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The Arsenal Monument in the Congressional Cemetery in Washington D.C. commemorates the twenty-one women who died while working as cartridge makers in the Washington Arsenal on June 17th, 1864. It utilizes both traditional and idealized memorial imagery, represented by an allegorical figure of Grief who stands atop the Monument’s shaft, as well as a realistic representation of the Arsenal explosion carved into the base. Erected only a year after the incident, the Monument can be interpreted as commemorating all twenty-one women by the inclusion of their names on the sides of the base. From this listing of names and the Monument’s location within a cemetery, it would also appear that the Monument serves as a headstone for the mass grave below.

However, six women, whose families preferred them to be buried separately from their fellow comrades, are in other locations both within the Congressional Cemetery and in Mount Olivet Cemetery. This separation raises questions as to whether or not this public Monument was a successful memorial for the women’s families. Before the rise in popularity of monument building in the decades following the Civil War, mourning and memorializing was a private practice conducted by family and friends rather than the government and fellow citizens. Given this, the Arsenal Monument can be viewed as an object that mediates between the private act and the eventual public recognition of lives lost during wartime.
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On a hot summer day on June 19, 1864, approximately a thousand people collected at the Washington D.C. Arsenal’s gates to witness the funerary rites for fifteen young women who had perished in the Arsenal fire two days previously.\(^1\) The women worked in the Arsenal as cartridge makers during the Civil War. After the ceremony, the funeral procession made its way from the entry gates of the Arsenal complex to the Congressional Cemetery. The streets were lined with spectators. This accident had been the worst to have happened in the city during the entire span of the war leaving many shocked at such a sudden death toll that was unrelated to a battle.\(^2\) Though the cemetery was originally private, founded under Christ Church as the Washington Parish Burial Ground, the church set aside large portions of land specifically for members of Congress who died in the city while holding office.\(^3\) The choice by the Arsenal’s Funeral Committee, made up of the women’s fellow employees, to use the Congressional Cemetery offered the family members of the deceased an honorary tribute because their deaths had been in the public service. The last coffin in the line of hearses and ambulances was Annie Bache’s at the request of her family who, nevertheless, wanted her separated from the others and placed in a vault.\(^4\) The crowd of mourners increased

---


\(^2\) Because the war was being fought in all the areas surrounding Washington, D.C., in the South and Pennsylvania, the city was fortunate to avoid all major battles.


\(^4\) *Washington Star*, “The Funeral of the Victims of the Arsenal Explosion,” (June 20, 1864). Annie Bache, according to the newspaper, is said to have been kept to the back of the line and placed in a vault later when, in fact, she was “vaulted” three hours before along with Sallie McElfresh who was buried in a family plot. Today, both Bach and McElfresh are in unmarked, family plots. Although the newspapers stated that Bache was interred in a vault, it was a common practice for family vaults to be sold to other families when the original family “died off” [See Blanche Linden-Ward’s *Silent City on a Hill* chapter,
when the coffins arrived at the cemetery and, due to the early attendees who had claimed prime positions hours previously, forced the latecomers to the edges. The fifteen coffins were lowered into two large pits one at a time. To honor these women, the newly formed Monument Committee decided a day after the funeral that a monument should be constructed. A year later, a monument stood on the spot.

Located in the northwest area of the Congressional Cemetery, the Arsenal Monument designed by Lot Flannery faces south aligning with no other tombstones or funerary obelisks in the cemetery which all face the east (fig. 1-9). It stands at the opposite end of the cemetery from the Congressional Cenotaphs designed by Benjamin Latrobe in 1812 (fig. 10). Atop a twenty-foot shaft an allegorical figure of Grief stands in a rested contrapposto, clad in a simple peplos belted at her waist. Her hands are clasped below her waist as her head tilts to her right, eyes closed in sorrow, representing the national and familial feelings for the deceased. Weather and time have not been sympathetic towards the carved marble as Grief’s face displays streaks of water damage as if she really weeps for the victims. Holly leaves and berries decorate the shaft and capital on which she stands – an evergreen plant whose connotations, perhaps, symbolize the everlasting soul after death. Carved into each of the four sides of the pedestal’s

---

“Grave Problems in Boston,” (Columbus: Ohio State University Press, 1989), 149-166.; this could explain the discrepancy between the newspaper’s account and the dead’s current status. Congressional Cemetery docent, Steve Hammond, is working on receiving government funding to provide headstones for the two graves.


6 “Congressional Cemetery Historical Information,” <http://www.cem.va.gov/cems/lots/congressional.asp>. The exact date as to when the Cenotaphs were first constructed is unknown. Although they are called cenotaphs, implying they represent the deceased that were buried in other locations, the earliest government officials to pass away and be recognized in the Congressional Cemetery were buried underneath them rather than transported back to their home cities. Because of the undeveloped embalming techniques of the time, it was impractical and expensive to transport the bodies across long distances.
cornice are winged hourglasses. Below, on the east and west façades, the twenty-one names of the deceased are listed, though six women were not buried at the site. The north side states: “Erected by public contribution by the citizens of Washington, D.C. June 17th.” Carved on the pedestal’s south façade, the side Grief peers down on, is a graphic, low relief representation of the Arsenal explosion. Dense smoke seeps from the doors and windows of the building, blocking the majority of the building’s structure from view. An explosion blast disrupts the smoke, indicated by jagged edges and finely carved lines. Beneath the dreadful scene are the words: “Killed by an explosion at the U.S. Arsenal Washington, D.C. June 17th, 1864.” The word “arsenal,” originally misspelled, shows the crude correction of an inserted ‘E.’ The surrounding marble, discolored by time, further enhances the bone-white error.

This monument’s iconography, in many ways, carries on the gendered traditions of private memorializing, but, as a marker of “mass” death, did this tradition still ease the emotional suffering of family and friends? Equally, what did it mean to have a conspicuously tall, vertical object dedicated to women in an otherwise male-dominated public space? This paper will explore these questions, arguing that the Arsenal Monument’s overarching significance is as an object that, rather than breaking down gender divisions, as the commemoration of women’s labor during the war might suggest, instead dismisses female involvement in public service as well as suggests the widening class divisions of the post-war era.

The Washington Arsenal was located on the southern point of land where the Anacostia and Potomac Rivers met, named Greenleaf’s Point. Chosen in 1803, this spot

7 See Appendix 4A for a full listing of the women.
offered the Arsenal strong defenses because of the strategic ease of transporting military goods using the nearby waterways. It was, however, not until 1810 that the site was recognized as an official arsenal with a complex of buildings ranging from a powder magazine and a carpenter shop, to a metal smith. (fig. 11-14). With the War of 1812 and the British invasion in 1814, the Arsenal was destroyed during an attempt to capture the magazine. Later rebuilt, and completed by 1817, Andrew Villard, in charge of gun carriages, along with the Quartermaster General, headed the Arsenal’s construction with explicit instructions to not “use artificers to erect buildings and workshops.” The final cost for the complex of eight two-storied brick buildings was $30,000, paid for by Congress. Eventually, Greenleaf’s Point would also house the District Penitentiary (by 1831) and later, in 1862, the Penitentiary would be turned over to the War Department becoming part of the armaments program during the Civil War as the need arose for more production and storage space.

A short article accompanied a *Harper’s Weekly* illustration of the Washington Arsenal in the March 16, 1861, issue describing the activity that surrounded the buildings at this time just a month before Fort Sumter:

In connection with the military movements now proceeding at Washington we publish herewith a view of the Arsenal at that city. It stands on the junction of the eastern branch with the Potomac, and is surrounded on three sides by water. Here are foundries, work-shops, magazines, laboratories, and everything necessary for the manufacture of implements and materials of war. At the present time the Arsenal is a scene of great activity. In front of the Arsenal stand a collection of

---

9 McClellan, 12. The barracks were destroyed as well as 20,000 small arms.
10 Ibid, 13 & 15.
foreign brass cannon, some of which are trophies taken in battle at Saratoga, Yorktown, Niagara, and Vera Cruz.\textsuperscript{12}

This quote, reassuringly lists previous battle victories and describes for interested readers, primarily middle-class, white men, what the nation’s capital was doing to prepare for war as political tensions rose between the United States and the newly self-proclaimed Confederate States of America.\textsuperscript{13} It also provided military enthusiasts a brief, yet thorough account of an important military site and its function should war arise. Arsenals offered an efficient and logical venue for artillery production during the Civil War because of their already designated locations near transport as well as the amount of storage capacity for materials.\textsuperscript{14}

The Arsenal’s female workers, largely a population of young women with a few exceptions of some slightly older, married women, by their employment were breaking the bounds of what was seen as acceptable women’s labor. While white middle-class female nurses during the Civil War were, at first, frowned upon for taking on roles exposing them to men’s bodies and hard physical labor, nursing evolved in the public perception to hold a degree of domesticity that made it acceptable for middle-class women during a time when the necessary number of men to take on such services was

\textsuperscript{12} Harper’s Weekly, “Arsenal at Washington,” 16 March 1861, 173.

\textsuperscript{13} Lorman A. Ratner, Paula T. Kaufman, and Dwight L. Teeter Jr., Paradoxes of Prosperity: Wealth-Seeking versus Christian Values in Pre-Civil War America (Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 2009), 47-62. This book details the readership of Harper’s Monthly, the progenitor of Harper’s Weekly, by discussing who the magazine criticized (Irish immigrants, African Americans) for sabotaging the nation’s democratic foundation. Though the source states the an equal amount of men and women read Harper’s, and therefore printed items that would not have purposely offended women, the magazine was not a supporter of suffrage and saw to it that female-oriented stories advocated for the non-working, stay at home mother and wife.

\textsuperscript{14} Although they were convenient, arsenals also became immediate targets during the war. The Confederacy often captured Federal Arsenals, taking the military stores to other locations away from the coast. See Brian Bryant, “Working Women in the Confederate South,” (Ph.D. diss, University of Houston, 2008), 78.
dwindling. Signed into existence by Abraham Lincoln near the beginning of the war, the United States Sanitary Commission maintained a support system from the domestic front allowing women to raise money for the Union war effort as well as volunteer in Army camps as nurses and cooks. However, women working at arsenals did not receive the same backing, perhaps due to the inappropriate or undisguised working-class character of the amount of hands-on physical labor needed in an industrial, rather than “bedside,” context. Eventually, defenders of female employment in arsenal settings used women’s “natural” dexterity as evidenced in their sewing as the perfect talent for transferring to “choking” cartridges.15

Cartridges were not the only forms of artillery being made at the Arsenal but they were what the women were most concerned in making because of their “natural” feminine talents. Made for one of the types of rifles being used during the war, cartridges were a necessity if soldiers were to be able to load their rifles quickly with the correct amount of gunpowder to fire Minié balls, or conical shaped, lead bullets.16 White working-class women became the dominant manufacturers of cartridges as more men were called away to fight. They placed lead balls in paper tubes water-proofed by wax, filled them with gunpowder, and finally tied the ends closed. Their bosses would supervise the process, making sure the correct measurements were being used as well as firing anyone who was being careless.17

---

15 Bryant, 79.
16 Ibid, 77.
17 Brian Bergin, “The Forgotten History,” (unpublished presentation, July 22, 2009. Microsoft PowerPoint file). Before the fire, earlier in the day, the Washington Arsenal’s Chief Pyrotechnist fired a girl who was caught talking and laughing.
The psychological fulfillment women gained from serving their country encouraged them to pursue Arsenal jobs as did the relatively decent pay a woman could earn. Compensation for female cartridge makers in arsenals varied. In the South, an average was $2 a day, based on experience, but with currency that was exponentially failing due to inflation. After the Richmond, Virginia, Arsenal disaster, on March 13, 1863, many women went on strike for higher pay.18 Women at the Washington Arsenal were probably paid between forty and seventy-five cents a day with few exceeding $1.10.19 Pay for nurses ranged greatly between the Union and Confederacy. While nurses in the South were paid $25 a month, Sanitary Commission nurses led by Dorothea Dix in the North were paid $12 a month.20 Equating to nearly seventy cents less than what the women arsenal workers were paid, compensation was the least of Northern nurses’ concerns as they truly believed they served a greater cause by providing ailing soldiers bed-side assistance.21 Nurses who, at least in the public imagination, became virtuous surrogate mothers and wives at soldiers’ bedsides, women arsenal workers became, themselves, war makers and so, as one historian has said, “bodies out of place,” who seemed to assert themselves into the realm of men and soldiers.22

18 Bryant, 70, 79, 85, 92.
19 Bergin, “The Forgotten History.”
20 Bryant, 7-8. Bryan points out the differences between matrons and nurses who are defined as female caregivers. Southern hospitals were instructed to hire as many nurses as possible probably because they did not assist in any surgeries, therefore, they did not need to be trained. Instead, their purpose was to alleviate the physical and emotional pain of soldiers. Compensation for each month for the various types of matrons was: $40 for chief matron, $35 for assistant matron, $30 for ward matrons.
21 Silber, 199-200.
Popular magazine illustrations epitomized the sort of labor hierarchy women confronted. A selection of illustrations from *Harper’s Weekly* between the years 1859 and 1862 presents the common perceptions of women’s roles. This particular publication more often used illustrations when stories, fictional entertainment or news breaking events matched up with images that had already been produced and were readily available. One illustration usually required more than one artist, each one specializing in a certain motif such as face and hands or architecture, in order to gain the most naturalistic depiction. But if one artist was designated as the main artist, they often inscribed their name into the illustration or were mentioned within the accompanying text as will be seen later with two illustrations signed by Winslow Homer. This selection of illustrations, from a four year time span, was chosen as representative of the typical *Harper’s Weekly* publication from before the start of the war through one year past the war’s start. In this way, we can see how illustrations changed (or not) in representing women. This sampling can then be representative of the dominant Northern elite’s view of working women in comparison to middle-class ones. Even their “factory-style” production corresponds to a taste that demanded such images be produced on a mass-culture scale.

In the September 6, 1862, illustration, “Our Women and the War,” a series of vignettes presents the women as purely domestic types (fig.15). Asymmetrically composed, the largest scenes in the foreground pair two different locales but both have older women, one a nun symbolizing charity and the other a motherly letter writer.

---

symbolizing home, at the side of bed-ridden soldiers. The assumption that these men are soldiers, and that the scenes are taking place in a hospital, is based not on any details but on the incorporated text that guides the viewer to read the illustration as set outside the home. Centrally positioned and above these two reassuringly familiar and asexual figures, the artist depicts young, attractive women in a social gathering in an interior sewing clothes. A box is labeled “soldier’s shirts” to avoid confusion for the reader. Floating near them to remind them that their labor is in the service of domestic and personal sentiment, and not for remuneration, are romantic tokens including a lock of hair and a daguerreotype. Balancing these delicate beribboned objects is a small vignette of a slim, youthful laundress in action at a camp while an officer supervises. Unlike the other women, the laundress turns away from the reader as she cleans, becoming an anomalous figure and, therefore, unimportant compared to the officer who faces the reader displaying his full formal attire and sword. He leads troops for the greater good of preserving the Union. In all of these images, which combined create a two-page spread for the “Journal of Civilization,” women are shown as helpful in the war effort: sewing clothes, washing clothes and comforting those who are ill or injured. Except for the camp’s laundress, a woman’s place is inside the domestic space, where they control and dominate men who have been identified as vulnerable or in need of care. The laundress is the only one located outside, and, because of this, she requires male supervision. By entering into the male realm, but still carrying on with what women are naturally capable of, she becomes subordinate to the officer and soldier.
According to “Our Women and the War,” the best way a woman can help during war is to continue doing what she does best: household activities even when away from the private home. Another illustration in Harper’s Weekly, the June 2, 1861, issue cover, conforms to this mind-set on the domestic war effort (fig.16). “The War – Making Havelocks for the Volunteers,” by Winslow Homer, shows a large group of women sewing together in a sitting room. The detail that identifies this scene as a “war” one is the pile of havelocks, or hats with pieces of fabric sewn onto the back to protect the wearer from sunburn, in the foreground. One havelock is being worn by the woman facing the viewer, mending an officer’s jacket on her lap. By not conveying whether or not military hat-making involves more work than cross-stitching, or any other decorative craft, the illustration is able to project the naturally delicate nature of women within the interior. Even when they are making something to be worn for a future battle, a lady’s grace is innate and even emphasized by the contrast with the rougher masculine forms. If these attributes of war (the various pieces of soldier’s uniforms, a draped American flag, and the framed portrait of a soldier in the upper left corner) had not been included, this illustration would look no different from any other domestic gathering of crafting women. But because these sentimental and patriotic reminders are present, the reader becomes aware that the projects in the hands of these women are not trivial or personal but supportive of men and a greater cause.

Another illustration by Homer further supports this domestic masking of female labor during the war. The cover illustration for the July 20, 1861, issue, captioned as “Filling cartridges at the United States Arsenal, at Watertown, Massachusetts,” presents a
composite of two illustrations separated by crossed bayonets. Both show the same action, filling cartridges, but by two different techniques and genders (fig.17). On top, two rows of women sit around a long rectangular table “choking cartridges” while a male uniformed overseer inspects. Below, just four men sit or stand, not so much at tables as at individual trays, placed there to catch lead balls and gunpowder that may miss being funneled into the paper tubes. While the women sit in orderly rows on long benches, the men sit more informally on boxes and barrels, apparently all as equals, without a supervisor. Visually, the scene for the women is in some ways similar to the previous illustrations. A type of domestic-camouflage has been created within this workshop by the shawls and hats that hang neatly on the wall, softening the hard wooden surface. The only standing woman is hanging up her hat and her gesture and gaze leads the eye to the darker, broad shouldered and hatted form of the ‘boss,’ who inspects one of the cartridges. None of the other women look up from their concentration on the delicate task of using fingers to insert the balls into the narrow tubes. In contrast, like the military supervisor for the women, the men in the lower scene keep their hats on and expose shirtsleeves like artisans. Funnels on the table signify the tools they use instead of fingers. With thread spools visible instead on the women’s working table, their ‘gathering’ resembles a quilting circle, and the jackets they wear – not the rolled up sleeves of the laundress – reinforce their gentility. This illustration attempts to put back into place bodies that were out of place by highlighting their continued subordination to the male supervisor, as was seen previously with the working-class laundress, while avoiding affording them the individuality male workers were able to maintain.24

24 Giesberg furthers this discussion of separate spheres in the arsenal setting, pages 75-76.
One final set of illustrations involves the popular fashion of dress that many women, including the U.S. Arsenal workers, were wearing at mid-century. *Harper’s Weekly* of February 19, 1859, had an article titled “Employment of Women.” Its accompanying illustrations present different scenes of women working in the “W.S. & C.H. Thomson’s Skirt Manufactory” (fig.18). The number of female workers’ figures doubles as they handle and mass-produce hoop skirts for future wearers and display the voluminous skirts as well. In the lower illustration, the women sit and stand in ordered rows either at sewing machines, in front of the hoops, or in small groups to hand-sew (with similar bent postures as the previously mentioned “Havelocks” illustration). The two smaller images in the upper corners of the page highlight and magnify the lower scene. The article states that this factory will not only produce thousands of “indestructible” hoopskirts but also employ one thousand women with a pay of between $4 and $16 a week. *Harper’s* touts this company as providing for women who have dependents to care for and that the factory, despite the foolish fashion it produces, is not a “wholly useless” institution because of the greater good of the families being kept in mind by these women workers as well as the continuing reminder to them to “Strive to Excel.”

*Harper’s* again reassures its readers that any women entering this industrial environment will still be within a patriarchal, or paternal, structure as the manufacturer intends to build a library and hold lectures for the employees, though the illustration itself does not show a male supervisor in this female-dominated space.

But the hoopskirt itself became a joke. “Hoops and Combustion,” from *Harper’s* March 30, 1861, issue illustrates the type of humor aimed at the mid-century fashion.

---

According to the cartoon, hoopskirts present the possibility of spontaneous combustion when in close proximity to an attractive beau. If the need had arisen, the suitor need only smother the flames with the “patented extinguisher.” The cartoon heavy-handedly suggests women’s incapability of controlling themselves emotionally in comparison to the man who is able to respond quickly in the face of danger with his available tools. Though meant to be in the context of other “Humors of the Day,” or satires of contemporary follies that Harper’s published, the mixing of fire with fashion took a literal turn at the Washington D.C. Arsenal. Discussed below, the hoopskirts worn by many of the cartridge makers at the Arsenal hindered their ability to work under conditions similar to that of men. What necessitated their continuing to wear fashionable dress even in an industrial setting that held the real possibility of combustion? Though socially unacceptable to allow women to wear pants, even for practicality’s sake, wearing the dress and hoopskirt both upheld female subordination by signifying their incompetence as artisans and maintained their class status as genteel inhabitants of a domesticated workplace.

Though perhaps it was not the main reason for this choice, the columnar and classically straight robe of Grief on the Arsenal Monument was a garment that avoided all associations with the contemporary fashion linked to the high death toll. But the choice of classical dress also served to continue a tradition of utilizing classical female figures to convey abstract concepts. Because Grief is an allegorical figure, a personification, she does not wear the contemporary fashions of the Arsenal workers. But
her neo-classical costume also may have kept her as an ideal of femininity distant from visitors to the grave today as well as in the nineteenth century.\textsuperscript{26}

Perhaps not initially, but eventually, great care was given to prevent any and all possible sparks that could lead to explosions in arsenals.\textsuperscript{27} By the time of the Washington Arsenal’s incident, such disasters were not uncommon.\textsuperscript{28} Arsenal workers took precautions inside the cartridge rooms, but in this case the catalyst for the Washington fire occurred outside. Thomas B. Brown, the Arsenal “Pyrotechnist,” or the one in charge of fireworks and rockets, as well as the superintendent who oversaw the cartridge makers, had set white star fireworks out to dry on the morning of June 17th near the southwest corner of the facility. Around noon, due to the intense summer heat, the fireworks ignited, sending sparks into the Arsenal’s window where the women were producing cartridges, the so-called Choking Room.\textsuperscript{29} Surprisingly, no men died. Earlier that day, Brown had fired a female worker for laughing and talking but it is not known where he was at the time of the explosion.\textsuperscript{30} From this, it is clear that \textit{Harper’s} Watervliet Arsenal with its prominent depiction of the presence of a supervisor in the cartridge rooms was intended to be a reassurance to families considering women’s war employment rather than an

\textsuperscript{26} See Marina Warner, \textit{Monuments and Maidens: The Allegory of the Female Form} (London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1985), chapter 4, “Engendered Images,” 63-87. Because allegories function as metaphor, viewers of allegory are never viewing a woman, or in rare cases a man, so much as a stand-in for the abstract idea being represented. In the case of the Arsenal Monument, the figure is not a grieving woman but Grief embodied.

\textsuperscript{27} Bryant, 81. In his dissertation, Bryant states that Confederate Arsenals were inspected in order to reduce the fear that unsafe practices were happening in the working environment (“men with nailed sole boots walking over spilled gunpowder”). Though it was reported in a \textit{Richmond Dispatch}, July 13, 1861 article that only spontaneous combustion would create an explosion in the Richmond Arsenal because of its strict safety precautions, an explosion occurred shortly after the printing.

\textsuperscript{28} Allegheny, PA, 17 September 1862; Jackson, MS, 5 November 1862; Richmond, VA, 13 March, 1863; Watervliet, NY & Washington D.C. 17 June 1864.

\textsuperscript{29} \textit{Washington Star}, “The Explosion Yesterday at the Arsenal; Further Details and Particulars – The Coroner’s Inquest,” (18 June, 1864).

\textsuperscript{30} Bergin, “The Forgotten History.”
accurate description. Brown would later be tried for and found guilty of “gross negligence.”

The *Washington Star*’s printing on June 18, 1864, of the “Coroner’s Inquest,” details the aftermath of the fire and identifies the deceased, but also presents a theory as to why certain victims were burnt worse than others. The coroner believed that it was the metal hoop skirts worn by most of the women that “caged” them and “afforded facilities for the flames to fasten upon them with fatal effect.” As a result, some bodies were “crisped quite bloodless.” The sensationalism, or the outrageous details that the newspapers printed detailing the aftermath of the Arsenal fire is typical of the Civil War era and it has been described as a realist discourse. Other gruesome details mentioned, apart from the crispy remains, included how boxes were used at the site to collect small body parts. But along with such grotesque details, the newspapers were also known for their emotionalism, by putting in personal responses to the sight: "With tears and sobs the relatives moved around the platform, anxiously looking for the remains of their loved ones, and when they were able to single out the coffin containing the body searched for, the distress was most painful." This description fits romantic, Victorian notions of sentimentalism that will be discussed in more depth later with mourning images.

The realism and emotionalism of newspaper accounts illustrates how the arsenal’s explosion impacted civilians. It was a disaster not caused by an enemy but by an accident.

---

31 Giesberg, 89.
32 *Washington Star*, Saturday, June 18, 1864, “The Explosion Yesterday at the Arsenal, Further Details and Particulars – The Coronor’s Inquest; The Inquest.”
34 *Washington Star*, Monday, June 20, 1864, "The Funeral of the Victims of the Arsenal Explosion."
35 Barton, 159. He also categorizes this deep reflection of loss as Dionysianism.
of war at home. At the funeral, newspapers described sisters fainting besides coffins and parents demanding one last glimpse of their beloved child. There was a definite need then to assuage this public outcry. The Arsenal Monument, raised only a year after the internment, was the answer. Like the newspapers, the carved marble is a mix of realism and romanticism. The realism is represented by the relief depicting the shocking explosion and wafting smoke and the allegory, embodying sentimental and romantic ideals, does not correspond with the deceased women so much as the abstract emotions felt by the public on that seventeenth day of June.

The ages of the women ranged from the oldest, Rebecca Hull, at 40 years old, to the youngest, Sallie McElfresh, 12 years old. Pinky Scott, at 31 years, was a widow with two children. Not much information is available to give full biographies of each woman but generalizations can be made by taking instances from other arsenals to understand who these women may have been. At the Allegheny Arsenal in Pennsylvania, fathers who held positions there tended to arrange for their daughters to also work there allowing them to keep an eye on the young women. Women who were poor also sought work at arsenals and were hired as long as they were capable of keeping up with fast-paced production. Middle and upper-class women also worked, in some accounts in order to donate their earnings to places like hospitals, a narrative that allowed class divisions to disappear temporarily in the workplace. Whether these women were settled U.S. citizens or immigrants is impossible to know for sure but looking at how the draft was extended to newly-arrived male immigrants in the North to fill the need for soldiers, the
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same conditions might apply for industrial work. As long as the individual understood the task, or spoke English enough to understand the safety measures, and were capable of handling production, there seems to have been no reason to discriminate if there were open positions.

The day after the fire, on Saturday, the 4 o’clock edition of the *Washington Star* reported that a meeting of Arsenal employees was held. The meeting continued the following Monday, the day after the funeral, headed by John Dudley who was unanimously elected chair. John Dudley’s position at the Arsenal was not specified in any news coverage of the fire but he and other men (laborers, soldiers, and clerks) ran to the building immediately upon hearing of the fire, and, risking their own safety, retrieved bodies from the burning Arsenal. Dudley was also the original voice in favor of raising a monument for the women when the funeral was being planned, at which he was selected to be Chief Marshall during the obsequies.

A Monument Committee, separate from the committee that arranged the funeral, formed to begin soliciting contributions from private citizens. Their first official meeting was the day after the funeral on Monday, June 20. The committee was comprised of men, each member being a representative of the different departments of the Arsenal from clerks to blacksmiths. They were successful in their goal because, according to a
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small insert in a San Francisco newspaper, $3,000 was raised after only two months.\textsuperscript{43} Significantly, as an all-male committee, this group differed from later monument committees that erected Common Soldier and Sailor Monuments after the war. Those later Committees, though usually a mix of men and women, were often led by women as the main proponents of the memorial because of their new cultural positions as widows and mothers of deceased sons. The Arsenal Monument Committee, which was memorializing women who were working outside of their homes and away from their families, seem to have acted from a sense of the “brotherhood” of labor rather than from the familial sentiments behind the commissioning of public Common Soldier Monuments.

Arsenal disasters occurred in the North and the South with death tolls numbering from a few to over one hundred. These dangerous work conditions disturbed paternal caregivers too, something that may also be represented in the immediate response from men near the explosion and the quickly formed, male Monument Committee. To heads of households, that these women needed to work outside the home for financial reasons reflected poorly on their role as patriarchs. These women, killed in the course of the “Rich Man’s War” appeared, even worse, to be unprotected. Perhaps raising a monument then became one last effort to demonstrate paternal and social care for the daughters, sisters and wives whose lives had been lost to federal negligence.\textsuperscript{44} As noted previously, \textit{Harper’s Weekly}’s praised Thomson’s Skirt Manufactory for its ability to care for the

\textsuperscript{43} See Appendix 3A.
\textsuperscript{44} \textit{Washington Star}, “Meeting of the Employees of the Arsenal,” (20 June, 1864). There is a very good chance that women were involved in raising funds for the Monument because the war was still going on and the number of available men was dwindling. Unfortunately, there is no available evidence to state otherwise. The \textit{Washington Star} mentions only the men Arsenal employees.
women working under their employ beyond merely distributing wages. This is telling of how important it was for both private businesses and the government to treat women as dependents in a family rather than solely as “employees.” Women were assumed to be incapable of taking care of themselves in the workplace and so it was important for public employers and private businesses to demonstrate benevolence towards the more vulnerable sex, thereby reaffirming their dependence.

The decision where the deceased would be buried continues the paternalist vein of the Committee’s effort to honor the lost lives of the women arsenal workers. The Congressional Cemetery seemed fitting because all twenty-one women were working under government employ and died in the name of preserving the Union, in a manner strikingly similar to soldiers on the battlefield. But unlike soldiers, who would eventually be buried in newly formed federal cemeteries with the specific intentions of holding both unidentified and identified fallen soldiers, the Arsenal employees were buried in an already formed cemetery. On the day after the explosion, at the first gathering of Arsenal employees, a Committee unrelated to the Monument Committee was formed to settle burial arrangements which included choosing the Congressional Cemetery as the site for internment. Also decided was that “every man connected with the Arsenal contribute one day’s pay to defray expenses” for the funeral. This statement of brotherhood and union in labor seems to be a direct response to the errors of a male supervisor that ended in the
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death of the women. However, masculinity and paternity was restored by the construction of a monument that took on domestic traits and traditions, even when placed in a male-dominated and historically honorable cemetery designed to acknowledge individuals’ public service.

By August of 1864, the Monument Committee raised $3,000 and news of such a success stretched across the nation to San Francisco. The next step, then, was to find someone to produce a monument. A small newspaper article advertised a call for submissions of sculpture designs along with a few guidelines that the monument must follow. The winner of the design competition was Lot Flannery.

Not much is known of Flannery. What is known of his career follows the typical sequence of mid to late-nineteenth-century sculptors in the United States. He owned a business with his brother, Martin, named Flannery Brothers Marble Manufacturers. It would later become the firm of Flannery and Phillipson. His artisanal business was successful in Washington D.C. as he was given various commissions such as creating the first sculpture of Abraham Lincoln after his assassination as well as being contracted to work on the Capitol building’s marble terrace (fig. 20). Unfortunately, his built up reputation from midcentury seems to have declined and even come to a halt in 1890 when he lost a design competition for an equestrian statue of General John A. Logan in the Iowa Circle, now Logan Circle, in Washington D.C.
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The decision by Flannery to design a memorial that brings together allegory and realism is a significant characteristic of the Arsenal Monument. Allegories representing public virtues like Justice or Liberty were more common and traditional motifs than personifications of emotional pain. But Grief, as an embodied abstraction, does continue a long and popular mode of personification in memorializing imagery. Representations of Grief in emblem books, like Caesar Ripa’s *Iconologia*, a resource used by artists to create a visual vernacular language, show and describe Grief as a melancholic, nude male who wears manacles while a serpent gnaws his side (fig. 21). Rather than such academic sources, Flannery seems to have turned instead to early nineteenth-century mourning imagery which featured grieving female figures in modern fashions (fig. 22 & 23).

American memorial images, whether printed, embroidered or water colored, spiked in popularity from the end of the eighteenth century to the early part of the nineteenth century. Women often copied established commemorative patterns and scenes as a way to learn how to embroider or paint. The typical iconography comprised a monument, or tomb, that may have included a classical funerary urn on top, a willow tree, and finally one or more women. The lone woman was the most common template in these images because she helped convey emotion due to her lesser, flawed nature of not being able to control her own emotions. If a man was included, he would be accompanying the woman and was never alone in the image nor, as the more “objective”
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His style may have fit the Logan Monument Committee’s tastes by the end of the century by incorporating training that Flannery was unable to offer.

sex, did he become the primary victim of sorrow (fig. 24).\textsuperscript{53} In this image, \textit{Memorial for George Washington} from 1840, the man turns away, perhaps to mask the possibility of his emotion, while the woman leans against George Washington’s tomb weeping openly into her handkerchief. Here the dichotomy between women and men, emotion and logic, is again offered but now in the context of acknowledging public service. Anita Schorsch connects the boom in the popularity of mourning images with the death of George Washington. Mourning pictures for the first president showed women representing various civic virtues lamenting over Washington's tomb, which became a national symbol of patriotism and the good Christian citizen.\textsuperscript{54} By the 1830s, Laverne Muto says that the memorial images faded with the decline of Romanticism.\textsuperscript{55}

The Arsenal Monument, constructed in 1865, revitalized memorial motifs by presenting the same forms that were common in those types of images. The female figure usually shown mourning beside the tomb is, instead, placed on top. Because she is physically part of the monument, there is no need for her to touch it in recognition and lamentation of the deceased. Such figures of Grief were female, but in this Monument she also might appear to stand as a representative for the dead women. However, she does not wear contemporary fashion like the hoop skirt. Instead, a loose fitting dress belted at the waist creates a cascade effect of fabric folds and layers. Her neo-classical dress and features assist in the visitor’s understanding that this monument is not triumphant or


\textsuperscript{55} Muto, 358.
individual but emblematic of sorrow. As well as channeling or representing visitors' sorrow, her presence encourages visitors to touch the monument instead. In this way, the Arsenal Monument helps visitors re-enact the Romantic rituals of mourning by displaying their own feeling towards the dead. The Monument almost becomes the physical embodiment of the older sentimental images. At the same time, the realistic iconography Flannery included on the base communicates the deceased's courage, sacrifice, and patriotism.

The Arsenal Monument’s south-facing relief on the pedestal, a graphic depiction of the Arsenal’s explosion, far from being symbolic and in keeping with the allegory, includes a style of representation as associated with men as the ideal, classicized, allegorical personification was with women. As a monument located in the Congressional Cemetery, but built to honor women, Flannery achieved legibility by joining ideals: one referring to private emotion and not public, the other to public heroism rather than private life. A public monument to women at mid-century needed to be marked as different from men’s but, at the same time, maintain the masculine ideals suited for memorial structures in a civic space.

Similar issues arose later in the century when commemorating African Americans who sacrificed their lives for the greater good. Augustus Saint-Gaudens’ 1884-1897 Shaw Memorial includes an angelic allegorized figure whose classically draped female form flies above a realistic scene of marching African American troops. In Standing Soldiers, Kneeling Slaves, Kirk Savage notes Saint-Gaudens’ difficulty in deciding whether or not to depict African American troops and if so, how realistically. To not have them present...
was not an option because Robert Gould Shaw’s heroism was defined by his leadership of these troops. The question, then, became how to situate the real (understood as African Americans) with the ideal (understood as restricted to whites) in commemorating a white hero’s deeds.⁵⁶ Savage’s answer involved the compositional hierarchy, or Saint-Gaudens’ choosing to realistically depict individual African Americans marching alongside Shaw, rather than behind or below, him, allowing the allegorical female above the men to represent the heroic ideal.

Though not an issue of race so much as gender, the Arsenal Monument shares a similar formal structure. An allegorical figure atop the monument looks down on the relief of a realistic and individualized scene. But unlike the Shaw Memorial, where the allegory of peace and remembrance is a supplement to the male portraits below, the Arsenal Monument’s lone figure replaces the need to depict an individual woman. In this respect, the layout of the Monument resembles the standardized Common Soldiers Monument (fig. 25). The standing soldier motif that graced so many Civil War memorials up to the turn of the century represented the common man who had earned his masculinity by submitting himself to military service and by experiencing war.⁵⁷ Though these memorials are similar to the Arsenal’s in their standardization or generic symbolism rather than functioning as a celebration of individuals like Shaw, the Arsenal Monument still remains isolated and difficult to fit into even this pattern of Civil War memorialization. Unlike the Common Soldiers Monuments where masculinity is celebrated in part by the very standardization of the soldiers’ form, echoing the common
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military service of all men for whom they stand, the Arsenal Monument is, instead, cautious in acknowledging the femininity of those it commemorates. As with the allegory in the Shaw Memorial, the female figure is not supposed to relate to the deceased by its gender. If that were its function, a male figure would be present instead. Rather, the Arsenal Monument’s diffidence about and avoidance of acknowledging the war service of individuals, other than by putting their names on the pedestal, changes the focus from the deceased women’s contribution to, instead, the public’s grief over a terrible accident.

Much later, another memorial to women was erected in a cemetery in the aftermath of a factory fire. The Triangle Fire Memorial to the Unknowns is located at the Cemetery of the Evergreens in Brooklyn, New York, and though built nearly fifty years later, continued the tradition of including a classical figure in a memorial (fig. 26). A rectangular marble slab exhibits an engraved neo-classical figure kneeling beside a funerary urn. The drapery from her body covers the urn and she uses the gathered folds to cover her face in mourning. Below her the dedicatory words describing the purpose of the monument relay a message to future visitors that buried beneath are the graves of unidentified women and children. In a recent article, “Remembering the Unknowns,” Ellen Wiley Todd describes the failed safety reforms that led to the fire in the Shirtwaist factory in 1911 killing 146 women and children.58 The fire was seen as an embarrassment to both reformers and to society at large (for its failure to regulate industry) as newspapers tried to blame someone for the disaster. Seven still unidentified bodies were buried in Evergreens Cemetery with the Memorial, whose relief was carved by Evelyn

Beatrice Longman received her training from the Art Institute of Chicago under the mentorship of Lorado Taft. She was appointed as the memorial sculptor and commissioned by Robert W. de Forest on behalf of the Red Cross Emergency Relief Committee, a branch of the Charity Organization Society, an elite middle-class organization. It was quietly erected a year and a half after the fire without an unveiling ceremony. While factory owners and opponents of labor laws might not have wished to memorialize the dead in a practice that revisited the monument, labor leaders refused to overlook the past and have the memory be forgotten to history. Not until the fire’s fiftieth anniversary, however, was an annual commemoration service initiated starting at the site of the fire and ending at the Memorial with the purpose of detailing continuing efforts to better working conditions.

Todd argues that the monument’s relatively remote location from the immigrant communities that the women came from as well as its classical iconography “failed to signify for the communities it memorialized.” The classically styled figure who mourns over an urn covered in drapery is exemplary of elite Anglo-Protestant ideals of the dignified mourner rather than a choice based on the styles or imagery closest to or most familiar to the women’s families. The factory workers and their families, largely Jewish and Italian immigrants, further took insult at the monument being on the edge of the cemetery, because of Jewish traditions of reserving this marginal area for the poor and
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Some interpreted its location as an additional attempt to sweep memory of the disaster under the proverbial rug. For that matter, classicism in 1913 did not retain the same symbolic power as in the nineteenth century, when in the wake of George Washington it still denominated public service and honor.

The Longman Memorial to the Triangle fire victims and the Arsenal Monument, are similar to each other in that they commemorate women’s lives lost while outside a familial or domestic role, but the motivations behind each of their creations were completely different. Todd suggests that the Longman Memorial was a public relations endeavor by an elite charity group aimed at appeasing immigrant anger and preventing it from taking the form of an attack on American economic and legal systems. The force that drove the Arsenal Monument’s construction was somewhat more sincere and sentimental. Its construction came about during an era when Neo-classicism was believed to truly represent “genderless” universals and when allegories were standard in private mourning iconography. In order for a successful monument to be built to public women, Flannery, like Harper’s, reinserted them into a domestic place.

Disturbingly, the Triangle Shirtwaist Fire seems to repeat the lack of concern for workers, especially women workers, evidenced by the Washington Arsenal and all the other arsenal explosions during the Civil War. The question, then, is why only forty-six years after the end of the Civil War could another disaster involving women working under similar conditions as the Washington Arsenal happen? A discrepancy, of course, is the difference between public and private sectors of employment and the yet-to-be-
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federally regulated industrial labor conditions. But in terms of public memory, the answer to this failure to act must in part involve the location of the Arsenal Monument.

Because the Arsenal Monument is situated in a cemetery, unless one is aware of the story, a visitor will believe the Monument is a tombstone, like any other private memorial. For the monument to have had public impact, it should have been placed in a location more central to the community, similar to where future Common Soldiers monuments would be placed (in city parks, frequently, sites that emphasized the governments’ role in commemorating and benefitting its citizens), or at Greenleaf’s Point near the site of the disaster. Though the Congressional Cemetery was viewed as an honorable site for a funeral for women in the public service, among memorial tombstones and obelisks to men in a cemetery, the monument lost its public character, especially for those who did not have a personal connection to the women.

Further, one must ask why all the women aren’t buried at the Monument. If being buried in the Congressional Cemetery with funeral costs all paid for by the Federal Government and having a monument erected in the name of commemoration and honor of the dead was not sufficient inducement, why wasn’t it? What was the need for private ceremonies and burials in other locations? One of the questions posed at the beginning of this paper was whether or not the Monument was successful in alleviating the suffering of family members. Because not all of the deceased are present in the Congressional Cemetery, the answer must be no. Perhaps the reason why the government offered to cover the mass funeral expenses was because the families of some of the women were unable to themselves. But if the Federal Government did not pay for separate private
funerals, to have one would have marked the women as different, whether upper class or Catholic. For the four women buried in Mount Olivet, a private Roman Catholic cemetery, and the two in other locations in the Congressional Cemetery, this physical separation may be a literal separation based on class and religion despite the possible bonding that may have happened as they worked together and with men in the public service at the Arsenal. For upper-class families, it may have been more important to maintaining that position mourn in private and preserve a private identity than to display female labor or civic virtue. Similarly, though with different effects for the Arsenal workers whose families may have been too poor for private funerary services, the government action may have elevated their status in society. In either case, it was the women’s gentility, their class position, that was most significant, not their labor or public role.

The need to memorialize is a phenomenon that stretches back for thousands of years. Monuments serve as markers on earth, to not just honor the deceased, but also to serve as reminders for modern viewers of the past and the events that led up to a monument’s existence. But once a monument outlives the lives of those who had first-hand experience and connection with what that monument represents, what becomes of the memory of the memorializing object? For the Arsenal Monument, specifically, it faded into the area it stands in and, assimilated as a tombstone, lost its original meaning. Monuments better known and easily seen, like the Common Soldiers Monuments, act as constant reminders of the Civil War for society thereby creating an artificial memory. The artificiality of these shared memories is due to the fact that no one is capable of
remembering this period of history so much as knowing that it happened. While history books acknowledge and record historical events by informing readers with facts and timelines, monuments present the visual proof of history. For example, the Arsenal Monument’s construction was due to the explosion caused by drying fireworks that were meant to be used in a Civil War battle. Unlike written records that show names next to numbers, the Arsenal Monument presents an image to create an association between the women’s personal identities and the event itself. As a way to rectify the endangerment of women during a time when the feminine was highly defined and separated from the masculine, a visitor to the Monument might be able to see that its existence is due to a sentimental attempt to memorialize private individuals and at the same time acknowledge an accident of war. In a way, monuments are more real than words written about the past because they are products of that past.

The Arsenal Monument, built to commemorate twenty-one women who died in a tragedy that could have been prevented, is an object that attempts to generate a memory that transcends generations by using traditions of private memorialization. A visitor who sees the allegory of Grief in conjunction with the Arsenal’s explosion engraved on the base understands that the disaster created a great emotional loss to families and fellow workers on June 17th, 1864. What was not taken into careful account in building the memorial was the location. That the Monument is situated in a cemetery, a space closed off with walls and gates, presents an environment that hints at restricted access although the Congressional Cemetery is a public space where people are allowed to visit freely. Perhaps an intentional act, the decision to erect the monument to women in a secluded
area rather than a more prominent space means that the monument is unable to represent an artificial memory for future generations because it is not in an area where it can be a constant reminder of the past. Because there were six women buried separately from the mass burial, the Monument could have been constructed outside the Cemetery as a cenotaph with all the women buried in their own private graves. Instead, the Monument is a cenotaph and tombstone hybrid. With the soon-to-be popular manufacture of the Common Soldiers Monuments for public civic locations, the Arsenal Monument serves as a bridge between old traditions of private commemoration and a broader, more public memorializing of the new mass deaths of civilians and soldiers that modern war and technology brought.
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THE FORTS IN TEXAS.

We published an account of the military preparations of Texas in our last number, taking it from Harper's Weekly, and we cannot pass over the important news which that paper has just brought us. Harper's Weekly, quoting the latest of the New York Times, says that the United States Government has ordered the construction of Forts as protection against Texas secession. Harper's Weekly points out that the United States Government has already built Forts at Harpers Ferry, at the falls of the Potomac, and that the construction of Forts at the other points is now being ordered. Harper's Weekly states that the United States Government is also preparing to send troops to Texas, to be stationed at the forts.
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Figure 26 Evelyn Beatrice Longman, *The Triangle Fire Memorial to the Unknowns*, Evergreens Cemetery, Brooklyn, New York, marble, 1912, acquired from Ellen Wiley Todd, “Remembering the Unknowns.”
A) "Terrible Calamity; Explosion at the Washington Arsenal." Daily National Intelligencer, 18 June 1864, column D.
B) "Calamity at the Arsenal, The." *Daily National Intelligencer*, 20 June 1864, column E.

**THE CALAMITY AT THE ARSENAL.**

We learn that four of the sufferers who were rescued alive from the burning ruins of the laboratory at the Arsenal on Friday last have since died, increasing the total number of the deaths by that calamity to twenty-one, whose names are thus reported:

Susan Harris, a young girl, member of Wesley Chapel; Eliza Lacy, whose husband is a soldier in Gen. Grant's army; Miss Collins; Miss Young; Eliza Adams, daughter of a dealer in Centre Market; Miss McIlwraith, who was removed to her mother's residence and died during Friday night; Ellen Brench, and in hospital on Friday night; Joanna Connor; Kate Horan; Miss Dunn; Julius McEwen; Miss Tippett; Miss Murphy; Miss Lloyd; Rebecca Hult; Miss Brailor; Emma Baird; Mary Burnside; and Ada or Willie Webster; which of the two is not certain, but that one of the sisters is dead appears beyond doubt.

We have before given the substance of the report of the

C) "Mournful Spectacle, A." *Daily National Intelligencer*, 20 June 1864, column B.

**A MOURNFUL SPECTACLE.**

The obsequies of the young women who, on Friday last, fell victims to the deplorable calamity which on that day took place at the Arsenal in this city, were yesterday appropriately commemorated, amid demonstrations of profound public sorrow, elicited by an event so solemn and touching. Whether regarded as the aweful circumstances under which death so suddenly came to these unhappy youth, or to the number who were involved in the catastrophe, the accident was painful and tragic beyond any that has ever before occurred in the history of our city, and, as was attested by the number and character of those who participated in the funeral cortège, or who thronged to witness the sad procession, the public sensibilities responded to the appeal addressed to the sympathy of our citizens. The remains of the unfortunate victims, enclosed in handsome coffins, bedecked with flowers, and each borne on a separate hearse, were conveyed from the Arsenal to the Congressional Cemetery, and there interred. Among those who filled the long line of carriages which composed the procession we noticed the President of the United States, the Secretary of War, Gen. Ransom, Chief of the Ordnance Bureau, and other distinguished personages.

The marble statue of Lincoln in front of the City hall is the work of Lot Flannery. Its cost was defrayed by patriotic citizens. Flannery was a self-taught sculptor, who combined energy and enthusiasm with a slight modicum of genius. Among the proposed statues, other than that of Gen. Thomas, is one yet to be erected to Admiral Farragut, in Farragut square, on Connecticut avenue, between K and R and Seventeenth streets. The monument is to be of colossal height, of bronze, for which Congress appropriated $20,000 in April, 1872. Vinnie Ream, the sculptor, has completed the plaster cast and will soon mould it in bronze.


---

Fell From a Bridge.

A young man named Brewer, while standing on the M-street bridge at Georgetown, last night, was taken with a fit and fell backwards from the bridge, striking on the bank and rolling thence into the creek. He was picked up immediately and taken to his home, where it was found that he was very seriously injured.

---

An Important Contract Awarded.

The contract for the marble work on the proposed terrace improvement around the Capitol building has been awarded to Messrs. Martin and Lot Flannery, of this city, at $87,000.

---

Judge Wyile's Successor.

Attorney General Garland said yesterday that Judge Wyile's resignation would take effect to-day, and that the President would probably consider the selection of his successor at once.

---

The New Auditors Qualify.

First Auditor Chenoweth and Third Auditor
C) “General Logan’s Statue; Sculptor Flannery has Prepared a Model for the Committee.”
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**GENERAL LOGAN’S STATUE.**

_Sculptor Flannery Has Prepared a Model for the Committee._

_In a little frame house under the shadow of the Capitol stands a plaster cast of an equestrian statue of General John A. Logan. The sculptor is Lot Flannery, whose statue of Lincoln is perched on top of a tall and thin column in front of the City Hall. Logan’s statue is to be erected in Iowa Circle, Congress having already appropriated the money for the pedestal, while the cost of the statue will be defrayed by the Army of the Tennessee. The committee which will select a model consists of General Alger, General Raum, Capt. George E. Lemon, and Mrs. Logan._

_Mr. Flannery’s statue represents General Logan at the battle of Atlanta, just after the death of McPherson. The horse stands with head curved downward and one foot raised, as if about to paw the ground. The general’s left hand holds the reins not too tightly, and his right hand, extended down his side, has a firm clutch on the crown of his army hat—“the identical pose,” says Mr. Flannery, “that was photographed on my mind as General Logan rode up Pennsylvania avenue on the day of the review of the Army of the Potomac.” There is a total absence of military accessories, no pistol holster, blanket roll or sword being seen. The face is full of character, determination, and intelligence, and is modeled from a bust which Mr. Flannery executed after General Logan had given him a six month’s sitting. Mr. Flannery does not know how many models will be submitted nor how many other artists are working to secure this very desirable commission._

WOUNDS AN INTRUDER

Lot Flannery, Sculptor, Held for Shooting Negro.

VICTIM NOT SERIOUSLY HURT

Veteran Artist, Who Designed and Executed Statue of Lincoln Which Stands in Front of Old City Hall, Says Jack Owens Was Attempting to Break Into His Studio-Home.

Lot Flannery, a veteran sculptor, was arrested at his workshop, Delaware avenue and 11 street southwest, last night by Leet Flather and Policemen Grant and Heathcote, of the Fourth precinct, charged with shooting Jack Owens, a young negro, who, Mr. Flannery says, attempted to break into his place.

Owens was picked up at Second and Canal streets southwest and hurried to Casualty Hospital, where it was found he had been shot through the back near the spine, the bullet passing out the left side. The surgeons say he will recover.

Owens said he entered the premises and was looking around, with no intention to steal, when Mr. Flannery appeared and fired four shots at him, none taking effect. He ran, and, Owens says, the fifth shot hit him in the back.

Overcome by Weakness.

At Second and Canal streets he became too weak to run further. There he met a man and told him he had been shot, asking him to call an ambulance. It was an hour and a half before the police of the Fourth precinct heard of the shooting. Mr. Flannery was arrested at 8:30 o'clock.

When taken to Fourth precinct station, where he is being held, Mr. Flannery told the police he had fired twice at the negro. He says he challenged him to know what he was doing there, and the negro darted through the high growth of weeds. Mr. Flannery said he then fired, but did not know he had hit the fleeing man.

The prisoner designed and executed the Lincoln statue that stands on the high shaft in front of old city hall in Judiciary square. He is a bachelor, 62 years old, and lives alone in rooms adjoining his studio and workrooms. He is the senior member of the firm of Flannery & Phillipson.
LINCOLN STATUE TO BE RESTORED

Exiled Monument Now Is Stored in Basement

WASHINGTON, April 28.—Re-erection on its original site in Washington of one of the first monuments dedicated to Abraham Lincoln, and which for two years or more has been stored in a courthouse basement, is ordered in a bill passed by the House.

When a new courthouse was built several years ago, the monument, funds for which were raised by popular subscription shortly after 1865, was ordered down by the Fine Arts Commission, on the theory that it was out of harmony with its surroundings and that its pedestal was unsafe. The monument, which was the work of Lot Flannery, who knew Lincoln well, consists of a life-size statue.

Ever since it was taken down, a fight led by the Grand Army of the Republic, the Loyal Legion and other organizations, has been waged for Congress to put it back. The President joined in, declaring there seemed to be so much of appealing sentiment about the restoration that Congress ought to help. The Legion contended removal of the monument was a desecration, and posts throughout the country had offered to take it and set it up if it was to remain under a cover of rags in a basement, where no one could see it.

3. Other Newspapers


$3,000 has been raised in Washington for the fund to be appropriated to the erection of a monument over the remains of those who lost their lives by the explosion at the arsenal.
Proposals will be received until Saturday, November 19th, for the erection of a Monument to the memory of the young women who perished by an explosion at Washington Arsenal, June 17th, 1864.

Proposals must be accompanied with a design, dimensions, &c., of the proposed Monument, and also, of a railing to enclose the same.

The Monument to be of the best American White Marble, with the names of the Twenty-One (21) young women suitably inscribed thereon together with the date of the accident.

The foundation must be of granite at least six (6) feet square and 2 ½ feet deep, substantially laid in cement.

The railing must be of Cast Iron, enclosing a lot fifteen by eighteen (15 x 18) feet, and resting upon suitable blocks of granite.

The cost of the whole not to exceed Three Thousand ($3,000) Dollars. The work to be executed to the satisfaction of the Committee.

Bidders will please state the time required to complete the work.

Proposals may be addressed to either of the undersigned at Washington Arsenal.

Joseph A. Burch,
John G. Dudley,
James R. King,
James Johnson.

Nov 3rd to 19th [Chron.] Committee.
4. Arsenal Workers

A) The following table lists the names of the deceased following the layout of the Monument’s pedestal. Accompanying information covers their ages (if known), whether they were unidentified, and their location of burial.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WEST</th>
<th>EAST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Emma Baird</td>
<td>Ellen Roche</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19, unidentified, Monument site</td>
<td>unidentified, Monument site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kate Brosnahan</td>
<td>Julia McEwen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20, unidentified, Monument site</td>
<td>Monument site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisa Lloyd</td>
<td>Bridget Dunn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unidentified, Monument site</td>
<td>Mt. Olivet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melissa Adams</td>
<td>W.E. Tippett</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18, unidentified, Monument site</td>
<td>unidentified, Monument site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emily Collins</td>
<td>Margaret Horan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24, Monument site</td>
<td>20, Mount Olivet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rebecca Hull</td>
<td>Johanna Connor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40, Mount Olivet</td>
<td>20, Mount Olivet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annie Bache</td>
<td>Susan Harris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18, unmarked Congressional</td>
<td>19, unidentified, Monument site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Burroughs</td>
<td>Lizzie Brahlor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unidentified, Monument site</td>
<td>13, Monument site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sallie McElfresh</td>
<td>Margaret C. Yonson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12, unmarked Congressional</td>
<td>Monument site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pinky Scott</td>
<td>Bettie Branagan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31, Monument site</td>
<td>Monument site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Eliza Lacey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>28, Monument site</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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