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1: Introduction

The Civil War is a turning point of American history and is deeply imbedded in the American conscience. The war was tragic and transformational. Over 620,000 Americans died as a result of the war and millions more were wounded and scarred for life. Yet the war facilitated the freedom of over 4 million slaves. Once the fighting ended, the United States emerged a stronger and more unified country than before.

The Civil War impacted all parts of the United States, including Cincinnati. Physical remnants and reminders of the war are scattered throughout the Cincinnati area. Cincinnati’s Civil War resources, in the form of markers, monuments, sites, and structures deserve special attention – especially because of the fast approaching 150th anniversary of the Civil War, also referred to as the Sesquicentennial.

Organizations such as the National Park Service believe that the Civil War Sesquicentennial will reawaken interest in this important era of American history.¹ American’s may commemorate important Civil War events or people and will seek out opportunities to learn and make connections with the past. With this in mind it is anticipated that Civil War markers, monuments, sites, and structures will increase in popularity from 2011 to 2015.

I have a special interest in the American Civil War, and even though my undergraduate degree is in history, I was never able to write extensively about this topic. After completing my undergraduate degree, I worked with the Civil War Preservation Trust (CWPT) in Washington, DC. The mission of CWPT is to preserve significant battlefield land across the nation. I am not trying to complete a Masters of Community Planning. Taking the advice of several individuals who have completed a thesis or who have served on thesis committees, I chose a topic that is of interest to me and that satisfies the requirements of my degree. “An Assessment of Cincinnati Area Civil War Resources” is the result of my personal interest in the Civil War, experience with historic preservation, and knowledge gained from education in the Master’s of Community Planning degree at the University of Cincinnati.

I feel that communities, organizations, individuals and other stakeholders should not sit idly as the Civil War Sesquicentennial approaches. This evaluation reveals that Cincinnati and the region have something to gain from local Civil War resources. These resources represent an element of Cincinnati’s history and an opportunity that has yet to be tapped. Among other things, improved access to local Civil War resources may provide new educational opportunities for schools and attract tourists to the Cincinnati area.

1.1: Statement of Purpose

There is no collective list, study, or documentation of Cincinnati’s Civil War resources. Before doing anything else, some basic information must be both understood and collected. The
resulting Assessment answers the following questions in order to evaluate Cincinnati area Civil War resources:

1. Why is the Civil War important and did the war have any impact locally?
2. What are cultural resources, why are they relevant, and how do they relate to the Civil War?
3. Are local Civil War resources significant enough to justify attention?
   - How many Civil War resources exist in the Cincinnati area?
   - What types of resources exist?
   - Where are the resources located?
   - Who owns or manages the resources?
   - Are the resources documented, interpreted, preserved?

Identification of Cincinnati area Civil War resources, collecting information about these resources, analyzing this information, and offering recommendations is the primary purpose of the Assessment. The findings of the Assessment may be of interest to individuals, organizations, and communities that value history and are open to new and innovative means of education and tourism. Recognition of the Civil War resources in the Cincinnati area may encourage stakeholders to appropriately address their existence and may justify further actions such as documentation, interpretation, or preservation.

**1.2: Document Layout**

Sections 2 through 6 review existing literature and identify key findings that justify An Assessment of Cincinnati Area Civil War Resources. Following the introduction, Section 2 explores Cincinnati’s role in the war, will generally discuss the significance of the war, and will
highlight how the war resonates in the American conscience. Section 3 explores the concept of cultural heritage. Section 4 provides an overview of cultural resource preservation in the United States. Section 5 explores relevant cultural resource documentation studies. To conclude the review process, Section 6 identifies the key findings of each of the previous sections. These key findings support An Assessment of Cincinnati Area Civil War Resources.

Sections 7 through 9 are the Assessment itself. Section 7 discusses the methods by which the Assessment was conducted. Data and data analysis are the focus in Section 8. The final part, Section 9, evaluates the data, introduces recommendations, and concludes the Assessment.
2: The Civil War

Almost 150 years later, Americans are still fascinated with the Civil War. Publications about the war explore causes, battles, leaders, and consequences. Also to a degree, research has focused on remembering the war and the war in the American conscience. The recent destruction of Civil War sites has encouraged exploration of another sub-field – Civil War resources. History is not the only discipline concerned with the Civil War. To an equal degree, anthropologists, policy-makers, planners, engineers, naturalists, environmentalists, citizens, hobbyists, and casual historians demonstrate growing interest concerning Civil War resources.

Nina Silber, author of *Landmarks of the Civil War* (New York, 2003), asserts that “Without question, it is the battlefields that dominate our images of the Civil War landscape.” Though preserving battlefields has been a worthy and successful venture, preserving the memory of the Civil War extends beyond battlefields. The Civil War is remembered with cultural resources by communities such as Cincinnati that are miles from the war’s great battlefields.

2.1: Cincinnati and the Civil War

Cincinnati was not the scene of any significant fighting. However, several examined sources reveal the impact the war had on the city. Louis Leonard Tucker’s *Cincinnati During the Civil War* (Columbus, 1962) gives an overview of the impact of the war on Cincinnati focusing mostly

---

on the years 1861 - 1863. Robert J. Wimberg has recorded the day to day events in his works *Cincinnati and the Civil War: Off to Battle* (Cincinnati, 1992) and *Cincinnati and the Civil War: Under Attack* (Cincinnati, 1999). The role of Cincinnati’s black American population and the 1862 threat of Confederate invasion are detailed by Peter H. Clark in *The Black Brigade of Cincinnati* (Cincinnati, 1864). Lester Horwitz documents John Hunt Morgan’s Confederate cavalry raid through Hamilton County in *The Longest Raid of the Civil War* (Cincinnati, 1999). These and other sources narrate the impact of the war on Cincinnati.

In April of 1865, Cincinnatians rejoiced at the end of the Civil War. When news of Robert E. Lee’s surrender reached Cincinnati, “The fire bells all over the city pealed forth, bonfires blasted throughout the city. In a few minutes thereafter tens of thousands of people thronged the streets and the wildest enthusiasm prevailed.”3 The city escaped the devastation faced by countless villages, boroughs, towns, and cities across the country. Southern cities such as Atlanta, Charleston, Richmond, and Vicksburg, were reduced to rubble. A few Northern towns, like Gettysburg and Sharpsburg, also felt the cruel hand of war. In comparison to the hardships suffered by other population centers, Cincinnati emerged from four years of hostility physically unscathed. The city proper was not bombarded by enemy artillery, nor was its manufacturing destroyed.

Located along the banks of the Ohio River, Cincinnati was one of the largest industrial cities in the pre-war era. Walter Stix Glazer, author of *Cincinnati in 1840* (Columbus, 1999) notes that

---

by 1850, with a population of over 100,000, Cincinnati was the fifth largest city in the nation and ranked second in manufacturing.\textsuperscript{4} Through river and canal commerce, the city was connected economically and socially with Southern river ports and interests. When war broke out between North and South in 1861, some feared Cincinnati would side with the South.\textsuperscript{5} This was not the case – Cincinnatians responded to the attack on Fort Sumter with patriotic support for the Union.\textsuperscript{6}

The war did find Cincinnati. Bordering a slave-holding Commonwealth, the strategic importance of Cincinnati was realized when Kentucky declared neutrality. Cincinnatians looked across the river with suspicion. Determined to preserve the Union, volunteers raced to recruiting posts. “Cincinnati in the War of the Rebellion” (Cincinnati, 1894) lists several hastily organized training grounds such as Camp Colerain near the small hamlet of Bevis, Camp John McLean in present-day Wyoming, Camp Clay in Hyde Park, and Camp Harrison near present-day Spring Grove Cemetery.\textsuperscript{7}

In “Camp Dennison: 1861-1965” (Columbus, 1961), author Stephen Z. Starr discusses the formation of a large training ground. George B. McClellan, a West Point graduate and Mexican-American war veteran, consolidated the region’s many smaller camps of instruction into one

\textsuperscript{4} Walter Stix Glazer, Cincinnati in 1840: The Social and Functional Organization of an Urban Community during the Pre-Civil War Period (Columbus: Ohio State University Press, 1999), 7.
\textsuperscript{5} Louis Leonard Tucker, Cincinnati During the Civil War (Columbus: Ohio State University Press for the Ohio Historical Society, 1962), 8.
\textsuperscript{6} Tucker, Cincinnati During the Civil War, 11.
large training ground. He realized that Cincinnati provided an excellent staging-area from which properly trained troops could be transported to the front lines. For this reason he proposed the location of this central training camp be near the city. Given the uncertainty of Kentucky’s allegiance, this was a practical decision. William S. Rosecrans selected a site several miles east of Cincinnati on a flat plain flanked by hills and the Little Miami River. Named for Ohio’s governor at the time, Camp Dennison was situated south of Miamiville and north of Milford.

During the course of the war, men from the Cincinnati area and the State of Ohio filtered through Camp Dennison on their way to face Southern armies. Among the groups that trained at the camp was the 5th Ohio Volunteer Infantry, dubbed the “Cincinnati Regiment.” The 5th later fought against Stonewall Jackson in the Shenandoah Valley, attacked the Confederate lines near the Dunker Church at the Battle of Antietam, and defended Culp’s Hill from Rebel charges at the Battle of Gettysburg. The 9th Ohio Volunteer Infantry, another Cincinnati regiment, trained at Camp Dennison. The history of the 9th Ohio is detailed in Constantine Grebner’s We Were the Ninth: A History of the Ninth Regiment, Ohio Volunteer Infantry (Kent, 1987). They were known as “Die Neuner” because the ranks were filled with first and second generation German-Americans. The regiment was given marching orders in their familiar German language. The 9th Ohio later stunned their Confederate opponents at the Battle of Mill

---


9 Later in the war, Rosecrans commanded the Union’s Army of the Cumberland during the Stones River, Tullahoma, and Chickamauga Campaigns.

10 Camp Dennison was named for Ohio’s governor at the start of the war, William Dennison.

Springs with the first bayonet charge of the war and fought fiercely at the Battle of Chickamauga. Many additional regiments composed of Cincinnati-area men were converted into fighting units at Camp Dennison.

Cincinnati was untouched by the maneuvering of armies until the middle of 1862. In August of that year, two large Confederate forces advanced from Tennessee into Kentucky. These events are detailed by Lowell H. Harrison in *The Civil War in Kentucky* (Lexington, 1975). The prospect of invasion sent Cincinnati into a panic. Local headlines in the September 5, 1862 edition of the *Cincinnati Daily Enquirer* read “All able-bodied citizens to the number of three thousand are hereby ordered to report for duty...”

Major General Lew Wallace was assigned the task of defending Cincinnati from Confederate attack. In his autobiography, *Lew Wallace: An Autobiography* (New York, 1906), General Wallace explains how with very few trained and equipped troops available to him he relied on the citizens to defend their homes. After declaring martial law, he gave all able-bodied men the choice between shouldering a shovel to work or a gun to fight. A network of defenses was constructed on the hills above Cincinnati and Northern Kentucky. Laborers included a large

---

14 “City and Suburban News.” *Cincinnati Daily Enquirer* September 5, 1862.
15 Later in the war, Lew Wallace defended Washington, DC from Confederate attack. After the war Wallace authored the classic novel *Ben Hur*.
body of African-Americans known as the “Black Brigade.” The men of the Black Brigade, at first forced into service, were then given the chance to volunteer and responded in even greater numbers than when impressed. When Confederate General Henry Heth, commanding the Confederate advance, realized the extent of Cincinnati’s defenses, he withdrew his forces. Cincinnati was saved.

Cincinnati was again unsettled in July of 1863. The Cincinnati Daily Enquirer exclaimed “Our city is wild with excitement over the near approach of John Morgan and his force of 5,000 guerillas.” Confederate General Braxton Bragg detached John Hunt Morgan’s cavalry brigade for a raid on Northern supply lines. Bragg hoped Morgan’s ruse would distract Union forces away from the battlefront. Morgan disobeyed Bragg’s orders to stay south of the Ohio River and crossed with his 2,500 cavalrmen into Indiana and then Ohio. As they passed through the northern suburbs of Cincinnati, they burned bridges, looted stores, stole horses, and derailed a train. Before leaving Hamilton County, they fought several small skirmishes with patriotic citizens and Union troops. Much of Morgan’s force was captured at the Battle of Buffington Island, the only battle of significance fought in Ohio during the Civil War.

---

18 Geoffrey R. Walden, “Panic on the Ohio! Confederates March on Cincinnati, September 1862,” Blue & Gray Magazine (May 1986).
21 Horwitz, The Longest Raid of the Civil War, 111, 129.
22 On July 19, pursuing Union forces caught up with and attacked John Hunt Morgan’s Confederates near Buffington Island. Much of Morgan’s force was captured, but about 400 men managed to escape. The Confederates that escaped, including Morgan, were captured a week later in eastern Ohio.
The Civil War impacted Cincinnati beyond the scope of military maneuvers. When war broke out in 1861, Cincinnati merchants worried about the loss of Southern markets.\textsuperscript{23} The fear of losing business diminished with local, state, and federal contracts for the production of war material. In \textit{All For the Union: Ohio Leaders in the Civil War} (Columbus, 1998), author Carl M. Becker writes about merchantman Miles Greenwood. The Cincinnati industrialist secured several contracts to refurbish smoothbore muskets, cast cannons, and even built the first prototypes of the Gatling Gun.\textsuperscript{24} William H. Roberts, in his \textit{Civil War Ironclads} (Baltimore, 2002), writes about Greenwood and other manufacturers including Niles Works, Hambleton’s shipyard, and Litherbury’s shipyard. These manufacturers assisted in the construction of several monitor-class ironclads.\textsuperscript{25} Carbines, popular with Union cavalrmen, were produced in Hamilton by Cosmopolitan (later Gwynn & Campbell).\textsuperscript{26}

The sources above indicate that Cincinnati and the surrounding areas were greatly impacted by the war. Local citizens were recruited to fight for the Union. Ohio’s largest training camp was located nearby. The city was threatened twice by Confederate forces and was also a center for the manufacture of war material. All the above sources not only show that the war impacted Cincinnati, but they also indicate the likely presence of several Civil War resources.

\textbf{2.2: The Significance of the Civil War}

\textsuperscript{23} Tucker, \textit{Cincinnati During the Civil War}, 9.
\textsuperscript{24} Carl M. Becker, “Miles Greenwood,” \textit{All For the Union: Ohio Leaders in the Civil War}, Ed. Kenneth W. Wheeler (Columbus: The Ohio State University, 1998).
\textsuperscript{26} Thomas Rentschler, \textit{Cosmopolitan and Gwynn & Campbell Carbines in the Civil War} (Lincoln, RI: Andrew Mowbray Publishers, 2000).
The Civil War was tragic and transformational. More than 620,000 Americans lost their lives as a result of the war. Yet 4 million slaves were freed and the Union preserved. Historians may disagree about the causes and even certain outcomes, but they generally agree that the Civil War is one of the most significant events in American history. Why so?

In his book, *Abraham Lincoln and the Second American Revolution* (New York, 1990), author James McPherson reveals the transformational affects that the Civil War had on the country. Most importantly, he notes that four million slaves were freed by Union armies first, and then by the 13th Amendment to the Constitution.\(^{27}\) Not long afterward, the 14th Amendment to the Constitution granted black Americans citizenship and the right to vote. McPherson argues that these society-altering events were precipitated and hastened by the war.

McPherson further talks about how the Civil War tested the political strength of the republic and the devotion of the citizenry to its country. President Lincoln suspended the writ of habeas corpus – this allowed the government to arrest anyone without formal charges. He also emancipated the slaves and armed black Americans to fight for the Union. The government instituted an unpopular draft to swell the ranks of the army. At the end of the war, Lincoln favored reconciliation over repercussion and pardoned Confederate soldiers and statesmen from any wrong-doing. These controversial political moves elicited opposition and even riots. But ultimately Lincoln’s political maneuvering won the war for the Union and restored peace.

---

The impact of the Civil War is also made apparent by numbers. Drew Gilpin Faust, author of *This Republic of Suffering: Death and the American Civil War* (New York, 2008), asserts that probably more than 620,000 Americans died as a result of the war, a full 2% of the total population.\(^{28}\) If the same proportion of casualties occurred in the year 2008, the number of persons who died as a result of the war would reach 6 million.\(^{29}\) In *Crossroads of Freedom: Antietam* (New York, 2002), author James McPherson describes the Battle of Antietam as the single bloodiest day of the war and in American history.\(^{30}\) 23,000 men were killed, wounded, or went missing in a single day of fighting.

In 1993, the Civil War Sites Advisory Commission submitted a study of Civil War battlefields to Congress. The commission estimated that over 10,500 engagements were fought between the years 1861 and 1865. This includes the smallest skirmishes to the largest battles. These engagements were fought over a large geographic area – from the Eastern Seaboard as far west as New Mexico and even raged overseas.\(^{31}\)

The economic structure of the country was drastically altered by the war. The article “The National Debt and Wars” (2008) by the National Council of Teachers of Mathematics shows that during the decade of the 1860s, the national debt reached $2,417,000,000, an increase of


\(^{29}\) Faust, *This Republic of Suffering*, xi.


almost 3000%. In his book *Drawn With the Sword* (New York, 1996), author James McPherson notes the federal government’s consolidation of powers – the government “created an internal revenue bureau to collect these taxes, expanded the jurisdiction of the federal courts, established a national currency and also a national banking structure.”

The war physically destroyed the South. Union armies ripped up thousands of miles of railroad tracks and destroyed hundreds of bridges. They wrecked half of the South’s farm machinery and killed two-fifths of its livestock. Many major Southern cities were destroyed including Atlanta, Georgia, Columbia, South Carolina, and Richmond, Virginia.

Simply put, the Civil War transformed the United States socially, politically, economically, and physically. Through the untimely deaths of hundreds of thousands Americans, the war forged a new identity for the nation. The slaves were freed, black Americans were granted citizenship, the federal government consolidated its powers, instituted a draft, temporarily suspended habeas corpus, and successfully waged a war that saved the United States from dissolution. This is why the Civil War is perhaps the most significant event in American history and why it deserves the attention of current and future generations.

### 2.3: The Civil War in the American Conscience

---


Because of its transformational changes the Civil War is imbedded in the American conscience. Even so, consensus about the meaning of the war is far from universal. Over the years, Americans have struggled with their interpretation of the war. Interpretations of the war vary by race, region and generation. Values and interpretations of the war can be seen in the monuments dedicated and the political battles waged. Only one thing is certain, debate about the meaning of the war is as much alive in modern times as it was in the 1860s. The following section looks at the interpretation of the war from one generation to the next and highlights the Civil War in popular culture.

The first efforts to memorialize the people and events of the Civil War occurred during the war. Monuments to commemorate battles and the dead of those battles were erected by the soldiers themselves such as the Hazen monument at Stones River or the Bloedner monument at Munfordville. The national cemetery at Gettysburg was famously dedicated by President Abraham Lincoln in November of 1863, just three months after the climactic battle that caused upwards of 50,000 casualties. The establishment of national cemeteries marked the first effort by the federal government to honor the memory of the dead. This eventually led to the practice of preserving the battlefields themselves.

---


During the decade of the 1890s, the federal government acquired vast tracts of land at five major battlefields: Chickamauga and Chattanooga, Antietam, Shiloh, Gettysburg, and Vicksburg. This era of preservation is extensively researched by Timothy B. Smith in his *Golden Age of Battlefield Preservation: The Decade of the 1890s and the Establishment of America’s First Five Military Parks* (Knoxville, 2008). Success was achieved with the help of the veterans who ascended to positions of political power. The veterans embodied the philosophy of setting aside differences. They informally agreed to look beyond social, political, moral and ethical disagreements. Instead they jointly honored the valor and sacrifice of Northern and Southern soldiers.

The hardships of the Great Depression again brought attention to the Civil War. The government sent thousands of laborers to work on projects at the nation’s battlefields. They also paid workers to research and write histories about the war. Many of these workers were African Americans, some of whom were veterans of the First World War. The black workers labored to preserve the sites and history of the war that broke the shackles of slavery. Ironically, they were subjected to segregation and racial inequalities perpetuated by white Americans more than 50 years after the war ended.37

The preservation of Civil War battlefields continued during the Centennial anniversary of the war. Robert J. Cook is the author of *Troubled Commemoration: The American Civil War Centennial, 1961-1965* (Baton Rouge, 2007). He finds that the recognition of the Centennial

failed because organizers built the anniversary “on a racially exclusive interpretation of the Civil War era” and that it was “pre-eminently a cold war event designed to galvanize civilian non-combatants.”\(^{38}\) Participants in the Centennial anniversary had an unjust agenda – when their bias became clear to the American public the event failed. Considering that the Centennial coincided with the height of the Civil Rights Movement, this was a terrible missed opportunity “for citizens to discover the war’s relevance and meaning to their own lives.”\(^{39}\)

Even though the 100\(^{th}\) anniversary is viewed as a failure, interest did not completely wane. During the 1980s, the increased threat to develop Civil War battlefields encouraged what has become the modern battlefield preservation movement. The beginnings of the modern movement are documented by Georgie Boge and Margie Holder Boge in *Paving Over the Past: A History and Guide to Civil War Battlefield Preservation* (Washington, 1993). In 1988 the federal government used its eminent domain powers to take 542 acres at the Manassas battlefield from the grips of development.\(^{40}\) This costly taking ($130 million) spurred the proactive preservation movement.\(^{41}\) Nonprofit groups such as the Association for the Preservation of Civil War Sites and the Civil War Trust spearheaded public-private efforts to preserve battlefield land and educate the public. The two groups merged in 1999 into the Civil


\(^{40}\) Boge and Boge, *Paving Over the Past*, xiii.

War Preservation Trust (CWPT). CWPT and its predecessors are responsible for the preservation of 28,000 acres of Civil War battlefield in 20 states.42

From the 1980s to present time, heritage tourism has attracted Americans to visit culturally significant sites, including the Civil War battlefields. Civil War battlefields managed by the National Park Service are visited by hundreds of thousands of people each year. In 2008 Gettysburg National Military Park tallied 1,455,951 visitors; Kennesaw Mountain National Battlefield Park brought in 1,415,917 visitors; 993,525 people visited Chickamauga and Chattanooga National Military Park; and 744,971 visitors were recorded at Fort Sumter National Monument.43

The Civil War is often the setting for movies. Author Bruce Chadwick, in his book The Reel Civil War: Mythmaking in American Film (New York, 2001) and author Brian Steel Wills, in his book Gone With the Glory: The Civil War in Cinema (Lanham, 2007) demonstrate that movies provide another source from which to analyze society’s perception of the Civil War.44 Several movies show the evolution of understanding and interpretation of the war from one generation to the next. One of the earliest movies is The Birth of a Nation (D.W. Griffith, 1915) set in the Reconstruction South. The movie depicted freed slaves and black Americans as unruly and malicious.

The American classic, *Gone With the Wind* (Victor Fleming, 1939) did not depict black Americans as antagonists, but still conveyed a false interpretation. Set at a Southern plantation during the Civil War, the movie overlooked the brutalities of slavery altogether. The silver screen eventually evolved to include and even feature the plight of slaves and black Americans. The release of *Glory* (Edward Zwick) in 1989 demonstrated the role of black Americans during the war and *Amistad* (Steven Spielberg, 1997) revealed the brutality of slavery.

In more recent times the Civil War is still controversial. The flags of several southern states incorporate symbols of the Confederacy and are the center of constant debate. In 2000 after much resistance, South Carolina removed the Confederate battle flag from its statehouse. The United States House of Representatives apologized to black Americans for the “fundamental injustice, cruelty, brutality and inhumanity of slavery and Jim Crow" in July of 2008. \(^{45}\) Not long after (June 2009) the United States Senate followed suit and apologized. \(^{46}\) Several states have also issued formal apologies.

As we near the 150\(^{th}\) anniversary of the Civil War, what impact if any will this event have on Americans? The National Park Service and other organizations expect that interest in the Civil War will grow. However, to date no national Civil War Sesquicentennial commission has been created. Realizing that some preparations are necessary at a higher level, the Midwest Region of the National Park Service developed a plan entitled “Civil War to Civil Rights.” This plan acknowledges the necessity of preparing for the Civil War Sesquicentennial, highlights mistakes

---

of the Centennial observation, sets goals and offers recommendations for the Sesquicentennial event. In addition, several states, including Ohio, have proactively prepared for the approach of the Civil War Sesquicentennial by forming committees.\(^{47}\) The overall purposes of the several state commissions are to plan programs appropriate for the commemoration and encourage an examination of the war.

Preparations for the Sesquicentennial of the Civil War seem to be mindful of the Centennial anniversary shortcomings identified by Cook. The National Council on Public History (NCPH) has created a Working Group entitled “Continuing Conversations/Bearing the Standard: Public Historians Role in the Commemorations of the Sesquicentennial of the American Civil War.”\(^{48}\) Participants in the group agree that new scholarship and pressures suggest that the traditional focus on military history should be revised or expanded to include social, economic, and political perspectives. This will make the Sesquicentennial event relevant to a broader audience.\(^{49}\)

Several participants in the NCPH working group feel that the subject-matter should be expanded beyond the battlefields to include non-battlefield sites (Tuyl, Sanfilippo, Stoutmire). Another suggestion is that today’s technology can play a role in promoting the Sesquicentennial event (Moore, Singel). Unlike the Centennial when controversial issues were ignored, one


participant suggests that present-day issues may be used as a “hook” for engaging a wider audience (Tuyl). Potential roadblocks, including the poor economy and working with uncompromising heritage organizations, should be identified and solutions proposed (Sanfilippo, Stoutmire). And finally, Civil War resource stakeholders should be persuaded to get involved (Ruck).

Over the nearly 150 time-span since the end of the war, generations of Americans have not forgotten about this significant event. Knowingly or not, each generation interprets the meaning of the Civil War according to its values and beliefs. In more recent times the war is rekindled by visits to National Parks, movies, controversies over flying the Confederate flag, and formal apologies for slavery. The Centennial anniversary of the war was less than successful for several reasons. The Sesquicentennial anniversary is an opportunity to learn from past failures and succeed in appropriately recognizing the Civil War as perhaps the most significant event in American history. The 150th anniversary may possibly bring about a new wave of Civil War enthusiasm. With this in mind, Civil War resource studies may assist stakeholders with identification, interpretation, management, and possibly preservation of markers, monuments, structures, and sites associated with the war.
Americans associate their identity as citizens with the people, places, and events of the past. So it makes sense that historic markers, monuments, sites and structures are viewed as important for creating and maintaining national identity. Imagine visiting Gettysburg and finding residential subdivisions instead of a National Park or New York Harbor without the Statue of Liberty. What if the Mount Vernon Ladies Association had done nothing to preserve George Washington’s Mount Vernon? Cultural resources provide the information, intrigue, and physical connection needed to develop national identity. This section will explore several definitions for the term “cultural resource,” establish the importance of cultural resources for societies, and discuss the attachment of value to cultural resources.

3.1: Defining Cultural Resource

William J. Murtagh, author of *Keeping Time: The History and Theory of Preservation in America* (Hoboken, 2006) defines cultural resource as: “A building, structure, district, site, or object that is significant in American history, architecture, archaeology, or culture.” The National Park Service defines cultural resource as:
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“an aspect of a cultural system that is valued by or significantly representative of a culture or that contains significant information about a culture. A cultural resource may be a tangible entity or a cultural practice. Tangible cultural resources are categorized as districts, sites, buildings, structures, and objects for the National Register of Historic Places and as archeological resources, cultural landscapes, structures, museum objects, and ethnographic resources for NPS management purposes.”

Cultural resources are important for many disciplines of study such as archaeology, architecture, historic preservation, history, sociology, and urban planning, among others. Each discipline may have a slightly different definition for cultural resource. For an architect, cultural resources refer to the built environment. In *Historic Preservation: An Introduction to Its History, Principles, and Practice* (New York, 2000), author Norman Tyler discusses how American’s have searched for their cultural identity through architecture. Tyler suggests that architectural styles are representative of the generation that adopts them for design of its buildings. He asserts that “The history of American architecture is the tale of a search for an architectural style to truly represent the new American culture.”

Archaeologists look beyond the built environment for cultural resources. Donald L. Hardesty and Barbara J. Little, the authors of *Assessing Site Significance: A Guide for Archaeologists and*

---
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Historians (Lanham, 2009) define the cultural resource as “A building, structure, district, site, or object that is historically significant.” Their definition does not include a reference to society. However, the definition does broaden the scope of cultural resources to include more than just buildings.

3.2: The Importance of Cultural Resources

Why are cultural resources important and what value do we place on them? In “Theoretical and Practical Arguments for Values-Centered Preservation,” by Randall Mason, the author asserts that preservation is assumed to be “inherently good and, therefore, beyond question and in no need of further examination.” Mason argues that this view is incorrect. Rather, “one must explore specific economic, political, and material conditions and conflicts that give rise to the need for historic preservation.”

Dirk H.R. Spennemann, author of “Gauging Community Values in Historic Preservation,” points out that “objects, places, and resources have no intrinsic value per se. Individuals project value onto an object, place, or resource based on their own needs and desires, shaped by their current social, cultural, and economic circumstances...” In separate writings, Mason and Spennemann suggest that the value placed on cultural resources is broadly tied with extant social, political, and economic conditions.

55 Hardesty and Little, Assessing Site Significance, 204.
Hardesty and Little identify four values embedded in the social and cultural context of cultural resources:

“First of all, they may have economic value as commodities, especially as tourist attractions or for adaptive reuse. Second, cultural resources might gain value from their association with, or as symbols of, important historical events, themes, and patterns or from their association with important architectural styles or engineering types... Third, cultural resources could have information value as a repository of data important to scientific or scholarly research. Finally, cultural resources might have aesthetic values, for example, pleasing architectural styles or landscapes.”

Any value placed on a cultural resource must be carefully considered. One justification for the existence of cultural resources is that they can be preserved for the enjoyment of future generations. Spennemann feels that “Since we cannot predict the values that may be held by our children in the future, let alone by their children, any assumption that we preserve the places for future generations to enjoy is without solid foundation.” Instead, “we are preserving the past according to our present values and essentially for our own benefit...” Spennemann acknowledges the possibility of future criticism and notes that “we can argue at least that we have made educated and conscientious decisions based on current best practice and understanding.”

---
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3.3: Values-based Implications of Cultural Resources

Society assigns economic, political, and social values to cultural resources. The sources below reveal that social and political values are often the most contentious. Perceptions about what cultural resources are worthy of protection and interpretation evolve from one generation to the next. The resources that have survived to be seen and used by this generation are a reflection of past values. Likewise, cultural resources that this generation chooses to protect or interpret will reveal current values to future generations.

Dolores Hayden, the author of *The Power of Place: Urban Landscapes as Public History* (Cambridge, 1995), suggests that places and spaces to which society assigns value conveys an image about that society, also known as sense of place.60 In their separate publications, Hayden and then Sanford Levinson, the author of *Written in Stone: Public Monuments in Changing Societies* (Durham, 1998) reveal the idea of “the politics of space” or “identity politics.”61 The idea is that the meaning of a physical location or object is debatable.

The same resource can be interpreted to have different meaning. This is the point of authors Jennifer L. Eichstedt and Stephen Small in their analysis of Southern plantation museums. In their book, *Representations of Slavery: Race and Ideology in Southern Plantation Museums*

(Washington, 2002), they demonstrate how black Americans and the stewards of Southern plantation museums (often Southern white Americans) view the same resource, in this case the plantation museum, with different meaning.\(^{62}\)

Eichstedt and Small identify two terms that are important for the discussion of cultural resources, social forgetting and construction.\(^{63}\) Social forgetting refers to the suppression or purposeful exclusion of information that is often controversial or unpleasant in nature. Construction refers to the creation of an idea, ideology, or information that misrepresents the truth. Eichstedt and Small conclude that Southern plantation museums, as cultural resources, are guilty of both social forgetting and construction. When dealing with the unmistakable connection between plantations and slavery, many Southern plantation museums simply ignore or distort the story of enslaved Africans and African Americans.

On a similar note, former Gettysburg National Military Park Superintendent, John Latschar, reveals that “Civil War parks have failed to appeal to the black population of America... In an effort to honor both the Union and the Confederate forces that fought on the battlefields, park interpretive programs had been avoiding discussions of what they were fighting about.” The National Park Service realized its failure to appropriately interpret the battle and reworked


\(^{63}\) Eichstedt and Small, *Representations of Slavery*, 1,3.
itself to “present the story of Gettysburg within the larger story of the causes and consequences of the Civil War – including slavery.”

Cultural resources that remind us of tragedy and violence are the focus of author Kenneth E. Foote in his book *Shadowed Ground: America’s Landscapes of Violence and Tragedy* (Austin, 1997). Foote also presents the idea of social forgetting by exploring places like Salem, Massachusetts, where 19 people were accused of witchcraft and executed in 1692; or California’s Manzanar Relocation Center where civilian Japanese-Americans were held as prisoners during World War II. A more recent example is the site of the World Trade Center, destroyed by the terrorist attacks of September 11th, 2001. These sites, though historic, are also tragic and potentially evoke strong feelings to the point that society has an easier time forgetting about them than memorializing them.

A sense of place is important for society. Cultural resources contribute to a sense of place and give clues to societal values. Therefore, what society chooses to preserve and how it is interpreted is important. How a society handles its cultural resources says much about that society. Manipulating these resources can alter perceptions of the past and construct alternative viewpoints. For this reason cultural resources are valuable societal resources. Their purpose and meaning should be carefully considered.

---

4: Cultural Resource Preservation in the United States

4.1: An Overview of Cultural Resource Preservation in the United States

The preservation and interpretation of cultural resources in the United States began prior to the Civil War. The earliest forms of preservation in this country are discussed by Tyler in *Historic Preservation*. Tyler notes that from the 1850s until the end of the 19th century, mostly private groups focused their preservation efforts on resources associated with significant individuals. For example, the Mount Vernon Ladies Association was founded in 1853 to purchase and preserve George Washington’s Mount Vernon estate.\(^66\)

Perhaps the first great cultural resource preservation movement occurred in the 1880s and 1890s during the “golden age of battlefield preservation.” Veterans of the Civil War, who held positions of political power, preserved some of the war’s most important battlefields. As a result, during the last decades of the 1800s the federal government officially entered into the role of preserving and managing cultural resources.\(^67\)

---
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The federal government’s role in protecting and managing cultural resources expanded in the 20th century. In 1906 Congress passed the *Antiquities Act* to protect historic and prehistoric sites from unauthorized excavations, to create national monuments, and to grant permits to such sites. However, this law was and is limited to lands owned by the federal government.68

Ten years later, the National Park Service was created as part of the *National Park Service Organic Act of 1916*.69 Since this time the National Park Service has managed culturally and historically significant lands owned by the federal government. The *Historic Sites Act of 1935* equated federal policy with the preservation of historic sites, buildings, and objects of national significance. The act authorized the federal government to acquire historically significant lands through gift, purchase, or other means.70 The National Register of Historic Places, created by the *National Historic Preservation Act of 1966*, was designed to gather information about publicly and privately-owned historic resources that should be preserved.71

The role of the federal government in protecting cultural heritage sites is sometimes hindered by bureaucracy. Outside of the federal government, private and nonprofit groups have assumed a complimentary role. They educate, advocate, and manage historic resources and can do so without obstacles faced by the federal government. Groups like the National Parks Conservation Association (founded in 1919) and the National Trust for Historic Preservation


(founded in 1949), often advocate on behalf of historic resources when the situation is inappropriate for government to do so. In response to the destruction of Civil War battlefields, the Civil War Trust and Association for the Preservation of Civil War Sites were formed in the late 1980s. They later merged into the Civil War Preservation Trust, the nation’s largest nonprofit battlefield preservation group.

4.2: Legal Protection of Cultural Resources

Cultural resource legislation promotes the preservation of the nation’s historic resources, yet it protects only the resources owned and maintained by the federal government, or resources that may be affected by projects funded with federal monies. With the exception of Native American resources, current legislation does little to protect cultural resources that are privately-owned.

However, case law has demonstrated the constitutional right of the government to use the power of eminent domain for preservation purposes. Eminent domain is an exercise of the government’s police powers to take lands for public use. The government is required to compensate the owner the fair-market value of the property taken.
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The first such taking of private property for historic preservation purposes involved the condemnation of lands associated with the Battle of Gettysburg. To capitalize on tourism, Gettysburg entrepreneur William Tipton started construction of the Gettysburg Electric Railway Company in 1892 over key parts of the battlefield. In his book *Sickles at Gettysburg: The Controversial General That Committed Murder, Abandoned Little Round Top, and Declared Himself the Hero of Gettysburg* (New York, 2009), author James Hessler describes how Congressman Daniel Sickles of New York, a controversial veteran of the battle and friend of battlefield preservation, proposed legislation to condemn lands owned by Tipton and acquire them for incorporation into a park.\(^73\)

The U.S. District Court in Philadelphia found the taking of land for this purpose to be unconstitutional. However, in *United States v. Gettysburg Electric Railway. Co.* (1896) the Supreme Court overturned the lower court and found the taking of lands in Gettysburg for historic preservation to be a valid federal power.\(^74\) Essentially, the ruling meant that the government had and has the right to take culturally significant land from private property owners for the sake of preserving it.

The preservation of cultural resources, especially the built environment, is an objective of modern zoning. Zoning regulations are enacted for the health, safety, and welfare of the general public – also known as the police powers. In *Berman v. Parker* (1954), the Supreme
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Court ruled that zoning based on aesthetics alone is a valid use of the police powers.

Preservationists have interpreted this ruling to preserve historic buildings and structures solely based on their aesthetics. This decision was followed by *Penn Central Transportation Company v. City of New York* (1978) in which the Supreme Court upheld the legitimacy of historic preservation as a governmental goal in and of itself.75

**4.3: Documenting Cultural Resources**

The taking of private property for preservation purposes may be controversial and costly. One alternative to this is to document cultural or historic resources (the terms cultural resource and historic resource may be used interchangeably). Documentation ensures that if a resource is removed or destroyed, information about that resource is not entirely lost. An accurate inventory of cultural resources can help communities identify what resources are important and how best to care for them. Documentation may reveal resources not previously known to exist; or it may lead to the preservation or interpretation of some resources and not others. The documentation of cultural resources can also forge a unique community identity – something that distinguishes one community from another.

Cultural or historic resource studies gather information about resources. The information collected describes why a resource is important, identifies resource characteristics, and reveals threats and opportunities associated with the resource. This information can be evaluated and
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the results communicated to stakeholders who in turn may influence future care and upkeep of the resource.

Several federal agencies exist for the purpose of documenting cultural resources. These heritage documentation programs include the Historic American Building Survey (HABS), the Historic American Engineering Record (HAER), the Historic American Landscapes Survey (HALS), and the Cultural Resources Geographical Information System Facility (CRGIS). These four programs are responsible for collecting information on nearly 40,000 historic sites across the country. The records are kept in the Library of Congress.\textsuperscript{76}

The National Register of Historic Places (National Register) is an official inventory of the Nation’s historic places worthy of preservation. The purpose of the National Register is to encourage uniform documentation of historic resources. Documentation of a cultural resource can be completed by any person or group, but must follow a uniform process. Nominations are submitted to the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) and reviewed to determine if the resource meets the criteria for inclusion. If a resource is nominated without the owner’s approval, and then approved by the SHPO, it is considered to be eligible for listing.

A popular misconception is that National Register status protects cultural resources from alteration or demolition. The National Register designation does not restrict owners from

modifying or demolishing eligible or registered resources. The National Register is simply a tool for information gathering and documentation. It is true, however, that projects using federal monies or projects initiated by federal agencies must perform an analysis of any resource that is listed on the National Register or that is eligible for listing. This requirement is referred to by its federal regulation number, Section 106. Often times, local communities authorize historic landmark designations that follow the same guidelines as the National Register.

To give an example, the National Cemetery Administration (NCA) recently completed a historic resource inventory of its holdings. The NCA, under the Department of Veterans Affairs, manages 122 national cemeteries and 33 soldiers’ or government lots totaling 14,600 acres. In her article “The National Cemetery Administration’s Documentation Initiative,” author Sara Amy Leach notes that as part of a comprehensive plan, the NCA started the Memorial Inventory Project in 2001 to document monuments, memorials, and landscape features (not headstones). The documentation process utilizes volunteers to document and photograph resources.77

Over the course of the past two centuries, preservation and documentation practices influenced what historic resources remain today, and what is known about resources that no longer exist. This is true for the thousands of Civil War resources that exist or once existed across the country.

---

5: Overview of Several Existing Studies

An Assessment of Cincinnati Area Civil War Resources was developed with the intention of gathering information about local Civil War resources to determine if any additional actions, such as documentation, interpretation, or preservation, may be considered. Unfortunately, no comprehensive assessment of Civil War resources has been completed for the Cincinnati area. Research of several similar studies assisted in developing a local assessment. These studies, all of which focus on Civil War resources, were conducted at national, regional, and local levels. The studies are useful for determining what data to collect and how the data may be used. The following section will discuss the various studies, identify their purpose, and discuss their useful components.

5.1: Evolution of Civil War Resource Documentation

The most visible of Civil War resources are battlefields. A battlefield is a tangible remnant of an important historic event. Preservation of battlefield sites is justified for educational and cultural purposes and to honor the sacrifices of those involved and impacted by war. The practice of preserving battlefields, much like the idea of documenting cultural resources, has evolved over time.

Prior to United States v. Gettysburg Electric Railway Co. (1896), the federal government’s role in protecting Civil War battlefields was limited. Before this, the preservation of historic sites
depended largely on efforts of grassroots citizens’ organizations.\textsuperscript{78} This important case gave the federal government the power to take historically significant land from private land owners. During the decade of the 1890s, the federal government acquired land at five key battlefields.\textsuperscript{79}

Preservation of battlefields began before the encouragement of widespread documentation. By the early 20\textsuperscript{th} century, preservationists realized that acquiring battlefields in their entirety was financially burdensome and increasingly controversial. When in 1926, legislators introduced 14 bills for the creation of new national military parks, Congress decided it would be wise to conduct a general battlefield-site study.\textsuperscript{80} While acknowledging the impracticality of preserving every battlefield, the study demonstrated that information about cultural resources can be collected and is valuable in its own right. This early study was never formally adopted by Congress.

\textbf{5.2: Federal Documentation and Assessment Initiatives}

When significant battlefield land at Manassas was almost lost to development the federal government conducted and then adopted a comprehensive study of Civil War battlefields. In 1990, the Civil War Sites Advisory Commission (CWSAC) was created by Congress to study the nation’s Civil War battlefields. The purpose of the Commission was “to identify the significant Civil War sites, determine their condition, assess threats to their integrity, and offer alternatives
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for their preservation.” The study narrowed its focus to 384 principal battlefields and assigned each a “preservation priority” rating “based on the level of historical significance, the integrity of the remaining battlefield features, and the level of threat to the battlefield’s existence.” The study also recorded site location and developed a narrative describing historic significance.

In addition to identifying significant Civil War sites, another purpose of the study was to offer alternatives to preservation. The Commission collectively analyzed information about the 384 sites including: location, ownership, condition, and preservation status. From the analysis the Committee made recommendations about: government leadership, preservation prioritization, public/private preservation efforts, funding, technical support, immediate action that should be taken by Congress and the Secretary of the Interior.

The findings and recommendations of the CWSAC were adopted by Congress in 1993. Since then, it has been the responsibility of the American Battlefield Protection Program (ABPP) to execute the recommendations of the CWSAC. The ABPP role includes: protection of battlefield sites; preservation, management, and interpretation encouragement and assistance; and raising awareness about the importance of battlefield preservation. Administering a battlefield land acquisition grant is another important function of the ABPP.

81 NPS, Civil War Sites Advisory Commission Report on the Nation’s Civil War Battlefields, 3.
The CWSAC resulted in battlefield preservation legislation. Following the recommendations of the CWSAC to create a law specifically for battlefield preservation, Congress passed The American Battlefield Protection Program Act of 1996 (amended by the Civil War Battlefield Preservation Act of 2002). The purposes of the act are: “1) to act quickly and proactively to preserve and protect nationally significant Civil War battlefields through conservation easements and fee-simple purchases of those battlefields from willing sellers; and, 2) to create partnerships among State and local governments, regional entities, and the private sector to preserve, conserve, and enhance nationally significant Civil War battlefields.” The act authorizes the appropriation of $3 million annually for battlefield preservation.

Seventeen years have passed since the CWSAC reported its findings and recommendations. Realizing that the findings of the CWSAC are dated, the ABPP is spearheading an effort to update and resurvey the 384 principal battlefields. The project is progressing one state at a time. Currently, updated reports are available for the District of Columbia, Indiana, Kentucky, Maryland, Ohio, Pennsylvania, Tennessee, Virginia, and West Virginia. In addition to the 1993 findings (historic significance and preservation priority), the CWSAC update includes information about: potential national register lands, protected lands, publicly accessible lands,
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management area, friends group(s), preservation activities since 1993, public interpretation since 1993, condition statement, and historical designation.\textsuperscript{87}

\textbf{5.3: NPCA – A Non-profit Resource Assessment Initiative}

In 2000, the National Parks Conservation Association (NPCA) initiated the State of the Parks program “to assess the condition of natural and cultural resources in the parks, and determine how well equipped the National Park Service is to protect the parks—its stewardship capacity.”\textsuperscript{88} The study looks at 160 national parks, several of which are Civil War parks. Researchers focused on six cultural resource subcategories: museum collections and archives, ethnography, cultural landscapes, archaeology, historic structures, and history. Ten performance indicator questions were asked for each of the six categories and were rated on a scale of 1 to 10. Ratings from all ten questions provided a grading scale of 0-100 for each of the six categories.\textsuperscript{89}

As of 2008, 54 of the 160 sample national parks had been studied and preliminary findings released by NPCA in \textit{The State of Our National Parks: A Resources Index}. Preliminary findings suggest that resources managed by the National Park Service suffer from funding shortfalls, \hfill
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emissions and climate change, and incompatible adjacent land use.\textsuperscript{90} The study does not offer recommendations to NPS as a system, only to the individual parks.

Several State of the Parks assessments have been completed for Civil War parks. Among these are Andersonville National Historic Site, Appomattox Court House National Historical Park, Chickamauga and Chattanooga National Military Park, Fort Donelson National Battlefield, Fort Sumter National Monument, Harpers Ferry National Historical Park, Pea Ridge National Military Park, Shiloh National Military Park, Stones River National Battlefield, Vicksburg National Military Park, and Wilson’s Creek National Battlefield. Assessments identify strengths and weaknesses, and make park-specific recommendations.

\textbf{5.4: Tennessee – An Example of Regional Resource Assessment Initiative}

The CWSAC and State of the Parks study by NPCA are two studies that have documented Civil War battlefields and Civil War parks. They identify data that is useful for specific cultural resources, mainly battlefields and national parks. However, other types of resources are unaccounted for.

Several communities in Tennessee have realized the value of local Civil War battlefield and non-battlefield resources. Efforts to record, preserve, and interpret Tennessee’s Civil War resources have been nurtured by the creation of the Tennessee Civil War National Heritage Area

\textsuperscript{90} NPCA, \textit{The State of Our National Parks}, 28.
(TCWNHA). This designation is appropriate as Tennessee was the scene of more battles than any other state, aside from Virginia. The TCWNHA realizes that “This legacy goes beyond the traditional military history of the war to include the impact of the war and its aftermath (the occupation and home front) on the civilian population of Tennessee. The social history of the war and Reconstruction can be told through the hundreds of historic resources located throughout the state ranging from privately owned farmhouses to publicly owned battlefields.”

TCWNHA asserts that non-battlefield resources are as important as battlefield resources for understanding and appreciating the past.

In response to the creation of the TCWNHA, the Battle of Nashville Preservation Society, Inc. created “A Proposal for A Civil War Protection Plan for Davidson County, Tennessee.” The proposal acknowledges the successful efforts of nearby communities in capitalizing on Civil War resources. It also asks “that Metro government commission a plan to protect and interpret Davidson County’s many Civil War sites and resources.” The plan calls for: background research; inventory and evaluation of Civil War resources; interpretation strategy; marketing and leveraging.

5.5: Heritage Tourism and Economic Benefits Assessments


In addition to resource conditions and characteristics, other studies assess the strength and economic impact of heritage tourism. Murtagh defines heritage tourism as “Traveling to experience the places and activities that authentically represent the stories and people of the past and present.”

A 2006 study commissioned by the Civil War Preservation Trust demonstrates that heritage tourism in general, and tourism of Civil War battlefields in particular is advantageous for local economies. The study included twenty Civil War sites. For each of the twenty sites, the study collected information about: visitation; visitor expenditures; jobs supported; government revenue; overnight stays; visitor profile; interest in the Civil War; trip characteristics and visitor experience. The completed study highlights several impacts associated with Civil War tourism. The study found that Civil War tourists support jobs for local residents; are active, affluent, and interested visitors; generate new state and local tax revenues; generate business for the local economy; and are most interested in the battlefields (as opposed to other area attractions).  

In the proposal “Working Assets: Reinvesting in National Parks to Create Jobs and Protect America’s Heritage,” the National Parks Conservation Association (NPCA), argues that investing in National Parks will create jobs and rebuild a crucial national asset. According to the document, there are $2.5 billion in ready-to-go projects in the National Park budget. With reference to depression-era government programs that put Americans to work and improved
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infrastructure of National Parks, the document proposes that the current administration adopt a similar policy. Essentially the proposal equates job creation with protection of the National Parks and cultural heritage sites.\textsuperscript{94}

The studies discussed above suggest that cultural resources and their upkeep can beneficially impact the economy through heritage tourism and job creation. Important components of these studies include job creation, visitor interest in cultural resources, and revenue generation.

\textbf{5.6: Important Components of Resource Assessment}

Section 5 demonstrates that Civil War resources, both battlefield and non-battlefield, have been the subject of several studies. Because of varying purposes and scopes, no single study can serve as a model for documentation of local Civil War resources. However, the studies helped identify what data should be collected for An Assessment of Cincinnati area Civil War Resources. Several components of the referenced studies are used in the following Assessment of local resources. These components include: location; integrity; ownership; interpretation; and historical analysis.

6: Literature Summary and Findings

Sections 2 through 5 reviewed sources and information relating to the Civil War, cultural resources, cultural resource preservation in the United States, and existing cultural resource studies. The purpose of researching these topics is to build a case for An Assessment of Cincinnati Are Civil War Resources and identify what data should be collected. The following is a summary of important elements and findings from each of the previous sections.

The sources discussed in Section 2 confirm that the Civil War did have a significant impact on Cincinnati and the United States. Additional sources indicated that subsequent generations of Americans have interpreted the war differently. Nevertheless, the Civil War and issues relating to it have been and are still very much a part of the American conscience. The approaching 150th anniversary of the war will likely grow interest and enthusiasm for learning about and commemorating the war. For these reasons, An Assessment of Cincinnati Civil War Resources is relevant.

Section 3 explored the definition and importance of cultural resource. The sources show that society initiates the construction and preservation of cultural resources to commemorate important people or events and educate present and future generations about the past. They also demonstrate that cultural resources are more than inanimate objects – they are objects that society attaches value to. The social, economic, and political value of resources are just as
important as historical value. For these reasons, cultural resources are worth the time and effort to document, interpret, or preserve.

Section 4 surveyed cultural resource preservation in the United States. Certain cultural resources in the United States are protected by legislation and case law. Yet there are limitations on what resources are protected. Because all cultural resources cannot be protected or properly managed, the next best option is to thoroughly document them. Documentation of a resource guarantees that information about the resource is available even if it is demolished or obliterated.

Section 5 provided an overview of existing cultural resource studies related to Civil War resources. Over time, the federal government realized the impossibility of preserving every key Civil War resource and moved toward documenting resources that were not feasible to preserve. The 1993 Civil War Sites Advisory Commission (CWSAC) report was the first comprehensive study of Civil War battlefields. The CWSAC spurred regional studies including one for the State of Tennessee. In turn, this resulted in a more localized study for Civil War resources around Nashville. Civil War resources are tied to heritage tourism and are shown to benefit local economies. Hence, communities with Civil War resources should care about the resources not only because of their historical value, but because there may be potential for economic benefit. Components of these studies that will be useful for An Assessment of Cincinnati Area Civil War resources include: location, integrity, ownership, interpretation, and historical value.
After review of many sources related to the Civil War, cultural resources, and cultural resource studies, several important findings are apparent. The findings that justify An Assessment of Cincinnati Area Civil War Resources include:

- The Civil War is an important event in American history and is part of the American conscience and identity.
- Cincinnati was greatly impacted by the Civil War.
- The 150th anniversary of the Civil War will begin in 2011 and will likely grow enthusiasm for learning about the war and visiting local Civil War resources.
- Cultural resources are important for remembering, interpreting, and educating about past events, people, and values.
- Cultural resources may benefit the communities where they are located.
- Documentation of cultural resources is less costly and controversial than preservation, may lead to preservation, or record information about a resource before it is destroyed.
- No study of local Civil War resources has yet been completed.

With these key points in mind, the following Assessment focuses on local Civil War resources such as markers, monuments, sites and structures. Information about these resources has been collected to reveal what Civil War events impacted Cincinnati, what Civil War resources exist or have existed, where the resources are located, what resources have been documented and how, what resources have been interpreted, and who owns or manages the resources.
7: Methodology

As stated in the Introduction, identification of Cincinnati area Civil War resources, collecting information about these resources, analyzing this information, and offering recommendations is the primary purpose of the Assessment. Using several of the components identified in Section 5, information about the characteristics of each resource was collected and then comparisons made. Analysis of the resources and their characteristics are followed by a conclusion that evaluates the findings and offers recommendations.

The Assessment is based on qualitative research methods. Sharan B. Merriam’s book, *Qualitative Research: A Guide to Design and Implementation* (San Francisco, 2009) was consulted to assist in the methodological preparation of gathering and analyzing data. To construct an accurate list of the resources and their characteristics, the assessment utilized more than one qualitative data analysis method. The data collected for each resource was placed into the appropriate typology. Typology refers to the formation of categories based on a theme that emerges from the data. To a lesser degree, the Assessment relies on content analysis for the collection of information. Content analysis refers to the examination of documents, text, or speech for evidence of what is being studied.

7.1: Typology
From a review of the literature, analysis of other publications and internet sources, and from interviews with local Civil War experts, an extensive list of resources was assembled. Several characteristics of each resource were recorded. For the Assessment, each resource was categorized by type, or typology. One such important typology refers to the resource’s physical form. The physical typology of each resource was recorded as a marker, monument, site, or structure. The following paragraphs describe the characteristics of physical types of resources.

Markers bring attention to important persons or events. However, markers are generally less ceremonial than monuments. Whereas monuments boast of a significant person or event, markers are more educational in nature. Generally, they occupy less space than monuments, are constructed of less permanent materials, and are more descriptive. Markers are owned and managed by both public and private organizations. One such example is the “Fort Wright” marker located in the Northern Kentucky suburb of the same name. Fort Wright (the fortification) no longer exists, but a marker nearby describes the fort’s importance.

A monument is a type of resource placed with the purpose of commemorating a significant person or event. Monuments serve as ceremonial reminders of virtue or warnings of events to be avoided. They are usually installed in perpetuity or intended to remain in place for long periods of time. Generally, monuments are maintained and owned by a public entity. One such example is the Abraham Lincoln Monument in Lytle Park. The monument is owned and maintained by the City of Cincinnati and the Cincinnati Park Board and located in a public space.

---

95 Foote, Shadowed Ground, 8-9.
A site is the location of a historic event or structure and range in physical size from a building to a large land area. Perhaps the best example of a site as a landscape is a battlefield – the expanse of land where military maneuvers and fighting occurred. Battery Bates, a Civil War fortification within the boundaries of Devou Park in Covington, is one local example of a site. There are no monuments or interpretive markers at the location of the fort. The fort, however, is well preserved in a discrete location within park boundaries. An important note about graves or gravesites – it would be nearly impossible to document the gravesite of every Civil War soldier in the Cincinnati area. For this reason, only cemeteries with significant resource holdings are considered. These cemeteries are listed as sites.

A structure may have existed in connection with a significant person, or was the location of a significant event. The Butler County Soldiers, Sailors and Pioneers Monument in the City of Hamilton (Butler County) is one such example. The Monument building was constructed after the war but for the purpose commemorating the valor of the men and women of America’s wars. Structures such as these serve a dual purpose. They are meant to be both ceremonial and functional.

Additional information taken from the resources may be of interest to resource stakeholders and historians. For example, historians may be interested to know if the resource represents Union or Confederate events/sentiments, or to what historic event the specific resource relates to. Historic preservationists may be interested to know whether the resource currently exists,
is properly documented, and its condition. Interested stakeholders will likely want to know where the resource is located and who owns the resource. This information, if available, was collected for each of the resources.

For An Assessment of Cincinnati Area Civil War Resources, a resource was recorded as primary or secondary. Primary resources physically existed at the time of the war. They were used by significant persons, or impacted by significant events. An example of this is the Burnet House. Abraham Lincoln stayed at the Burnet House during his 1859 visit to Cincinnati. In 1864, Generals Ulysses S. Grant and William T. Sherman met at the Burnet House to discuss their strategy for ending the war. The Burnet House is significant for the people who stayed there (Lincoln, Grant, and Sherman) and an event that occurred there (strategy to end the war).

Secondary resources did not exist during the war, but were constructed post-war and serves as a reminder of people or events significant to the war. One example is the Grand Army of the Republic flagstaff located in Eden Park. The flagstaff was dedicated in 1930 by veterans of the Civil War to recall the valor and sacrifice of their Union comrades. Another example is the Veteran’s Monument at Linden Grove Cemetery (Kenton County). Dedicated in 1933, the monument celebrates the sacrifice of both Union and Confederate soldiers.

7.2: Content Analysis
Content analysis was a useful methodological tool to help identify the Civil War resources that were likely to exist, are known to exist, or that once existed. Several publications discussed in the Civil War section of the literature review identified people and events that impacted Cincinnati during the war. This provided useful insight into what types of resources existed or may have existed. A common theme addressed in multiple publications was the threat of Confederate invasion in September of 1862. Hence, it was reasonable to assume that there may be Civil War resources in the area that relate to this event.

Content analysis was also used to analyze the characteristics of resources. This was especially true for monuments and markers. Monuments are inscribed with epitaphs and statements honoring their subject. Markers are generally more informative in nature. The purpose here was to determine if the text is suggestive of any viewpoints.

7.3: Scope and Limitations

Identification of Cincinnati area Civil War resources, collecting information about these resources, analyzing this information, and offering recommendations is the primary purpose of the Assessment. The findings of the Assessment may be of interest to communities, organizations, individuals and other stakeholders. Identifying local Civil War resources may encourage efforts to document, interpret, or preserve and lead to enhanced learning opportunities, tourism, and beneficial economic opportunities. Recognition of the Civil War
resources in the Cincinnati area may encourage stakeholders to appropriately address their existence and use them to their advantage.

The Assessment is not intended as an analysis of the social, political, economic or other implications of Civil War resources in the Cincinnati area. Yes, cultural resources are associated with social, political, economic and other meanings but this is not a focus of the Assessment. The values-based implications of cultural resources are generally discussed in the Section 3 of this document.

An Assessment of Cincinnati Area Civil War Resources excludes Underground Railroad resources. Preliminary research indicated an overwhelming presence of these resources. However, including these resources in the Assessment, and recording and verifying their authenticity would have taken more time than was available for this thesis. In no way was this done to diminish their importance. I suggest that future a study focus exclusively on Underground Railroad resources or incorporate them into a more complete evaluation of local Civil War resources.

The types of resources included were markers, monuments, sites, and structures. To be considered for the Assessment, the resource had to have some connection to the Civil War. To be further eligible, the resource must have originated from 1860 or after. In other words, the resource must have resulted from the war (training camp, fort, skirmish site, etc.), must have been used during the war (headquarters building, shipyard, cemetery, etc.) or, if it was created
after the war, it must in some way commemorate, interpret or relate to the war (marker, monument, memorial building).

The physical boundary of the study area included eight counties that make-up the Greater Cincinnati Area: Dearborn County in Indiana; Boone, Campbell and Kenton Counties in Kentucky; and Butler, Clermont, Hamilton, and Warren Counties in Ohio. Expanding the study area beyond these eight counties may have over-extended the Assessment. Nevertheless, this scope allowed for adequate documentation of important Civil War resources in the Cincinnati area.
Finally, this Assessment was intended as part of a master’s thesis and as such time constraints posed limitations. Because goals had to be met by certain dates, there is no assurance that every resource was documented. The resulting Assessment is of the data collected for the resources specified in the appendix. Therefore, it may not be wholly representative of all Civil War resources in the Cincinnati area, but accurate enough to make useful observations.

7.4: Assessment Process
Resources were listed using a spreadsheet in Microsoft Excel. The following characteristics were recorded for each resource: name, type (marker, monument, site, structure), integrity, owner/manager info, interpretation, documentation, county, address, date of significance, historical information, and narrative. The search for resources began with the sources used to research the Civil War’s impact on Cincinnati. After this, the search was expanded to internet research, interviews, and site visits. For a complete list of sources used to find the resources consult the appendix. The author relied heavily on the credibility of the sources for accurate information. In some cases, the author personally visited resources to collect and verify information.

After approximately two months of research, the author refined the collected information and prepared the data for analysis. Some analysis of the data was conducted using the chart and table wizard in Microsoft Excel. Additional analysis was completed with the use of ArcGIS and shapefiles from Cincinnati Area Geographic Information System (CAGIS) to create a map of the study area. After difficulty geocoding the addresses, the author manually located the locations of resources on the map using MapQuest as a reference. The findings and recommendations are detailed in sections 8 and 9.
8: Data Analysis

The primary purpose of the Assessment is to identify Cincinnati area Civil War resources, collect information about these resources, analyze this information, and offer recommendations. The collection of information involves gathering data about resource location, owner, integrity, interpretation, historical value, and type. Type refers to markers, monuments, sites, and structures.

Over the course of three months the author located and compiled information about 177 Civil War markers, monuments, sites and structures in the Cincinnati area. This section analyzes the data collected for the 177 Cincinnati area Civil War resources. For easy dissemination the analysis has been divided into four sub-sections. The first sub-section identifies the types of resources found and their locations. Following this, the second sub-section analyzes the documentation programs utilized for the resources. This sub-section also evaluates the integrity of existing resources. The third sub-section identifies the owners/managers of the resources and categorizes these according to type. The final sub-section is a historical analysis of primary and secondary Civil War resources. A complete list of the 177 Civil War resources can be found in the appendix.

8.1: The Resources and Resource Locations
The Assessment included resources from Dearborn County in Indiana; Boone, Campbell and Kenton Counties in Kentucky; and Butler, Clermont, Hamilton, and Warren Counties in Ohio. Of the 177 Civil War resources documented, 66 of these were sites, 51 were structures, 35 were markers, and 25 were monuments (Resources by Type).

![Resources by Resource Type]

A majority of resources were found in Hamilton County (86), followed by Kenton (40), Clermont (21), Dearborn (11), Butler (8), Campbell (5), Boone (4), and Warren Counties (2) (Resources by County).
A map of the study area with resource locations marked revealed a couple of trends (Cincinnati Area Civil War Resources). First is that a great number of the resources are clustered nearest to the center of the study area. This area is the City of Cincinnati and other nearby municipalities such as Covington, Kentucky. Generally, as distance from the center of the study area increases the number of resources decrease. The exception to this is a second distinguishable trend – a cluster of resources that extend along a line from Dearborn County in Indiana through northern Hamilton County and into Clermont County. The implications of these trends will be further revealed in the historical analysis.
8.2: Existence and Integrity

It is important to note which of the Civil War resources exist, have been altered, or obliterated. Knowing this assisted with the formulation of recommendations. Information about existence and integrity was compiled from published and electronic sources listed in the appendix, from interviews, and from site visits conducted by the author.
Of the 177 Civil War resources, 119 are intact, 13 are partially intact, 1 is a reconstruction, and 39 no longer exist (Resources Exist/No Longer Exist).

**Figure 8.4:** Chart, Resources that Exist/No Longer Exist. Created by Author.

Thus a total of 133 of the 177 resources exist in some form. An effort was also made to determine the integrity of the resources. Integrity refers to physical condition and the influence of immediate surroundings on condition. Determination of integrity was the author’s subjective judgment. Integrity was not determined for 38 of the 133 resources known to exist. Of the remaining 95 existing resources, 30 are in excellent condition, 41 in good condition, 16 in fair condition, and 8 are in poor condition (Integrity of Existing Resources).
As noted earlier, resources were labeled either “primary” and “secondary.” Resources constructed or used during the war (1861-1865), or that were the scene of some activity during the war were assigned primary status. Secondary resources were constructed or used after the war (1866-present) and relate in some way to the Civil War. A few of the resources fall under both categories. Of the 177 resources documented, 106 were found to be primary, 68 were found to be secondary, and 3 were both primary and secondary (Primary vs. Secondary Resources).
Figure 8.6: Chart, Primary vs. Secondary Resources. Created by Author.

For future reference, the 3 resources that were found to fit under both categories are included in the number of primary resources when discussing primary resources, and are included in the number of secondary resources when discussing secondary resources, bringing their totals to 109 and 71 respectively.

Generally, the older an object the more likely it is to become rare and unique. Analysis of primary vs. secondary resources revealed that this is true for Cincinnati area Civil War resources. Of 109 primary resources, 67 (or 61% of total primary resources) still exist suggesting that a significant number of primary resources have been lost over time (Primary Resources That Exist).
8.3: Documentation and Interpretation

In addition to locating Civil War resources, the Assessment recorded which resources were previously documented and the programs through which they were documented. Most resources have not been documented (Documentation/Protection Programs).
Of those that have been documented, most have been recorded by the National Register of Historic Places (20). Several more resources have been documented through state sponsored historic marker programs: Ohio Historical Society markers (13); Kentucky Historical Society markers (12); and a single Indiana Heritage Bureau marker (1). The Historic Architectural and Building Survey, or HABS, was used to document a single resource (1). Some resources are owned or managed as part of a local park system. However, no resources are formally protected by law or easement.

Information about the interpretation of the Civil War resources was recorded. Interpretation, in the sense of cultural resources and the Assessment, is an explanation of a past event or person through the use of signs or markers. The OHS, KHS, and IHB markers serve this purpose.
Hence, every marker recorded by the Assessment (35 in all) is a form of interpretation. 1 monument, 8 sites, and 3 structures relating to Civil War resources documented by the Assessment have been interpreted by state historic markers. One additional site, Battery Hooper in Northern Kentucky, is interpreted through the use of wayside markers. Of the 142 non-marker resources eligible for interpretation, only 16 (or 11% of eligible resources) are interpreted (Resources Eligible for Interpretation).

**Figure 8.9:** Chart, Resources Eligible for Interpretation. Created by Author.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resources Eligible for Interpretation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Resources Interpreted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Resources Uninterpreted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 8.4: Resource Owners

For purposes of interpretation or preservation it is important to know who owns or manages each of the Civil War resources. However, out of respect and for the protection of private
property owners, personal information was not recorded. An exception is made for resources owned or managed by organizations and businesses.

Of the 177 Civil War resources, 101 are privately owned (Resources by Owner Type).

**Figure 8.10**: Chart, Resources by Owner/Manager Type. Created by Author.

Owner information for 9 resources could not be determined. 60 of the resources are owned or managed by some public entity – 32 of these by a local organization, 28 by a state operated organization. No resources are owned or managed by the Federal government or any other national-level organization. 7 resources are both publicly and privately owned or managed. Several of these are sites on private property that extend onto road right-of-way.
Ownership or management of 95 resources can be attributed to one of 41 organizations or governments. Owners and managers with significant resource holdings include: OHS with 14 resources, KHS with 13 resources, and the Cincinnati Park Board with 8 resources (Owners/Managers w/Resource Holdings).

**Figure 8.11**: Table, Owners/Managers with Resource Holdings. Created by Author.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Owner/Manager Name</th>
<th># of Resources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ohio Historical Society</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kentucky Historical Society</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Cincinnati/Park Board</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana John Hunt Morgan Heritage Trail</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring Grove Cemetery</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Owners/Managers with 3 resource holdings**: City of Blue Ash, Linden Grove Cemetery, Little Miami Scenic Trail State Park, 9

**Owners/Managers with 2 resource holdings**: City of Covington, Village of Indian Hill, Evergreen Cemetery, Hamilton County, Hamilton County Park District, Symmes Township, Union Baptist Cemetery, United Jewish Cemeteries 16

**Owners/Managers with 1 resource holding**: Butler County, Butler County Agricultural Society, Cincinnati Board of Education, Public Library of Cincinnati and Hamilton County, City of Montgomery, City of Springdale, City of Wyoming, Gorman Heritage Farm, Greenwood Cemetery, Highland Cemetery, Indiana Heritage Bureau, Kenton County, Morgan Township, New Burlington Cemetery, Northern Kentucky University, Ohio Department of Transportation, Ohio Society DAR, Saint Mary's Educational (Mount Notre Dame Academy), Starbucks Coffee, United Daughters of the Confederacy, Villa Madonna Academy, Village of Greenhills, Village of Williamsburg, Woodhill Cemetery, Woodside Cemetery Association 25

Resource owners and managers include 17 local or state governments, 10 cemeteries, 4 educational institutions, 1 non-profit, and 9 for-profits (Owner/Manager Type).
**8.5: Historical Analysis**

In addition to planning components such as location, condition, documentation, and ownership, the Assessment collected information that revealed interesting historical insights. One such analysis, primary vs. secondary resources, was discussed earlier. Another historical analysis focused on the date of significance. The Assessment recorded the date of significance for each resource (if the information was available). Date of significance refers to the specific point in time when the resource was created or became associated with the war or war effort. For example, the date of significance for a skirmish would be the date on which it was fought. As another example, the date of significance for a monument would be the date upon which it was dedicated.
If the resources are grouped by decade according to their date of significance, the greatest number of Civil War resources originated in the 1860s (Date of Significance by Decade).

**Figure 8.13:** Graph, Date of Significance by Decade. Created by Author.

Of 111 resources with a date of significance in the 1860s, 109 of these are primary resources (1861-1865) and 2 of these have dates of significance immediately following the war but before 1870. The next greatest decade of origination is the 2000s (14 resources). No resources recorded in the Assessment originated in the decades of the 1940s, 1950s, and 1980s.

Organizing the primary resources according to the year(s) in which they became significant resources (1861-1865) yielded additional information useful for historical analysis (Primary Resources by Year of Significance).
Taking into consideration that several resources had more than one year of significance, some were counted in multiple years. The findings are placed in order chronologically by year: 10 in the year 1861; 33 in 1862; 59 in 1863; 9 in 1864; and 7 in the year 1865.

Each of the primary resources was assigned a relation to one or more historic events or categories (Resources by Historic Events/Categories).
Of the primary resources analyzed, most related to Morgan’s Raid (61), followed by the Defense of Cincinnati (36), Camps of Instruction (11), Military hospitals (7), Industry (5), War Burials (3), and Copperheadism (2). Morgan’s Raid refers to John Hunt Morgan’s Confederate Raid through Kentucky, Indiana, and Ohio in June and July of 1863. The Defense of Cincinnati occurred in August through October of 1862 when Cincinnati was threatened by an advancing Confederate army. Camps of Instruction refer to the training grounds and sites of assemblage for Union troops. Military hospitals are hospitals established or sanctioned by the U.S. government that treated Union and Confederate casualties. Industry includes those businesses that manufactured supplies for the war effort. War Burials refer to interments of soldiers during the war. Copperheadism refers to a political party that supported the Union, but that criticized continuation of the war as casualties and debt mounted.
The map below shows the locations of primary resources related to Morgan’s Raid, the Defense of Cincinnati, and the remaining primary resources (Cincinnati Civil War Resources: Primary Resources). Notice the clustering of Defense of Cincinnati resources just to the south of Cincinnati, mostly in Covington, Kentucky (northern Kenton County). Many of these are the fortifications constructed to protect Cincinnati. Also observe the line of resources relating to Morgan’s Raid that stretch from Dearborn County in Indiana, across northern Hamilton County and into Clermont County. Most of these resources are houses visited by Morgan’s Raiders or skirmish sites associated with Morgan’s Raid. The primary resources related to Morgan’s Raid essentially mark the movement of his forces from west to east across the region in July of 1863.
It was also interesting to note which of the primary resources came into contact by Union or Confederate forces or both. Of the 109 primary resources, 52 were controlled by Union forces, 39 came into contact with Confederate forces, 15 were the site of both Union and Confederate contact, 1 was a Copperhead meeting site, and 2 are not specified (Primary Resources by Union/Confederate Contact). Most of the 15 resources of both Union and Confederate contact are the sites of skirmishes fought in 1862 and 1863.
Secondary resources also offered an opportunity for historical analysis, more specifically content analysis. The 71 post-war resources were subjectively analyzed for bias in their representation. In other words, was the resource purposefully designed to honor the Union or Confederacy or both? Although no bias could be found for 41 of the post-war resources, 23 were deemed specific to honoring the Union cause, 2 were specific to honoring the Confederate cause, and 5 honored both causes (Secondary Resources by Representation).
**8.6: Review of the Data**

The data shows that most of the Civil War resources found in the Cincinnati area are sites, followed in number by structures, markers, and then monuments. The data demonstrates that most Civil War resources in the Cincinnati area are found in Hamilton County. Also, the resources are found in greater numbers close to the center of the study area.

Most the 177 Civil War resources still exist, of which most are in good and excellent condition. Many of the resources are primary in that they existed, were constructed, or resulted from an event during the war. Only a small number of the resources are documented and most are not interpreted.
A majority of the resources are privately owned. Of those that are owned by public entities, most are managed by state and local government. Also, more resources originated in the decade of the 1860s than any other time period since. Of those that were significant during the war, most of these originated in the year 1863. Of the primary resources analyzed, most were related to Morgan’s Raid.
9: Conclusion

The conclusion is divided into two parts. Part one is the author’s evaluation of the data findings. In this section, the author identifies key findings from the data, offers interpretations, and answers initial research questions. Part two of the conclusion focuses on the author’s recommendations for Cincinnati area Civil War resources. In this section, the author recommends courses of action based on the literature, data, and findings.

9.1: Key Findings

Before discussing the findings, recall the several research questions posed earlier:

1. Why is the Civil War important and did the war have any impact locally?

2. What are cultural resources, why are they relevant, and how do they relate to the Civil War?

3. Are local Civil War resources significant enough to justify attention?
   - How many Civil War resources exist in the Cincinnati area?
   - What types of resources exist?
   - Where are the resources located?
   - Who owns or manages the resources?
   - Are the resources documented, interpreted, preserved?

The literature review answered questions 1 and 2 by revealing the importance of the Civil War, identifying the war’s local impact, and exploring cultural resources. The answer to question 3 is based on the findings of the Assessment conducted for local Civil War resources. The findings suggest that local Civil War resources are significant enough to justify special attention:
- **There are a significant number of Civil War resources in the Cincinnati Area.** These 177 resources relate to historic events that happened during the war, and to commemoration, interpretation, and education in the decades following the war.

- **Most of the Civil War resources are sites.** Of the four categories specified by the Assessment, most resources fall under the definition of site. There are also significant numbers of structures. There are fewer markers and even fewer monuments related to the Civil War. That there are more sites and structures than markers and monuments suggests that there may be opportunity for additional interpretation of resources.

- **Most of the Civil War resources are in Hamilton County (OH).** Because the population-center of the eight county study area is centered around Cincinnati and Hamilton County, it is not surprising that most of the resources are located there.

- **Most of the Civil War resources originate from the decade of the 1860s.** A majority of the resources originated from the war itself. These are considered primary resources.

- **Most primary resources still exist.** Of all the resources that originated during the war, some no longer exist, but most still do. This means there is opportunity to document, interpret, or preserve several primary resources. Also, future work might focus on what primary resources are preserved or ought to be preserved and how this might be accomplished.

- **Few resources have been formally documented.** This finding is important and suggests that much more needs to be done to record valuable historical information before resources and the information they hold are no longer available.
• *Only a small number of the resources have been interpreted.* Another important finding that implies that resources are not being utilized by stakeholders to their fullest potential (education, tourism, etc.).

• *Most of the resources are privately owned/managed by several different organizations.* Convincing private-property owners of the significance of the resource they own or manage may be a difficult task. Private property owners are not required to maintain the resources or allow public access. Because there are so many owners/managers, enlisting their collective cooperation to document, interpret, or preserve the resources may be a difficult task.

• *Most of the primary resources relate to either Morgan’s Raid or the Defense of Cincinnati.* Historically, this finding demonstrates that perhaps Morgan’s Raid had the greatest impact of all on the Cincinnati area during the Civil War, followed by the Defense of Cincinnati. Also, the resources related to Morgan’s Raid and the Defense of Cincinnati, when mapped, demonstrate predictable patterns. The first pattern is that the primary resources related to the Defense of Cincinnati form a protective ring just south of the city. The second pattern, involving Morgan’s Raid primary resource locations, demonstrates the movement of Morgan’s Confederates north of Cincinnati.

**9.2: Recommendations**
Based on the research, analysis and interpretation of the data the author has compiled several recommendations with regards to Cincinnati’s Civil War resources. These recommendations include:

1. Create a local Civil War Resources Commission;
2. Work with resource stakeholders;
3. Seek partnerships;
4. Document existing resources;
5. Interpret resources;
6. Develop strategies to preserve select resources;
7. Prepare for and coordinate local Civil War Sesquicentennial events.

1. **Create a local Civil War Resources Commission.** The purpose of the commission should be to act on the following recommendations and provide technical expertise for the documentation, interpretation, preservation, and creation of Cincinnati area Civil War resources, especially during the Civil War Sesquicentennial. The commission should consist of stakeholders, partners and individuals from the eight-county region with specializations in the fields of historic preservation, history, planning, engineering, fundraising, and other related disciplines.

This commission might exist as an ad-hoc committee to a local organization. A successful host organization will need certain resources to contribute to the commission’s success. Already mentioned are individuals with varying backgrounds and expertise. The local Civil War Resources Commission may attract additional support for the host organization, perhaps by
additional membership enrollment, increased publicity, or even new revenue streams. The host organization will likely possess some level of financial stability and the ability to seek funding through donations, grants, bequests, etc. At first glance, a local Civil War Resources Commission may appear to be financially taxing to the host organization. However, the commission will open opportunities to seek additional and untapped revenue sources.

One potential organization may be the Cincinnati Civil War Round Table. Although their focus is primarily educational, this long-standing organization includes Civil War experts and manages a membership base consisting of people with varying backgrounds and expertise. Other host-organization possibilities include the Cincinnati Historical Society, the Ohio, Kentucky, and Indiana (OKI) Regional Council of Governments (although their focus is primarily transportation-related) and several local universities. The Northern Kentucky University in particular focuses on military history, has sponsored several educational programs at local Civil War sites, and manages the James A. Ramage Civil War Museum in Northern Kentucky.

2. Work with resource stakeholders. Several resource stakeholders are undoubtedly aware of the significance of the resource(s) they own or manage; yet some may not be. Stakeholders that are aware of the significance of the resource(s) under their control but who do not entertain any thoughts of addressing the resource(s) may be misinformed about cultural resources. They may be afraid that acknowledging the significance of the resource(s) under their control may interfere with their rights as private-property owners or may cost them time and money to address. There are any number of reasons that stakeholders may be unwilling to
work for the benefit of the resource(s) that they control. However, every effort should be made to engage resource stakeholders to make them aware of the uniqueness of the resource(s) under their influence; develop relationships with the owners/managers; and assess options that stakeholders are willing to work with or agree too. Working with stakeholders may be a tricky balancing act of respecting private property owner rights and advocating for Civil War resources.

Resource stakeholders include the municipalities where resources are located. Any effort to work with resource owners and managers should be further expanded to local governments. Local government departments may be able to assist with maintenance of the resources and development of documentation, interpretation, and preservation strategies. Places such as Covington, Kentucky, where a significant number of resources are located, should embrace Civil War resources as educational and even economic investments. Local governments should make it easy for resource owners and managers to want to document, interpret, or preserve the resources.

3. Seek partnerships. Often a single resource becomes the focus of two or more groups for as many reasons. The groups may agree upon the same use for the resource but for rationales that differ from one another. Such is the case with Civil War battlefield preservation and may also benefit efforts to document, interpret, or preserve local Civil War resources.
To use Civil War battlefield preservation as an example, the goal of the battlefield preservation group may be to preserve a parcel of significant battlefield land. In addition to its historical attributes, the same parcel of land is noted for its value as open-space and sensitive water habitat. In this example, the local battlefield preservation group may find itself partnering with a land conservation trust or environmentalists. Each group works toward preservation of the single parcel of land, but for different reasons.

The same idea should be and is being applied to local Civil War resources. Two local Civil War resources, Battery Bates and Coombs, are located within Devou Park in Covington, Kentucky (Kenton County). The city and park have been working with local mountain biking enthusiasts to plan trails within park boundaries. A recent site visit led by Northern Kentucky University anthropologist Jeannine Kreinbrink involved City of Covington officials, mountain bike advocates from the Cincinnati Off Road Association (CORA) and the Kentucky Mountain Biking Association (KYMBA), and park volunteers. It is hoped that cooperation between these groups will result in mountain biking trails that will not harm the Civil War fortifications. Additionally, the members of CORA and KYMBA have become advocates for the preservation of these historic sites.

A potential and important partner organization, especially for resources related to the Underground Railroad and black Americans, is the National Underground Railroad Freedom Center (NURFC). The NURFC will be an invaluable partner for the study of Underground
Railroad resources. This organization should also be involved with the local Civil War Resources Commission and local Sesquicentennial events.

The local Civil War Resources Commission should actively seek partners for the documentation, interpretation, and preservation of Civil War resources. These partners may include environmentalists concerned with the preservation of land and water resources, schools and universities looking for educational opportunities, cities, historical societies, and even mountain biking advocates.

4. **Document existing resources.** Before they become casualties of neglect or purposeful destruction, existing Cincinnati area Civil War resources should be uniformly documented. I have purposely listed documentation, interpretation, and preservation in the order that they appear based on the perceived increase in funding and commitment when moving from one action to the next. I perceive the movement from documentation to interpretation to preservation as an incrementally taxing process that should be reserved for the most significant of resources. Given the choices of documentation, interpretation, and preservation, documentation is perhaps a more desirable and important alternative than interpretation or preservation. Below are several reasons why documentation is preferable:

   i. Documentation can be completed by anyone with limited training and direction using a template such as that provided by the National Register of Historic Places.
ii. It is likely the least costly of the three methods, requiring only the time and money it takes to visit the site, research, and properly record information. Volunteers may be trained and utilized as an inexpensive and dedicated force to help document resources.

iii. Documentation is less controversial than interpretation and preservation. Interpretation and preservation requires consensus of stakeholders and usually increased costs above what is needed for documentation. Often, owners and managers are opposed to interpretation and preservation because it may interfere with property rights or privacy whereas documentation can be done without the consent of the owner and will not interfere with the owner’s property rights.

iv. The information collected through documentation is easily shared via modern technology methods. For example, digital photographs can be shared electronically and databases can be created and accessed by anyone through the internet.

Recall the National Cemetery Association’s use of volunteers to document National Cemeteries (discussed in Section 4.4); a local documentation program may also utilize volunteers. Several local resources qualify for federal documentation programs HABS, HALS, or HAER. These resources, and most others, may also be eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places. An attempt should be made to nominate qualified resources and at the very least document them according to National Register standards.

One such effort is already taking place. NKU anthropologist Jeannine Kreinbrink is currently working to document and nominate several fortifications in Northern Kentucky to the National
Register. Several of these fortifications are within the City of Covington’s Devou Park boundaries and protected by park policy. However, park boundaries do not completely protect these resources from destruction (ATV tracks over top of Battery Bates). Thorough documentation records important information even for preserved resources in case they are compromised by un-manageable impacts.

**Figure 9.1:** Image, ATV tire-tracks visible in the snow over top of Battery Bates, a Civil War fortification located in Devou Park, Covington, Kentucky. Source: Author.
The local Civil War Resources Commission may also develop a local documentation and designation program. Such a program may encourage documentation by rewarding qualified resources with designation by the commission as an authentic Civil War resource. Local documentation standards should collect information required by the National Register so that these resources may also be nominated to the National Register.

Among other benefits, it is possible that a local documentation and designation program may utilize volunteer and student help, attract publicity for local Civil War resources, and result in the finding of new resources. This local program of documentation could be conducted in conjunction with the Civil War Sesquicentennial.

5. **Interpret the resources.** Of 142 resources eligible for interpretation, only 16 are interpreted. This indicates that Cincinnatian's may be unaware of the Civil War resources that exist and that there are opportunities for further documentation, interpretation, or preservation. An effort should be made to interpret the Civil War resources in a contemporary manner so that they convey educational meaning and visitors understand their importance.

The resources could be interpreted individually but optimally should be interpreted as part of a network or trail. The Ohio Civil War Trails Commission is on track to install eleven interpretive markers (eight in Hamilton and 3 in Clermont Counties) by the end of 2010. The markers will identify significant events relating to Morgan’s Raid and are part of a continuous trail system that starts in Kentucky, passes through Indiana, and terminates in Ohio. Several more
significant resources are still in need of interpretation. To give an example, a road-side marker
trail may be appropriate for interpreting the Civil War fortifications in Northern Kentucky.

A network of interpretive signs may facilitate the development and marketing of a Civil War
driving tour. Civil War Trails is a program that has been successfully implemented in Maryland,
North Carolina, Tennessee, and Virginia. The program marks significant Civil War sites with
interpretive markers, has developed a driving tour to reach these sites, and directional signage
to locate them. A similar program can be developed for Civil War resources in the Cincinnati
area. Similarly, the Civil War Preservation Trust manages the Civil War Discovery Trail
website. The website identifies Civil War sites, gives directions, admission costs, and other
useful information. A website could be developed to list local sites. At the very least, eligible
local sites should be submitted to CWPT for inclusion in the Civil War Discovery Trail.

The Cincinnati Convention & Visitors Bureau and the Northern Kentucky Convention & Visitors
Bureau are two organizations that may be interested in developing and marketing a driving tour
of local Civil War resources. As was covered in Section 5.5, heritage tourism is shown to benefit
local economies. The development of a local Civil War trail may encourage area residents to
travel and spend locally instead of visiting other Civil War destinations. It may also attract
outside visitors interested in learning about Cincinnati’s involvement in the Civil War.

6. Develop strategies for the preservation of primary resources. When preserving Civil War resources, battlefields are often the focus of preservationists. Though there were no Civil War battles fought in the Cincinnati area, several resources are still worthy of preservation. These local Civil War resources include sites where raw recruits were transformed into soldiers and where free black Americans worked in the late-summer heat to construct a defensive network of fortifications. A study should be conducted to determine which of the primary resources are worthy of preservation efforts.

Camp Dennison is one such site worthy of formal preservation efforts. Today’s community of Camp Dennison is named for the camp of instruction that was located here during the Civil War. During the war, the camp processed thousands of troops on their way to and from the front lines. After the war the camp was closed but a community continued to exist where the camp once had. Today, the original Camp Dennison retains much of its historic integrity. If the soldiers were here today, they may recognize much of the landscape and several buildings. Some of the area has been preserved by Symmes Township as a community park and several buildings with historic significance are managed by the Ohio Chapter of the Daughters of the American Revolution. A preservation study should be conducted to determine what, if any additional preservation efforts should be attempted for the Camp Dennison area.

Another such preservation study should be conducted for the remaining original Civil War fortifications in Northern Kentucky. These defensive redoubts were constructed to protect Cincinnati from Confederate approach. Several of the fortifications were constructed with the
help of free black Americans, termed the “Black Brigade.” One site, Battery Hooper, is managed by Northern Kentucky University and has been the focus of archaeological investigation. Two other sites, Battery Bates and Battery Coombs are within the Devou Park boundaries and managed by the City of Covington, Kentucky. A preservation plan should be completed for these two sites, one of which retains much of its integrity.

Camp Dennison and the fortifications in Northern Kentucky are just a few examples of Civil War resources in the Cincinnati area worthy of preservation. Several more primary and secondary resources are worthy of formal preservation efforts. Any subsequent preservation study should determine which resources are most valuable for interpreting the impact of the Civil War in the Cincinnati area and identify which of the resources should be preserved.

7. Prepare for and coordinate local Civil War Sesquicentennial events. The Cincinnati area should capitalize on interest generated by the approaching Civil War Sesquicentennial anniversary and showcase local Civil War resources. The local Civil War Commission can lead efforts to create, coordinate, and publicize local Sesquicentennial events. Their leadership role will be possible because of a diverse membership, stakeholder cooperation, and cultivated partnerships.

Managing a project to thoroughly document local Civil War resources, creating an official Civil War resource designation process, or developing a local Civil War trail are tasks to be considered as part of a local effort to commemorate the Civil War Sesquicentennial. All such
efforts should be mindful of shortcomings of the Centennial anniversary identified by historians in Section 2.3. Local efforts should adopt the advice of experts who feel a the 150th anniversary should: be inclusive of social, political, and economic aspects of the Civil War; confront difficult topics such as racism and segregation; and commemorate the legacy of the war by demonstrating its relevance to the present. An Assessment of Cincinnati Area Civil War Resources demonstrates that local Civil War resources are significant, deserve attention, and with proper planning can benefit our communities.
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Appendix 2: The Resources Grouped by Type and Listed by County

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Markers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Resource Name</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skirmish at Florence Marker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skirmish at Snow's Pond Marker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cosmopolitan, Gwynn &amp; Campbell Marker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morgan Township Copperheads Marker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soldiers, Sailors, and Pioneers Monument Marker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ft. Thomas Army Post Marker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newport Barracks Marker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William H. Horsfall Marker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Grant Birthplace Marker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Grant Memorial Bridge Marker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil War General John T. Wilder Marker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana Morgan Stone Marker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana Morgan Stone Marker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource Name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana Morgan Stone Marker &amp; John Hunt Morgan Heritage Trail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Hunt Morgan Heritage Trail Indiana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Hunt Morgan Heritage Trail Indiana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Hunt Morgan Heritage Trail Indiana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benjamin Harrison/William Henry Harrison Marker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black Brigade of Cincinnati Marker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morgan's Raid Marker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morgan's Raid Through Springdale Marker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Powhatan Beaty Marker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Reily Marker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salmon Portland Chase Marker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheridan's Ride Marker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sultana Marker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waldschmidt Cemetery/Camp Dennison Marker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Confederate Thrust Marker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil War Fortifications and Pontoon Bridge Marker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confederate Financier Marker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First City Hall Marker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fort Mitchel Marker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fort Wright Marker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen. Ormsby MacKnight Mitchel Marker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant House Marker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Marker Resources</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resource Name</th>
<th>County</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Butler County Soldiers, Sailors, and Pioneers Monument</td>
<td>Butler</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middletown Soldiers and Sailors Monument</td>
<td>Butler</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Williamsburg Township Fallen Heroes Monument</td>
<td>Clermont</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5th OVI Monument</td>
<td>Hamilton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abraham Lincoln Monument</td>
<td>Hamilton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blue Ash Bicentennial Veterans Memorial</td>
<td>Hamilton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blue Ash Millennium American Heritage Bell Tower</td>
<td>Hamilton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil War Veterans Monument</td>
<td>Hamilton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Col. R.L. McCook Monument</td>
<td>Hamilton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farragut Memorial Cannon</td>
<td>Hamilton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friedrich Hecker Monument</td>
<td>Hamilton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garfield Monument</td>
<td>Hamilton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Army of the Republic Flagstaff</td>
<td>Hamilton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hamilton County Memorial Building or Cincinnati Civil War Memorial Hall</td>
<td>Hamilton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish Civil War Memorial</td>
<td>Hamilton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lincoln and Liberty Monument</td>
<td>Hamilton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Steamboat Monument</td>
<td>Hamilton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secrest Monument</td>
<td>Hamilton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Sentinel</td>
<td>Hamilton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown Dead Parrot Rifle Monument</td>
<td>Hamilton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource Name</td>
<td>County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florence Skirmish Site</td>
<td>Boone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snow's Pond Skirmish Site</td>
<td>Boone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camp Hamilton</td>
<td>Butler</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenwood Cemetery</td>
<td>Butler</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Battery Shaler</td>
<td>Campbell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evergreen Cemetery</td>
<td>Campbell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Augustus Oskamp House (&quot;Indian Ripple&quot;)</td>
<td>Clermont</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camp Shady (Camp Repose)</td>
<td>Clermont</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dug-Away Ford</td>
<td>Clermont</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen. Hobson's Union cavalry camp</td>
<td>Clermont</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Lytle House</td>
<td>Clermont</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loveland Militia Skirmish</td>
<td>Clermont</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manila Skirmish</td>
<td>Clermont</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miamiville Skirmish Site</td>
<td>Clermont</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morgan's first camp in Ohio</td>
<td>Clermont</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Train Derailment Site</td>
<td>Clermont</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hardinsburgh Skirmish</td>
<td>Dearborn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camp Clay</td>
<td>Hamilton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camp Colerain</td>
<td>Hamilton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camp Dennison</td>
<td>Hamilton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camp Harrison</td>
<td>Hamilton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camp John McLean</td>
<td>Hamilton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crossroads Skirmish</td>
<td>Hamilton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hambleton's Shipyard</td>
<td>Hamilton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Litherbury's Shipyard</td>
<td>Hamilton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miamitown Skirmish</td>
<td>Hamilton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miamiville Skirmish Site</td>
<td>Hamilton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miles Greenwood &amp; Co.</td>
<td>Hamilton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mt. Adams Battery</td>
<td>Hamilton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Burlington Church &amp; Cemetery</td>
<td>Hamilton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Niles Works</td>
<td>Hamilton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observatory Hill Battery</td>
<td>Hamilton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old St. Mary's Cemetery</td>
<td>Hamilton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Porter's Mill Ford</td>
<td>Hamilton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Price's Hill Battery</td>
<td>Hamilton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring Grove Cemetery</td>
<td>Hamilton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Union Baptist Cemetery</td>
<td>Hamilton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Jewish Cemeteries</td>
<td>Hamilton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource Name</td>
<td>County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morgan Township House</td>
<td>Butler</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles P. Harker House</td>
<td>Clermont</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Col. John Williams House</td>
<td>Clermont</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacob H. Thompson House</td>
<td>Clermont</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John F. Johnston House</td>
<td>Clermont</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moses F. Robinson House</td>
<td>Clermont</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old Boston Methodist Episcopal Church</td>
<td>Clermont</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Randall H. Leming House</td>
<td>Clermont</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Grant Memorial Bridge</td>
<td>Clermont</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harmon's Station Bridge Abutments</td>
<td>Dearborn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harrison covered bridge over Whitewater River</td>
<td>Dearborn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacob Gephart Saloon</td>
<td>Dearborn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American House Hotel</td>
<td>Hamilton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anthony Harkness House</td>
<td>Hamilton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benjamin R. Stevens House</td>
<td>Hamilton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burnet House</td>
<td>Hamilton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christian Loos House</td>
<td>Hamilton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evan Breese House</td>
<td>Hamilton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen. Grant's HQ in 1864</td>
<td>Hamilton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Brown House &amp; Barn</td>
<td>Hamilton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Hatch House</td>
<td>Hamilton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HQ, Dept of the Ohio, Ambrose Burnside</td>
<td>Hamilton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HQ, Military District of Cincinnati</td>
<td>Hamilton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HQ, Military District of Ohio</td>
<td>Hamilton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacob D. Cox House</td>
<td>Hamilton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacob Westermann Store</td>
<td>Hamilton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James M. Radcliff House</td>
<td>Hamilton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Whallon House</td>
<td>Hamilton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Wilder House or Wilder-Swaim House</td>
<td>Hamilton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John C. Hunt House</td>
<td>Hamilton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John R. Wright House</td>
<td>Hamilton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Schenk House</td>
<td>Hamilton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John T. Conklin House</td>
<td>Hamilton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johnston House</td>
<td>Hamilton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keys-Moulton House</td>
<td>Hamilton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin Werts House</td>
<td>Hamilton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Hardin House</td>
<td>Hamilton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mount Notre Dame Academy</td>
<td>Hamilton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nathaniel Humphrey House</td>
<td>Hamilton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Baltimore Bridge</td>
<td>Hamilton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quartermaster's Department</td>
<td>Hamilton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Reily House or Twin Oaks</td>
<td>Hamilton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sage Tavern</td>
<td>Hamilton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Twelve Mile House</td>
<td>Hamilton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waldschmidt House and associated buildings</td>
<td>Hamilton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whitewater Shaker Community Office Building</td>
<td>Hamilton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whitewater Shaker South Family Dwelling</td>
<td>Hamilton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Hamilton House</td>
<td>Hamilton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William S. Rosecrans House</td>
<td>Hamilton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amos Shinkle House</td>
<td>Kenton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant House</td>
<td>Kenton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Structure Resources</strong></td>
<td><strong>51</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>