1923 Denver Post newspapers stuffed around the window frames. Mice nests, wasp nests, and beehives occupied the wall and floor cavity spaces.

According to David Rhyne, the house exhibited little differential settlement over the years. The wall studs were found to be at about 14 inches on center, generally closer spacing than construction today. One of the features of the Sears Honor Bilt series of homes was the inclusion of wall studs at 14-3/8 inches on center for a higher quality structure.28 Only after the new spray foam insulation had been installed did the doors need to be squared.29 The Rhynes removed the doors from their frames, dip-stripped and re-hung them. An original window appeared from behind the bathroom tile. Custom-ordered aluminum-clad, energy efficient duplicates of the original windows replaced those removed by the Allis family as keepsakes. The stairways were reinforced from below and resurfaced with Douglas fir treads. David Rhyne duplicated the unsalvageable trim in each room in a basement carpentry shop. An asphalt roof replaced the built-up roof. New electrical, plumbing, heating and ventilation systems, and drywall were installed. Cabinets and lighting fixtures, duplicating the 1920s style, completed the renovation and provided the rooms with a sense of time and place.30 The Rhynes turned the rear bedroom into a large bathroom with
a contemporary shower and lavatory. Before work was completed, Alexis died in her sleep on January 8, 2005. Margaret and David and their family and friends continued restoration of the house in memory of Alexis, and dedicated the house to her.

Today the house is white with red trim, continuing the previous paint scheme of white with a red roof. It is a one-and-one-half-story clapboard frame side-gabled structure with many Craftsman-style features, such as the decorative exposed braces visible along the rake edges and the low-pitched roof. The off-center partial-width covered front porch has triangular knee braces for its front-gabled roof and stylized porch supports. Virginia and Lee McAlester describe the Craftsman style as the dominant style for small houses from about 1905 through the 1920s.31

Consideration of the possible source kit for the house included evaluation of features such as the general floor plan and room dimensions, number of floors, roofline, dormers, and decorative features. These kits could, and often were, customized. Nearly any feature could be changed to suit the customer, from the floor materials to combining the parts of two plans. Rooms could be enlarged by moving out a wall, windows could be upgraded, and floor plans mirrored from that shown in the catalog. Examination of reprints of several Sears catalogs revealed several candidates as the source kit. The ground floor plan and front elevation closely resembled the “Clyde” plan, listed in catalogs between 1921 and 1929 for $1,175 to $1,923. The living room/dining room/kitchen elevation on the north side differed from the “Clyde” plan with the bump-out for the dining room window and three fenestrations instead of two. The living room/bedrooms elevation with a southern exposure closely resembled the catalog plan, including the bumped-out bedroom and the small window in the bathroom uncovered during renovation. The Kouba house, however, did not have the fireplace as shown on the drawings. The most significant differences between the Kouba house and the “Clyde” pattern included the addition of another bedroom under the roof, the stairway access, and the orientation of the roof (front-gabled as designed, side-gabled as constructed). Mrs. Kouba made upgrades to the pattern, according to the family account, which may have included the addition of the bedroom under the roof and a stairway access.

The rear shed dormer, lighting the stairway and small anteroom or landing to the upstairs bedroom, appears to be out-of-scale and style with the ground level, possibly the result of customization. The other candidates for the base plan, the “Savoy” (from the 1916 catalog), the “Belmont” (from 1916 through 1921 catalogs), and the “Hazelton” (from 1911 through 1922 catalogs) each exhibit Craftsman-style exterior features such as exposed rafter tails, knee braces, and low-pitch roof. Each of these plans also includes a partial second floor unlike the “Clyde.” The general floor plans, however, differ significantly from the existing house with the inclusion of a sleeping porch, pantry, or even in the general room arrangement. The absence of plans, unique markings, or building records, however, precludes definitive identification of this house as a Sears “Clyde” plan structure.

When considering the years that the “Clyde” kit was advertised in the catalog (beginning in 1921), the presence of 1923 newspapers in the walls, and the newspaper notice of Mr. Kouba hauling a carload of lumber from Sedalia in 1923, it appeared
that the legend of storing the house for a decade in the barn became exaggerated over
the course of time. A circa-1923 photograph, with the family standing in front of the
house, possibly commemorated “moving-in day.” The information collected pointed
to a construction date sometime in the summer of 1923.

Concluding Remarks

Today all that remains of the Stevens-Kouba-Allis Ranch historical buildings are the
circa 1923 ranch house, and a wood house and a log barn dating possibly to the first years
of the Stevens ownership of the property. Interest in the kit house has not diminished
in the past decade. Kit houses have sometimes become erroneously associated with the
bungalow style, probably as a result of timing. Magazines like American Bungalow
provide a forum for the aficionados. A new book by Rich Binsacca, Kit Homes: Your
Guide to Home-Building Options from Catalogs to Factories, on contemporary kit
homes, testifies to continuing interest in the subject. However, the homes this book
describes are not kit homes as marketed by Sears a century ago, complete with nails,
paint, and finishes. These contemporary versions appear to be partially pre-assembled
before delivery to the site.32

Why a kit house? For the thirty-two years that Sears, Roebuck manufactured
homes, they filled a market niche by combining mass production efficiency with
individual preferences. This period marked a transition from the individual “custom-built”
homes, be they cabins, bungalows, or mansions, to the mass-produced middle class
development with pre-selected plans. Within a decade of the end of the Sears line
of homes, the planned development, represented by the Levittown, New York model,
introduced a different type of construction efficiency marketed to the same demographic
audience as the kit house. As to why so few of these kit homes found their way to the
American West, perhaps the answer lay in the marketing strategy. Buyers generally
purchased the homes through sales offices, none of which were located west of the
Mississippi. Perhaps, like Helen Kouba, western buyers visiting Illinois or another
eastern locale with a sales office had the opportunity to select and customize their
homes. The kit home could then symbolize ties to the east for a family. Certainly
more of these structures await discovery throughout the west.
**Introduction**

The Popular Front came to power in France on June 6, 1936. Having won the majority of votes during the May 3 elections, the parties making up the Front had earned the right to form a new government headed by the Socialists, who had won the most seats in the Chamber of Deputies.

Léon Blum, head of the Socialist party, was to be the new Prime Minister of France. Under the banner of the Popular Front, the Socialists united in a coalition with the Communists, the centrist Radicals, and several small parties, and rose to power on a platform primarily of anti-fascism with a modicum of proposed social reforms. The Popular Front’s rise to power had been precipitated by a shift in policy by the Communists, who, under the direction of the Comintern, had discarded their “class against class” tactics in favor of an anti-fascist rapprochement with their fellow parties of the left, following the suppression of the German communists and the fascist riots in Paris on February 6, 1934.

After the elections of May 3, the working classes determined that with the election of a Socialist-led government, change had become possible.\(^1\) A massive wave of strikes broke out and, as noted with very little exaggeration by Communist leader Maurice Thorez, “in less than two weeks the strike had spread throughout the country, borne along on a tre-
mendous wave of enthusiasm.” The strikes were on a scale that was unprecedented in French history. Nearly two million workers went on strike during the month of May. The largest previous strikes had totaled 1.2 million over the entire year of 1920. The strikes were also unusual in that over three-quarters of them took the form of peaceful, disciplined factory occupations with “property[,] machinery and stocks ... looked after with jealous care by the striking workers.” Instead of angry riots and protests through the streets, the workers had quietly taken control of factories, bringing a large percentage of French industry to a stunned halt.

The out-going government of Albert Sarraut did nothing against the strikers, but when Léon Blum’s government assumed power on June 6, Blum immediately moved to begin negotiations between the trade unions and the employer associations. The result was what became known as the Matignon Agreement. Representatives of the state, the union umbrella organization Confédération générale du travail (CGT), and the employer confederation Confédération générale de la production française (CGPF) signed the Matignon Agreement on June 7, 1936. The agreement provided an increase in working-class wages on a sliding scale of between seven and fifteen percent, allowed workers to join trade unions without fear of losing their jobs, and established the right of workers to negotiate collectively for benefits.

However, the signing of the Matignon Agreement did not lead to a halting of the strikes. Maurice Thorez, head of the Communist Party, declared that “[t]hough it is important to press our claims thoroughly, it is equally important to know when to stop.” Meanwhile, the Chamber of Deputies passed a flurry of social legislation meant to ameliorate the potentially explosive situation. That the always reactionary Senate also passed most of the proposed legislation during the first weeks of the Blum administration was an indication of the seriousness with which the perceived threat of the striking workers was taken by all of the political spectra of the French government. It was during these few weeks that bills establishing a forty-hour workweek and holidays with pay were written into law by the votes of the Chamber and Senate.

The question of holidays with pay, of which we shall primarily concern ourselves in this article, was not a new one in French politics. Bills had been proposed by Leftist deputies and passed in the Chamber of Deputies in both 1928 and 1932, only to be locked in committee by the conservative Senate for reasons that are not entirely clear, but may be speculated as being related to concerns regarding the economic impacts as well as the potential for “idleness” among workers.

The passage of the bill establishing holidays with pay would introduce a new element into the social life of the working classes, giving them opportunities to experience their nation as they never had before. In this article, I shall examine the effects of this newfound leisure and the means by which the Popular Front government implemented it. The question is a significant one, as holidays with pay is the single issue that has cemented the reputation of the Popular Front and is its greatest lasting success.
Holidays With Pay and Leisure During the Popular Front

The bill establishing holidays with pay provided paid vacations of fifteen days (twelve working days) for all salaried and wage-earning employees who had been on their job for at least one year. Unlike the Forty-Hour Law, which the Chamber of Deputies also passed at this time, that stipulated the implementation of a forty-hour work week, the law establishing holidays with pay was passed with relatively little vitriol or conflict. While the Forty-Hour Law immediately sparked controversy and attempts to dismantle it by the Right, paid vacations found support on both sides of the political spectrum. Many on both the Right and the Left believed that “vacations are necessary in the modern world.” Contemporary conservatives believed that the implementation of holidays with pay would reduce radical sentiments and sabotage revolutionary efforts on the far Left, while labor leaders on the Left felt that paid vacations were proper vehicles for the expression of individualism in modern society.

The implementation of paid vacations coincidentally occurred simultaneously with Léon Blum’s creation of a Ministry of Sports and Leisure, headed by the Socialist Léo Lagrange. One of the main tasks undertaken by Lagrange was to increase the presence of sporting and leisure activities in the daily lives of French workers. Lagrange believed strongly that the implementation of the Forty-Hour law (which would give birth to the weekend) and paid vacations must not be simply a period of non-work, but rather a time of leisurely pursuits that rejuvenated the spirits of the people.

In the pursuit of this goal and as part of the Blum government’s larger effort to reduce unemployment, Lagrange’s ministry funded the construction of 400 sports arenas across the nation by the end of 1937. Lagrange also supported the development of a network of youth hostels across France intended to encourage working class travel with their affordable rates. The government introduced physical education classes in almost half of France’s départements with the goal not only of increasing the health of students, but also of fostering a lifelong interest in physical leisure activities.

Lagrange personally intervened with the directors of France’s four largest railroads to arrange for ticket discounts for holiday travelers. Lagrange’s wife Madeleine would later quote one of the directors as having sputtered, “[w]hat you are asking us is anti-railroad!” Despite these protests, Lagrange wrung a forty percent ticket discount out of the railroads and, according to historian Jean Lacouture, “several millions of the people of France benefited.”

Lagrange’s motives for increasing the leisure opportunities of workers were not entirely altruistic. He argued that leisure would help to arrest the declining birth rate in France, which had been a major concern in France since before the inception of the Third Republic. Lagrange emphasized the role a healthy and fit working class would play in revitalizing the French nation and shaking off the entropic mentality that was widely perceived to have dogged France since the defeat at Sedan in 1870.

The view of Leftist intellectuals in relation to the subject of leisure tended to form around these cerebral conceptions. Before the implementation of paid holidays, the elites who made up the leadership of the various Left-wing movements in France imagined that mass assembly jobs were a drain on the creative and imaginative
abilities of the workers, reducing them to a state where they could only partake in passive leisure activities.\textsuperscript{17} The implementation of paid holidays was seen as an opportunity to instill intellectual and cultural values in the working classes and keep them from indulging in alcohol and idleness.\textsuperscript{18} The leftist intelligentsia, who operated through the various trade unions and parties of the left to sponsor structured leisure activities, exposed workers to their values. As historian Ellen Furlough wrote, “[d]emocratic access ... to art, music, theater, and cinema ... was at the heart of the cultural politics of the Popular Front.”\textsuperscript{19} Leftist organized leisure supplemented these staples of cultural life with lectures on the history of France, tours of cultural sites and trips to visit local workers and their places of work.\textsuperscript{20} Elites on the Left believed that they must “educate the people to enjoy what they like,” as though the people were not capable of experiencing joy in their own capacities.\textsuperscript{21}

Beyond the elitism of the left were the more practical attempts to foster holidays and leisure among the working classes. The Communist union Metalworkers of Paris organized festivals for its members, and purchased land for the purpose of allowing its members to camp and experience nature.\textsuperscript{22} Advertisements and magazine covers attempted to lure readers from the industrial cities to the beaches, mountains, and small townships of France.

Slowly at first, but in increasing numbers, the working classes did begin to take advantage of the new opportunities for leisure offered to them. In 1936, members of the working classes purchased 600,000 of the discounted rail tickets for which Lagrange had negotiated. In 1937 and 1938, this number increased to 1.2 million. While many took advantage of these new travel opportunities to visit exotic locations like the French Riviera, historian Michael Seidman noted that “even more took advantage of the reduced fares to visit their relatives in the countryside.”\textsuperscript{23}

Only five to ten percent of the population was actually able to go on vacations during the 1930s, despite the attempts of the government and the trade unions to encouraging time away “from boring work and an ugly urban environment, which lacked air and light.”\textsuperscript{24} The primary factor limiting vacation travel for the working classes was money. The Matignon Agreement increased wages, but these increases went first toward “necessary purchases,” and the effect of these pay raises was entirely marginalized as rising inflation eliminated the gains. Furlough explained further that psychology was also a factor. People who had queued up each morning in front of their factories for many years “awakened at their regular time, as if they were going to work ... [m]any were concerned whether they would be paid.” Also, many workers saw paid vacations as an opportunity to rest, as opposed to a compelling reason for travel. Many remained close to their homes, enjoying the opportunity to relax, and took advantage of local opportunities to engage in leisure.\textsuperscript{25}

The cartoon “Les Salopards en Vacances” by Pol Farjac appeared in the French publication Le Canard Enchaîné on August 12, 1936. The cartoon depicted a scene on a beach somewhere in France. In the background of the cartoon, vacationers could be seen lounging in the sun or playing in the ocean, while in the foreground, a bourgeois woman sat in a bath tub and said to her companion “[v]ous ne pensez pas
que j’allais me tremper dans la même eau que ces bolcheviks!”26 This cartoon reflected the considerable friction, which occurred where workers infringed on what had long been the domain of the bourgeoisie.

The right-wing magazine Combat accused vacationing workers of ruining the French countryside and declared that there would be “nothing left but to take a rifle and some cartridges and shoot down ... the tyrants who are as dangerous as German barbarians.”27 Similarly, an article in the conservative newspaper L’Echo de Paris referred to the author’s encounter with a “group of school children led by their teacher” singing the Communist Internationale and regarding the author and his (or her) four children with a “look of hatred [that] one finds almost anywhere ... in what was once our lovely France.”28 The existence of these sorts of hyperbolic statements reflected the yawning divides that had grown over the course of the Third Republic between the petite bourgeoisie and urban workers, the deeply religious and the secular, and those who sympathized with authoritarian ideologies and were terrified of the influences of Socialism and Communism on French society.

On a more rational level, some conservatives raised objections to the paid vacations of the working classes on the ground of the financial ramifications to business.29 However, a great many employers saw paid vacations as a way to improve discipline by denying them to workers who failed to conform to workplace expectations. For the most part, employers saw vacations as a lesser evil than the Forty-Hour Law. The eighty or so hours lost per employee per year because of paid vacations paled next to the four hundred hours (or more) of productivity that the Forty-Hour Law would cost businesses.30

For workers, paid vacations and increasing leisure opportunities were signs of an improving life. Travel, cultural experiences, and sporting activities that had previously been largely unavailable became more and more available as the 1930s waned. The masses engaged in formerly elite pursuits such as tennis, skiing, and soccer with the encouragement of men like Léo Lagrange, while beachfront and artistic venues experienced influxes of people of a type previously barred by unspoken agreement.

And yet, the intentions of the Ministry of Sport and Leisure and of other organizations led by Leftist intellectuals would ultimately fail in two ways. The first and most direct failure of the Leftist leisure movement was the failure of the Popular Front to invest properly in its leisure vision. The threat of a reinvigorated and bellicose Germany forced Léon Blum, in September 1936 and just three months after the Popular Front took power, to take the practical step of instituting France’s most ambitious armaments program since the end of World War I. This had a negative impact on the government’s ability to fund fully many of the planned leisure programs.31

The second and more subtle failure was the inability of the Left to control the leisure movement itself. While they envisioned the reconstruction of the working class into a sort of cultured proletarian ideal, workers themselves had another agenda in mind: the satisfaction of newly aroused consumer instincts based around pleasurable experiences. The Left had been attempting to achieve a form of democratic unity through leisure. However, they lacked the funds to follow through on their philosophies sufficiently to make up for the contradictions between the prized ideological concepts
of democratic unity and individualism, while enterprising forces in the free market were only too willing to provide pleasure and leisure without the drag of ideology.\textsuperscript{32}

It is important to make the distinction that this was a failure on the part of the elites of the Left political movement, and not a failure of the working classes themselves. As noted earlier, only five to ten percent of the French people were able to take a vacation in the 1930s; by the 1980s, this number had risen to above sixty percent.\textsuperscript{33} The movement toward leisure for the masses that began with the Popular Front has had a significant impact on the lives of a great many average citizens in France for over seventy years. While on trial in Vichy France, Léon Blum spoke eloquently on this matter:

\begin{quote}
I did not often leave my ministerial office during the course of my Ministry, but each time I did go out, when I passed through the great suburbs and saw the roads crowded with ramshackle cars, motor-bikes, tandems, with working-class couples in their gaily-coloured pullovers, showing that the idea of leisure was awakening within them a sort of simple and natural coquetry, I had in spite of everything the feeling of having introduced a little beauty, a ray of light into their drab and difficult lives.\textsuperscript{34}
\end{quote}

It is this “ray of light” of which Blum spoke that renders the question of the expansion of leisure to the working classes during the Popular Front so significant. This “ray of light” – the introduction of paid holidays and the expansion of leisure – is why the Popular Front, which so largely failed to achieve its goals (including its most significant goal – to defend France from fascism), has found a fond remembrance in the popular memory of so many in France.\textsuperscript{35}
Boettcher Mansion, also known as Lorraine Lodge, was the summer home of Charles Boettcher, one of Colorado’s best-known entrepreneurs and philanthropists. Situated atop Lookout Mountain in Golden, Colorado, the lodge is one of the finest examples of both indigenous architecture and Arts and Crafts design in the area. Drafted by William E. Fisher and Arthur A. Fisher, Architects, and constructed during the summers of 1916 – 1918, the mansion currently operates as an events center with an emphasis on weddings and receptions, as well as being home to the Colorado Arts and Crafts Society. This paper will look at the building from four different angles: the history of the original owner Charles Boettcher; the history of the structure; a structural and site description; and the building's current use.

Charles Boettcher: Entrepreneur

Charles Boettcher was born in Kolleda, Germany in 1852 and immigrated to the United States in 1869. He joined his brother Herman in Cheyenne, Wyoming as a tinsmith and soon became his partner in a thriving hardware business, which later expanded to include several other locations including Boulder and Leadville. Boettcher married Fannie Augusta Cowan in 1874 and
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the two settled in Boulder where his hardware business flourished. “Hard Goods, Hardware, and Hard Cash” was the company slogan. With the birth of his son Claude in 1875, Boettcher entered into what he referred to as the happiest period of his life. However, Boettcher left the happy life in Boulder in pursuit of fast money produced by the mining craze. A good portion of his prosperity was due to this move and, ultimately, to the explosive growth of the mining industry. Charles quickly learned about mining operations and catered to the needs of miners looking for supplies and machinery. Boettcher did admit to some regrets at uprooting his family from Boulder during such an idyllic phase of their lives, but later declared “… the die was cast, it was too late to look back; I determined to follow out my decision vigorously come good or ill.” Much of Boettcher’s nature could be summed up in that single statement.

In Leadville, Boettcher’s entrepreneurial skills bloomed, and he amassed incredible profits from supplying the miners of the silver boom. Hardware was his forte: “Hardware is one of the best businesses there is. I like that line. I was brought up in it. Axes and hammers don’t go out of style like so many other things.” With the Leadville store thriving, Boettcher set his sights on Denver and purchased an existing hardware business there in 1884. The family moved to their 11th and Grant Street mansion on Capitol Hill where daughter Ruth was born and where Boettcher took his place along “Millionaire’s Row.” Charles Boettcher had begun to make his mark on Colorado.

The turn of the century saw Boettcher branching out into various other business ventures. He established the Great Western Sugar Company and later the Ideal Cement Company, all while trying his hand at multiple ventures including banking, mining, and ranching. However, his dedication to business had taken extraordinary amounts of time away from his family; whether or not this was a contributing factor is not known, but Boettcher and Fannie separated in 1915, and legally divorced in 1920. Years later Boettcher rather poignantly noted, “… I feel sure now that had I stayed in Boulder, I would have led a happy life. Very likely I wouldn’t have made much money, but money isn’t everything, although it often helps.”

It was during this period that construction on the Lookout Mountain retreat known as Lorraine Lodge began. Boettcher history never provided an explanation for the name “Lorraine.” Fannie herself never lived there, remaining in the Grant Street house while Boettcher moved to, and later became joint owner of, the Brown Palace Hotel in downtown Denver. Hardly the type to enjoy retirement, Boettcher continued to work until well into his nineties, expanding an already lengthy résumé with ventures into the banking and insurance businesses, the meat packing industry, and a utilities corporation. With his approval, son Claude and grandson Charles II established the Boettcher Foundation, one of the largest family trust funds in Colorado, with assets totaling over $240 million. Boettcher passed away July 2, 1948, at the age of 96.

Described by many as having the “Midas Touch,” Boettcher did indeed seem to have a knack for turning a steady profit in every business venture. One could attribute much of this to sheer ambition and a shrewd sense of business, as opposed to gifts from a higher power. The combination of these two assets (along with a work ethic continually in overdrive) seems to have been the secret to his success. Lorraine Lodge, as a retreat
designed for recreation, seems somewhat inconsistent with Boettcher's nature. “My father,” stated Claude after Charles’s death, “never learned how to play.”6

History of Lorraine Lodge

Charles Boettcher reportedly chose the site for Lorraine Lodge after viewing the area during the construction of Lariat Trail in Golden; Boettcher’s cement company donated the materials needed to build the road. He had the lodge built on 110 acres of mountain meadowland with views of the Continental Divide on one side, and the city of Denver on the other. “There was nothing else up here when they built the home,” stated Susan Becker, former director of the Boettcher Mansion. “They brought building materials up here by horse and wagon via Lariat Loop, since I-70 wasn’t built yet. It was really a wilderness up here at that time, even though today it’s only twenty minutes from downtown.”7 Boettcher, an avid hunter, may have been attracted to the area because of its abundance of wildlife. Herds of elk, deer, and flocks of wild turkeys inhabited the surrounding acres, and Boettcher stocked the grounds with other forms of game for hunting.

Boettcher chose brothers William and Arthur Fisher to design the lodge. Prominent Colorado architects, the Fisher firm designed not only private homes but also hospitals, churches, schools, and commercial businesses. Many of their Denver buildings received listing on the National Register of Historic Places, including: the Phipps Mansion, the Denver City Tramway Building, and the A.C. Foster Building.

Boettcher frequently used the lodge as his personal retreat and for entertaining hunting parties, especially during the summer months. Several governors had been guests of Boettcher, and later of his son Claude, during the lodge’s heyday. Queen Marie of Rumania, on a visit to Colorado in 1926, visited Lorraine Lodge with her royal party for a luncheon with Boettcher himself. Boettcher’s summer retreat was a gathering place for Denver’s prestigious and elite, and was featured in both Modes and Manners and Municipal Facts, popular magazines of the time:

The one important house that seems most perfectly to harmonize with the Colorado mountains is the residence of Charles Boettcher on Lookout Mountain, designed by Fisher and Fisher. In the Arts & Crafts style, it surmounts the hill of which it seems a crowning member. In fact, it is next to impossible to ascertain at certain points of the structure, where the natural formation ends and the architecture begins. The Mansion is almost a part of the earth and rock.8 Municipal Facts, 1920

Modes and Manners, a publication of Denver Dry Goods and Denver’s premier style magazine, gushed over Lorraine Lodge in an article titled “Living in the Clouds”:

There are a number of opulent members of Denver society who literally “live in the clouds” in a manner befitting royalty. Great stone castles have been built in the mountains and they are far more luxurious than any royal domicile which you may read about in a continental guide book or historical novel. Standing on a high, secluded spot on Lookout Mountain, is the home
of Charles Boettcher. This great house built of gray stone might well have been designed for the seclusion of a warrior. The interior is of stone and the walls project copper and wrought iron lights, which add to the ancient castle atmosphere. The colossal stone fireplace, and the windows that frame magnificent mountain scenery, are features of this luxurious home. It was here that Queen Marie of Rumania tarried for lunch when she visited Denver in 1926.9 Modes and Manners, 1928

Three generations of Boettchers lived and entertained at Lorraine Lodge. Charline Breeden, daughter of Ruth Boettcher Humphries and granddaughter of Charles, moved her family into the home year round in the early 1960s, and after her cancer diagnosis in 1968, she requested in her will that ownership of the lodge be turned over to Jefferson County upon her death. The county took possession of Lorraine Lodge after Charline passed away in August of 1972. The building opened to the public in 1975 as the Jefferson County Conference and Nature Center, and in December 2005, a $3.1 million Capital Improvement Plan from Jefferson County’s Conservation Trust Fund received approval for the restoration of what was now renamed Boettcher Mansion.

Structural and Site Description

Boettcher Mansion, at 7500 feet, is quite literally a part of the mountain upon which it is located. Through a crawlspace in the basement of the building, it is possible to see where the foundation of the structure attaches directly to the stone itself. The building is situated on 110 acres on Lookout Mountain west of Golden, on what is termed as both mountain meadowland and rolling foothill terrain – if Boettcher used scenic views as part of his criteria in the purchase of the site, he undoubtedly was not disappointed. The area surrounding the mansion is Ponderosa pine forest, and filled with an enormous variety of birds and wildlife. Coyotes, fox, elk, mule deer, Swainson’s and Red-tailed hawks, Abert’s squirrels, and birds too numerous to mention were all spotted by the author during frequent visits to the lodge. Game trails are still visible throughout the acreage, many replaced by hiking trails established by the Nature Center itself, and the carriage road leading to the mansion is still visible near the original front entrance. Had a huge main gate not been erected at the entrance to the Nature Center and its property, one could drive by the site and not be aware the lodge even existed.

Boettcher Mansion, nominated in January of 1984 as a historic site on the National Register of Historic Places, was listed on the Register as “Lorraine Lodge (Charles Boettcher Summer Home),” Site Number 5JF.323.10 The nomination included 62 of the 110 surrounding acres, as well as six structures located on the property:

- The Boettcher Mansion itself
- The Carriage House, with caretaker’s residence on the second floor
- The gazebo, west of the main house
- The well house, east of the main house
- The barn, east of the well house
- The entrance gateposts
In addition to the Mansion itself, all the structures remain except for the barn; its exact location is not known save for the fact that it was east of the well house. The entrance gateposts, also designed by Fisher and Fisher, received extensive modification to allow for a larger amount of vehicular traffic, while the style remained in keeping with the previous design. Security requirements necessitated the addition of new iron gates in 1983. Charline had added servants’ quarters on the property in the 1960s – they were not included in the Register nomination; their removal made room for the new Nature Center located on the property.

The Fishers designed the Mansion in an irregular U-shape, with the south façade forming the base of the U, and the west portion forming the longer arm of the U. The south façade was originally the main entrance of the house, with a circular drive leading up to a large stone wall approximately ten feet in height. The home, however, did not sit hidden behind the massive wall but rather above it, making the wall appear more as the foundation than a protective structure. The effect gave the home the appearance of a rustic castle upon the hill. Natural fieldstone, quarried on site during construction and laid in an uncoursed rubble band, made up the entire south façade, making the home appear impenetrable. The owners have done very little through the years to alter any of the exterior, save the removal of some of the brickwork embedded in the patio, and a change in paint colors.

The north elevation, which is now being used as the main entryway, has undergone the most dramatic changes in the building’s structure. An enclosed lobby was added in 1986 to what had been the rear entrance to the home to accommodate its new usage as an events center. New walkways with heating elements beneath have been added, as well as a staircase leading up to the new entryway. A new slate roof was also added in 2006; although the original roof was wood, the slate roof retained the original look while being more durable. A new addition is being built, fully detachable, on the east side of the home. It will house a two-story kitchen and is intended to expand the catering capabilities of the mansion.

Extensive restoration of the interior of Boettcher Mansion was not necessary. The house was well taken care of through its 90-year history by family members as well as the county. At the time of Charline Breeden’s occupation, only basic alterations were done to “winterize” the house, including the removal of the screens in both the first- and second-floor “sleeping porches” and replacing them with glass, and changing paint colors in the rooms. After Jefferson County gained ownership of the building, however, more extensive work needed to be done in order to adapt the lodge to its current use as an events and conference center.

A brief description of the interior is necessary to identify the alterations. The lodge is made up of two stories, originally designed in the shape of an irregular U. The base of the U consists of the Grand Hall, a cavernous open area with an enormous stone fireplace, and two rooms on either side of the hall called the Buffet Room and the Piano Room. The area above these rooms is open. The longer side of the U’s arm (the east façade) consists of two bedrooms with an adjoining bathroom and sun room, formerly used as a sleeping porch. The upper floor of the east façade is a mirror image of the lower: two bedrooms, a bath, and another sun room. On the shorter
arm, or west façade, are the kitchen, pantry, front office, and storage area. Above this on the second floor are more offices, which were originally the servants’ rooms, and the staff bath.

From 1980 to 1989, the County approved and funded several much-needed improvements to the Mansion: the kitchen was remodeled to accommodate catering services, and the Carriage House adjoining the lodge was converted to provide additional meeting space. Perhaps the most striking alteration was the addition of a two-story lobby with gas fireplace at what was originally the back of the building, enclosing the small leaky porch and providing a much more dramatic entrance. 11

The most extensive alterations taking place under the current Capital Improvement Plan were made to the bedrooms, bathrooms, and kitchen: copper sinks and vanities accented with hand-made tile were installed in two of the bedrooms (to accommodate brides and grooms for wedding events); the bathrooms on both floors were enlarged and additional fixtures added to accommodate higher amounts of traffic; and stainless steel fixtures and a new dumbwaiter were installed in the kitchen. A wheelchair accessible bathroom with accompanying ramp was installed on the first floor to bring the building up to code. In the Piano and Buffet Rooms, plate glass windows were replaced with casement windows of Honduran mahogany, and in the Grand Hall, the previous flooring was replaced with new red oak.

The Carriage House has also had extensive alterations. Originally built to house Boettcher’s collection of vintage cars, the first floor now contains a kitchen, restrooms, and an open area large enough for meetings and conferences. The upstairs has housed caretakers since the Boettcher days, and contains two bedrooms, a living area, kitchen, bathroom, and mudroom, all currently being restored. The staff is in the process of hiring a new caretaker, and interestingly has as one of its candidates the previous caretaker from the 1960s when Charline’s family resided there.12 A major part of the cosmetic restoration process includes the installation of wallpaper true to the Arts and Crafts movement, along with interior paint in its respective palette, and the installation of new lighting fixtures and furnishings, all faithful to the Arts and Crafts style.

**Current Usage**

The Boettcher Mansion’s current use is three-fold: its main (and economic) function is as an events center - enormously popular as a wedding site - as well as a conference center for private and public use. Its lesser known function is as a home to the Colorado Arts and Crafts Society, which owns and exhibits an extensive collection of furniture appropriate to the Arts and Crafts period (1895-1920), as well as a browsing library for Arts and Crafts enthusiasts. While it is not known if Charles Boettcher truly intended to emphasize the Arts and Crafts style throughout the home, details unmistakably related to the style are apparent throughout the home: the Inglenook fireplace in the Grand Hall; the massive stone arches; the gargoyles in the notched timber beams; the thick wooden doors with heavy hardware; and the original wrought iron fixtures.13
Boettcher Mansion is also a noted historic destination, with guided tours offered to schools as well as individual groups. The mansion prides itself on being self-sustaining, with its social events and conference bookings bringing in sufficient revenue to support its own expenditures. Boettcher Mansion continues to be a place of historic significance, representing not only the style of an architectural movement, but the vision of a man.

Although (Charles) Boettcher and his family are renowned for their multiple contributions to the economic and social welfare of Colorado around the turn of the century, they’ve left behind an architectural legacy as well.
When I was a child, I had the privilege of being part of something special, though I did not realize it at the time. My family moved to Colorado when I was seven (1989), so that my father, Dr. Norman Provizer, could be a professor of political science at the Metropolitan State College of Denver. Prior to his arrival, the Golda Meir House made its arrival on the Auraria Campus and Dr. Provizer quickly became involved with the establishment, and indirectly so did the rest of the family. I remember being told that we were going to the Golda Meir House for an event, although it was never actually to go to just enjoy the happenings of the event. Instead I would walk to the house carrying hand soap, toilet paper, and towels, and my mother would be schlepping bagels, spread, serving platters, and plastic utensils (in fact, the basement still has a few of her serving pieces). It took a number of years (approximately 18) before I realized what my father had been doing. Although he was not involved with the Golda Meir House from the very start, Norman Provizer has influenced the scope of uses for a historic home. In this paper, I wish to explore the preservation of the Golda Meir House and how that effort has led to an innovative way to utilize a landmarked building.
Golda Meir — Her time in Denver, Colorado

“It was in Denver that my real education began” — Golda Meir, My Life

After serving as the Minister of Labor and Foreign Minister, Golda Meir (1898–1978) became Prime Minister of Israel on March 17, 1969. Meir became the third woman of the 20th century to emerge as a leader of a nation.

In 1906, she moved with her mother and sisters to join her father in America. The family settled in Milwaukee, Wisconsin. Golda entered school as a second grader, and quickly became the top student in her class. For Golda, education was an important part of life, and she planned to attend high school and become a teacher. Her parents were not supportive of this idea, because they would prefer their daughter marry. Instead of following her parent’s will, Golda, at age 14, ran away to Denver, Colorado to live with her sister Sheyna Korngold and her husband Shamai Korngold.

Though she only lived in Denver for a short time, it was an important time in her life. As she noted in her autobiography, My Life, it was in Denver that her real education began. Dr. Provizer pointed out that the house on Julian Street acted as an informal gathering place of Jewish intellectuals who would spend evenings drinking tea and discussing ideas. In her autobiography, Meir recalled being,

Fascinated by the people who used to drop into their home and sit around talking till late at night. I found the endless discussions about politics much more interesting than any of my lessons. Sheyna’s small apartment had become a kind of center in Denver for the Jewish immigrants from Russia. Some were anarchists, some were socialists, and some were socialist Zionists. These questioning young intellectuals all were uprooted and they all were passionately and vitally concerned with the major issues of the day… They drank cup after cup of tea with lemon. I blessed those rounds of tea because I managed to stay up most nights by volunteering to disinfect the cups afterward.1

Golda Meir insisted that the time spent in her sister’s house was pivotal in the development of her political philosophy. She also acknowledged that this time led to her decision to immigrate to Palestine.2 The house was not only a living place for Golda Meir, but importantly it was the site of the maturation of her personal and political growth.3

Her brief presence in Denver became the background of a movement to preserve her memory by struggling to preserve the house she once lived in.
The Denver House

“It was in Denver, at the home of her sister Sheyna, that she really cemented her whole concept and passion about Zionism”

— Ralph Martin, Golda Meir: The Romantic Years

The Golda Meir House moved to the Auraria Campus in September of 1988, after seven tumultuous years, including two separate moves from its original site, several threats of demolition, and several acts of vandalism.

In 1996, Owen Chariton, a former student at the University of Colorado Denver (UC Denver) who now teaches history at Metropolitan State College of Denver, did a case study of the Golda Meir House. He created a wonderful account of the journey of the house from its original location to the Auraria Campus. In 1981, Jean May, while doing research for a cookbook, learned of the address of the house that Golda lived in. At the time, the Denver Boys Club owned the building, which was scheduled for demolition to make way for new tennis courts. Bill Cope, executive director of the Boys Club, learned of the building’s history and agreed to work with neighborhood groups to save the structure. The Boys Club still wanted that property and it seemed as though the house could not be saved and kept in its same location. A group of concerned citizens formed the Committee to Save Golda’s Home (CSGH), a non-profit organization, and fundraising began. Jean May estimated that the cost of moving the house would be around $100,000. May strongly believed that the money could be raised, and the Denver City Council agreed to delay the demolition. Money was slow coming in and the Council told the CSGH that demolition of the house would occur if the house was not moved by March 1982. As the deadline approached, there was still a shortage of money. It looked as though the funds would not be raised in time. Fortunately, CSGH was able to strike a deal with the Audubon Society. The structure would be moved to Habitat Park, on Platte River Drive and West Exposition, and be used as offices and a nature museum, as well as serving as the Golda Meir Museum. Along with this agreement, the Denver City Council granted $30,000 in Community Development Funds to the CSGH. On Sunday, April 18, 1982 the house was relocated.

Sadly, a dispute quickly erupted between the Audubon Society and the CSGH over renovations costs. The city voted to void the contract with the Audubon Society, and the house sat in the park on steel girders and continued to deteriorate. The situation was further complicated by continual argument over whether or not the structure should remain in the park; Joe Shoemaker of the Greenway Foundation was the overseer of development in South Platte Valley. He discerned that the building was inappropriate, and should be removed immediately. It was then that the Rocky Mountain Chapter of the Paralyzed Veterans of America (PVA) became involved. The organization argued that the building should remain in its current location and be used as an activity center for the veterans and other handicapped groups. It was not until November of 1984 that the involved parties reached a new agreement on the
house. The City of Denver and the PVA signed a new lease on the house, which was to be moved a few blocks away to Sanderson Gulch Park at Louisiana Avenue and South Lipan Street. The City agreed to contribute $30,000 of the estimated $100,000 needed for the second move.

During this time two concerned Denver citizens, Mel and Esther Cohen became actively involved in the house’s dilemma. In 1983, the CSGH became the Golda Meir Memorial Association (GMMA) and the Cohens took charge of the situation. They worked hard to raise public awareness and funds for the Golda Meir house. In order to relocate the house, the Cohens and the GMMA were responsible for raising the additional $70,000 needed.5 A day after the agreement to relocate the house, an arsonist set the house ablaze. The interior suffered smoke damage, but it was determined that the structural integrity of the house was intact and that the home should be moved as planned. On Saturday, July 13, 1985, the house moved to its new location, 1236 West Louisiana Avenue. And in an ironic twist of fate, that same night it was the target of vandals once again. Though the incident was ugly it did create a national stage for the Golda Meir House and its predicament, and media groups, such as USA Today, ran articles about the house and showed photos of the defaced building.

The City of Denver began to think the house was a potential liability for them, especially in its weakened condition. With a change in administration, the support from the Mayor’s office diminished and, in January of 1987, the GMMA received an ultimatum that required meeting the stipulations of the Building Inspector’s Report on the house within thirty days, or else the house would be demolished.6 The Cohens and the GMMA filed a last-minute lawsuit in the Denver District Court on February 13, 1987, arguing that one of the members of the Board of Appeals had a prejudiced attitude against the house. The suit requested that the GMMA be given six months to bring the structure to code and find a proper, permanent location for the building. The lawsuit went in favor of the GMMA and demolition was postponed for the requested six months. The GMMA, in collaboration with the City and County of Denver’s Community Development Agency, actively sought proposals to develop and manage the house.

Luckily, the Auraria Higher Education Center (AHEC) looked into the possibility of bringing the structure to the Auraria campus. On October 1, 1987, the Auraria Foundation voted to authorize a feasibility study to see if the house should be relocated to the campus. In order to move the structure, the Foundation wanted to make sure the house had historical significance, was architecturally suitable for the Ninth Street Historic Park, and that there was the ability to gain funds to help with restoration. Although the deadline called for moving the home in October, the GMMA filed another lawsuit and were granted an additional ten months so that the Auraria Foundation could make a decision.

During this time, Larry Ambrose was the Development Director of AHEC and took the lead role in the feasibility study. He drafted the study in which he discussed the importance of relocating Denver homes to the campus to help save them from demolition. He then focused on the Golda Meir house. He concluded the building...
met the requirements of the Foundation. Ambrose estimated the costs for moving, remodeling, and landscaping of the house to be $160,000. He asserted that if half the sum of the project could be raised within a month’s time, the Foundation Board would approve of the project and provide the permanent location of the house.

The GMMA, who had previously struggled with the Jewish community to help with the project, continued to set meetings and ask for financial assistance. Finally, after many years and ten meetings, the Allied Jewish Federation agreed to pledge $10,000. Owen Chariton suggested that this agreement was the first major show of public support for the house and led to additional financial supports. The pledge from the Allied Jewish Federation “broke the ice, and led to additional pledges including a personal check from Mayor Federico Peña, and a check from the Gates Foundation.”7 With intensive campaigning, the GMMA raised the money by the June 1 deadline and graciously sold the house to the Auraria Foundation for ten dollars.

Though the Auraria Foundation now owned the house, there was still concern over moving it for a third time. The structure had been sitting, neglected, in the Sanderson Gulch Park, and there was doubt that it could be moved successfully. However, on Sunday, September 25, 1988, the house was moved to its new location. Chariton delightfully noted that “at 2:00 a.m … the house inched its way north on Kalamath Street. The Cohens and other dedicated members of the GMMA followed closely and retrieved the bricks that fell from the back wall.”8

With the house settled, the Auraria Foundation submitted its application to the Denver Landmark Preservation Commission in 1994 (more than 10 years after the house was first noticed). With the help of Rosemary Fetter, a history student at UC Denver and AHEC staff member, the structure was landmarked. Interestingly, on the application, only the historical importance criterion was checked and discussed. Yet, without noticeable architectural and geographic importance, the Golda Meir house received landmark status. The Auraria Foundation immediately set out to restore the inside of the building. It is important to note that prior to the grant request there was significant work done on the restoration of the exterior of the house. As noted in the State Historical Fund application, numerous contributors, both private and public, gave money toward the renovation of the exterior. Approximately $130,000 was raised and spent on stabilizing the house, repairing the foundation and exterior walls, replacing the roof, landscaping the perimeter and painting the trim.

The Auraria Foundation hoped to receive money to restore the interior of the Golda Meir house and enable it to open as a museum, conference center and academic facility. Work needed to be done on the walls, ceiling, floor, interior finishes and mechanical and electrical work.9 In 1994, the Golda Meir house received a $95,000 grant from the State Historical Fund to complete interior restoration of the house. Mary Ferrell, the Executive Director of the Auraria Foundation, stated, “It’s particularly appropriate that this house is here on the Auraria Campus. Golda Meir had few resources, yet she came to this simple home in order to complete her education and went on to change the world. Perhaps others will be inspired to do the same.”10
On Colorado Day, 1997, Governor Roy Romer dedicated the new Golda Meir House Museum and Political Leadership Center, but the museum and center began long before this date, in what turns out to be a somewhat complex and confusing story. In 1981, State Senator Dennis Gallagher went to the original location of the Golda Meir House. He recalled, “The first day I saw the place, I crawled under the construction fence to go in.”11 While inside the house, former Senator Gallagher snooped around and found many relics that later became a part of the museum. “Under the many layers of paint,” he noticed on the doorpost, a mezuzah, which he believed to be an original fixture of the Golda house.12 At the very beginning, people involved in the plight of the Golda Meir House intended for half of the structure to be used as a museum, and in 1996, it was finally and officially accomplished.

The museum is located on the 1606 side of the duplex where Golda lived. The living room and bedroom act as exhibit space, and the kitchen and bathroom have been restored in a manner consistent with its appearance when Golda lived in the house. Dr. Norman Provizer, professor of political science and director of the Golda Meir Center, points out that the museum contains artifacts found in the house during renovation. The photos on display are from a variety of sources, including family, and the University of Wisconsin, Milwaukee Library and Archives. From years of deterioration and vandalism, little of the original features and furniture remain. The only original piece of furniture in the house is the bathtub. The House contains representational furniture from the period, purchased with contributions raised over the years,13 plus a period kitchen stove on loan from the Colorado Historical Society.

Members of the Auraria community felt that there should be programming connected to the Golda Meir House and Museum. Dr. Provizer thought that a program would bring additional life to the house and get the student population involved, and in 1989 he proposed to start a center as a program of Metro State run by Auraria.

On December 1, 2007, for the first time in my life, I sat down with my father and asked him about his involvement with the Golda Meir House. He started by emphasizing that at the time there was no money, just an idea. So, instead of worrying about the financial aspects, he just thought about the possibility of a center as a learning facility for the students. Being in connection with the Golda Meir House, Dr. Provizer knew that the center should have something to do with her. He went through many possibilities and finally decided to focus on leadership, in the broadest sense. “We went with leadership because it was practical. There was already a Women’s Center; the University of Denver has numerous programs in Jewish studies and Middle-East Centers. It seemed foolish to try to be another program in one of those areas.”14 So they came up with the Golda Meir Center for Political Leadership.
The purpose of the Center is to expand public understanding of the important role of leadership at all levels of political and civic life, from community affairs to transnational relations. He also wanted the Center to provide programming that tied into the historic home, and represented Golda Meir. Dr Provizer commented that, “Golda comes from poor country, and was twice an emigrant and still moves on to become a prime minister.” This lays the theme in purpose. “Leadership does not have boundaries connected to class, gender, race or religion. And that it can emerge from most unlikely of places.”

With an exciting prospect for programming, Dr. Provizer was challenged to find the best way to tie in the Center with the house. He stated:

We thought the best thing to do was to work cooperatively with AHEC and the museum and conference room. We thought that if we could raise money, Metro State could buy the garden level of the house and that would be the space for the Golda Center. It makes things a little complicated because the museum and conference room are run by Auraria and the basement is run by the Center. So we ended up with a basement, but still needed money, because the interior of the house was a mess.

Luckily, Mort Perry, a part-time professor at the time, was able to donate money in order to start the renovation of the basement. The money went toward simple things, like a ceiling, a rug, and wallboard to make an actual physical space for the Center. At the same time, the Center decided to work closely with AHEC to get money for house renovations. Instead of focusing on just the Center, Dr. Provizer thought it would be best to get the house together as a whole. Although the basement was not completed, Dr. Provizer did not wait to start with programming. “We had a name and a basement, and that was it,” Dr. Provizer recalled. “We didn’t ask for money. We didn’t want to sit around and wait to see if it was financially possible. We wanted to start a track record and perhaps from that people would see what we did and get involved financially.” Before the renovations were completed, the Golda Meir Center for Political Leadership hosted a range of speakers, “operating under the assumption that a breakthrough would occur.” Dr. Provizer remembered with a smile:

There was nothing in the basement. We were on a constant scavenger hunt. Whenever we heard that a department was getting rid of things, we would call them up and go over and take what we needed. We would walk through campus carrying tables. When Vartan’s Jazz Club went out of business, we arranged to buy the chairs at a very good price. So we had chairs and tables; they didn’t match, and those chairs were uncomfortable. We also picked up a podium from somewhere.
The lack of continuous financial support has in no way deterred the Center from running numerous activities, but as Dr. Provizer notes, “everything is done with great concern of finances.” In continuation of working cooperatively with AHEC, the Center, and specifically Dr. Provizer, helps support the Golda House Museum by working with tour groups that come to visit. He also works with AHEC on outreach programs, to continue getting the word out about this small house and all it has to offer.

The Golda Meir Center for Political Leadership also brings in a variety of speakers to cover a wide range of subjects. Because the department works with little financial resources, Dr. Provizer sees who is speaking at other events and calls to see if the speaker has a little time to stop by the campus and talk with the students. Most often, Dr. Provizer checks to see who is planning on speaking at the Tattered Cover. He comments that, “this process has worked surprisingly well.” Recently the Center started hosting conferences. In 2000, it hosted the annual international meeting of the Association of Third World Studies. The Center has also been the site of conferences on topics including: Cultural and Political Leadership in Africa; American Indian Leadership; Reparations in America; the United Nations Declaration of Human Rights at 50; Native Americans Today; and Cuban-Jewish Artists.

Early on, the Center decided to focus on the arts and humanities as well as politics and public affairs. The Center not only brings in speakers on political issues, but also works to bring in people from the humanities. The basement has been known to be a temporary place for artists to exhibit their work. Norman Provizer notes that this side of the Center officially honors Golda Meir’s husband, Morris Myerson. Morris had the sensibility and sensitivity of art, which Golda admitted she lacked. The love of arts continues in her family. Her son, Menachem, is a cellist, and her daughter Sara married a potter. Neither child is involved in politics.

In 1998, to honor the centennial of Golda’s birth, the Center created an annual leadership award. The award is given to those who are significant players not only in politics and public affairs, but in the arts as well. The award itself is made up of a piece of the original floorboard of the Denver house and inscribed with words of Meir, “I can honestly say that I was never affected by the question of the success of an undertaking. If I felt it was the right thing to do, I was for it regardless of the possible outcome.” The award, to date, has been presented to:

- Director Steven Spielberg and choreographer/producer Debbie Allen (1998)
- Trumpeter and Pulitzer Prize-winning composer Wynton Marsalis (1999)
- United States Senator and former First Lady Hillary Rodham Clinton (2000)
- Member of the Little Rock Nine and recipient of the Congressional Gold Medal Carlotta Walls LaNier (2001)
- United States Supreme Court Justice Ruth Bader Ginsburg (2002)
- Actress Tovah Feldshuh, the star of the Broadway play Golda’s Balcony (2003)
• United States Senator John McCain (2004)
• Presidential Medal of Honor recipient Paul Rusesabagina, subject of the film Hotel Rwanda (2005)
• Former Secretary of State Madeleine Albright (2006)
• Jazz vocalist Diane Reeves (2007)

The Golda Meir Center has also become a resource for those interested in Golda Meir. Lifetime television did a documentary on Golda Meir and contacted the house to gain information and find materials. When the documentary was completed, the materials gathered by Lifetime, and a copy of the final product were given to the house. Tova Feldshuh, the actress who played Golda Meir in Golda's Balcony on Broadway, visited the house and Dr. Provizer to ask questions about Golda and to get a better sense of her character.

Dr. Provizer also receives phone calls from individuals or companies who want to use a picture of Golda for advertisement purposes and want permission to use the image. Dr. Provizer does not have authorization to release images, but will refer requests to the Meir family. Dr. Provizer acknowledges that he receives a lot of calls on this matter. “I get calls from schools who want to change the name to Meir. Recently, I received a message from a man who is starting a chain of coffee shops in New York and would like to call it Golda’s and use an image of her.”23 In this sense, the Center has become a liaison between the Meir family and the public.

With the growing number of speakers and events, Dr. Provizer maintains that the primary audience of the Center is the students. “When we set out to create programming as a part of the Golda House our focus was on our students, and while the events are generally open to the public, the Center does not make a serious effort to publicize outside of the student body.”24

Although the tumultuous days of the Golda Meir House are over, and my mom and I no longer need to bring food and paper products to the house, there are still operational issues that need to be ironed out. Dr. Provizer would like to see the Golda Meir House Museum and Center for Political Leadership become more actively engaged in fundraising and community outreach projects. He also hopes that the Center will become directly involved with the curriculum at Metro State by creating a leadership minor within the political science department. Dr. Provizer, however, acknowledges “the difficulty lies in that the Golda House is not at the forefront of anyone’s mind. The people involved with the house have other primary jobs and responsibilities, and sometimes the house falls by the wayside.”25 Even with these operational obstacles, Dr. Provizer, in cooperation with Metro State and AHEC, has instituted an innovative model for educational programming, inspired by a historic house.
Mr. Catlin has contrived to bring before our eyes the fullness of the life of the Western Indians…. The galleries illustrative of national character and antiquities which are to be found in London, Paris, Florence, and other cities, have been collected by the power of great kings; and the outlay of immense treasure…. This is the work of a single individual, a man without fortune and without patronage, who created it with his own mind and hand, without aid and even against countenance; and who sustained the lonely toils of eight years in a region fearful and forbidding beyond conceptions of civilized life, in order to present his countrymen with a work which he knew they would one day value as the most remarkable thing they owned…. He may point to his magnificent collection, which now receives the admiration of every eye, and say with honest pride, “Alone I did it!” (Philadelphia Saturday Courier, 1848)¹

¹ George Catlin: Artist and Advocate of the American Indian

Evelyn Rae Stool Waldron

Evelyn Rae Stool Waldron is studying for her MA in Western History and she intends to develop her paper into her master’s thesis about nineteenth century western artists. George Catlin has been an interest for the Stool family for forty years and Evelyn would like to dedicate this article to the memory of her father, Sylvan E. Stool, M.D. She wrote this paper for the Summer 2007 class, Western Art and Architecture.
This article from the *Saturday Courier* described George Catlin’s Indian Gallery, an extraordinary collection of paintings that depicted the Indians of the Great Plains. The paintings in the collection included portraits of tribal leaders and their families, Indian ceremonies, buffalo hunts, villages and landscapes of the frontier. Indian artifacts such as clothing, baskets, pipes, weapons and a twelve-foot tipi also belonged to the collection.

George Catlin was an artist and advocate of the American Indian. Painting was the means of his communication, documenting Indian culture was his mission. Catlin believed the Indians and their society would vanish and determined to paint them in their unspoiled western lands, “thus snatching from oblivion what could be saved for the benefit of posterity, and perpetuating it, as a fair and just monument, to the memory of a truly lofty and noble race.” He hoped to secure patronage for his undertaking, sure that the government would want to support him. Failing to secure support, Catlin pushed on all the same. George Catlin took it upon himself to advocate for the Indians, to learn their customs and document their culture before they disappeared forever. He was not predestined to become an artist or an ethnographer – where did he come from and what happened?

George Catlin was born on July 26, 1796, to Putnam and Polly Catlin in Wilkes-Barre, Pennsylvania. Putnam Catlin, who had fought in the American Revolution, was an attorney. George was the fifth of fourteen children; he grew up on farms in the Susquehanna Valley and spent his days fishing, hunting and digging up Indian artifacts in the fields. Writing about his childhood in later years Catlin wrote, “The plows in my father’s fields were daily turning up Indian skulls or Indian bones, and Indian flint arrow-heads.” These artifacts were likely to be remnants of the Wyoming massacre of 1778. British Loyalists and Iroquois raided settlements in northern Pennsylvania, killing and kidnapping American patriots. Indians abducted Catlin’s mother Polly, at the age of seven, and his grandmother during the battle but did not hurt them. His mother’s stories about the kindness of these Indians may have started to influence the young George Catlin.

Putnam Catlin took responsibility for the education of his boys and encouraged them to follow his lead and study law. Charles, the oldest brother, received his law education in Wilkes-Barre. Although George was showing signs of artistry, Putnam did not see painting as a career and persuaded George to go to law school. George entered the Litchfield Law School in Connecticut in July of 1817 at the age of twenty-one. A month later Putnam wrote to George on August 4, 1817, “You are now placed more favorably for study & the improvement of your mind than you could be at any other place in the United States. And the encouragement given me in your letter that you are resolved to profit what you can by it, is pleasing to me.” Putnam also advised him to avoid allurements of vice by instantly thinking of him, home and his siblings to escape such temptations. Financial constraints limited George’s education in the law to one year, but he was admitted to the bar in Connecticut in September of 1818 and soon after in Wilkes-Barre.

After practicing law for a few years, George Catlin sold his law library, bought paints and brushes, and left Wilkes-Barre for Philadelphia to pursue a career as an
artist. George exhibited a talent for portraiture, specifically miniatures painted on ivory. In the days before photography, miniature portraits were the only way to carry images of loved ones in a pocket or case. The Pennsylvania Academy of Fine Arts admitted Catlin in 1824. After two years, he moved to New York, was admitted to the National Academy of Design in 1827, and continued to paint portraits. Catlin’s first major commission came in 1828; he traveled to Albany to paint a portrait of Governor De Witt Clinton, and there he met Clara Gregory.

George Catlin and Clara Gregory were married on May 10, 1828, much to the delight of his family. Putnam made the mistake of thinking that marriage would settle George down, writing to George on May 30, 1828,

_I will anticipate seeing you very happy as a husband, with a wife looking over your shoulder, encouraging and admiring the arts, rather than leading you by the heart-strings into the fashionable mazes of luxury and dissipation. You will now be more happy and composed, what is the world now to you? In your room, and in your little parlor by your own fireside you will find contentment and solace, no where else._

However, marrying and starting a family did not settle George down; he was more ambitious than ever. Witnessing the visit to Philadelphia of a delegation of western Indians, their noble and classic beauty captivated him. He was inspired. He would paint Indians.

During the years 1830 to 1836, Catlin traveled and painted Indians. In 1830, Catlin headed west for St. Louis, meeting with William Clark, former explorer, now Superintendent of Indian Affairs. Catlin painted the tribes close to St. Louis for two years. On March 26, 1832, Catlin boarded the steamboat Yellow Stone, bound for the upper region of the Missouri River. Catlin disembarked at Fort Union, spending a month there painting various tribes. By mid July, he pushed off in a canoe to descend the Missouri, stopping at the American Fur Company post in Fort Clark for a month. By September, Catlin was at Fort Leavenworth, staying again for about a month and painting local tribes.

Catlin’s first trip into Indian Territory proved to be very productive; he produced about 170 paintings. His technique of defining the facial features while simply outlining the figure allowed him to work quickly; he finished the paintings in St. Louis. Many artists used similar methods, as traveling with full canvases on horseback or in canoes was very difficult. Catlin developed a trust and friendship with the Mandan Indians, who granted him unprecedented access to their religious ceremonies and sacred places. He was the first white man to record the Mandan ceremony of O-kee-pa, a rite-of-passage torture ceremony, and to see the sacred pipestone quarry. His final expedition was in 1836. Catlin had painted more than six hundred paintings and had collected thousands of artifacts. His paintings of the Mandan Indians were significant, as most of them died of smallpox in two months of 1837. Of the 1600 tribal members, only thirty-one survived the epidemic.

Elizabeth Wind Catlin, the first of four children, was born to Clara and George Catlin in 1837. Three more children would follow, Clara Catlin born in 1839, Louise
Catlin in 1841 and George Catlin, Jr. in 1843. With a growing family, George was continually worried about finances. In 1838, he tried to sell his Indian Gallery to Congress, who rejected it. While Catlin’s paintings showed the Indians to be beautiful, noble and peaceful people, Congress was not interested in such depiction. The Indian Removal Act was passed in 1830 giving the President power to negotiate with Indians east of the Mississippi for their land in exchange for land in the west. The Indians protested, and some Americans saw this act as brutal and unfair. Congress was concerned that Catlin’s portrait of Osceola, a Seminole chief, painted while Osceola and his warriors were imprisoned on South Carolina and days before the chief died, would create sympathy toward the Indians. The preservation of the Mandan culture in Catlin’s paintings and writings was valuable as the contamination of smallpox spread to the Mandan and other tribes by white fur traders, which was another secret Congress preferred to keep. Congress was not a customer in 1838, or later in 1846 and 1852.

Putnam Catlin was sure that George had been in the right place at the right time and would profit from these unfortunate incidents, noting that George, “was fortunate to get the portrait of Osceola just before his death, he has made a perfect lithograph of him …which will be profitable to him. He mourns the dreadful destiny of the Indian tribes by the smallpox, which report is verified, but unquestionable that shocking calamity will greatly increase the value of his enterprise & his works.”

Without patronage from the government, George had to find other means of financial support. This forced him to exhibit the Indian Gallery with a lecture series that evolved to include Indian performers. Catlin introduced the first Wild West show, although later he was criticized as a huckster for exploiting American Indians. Several died while in his care.

Catlin exhibited the Indian Gallery on the East Coast from 1837 to 1839. Over one hundred and forty paintings were displayed and the reviews were good. James Hall wrote enthusiastically in the Cincinnati Western Monthly Magazine, “We are glad that we have a native artist, who instead of carrying his talents to a foreign land, and blunting his sensibilities by the study of artificial models, has had the good sense to train his taste in the school of nature, and the patriotism to employ his genius on subjects connected to his own country.”

However, interest in the Indian Gallery waned, and Catlin set his sights on audiences across the Atlantic. In January of 1840, he arrived in London with eight tons of freight. The Indian Gallery included 485 paintings, a Crow tipi and several thousand items of Indian costume, weapons and utensils. On February 1, the exhibit opened to the public and was a “decided hit.” Catlin was thrilled with the response to the Gallery and his lectures; finally, he had some success. Unfortunately, he spent the admission income as quickly as it came in on overhead expenses. Clara and two of their daughters arrived in June, just as the attendance was dropping off. The exhibition never did more than break even and he made plans to take the exhibition to France. He added staged recreations of tribal dances and songs to the lectures, initially with white men dressed as Indians, and then later with Ojibwa and Iowa warriors. He published Letters and Notes on the Manners, Customs, and Conditions of the North American Indians, Written during Eight Years’ Travel (1832 – 1839) amongst the Wildest Tribes
of Indians in North America in 1841, financing it himself. The British and American press both wrote enthusiastically about Letters and Notes but, despite the favorable notices, it did not sell. Forced to have a publisher distribute it, Catlin’s hopes for any chance of profit vanished.

Taking the Gallery and his family to France, Catlin again had initial success. Good reviews in the press, royal audiences with King Louis Philippe, and a commitment of gallery space in the Louvre were all promising. However, tragedy struck in the form of illness and death, and the French revolution of 1848. His wife Clara died in Paris of pneumonia in 1845 and George sent her body to New York for burial. After her death, George devoted his time, when not painting, to his children. Tragedy struck the family again when a typhoid epidemic hit Paris in 1847, and George, Jr. died at the age of four. His body was also sent to New York, to be buried next to his mother. Catlin wrote of this in his publication, Catlin’s Notes in Europe, “The remains of this dear little fellow were sent to New York, as a lovely flower to be planted by the grave of his mother, and thus were my pleasures and peace in Paris ended.”

King Louis Philippe had commissioned fifteen paintings from Catlin. However, deposed by the revolution in 1848, King Louis Philippe and Queen Marie Amélie left the country. Consequently, the king never paid for the paintings. Catlin and his three daughters returned to London and Catlin gave lectures wherever he could find an audience. Again, he tried to persuade Congress to purchase the Indian Gallery because he believed his collection belonged in America. Poor business decisions had made it necessary for him to borrow against the Gallery and he was concerned he would have to sell it to a collector in Europe and it would be lost to America forever. In 1852, Congress again voted against purchasing the Gallery, the bill was defeated by two votes. George was in desperate straits; far over his head in debt, creditors had him arrested and sent to debtor’s prison. Clara’s brother, Dudley Gregory, came to London to take the three little girls back to America. Joseph Harrison, Jr., a Philadelphia businessman, purchased the Indian Gallery, quietly paid off Catlin’s debts, and shipped the Gallery to Philadelphia. George left London, returned to Paris and then departed for South America.

While in his personally imposed exile, Catlin reproduced much of the Indian Gallery from memory. These paintings, called Catlin’s Indian Cartoons, included hundreds of paintings of North and South American Indian life. Late in 1870, George Catlin returned to the United States to be reunited with his daughters. He opened an exhibit of the Cartoon Collection in New York City, ever hopeful that Congress would purchase his collection. However, there was little interest in Indian paintings, attendance was poor, the exhibition closed and the paintings were put in storage.

Joseph Henry, Director of the Smithsonian Institution and an old friend of Catlin’s from Albany, invited him to hang his collection in the National Museum in Washington. He moved to Washington in 1871 and arranged his cartoon collection in a gallery at the Smithsonian, sure that members of Congress would see his paintings, understand their value and acquire them for the country. Given a room in one of the towers of the Smithsonian, Catlin spent his days in the gallery waiting for members
of Congress to visit. This was as close as he came to his life’s dream. In October 1872, Joseph Henry wrote to Dudley Gregory that Catlin was not well. He stopped working, shipped his paintings to Jersey City, and followed them there to be with his daughters during his final illness. In his article, Kipling Buis wrote, “One account states that he had Bright’s disease, another that he had much pain but suffered in silence as an Indian might.”10 His greatest anxiety was to know what would happen to his Indian Gallery. Catlin died on December 23, 1872, age seventy-seven. He was buried next to his wife and son in Greenwood Cemetery in Brooklyn, New York.

George Catlin’s intentions for his Indian Gallery had been the documentation of a vanishing people. In 1824, when Catlin witnessed the Indian delegation visit to Philadelphia, the status of Native Americans as citizens of the United States was tenuous and confused; the condition of their civil rights could be described as hypocrisy at best. Mrs. Frances Trollop, a visitor to the United States in 1827, made the following observation,

They inveigh against the governments of Europe, because, as they say, they favour the powerful and oppress the weak. You may hear this declaimed upon in Congress, roared out in taverns, discussed in every drawing-room, satirized upon the stage, nay, even anathematized from the pulpit: listen to it, and then look at them at home; you will see them with one hand hoisting the cap of liberty, and with the other flogging their slaves. You will see them one hour lecturing their mob on the indefeasible rights of man, and the next driving from their homes the children of the soil, whom they have bound themselves to protect by the most solemn treaties.11

Mrs. Trollop referred to slavery and the removal of the Native Americans from their lands as two of America’s darkest moments.

Catlin’s painting of an Assiniboine warrior illustrated the destiny of the Indians and the story of Wi-Jun-Jon, the warrior, mirrored Catlin’s experience. The Assiniboine were one of the tribes making their home on the upper Missouri when Catlin first encountered them in 1830. In December of 1831, he painted his first portrait of Wi-Jun-Jon, “dressed in his native costume, which was classic and exceedingly beautiful.”12 Selected to represent his tribe, Wi-Jun-Jon joined a delegation visiting Washington in the winter of 1832. Catlin was in St. Louis when the delegation passed through on its way to Washington. While in St. Louis, Wi-Jun-Jon reluctantly consented to have his portrait painted. The painting depicted a serious, distinguished warrior, dressed in goatskin decorated with porcupine quills and scalps. In Washington, Wi-Jun-Jon acted as a spokesman for both his tribe and the delegation; he was the first to speak, the first to shake the President’s hand, and the first to attract the ladies. He saw the cities of the East, the forts, society and art.

In the spring, the delegation returned to Missouri. Catlin joined the delegation in St. Louis as they returned to their own home on the steamboat Yellow Stone. As the steamboat departed, Wi-Jun-Jon appeared on deck dressed in a military uniform of blue broadcloth trimmed with gold lace and epaulets, presented to him by the
President. He wore boots, a sword, white kid gloves, and a high-crowned beaver hat decorated with a red feather. A large silver medal hung from his neck, and he carried a blue umbrella and a fan. He had also received a gift of a keg of whiskey. Catlin described the condition of the warrior, “In this fashion was poor Wi-Jun-Jon metamorphosed, on his return from Washington; in this plight was he strut ting and whistling Yankee Doodle, about the deck of the steamer that was wending its way up the mighty Missouri, and taking him to his native land again …”

Wi-Jun-Jon arrived home and shared the story of his travels with the members of his tribe. His stories and observations were so far beyond the comprehension of his people that they determined he must be a liar. “He has been, among the whites, who are great liars, and all he has learned is to come home and tell lies.” Unfortunately, the other member of the tribe who made the journey with Wi-Jun-Jon died on the way home, and was unable to verify his stories. Once an upstanding, respected warrior, Wi-Jun-Jon developed a new reputation, one of a crazy person due to the astonishing tales he told. Fear of his abilities became great and one of the young men of the tribe assassinated him.

Catlin wrote of Wi-Jun-Jon’s fate, “thus ended the days and the greatness, and the pride and hopes of Wi-Jun-Jon, the Pigeon’s Egg Head, a warrior and a brave of the valiant Assiniboine, who traveled eight thousand miles to see the President, and all the great cities of the civilized world; and who, for telling the truth, and nothing but the truth, was, after he got home, disgraced and killed for a wizard.” Catlin used Wi-Jun-Jon’s tale to tell a story of ignorance and intolerance. People often do not believe what they do not understand; the Indian culture was new and exotic when Catlin started to paint in 1830. Catlin wrote in Letters and Notes, Letter No. 1,

*I am fully convinced, from long familiarity with these people, that the Indian’s misfortune has consisted chiefly in our ignorance of their true native character and disposition, which has always held us at a distrustful distance from them; inducing us to look upon them in no other light than that of a hostile foe, and worthy only of that system of continued warfare and abuse that has been for ever waged against them.*

His detractors accused Catlin of romanticizing the Indians, of downplaying their savage nature. Catlin disputed the popular perception of the adjective savage when he argued,

*The very use of the word savage, as it is applied in its general sense, I am inclined to believe is an abuse of the word, and the people to whom it is applied. The word, in its true definition, means no more than wild or wild man; and a wild man may have been endowed by his Maker with all the humane and noble traits that inhabit the heart of a tame man. Our ignorance and dread or fear of these people, therefore, have given a new definition to the adjective; and nearly the whole civilized world apply the word savage, as expressive of the most ferocious, cruel, and murderous character that can be described.*
Catlin, like Wi-Jun-Jon, returned to his native land with stories, paintings and artifacts that challenged the imagination. His decision to leave his law practice and then his established art career to become the historian of the American Indian was as brave as Wi-Jun-Jon’s participation in the Indian Delegation. Catlin documented a final look at American Indians living on their own lands, celebrating their own religion and way of life prior to contact with Euro-American culture. He painted each person as an individual, with respect for their humanity; he did not paint them as stereotyped Indians. His portraits captured their beauty and documented the ethnology of the Indian tribes. He endeavored to paint and record all aspects of the Indian society.

The religious ceremonies of the Mandan Indians were so brutal that some questioned the veracity of the paintings and accused Catlin of embellishing the truth. Henry Schoolcraft, congressional historian in 1853, indicated that he thought Catlin’s description of the ritual was false. Catlin believed this might have given Congress a reason to reject the purchase of his Indian Gallery. He enlisted support from Prince Maximilian of Neuwied, who had followed Catlin’s route to Fort Union in 1833. Maximilian and Catlin were of like mind in reference to the fate of the Indians, and he substantiated Catlin’s description of the O-kee-pa ceremony. Prince Maximilian’s credibility confirmed Catlin’s observations, unlike Wi-Jun-Jon’s unfortunate experience, since his traveling companion died on the way home from Washington.

Thomas Donaldson, a collector for the Smithsonian, became aware of the Catlin Gallery through his friendship with John McIlvain, a taxidermist in Philadelphia. Mrs. Harrison gave some of the Catlin artifacts to McIlvain, who was himself a collector of North American Indian artifacts, when he inspected the collection for her in 1872, after Catlin’s death. Following the death of Joseph Harrison, Jr., his widow, Sarah Poulterer Harrison, donated the collection to the Smithsonian in May of 1879. After twenty-seven years of storage in Mr. Harrison’s boiler plant in Philadelphia, the Gallery was at home in the Smithsonian. Donaldson was given the task of packing up the collection and sending it to Washington. “Donaldson undertook a great task; the materials were estimated to weigh 3500 pounds. Donaldson reported that he packed up 450 paintings and much buckskin and fur.”18 The Smithsonian exhibited the collection in 1886 and then dispersed the items to various locations and museums in the Smithsonian. The size of the collection may have necessitated this; the bulk of it was contained in the Hall of Arts and Industries.

In September 2002, curators reassembled George Catlin’s Indian Gallery, and it is again open to the public at the Smithsonian’s Renwick Gallery. The collection hangs in the Grand Salon exhibited in the same manner as on its tours in England and Europe. The Indian Gallery is now on view indefinitely. Catlin’s Cartoon Collection remained in the family until 1909, when Elizabeth Catlin loaned it to the American Museum of Natural History (AMNH) in New York. The AMNH purchased the Collection the following year.

Catlin’s publications described cultures that would have been lost to future generations. An advocate on behalf of the American Indian, George Catlin had the foresight to document their cultures at a time in American history when the government
was trying to dehumanize Indians in an effort to deal with them politically. He painted during a period when Indians received treatment as a historical phenomenon that would pass into history just as other ancient civilizations had. He undertook this enormous task at his own expense, without a patron or government support. Having to make a living, he had no other choice than to market the Indian Gallery through exhibitions of his work and lectures about the Indians. Detractors criticized him and referred to him as a huckster for staging Wild West shows, but his real desire was to educate people about American Indian culture. He was really very much ahead of his time; museums of the day did not include such multi-media events.

The impact of George Catlin’s work is far-reaching. The Indian Gallery is a study of a people, as well as a work of art, and his paintings are an important cultural and ethnographic visual record of the indigenous peoples of the United States. The Indian Gallery is finally at home at the Smithsonian American Art Museum, exhibited in the Renwick Gallery, as Catlin would have wanted it to be; a lasting history of the Native American cultures “…saved for the benefit of posterity, and perpetuating it, as a fair and just monument, to the memory of a truly lofty and noble race.” – George Catlin^{19}
PATRIOTIC UNION SONGS
of the U.S. Civil War

Lance C. Westfall

The Confederate General Robert E. Lee once stated, “I don’t believe we can have an army without music.”¹ This sentiment would not only represent the Confederacy, but that of the Union as well in the United States Civil War. The American Civil War inspired countless war hymns, marches, and melodic songs, designed to entertain the populace and inspire the armies. Each side of the war had composers and poets that would write catchy lyrics and pleasant melodies that were easy for all to sing, and many times, if the tune was popular enough, it would be adopted for both the Union and Confederacy. In some songs, whether written to be patriotic or political, the composer of the piece would try to convey the ideologies and emotions of the time that would rally a nation in one voice. Soldiers would use the songs to march in unison, build morale and to fight off the boredom between battles. During the U.S. Civil War, songs such as: *The First Gun is Fired! May God Protect the Right!*, *Battle-Cry of Freedom*; and *The Battle Hymn of the Republic* reflected not only the patriotism of the Union, but also gave meaning to the war and a sense of righteousness to the soldiers and the population in the North.
There were many composers of music and song during the Civil War, but one of the more distinguished composers was George F. Root. George Root was an educator and publisher of music. It is not certain if he was or was not an abolitionist, but he was a very sincere patriot who strongly opposed the dissolution of the Union. Root was responsible for at least 28 pro-Union songs such as *The First Gun is Fired!* *May God Protect the Right!* and *The Battle-Cry of Freedom*. In 1897, Charles A. Dana, the editor of the *New York Sun*, wrote a commentary about Root stating, “George Root did more to preserve the Union than a great many brigadier generals, and quite as much as some brigades.”

Root would later write in his autobiography, *The Story of a Musical Life*, “At every event, and in all the circumstances that followed, where I thought a song would be welcome, I wrote one.” This must have been his motivation on at least two different occasions, the first being on 12 April 1861. Shortly after hearing the news of the shelling of Fort Sumter in Charleston, South Carolina that signaled the beginning of the war, he penned his first patriotic song, *The First Gun is Fired!* *May God Protect the Right!* The song appeared in print four days later. President Lincoln’s second call for troops in the summer of 1862 inspired the second song of note, *The Battle-Cry of Freedom*.

*The First Gun is Fired!* *May God Protect the Right!* is a rousing call to the free-born men of the North to rise in the name of sacred freedom’s right and preserve the Union. In the first verse, Root implores the listener with the questions:

\[
\text{Shall the glorious Union our fathers made,} \\
\text{By ruthless hands be sunder’d?} \\
\text{And we of freedom’s sacred rights} \\
\text{By trait’rous foes be plunder’d?}
\]

He then puts forth a rallying cry in the chorus:

\[
\text{Arise, arise, arise!} \\
\text{And gird ye for the fight} \\
\text{And let our watch-word ever be} \\
\text{“May God protect the right.”}
\]

The fervor expressed in the chorus clearly conveyed the sentiment that the cause of the North was a righteous one. A report of a mass meeting where 10,000 people sang the song after taking the oath of fealty for the Union confirmed the song’s effectiveness in capturing the sentiment felt in the North.

On 11 January 1861, an editorial in the *New York Herald* stated, “Good martial, national music is one of the advantages we have over the rebels.” *The Battle-Cry of Freedom* not only was one of the most popular patriotic Union songs of the Civil War, but also a good example of the above statement. The success of this song lays with the melody and lyrics because it not only appealed to civilians, but to soldiers as well. The song was easy to learn and adapted to various situations. George F. Root’s first rendition was a call to the Union to “rally around the flag, fill the ranks of the [Union Army] with a million freemen,” and “not a man shall be a slave.” Interestingly enough,
Root deposited the song for copyright on 26 September 1862. This was four days after President Lincoln’s Emancipation Proclamation speech. Whether the timing was coincidental or planned by Root, the release of this song had positive effects for the Union Army in the border state of Tennessee, as recorded by Colonel Henry Stone. Colonel Stone wrote an account of his experience that *Century Magazine* published in December of 1887 and, upon his death, the account appeared in the *New York Times* on 21 February 1896.

Colonel Stone’s account started with the Battle of Stone’s River, fought near Murfreesboro, Tennessee. The battle ended on 3 January 1863 with the Confederate Army retreating from the area. However, the Emancipation Proclamation that took effect on 1 January 1863 overshadowed the Union victory. President Lincoln’s Proclamation stated, “That all persons held as slaves are, and henceforward shall be, free and that the military and naval authorities of the United States will recognize and maintain the freedom of such persons.” It was during this time that Colonel Stone noted that dissension started among the ranks of the officers from Kentucky and Tennessee. In a single regiment, one officer had persuaded his fellow officers to resign their commissions, arguing that the Proclamation had changed the character of the war, from preserving the Union to abolishing slavery. The officers used this to argue that the Proclamation had changed the terms of their contracts; therefore, they should be able to leave the service because they no longer agreed with the focus of the war. Eventually, under pressure, all but the original and instigating officer retracted their requests. The original officer was then discharged from the army in disgrace.

During this time, morale of the army in the region was very low, but it was about to change. A glee club from Chicago came to the camp singing a new song called *The Battle-Cry of Freedom*. The catchy tune and lyrics spread through the camp quickly, but two lines from the lyrics really built up the morale. “We’ll welcome to our numbers the loyal, true and brave, and although he may be poor, he shall never be a slave.” Colonel Stone went on to state, “The army at once became a unit on the great question of freedom, of which this lyric is well named the ‘Battle Cry.’ ”

Subsequent versions of the lyrics that followed were to rally the troops on the battlefield and to get people to vote in the 1864 election. The song played at virtually all events in the Union, from the announcement of President Lincoln winning a second term, to General Lee’s surrender. *The Battle-Cry of Freedom* was a perfect example of the patriotic and righteous emotions the Union had towards their cause in the war. The tune that would later become the favorite of the Union for both civilian and soldier alike had a unique history worth noting. The melody that provided the music for *John Brown’s Body* and *The Battle Hymn of the Republic* was rooted in true folk origins. It was the basis for drinking and sailors’ songs until Charles Wesley, a clergyman and brother of John Wesley the founder of the Methodist Church, heard it. Wesley took the tune and turned it into a religious song used in the Methodist Hymnal, which brought the melody to America. Upon reaching America, William Steffe from South Carolina gave the tune words. In 1855, Steffe was credited with starting the song with, “Say brothers, will you meet us on Canaan’s happy shore?” and
with the traditional refrain of, “Glory Hallelujah.” The song became a well-known hymn to church-going people and had a beat that was perfect for marching.

When the War Between the States started in 1861, the starting lines changed to “John Brown’s body lies a-mouldering in the grave, His soul is marching on.” Surprisingly, the new lyric was not about the famous abolitionist John Brown, but a young Scotsman who had the same name and served in the “Tiger” battalion of the Twelfth Massachusetts Regiment. John Brown became the butt of jokes by his fellow soldiers and his name became synonymous with the new marching tune. Sadly, Sergeant John Brown did not survive the war; he drowned while crossing the Rappahannock River on 6 June 1862.18

In November of 1861, the song John Brown’s Body was about to change yet once again. Julia Ward Howe would forever change the song’s lyrics and chorus. Julia was a remarkable woman of many different talents. She became active in the abolitionist movement in Boston and worked with important abolitionist figures such as William Lloyd Garrison and Wendell Phillips.19 Julia was married to a Dr. Samuel Gridley, who was head of the Perkins Institute for the Blind in Boston. Dr. Gridley was too old to enlist in the Army, so he accepted a position in the United States Sanitary Commission when the war started. Julia had accompanied her husband to Washington D.C. when he was to do some work for the Commission.

In late 1861, Julia was eager to see a review of the Army of the Potomac, posted near Washington, DC. Her pastor, Dr. James Freeman Clarke, accompanied her. To their dismay, what they were to witness was not the gallantry of Army pass and review, but a Confederate raiding party. In a fashion similar to the first Battle of Bull Run, a mass retreat started back towards Washington, but the convergence of the carriages and sightseers hindered the progress of the retreat. As Julia and Dr. Clarke were trying to get back into the city, they heard the soldiers marching and singing John Brown’s Body. There are different accounts of what happened at this point. Possibly the soldiers were singing a verse that Julia and Dr. Clarke may have found unsuitable for the music, such as “We’ll feed him on sour apples till he has the di-ar-ree!”20 It was at this moment that Dr. Clarke turned to Julia and suggested that she write some more appropriate words to the music. That night Julia awoke before dawn, and could see from her window the “watch fires of a hundred circling camps,” and heard “the trumpet that shall never call retreat.”21 The new words began to take shape in her head. Before she forgot them, she wrote out the words in the early morning darkness. On her return to her home in Boston, she submitted the poem to James T. Fields, the editor of the Atlantic Monthly, for which she received five dollars in payment. Fields then gave the poem its title, The Battle Hymn of the Republic. The poem first printed in the New York Tribune on 14 January 1862.22

The words that Julia Ward Howe had penned so early in the morning retained the camp meeting flavor. The new words gave the secular cause of the war, the abolition of slavery, a religious and sacred one. The new song not only gave God’s sanction to the war, but God commanded the battle be pursued.23 The line that best captured this sentiment was, “Let the hero born of woman crush the serpent with his heel.”24 The last verse in the song equated secession and slavery to being evil and compared the
Union cause to Christ’s mission, “As he died to make men holy, let us die to make men free.” Verses such as these would not only appeal to the abolitionists in the North, but gave meaning and cause to the Union soldier risking his life. The Battle Hymn of the Republic was an undisputed favorite of the Union; it also confirmed the belief that they were righteous in fighting the evilness of secession and slavery, thus giving purpose to the war.

When peace came in 1865 and with the Union restored, many veterans began to recall their time in the Union Army and the importance of the music they marched to and sang. Frank Rauscher, a veteran of the Union Army, recalled, “We boys used to yell at the band for music to cheer us up when we were tramping along so tired that we could hardly drag one foot after the other.” It was the music that kept the soldiers going, gave them purpose and reasons to hope. The same was true for the soldiers in the Confederate Army, for each side had patriotic songs, many of them with the same tune, just different words. Could one of the reasons behind the Union’s overall victory have been the music? Richard Wentworth Browne, a Union Veteran, recalled attending a musical party in Richmond just after the declaration of peace, at which paroled Confederate officers had asked to hear some of the Union Army songs. After the band had played several songs including, The Battle Hymn of the Republic and The Battle-Cry of Freedom, a Confederate major stood and exclaimed, “Gentlemen, if we had your songs, we’d have licked you out of your boots!” This statement by the major would seem to confirm that the music was a pivotal factor in the Union’s victory.

Clearly, the music of the U.S. Civil War was not just entertainment. The patriotism and righteousness reflected in songs such as: The First Gun is Fired! May God Protect the Right!; Battle-Cry of Freedom; and The Battle Hymn of the Republic strongly conveyed the purpose of the war to soldiers and civilians alike. The music bolstered their belief and commitment to the cause, which led to preservation of the Union and abolishment of slavery.
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