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Soldiers and civilians alike sought to make sense of the war following the silencing of the guns with the signing of the armistice in 1918. One of the foremost veteran groups leading this effort was the American Legion, founded in 1919. This World War I veteran organization would provide an outlet for Great War veterans to share camaraderie, interact with their local communities, and ultimately pay homage to their fallen brothers in arms. In line with the national organization’s agenda and programs, the American Legion Kings Mountain Post No. 24 in Johnson City, TN executed two very different versions of WWI memorialization, one built in 1922 and another in 1935. These two memorials served the community in vastly different ways throughout the 1900s. The first was a commemorative marker and the second was a community centerpiece.

In this paper, I argue that the differences between two World War I memorials in Johnson City are demonstrative of how the community progressively oriented its identity and infrastructures around Great War veterans following the conflict. Johnson City’s physical and memorial landscapes changed as the city sought to reconcile the war and its survivors. Each memorial served veterans and the larger community in ways that aligned with both the veterans’ needs and larger social contexts of Johnson City at the times of their creations. Ultimately, the memorials were intended to serve very different purposes within the community.

Both veterans and nonveterans in the community responded more favorably to the 1935 Johnson City WWI memorial initially, and then continued to utilize it much more frequently throughout the twentieth century. It was a memorial that was intended to be interacted with regularly. The second memorial’s central role in the community was cemented by how the
memorial’s placement and style differed from its predecessor. The second memorial was more accessible to the public, partnered with a more prominent municipal facility, had an expanded scope, and utilized nationalistic iconography. These key differences are a result of the community’s increased dedication to Great War veterans by 1935. As care for World War I veterans became a central component of the city, so did memorializing the conflict.

This project seeks to complicate the current understanding of what memorials commemorate, the functions they serve, the spaces they create, and how they are used. To this end, I use the memorials themselves, geospatial data, and local government documents to supplement the works of scholars like James Mayo who work with war memorials and the spaces they create.1 Additionally, I use other primary sources like newspapers and local American Legion post materials to track the styles, uses, and meanings of the memorials throughout the 20th century and build upon the work of scholars like Jay Winter who analyze the collective memory surrounding WWI.2 This project marries these two bodies of scholarship in order to analyze the process by which memorials come to serve as physical spaces that represent specific, but intangible, meanings and values while also serving the community in non-commemorative ways. At its core, how do privately constructed World War I memorials serve the public?

---

2 Jay Winter, Remembering War: The Great War Between Memory and History in the Twentieth Century, (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2006).
Between 1922 and 1935, the American Legion Kings Mountain Post No. 24 erected two very different World War I memorials in Johnson City, TN that served the community in very different ways. The first was a memorial placard, and the second was a community centerpiece that hosted both commemorative ceremonies and noncommemorative events. Why did the World War I veterans of Johnson City erect two memorials to the same conflict, and why were they so different from one another? This thesis examines the memorials and their roles in the community in order to demonstrate how World War I reshaped American communities with a vested interest in veteran affairs. World War I forever changed the social, physical, and memorial landscapes of Johnson City.

Following World War I, a series of medical, legal, and social veteran infrastructures were developed and established in Johnson City as the community reoriented itself around addressing the rising needs of Great War veterans returning home. The placements, styles, and functions of the memorials mirrored the city’s development into a community dedicated to World War veterans. Caring for Great War veterans became a central component of the city, and its memorialization of the conflict followed suit. World War I veterans were held in high esteem by the community following the conflict. The Legionnaires used that esteem to garner community support for their memorial projects and developed a version of memorialization that the entire community could use.
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Introduction

On November 11, 1936, hundreds of people entered the gates of Roosevelt Stadium in Johnson City, TN to watch an American Legion sponsored college football game between Milligan and Tusculum. As they entered the stadium, they passed underneath a looming statue of a World War I soldier with a wreath placed against it. The American Legion put the wreath there earlier that day as part of the Armistice Day observances intended to remember the “conflict that threatened to wipe out civilization itself.” At the same time, another World War I memorial stood approximately a mile and a half away that had not been part of the day’s festivities. In fact, that memorial at American Legion Park had not been used for commemoration ceremonies since its dedication thirteen years previous.

That November afternoon is representative of how the two World War I memorials in Johnson City were used throughout the 20th century. The first memorial, erected in 1922, was a locally-sourced boulder with a plaque bolted to it that listed Johnson City’s Great War dead. The second memorial, erected in 1935, was the mass-produced ‘Spirit of the American Doughboy’ statue copyrighted in 1920 by Indianan sculptor Ernest Moore Viquesney. The commercial nature of the second memorial did not make it any less genuine than its predecessor that had been physically unearthed from the community. In fact, the second memorial was the preferred commemoration and civic centerpiece out of the two. Over the years, the first memorial stood solemnly in a small municipal park on the fringes of town and served as a way for the city to

---

3 “Legion Parade and Grid Game on Slate Today,” *Johnson City Chronicle* (Johnson City, TN), November 11, 1936, pg. 1.
4 Ibid.
5 Johnson City Board of Commissioners, “Regular Meeting February 14, 1923,” *Minutes of the Board of Commissioners*, Vol. 9, pg. 575, City of Johnson City Records Collection, Archives of Appalachia, East Tennessee State University, Johnson City, Tennessee.
preserve the memories of their lost loved ones. The second memorial, however, served as a community centerpiece and provided an opportunity for the community to engage with and process those memories through veteran led commemoration exercises. Johnson City, TN serves as a case study where two memorials commemorating the same event had entirely different styles, roles in, and meanings to the community.

In this thesis, I use the differing designs and functions of the two World War I memorials in Johnson City to illustrate how communities with a vested interest in veteran affairs had to learn to construct memorials that allowed them to collectively commemorate the Great War. Johnson City had been a veteran-centric community since the Civil War, but World War I caused Johnson City to reinvent itself in order to serve the needs of Great War veterans. Between 1922 and 1935, the American Legion worked with the community in order to develop a memorial that nonveterans could use to demonstrate their continued support of veterans in Johnson City, and

---

7 Veterans Park WWI Monument, 1922, Johnson City, TN.
8 “Spirit of the American Doughboy”, 1935, Johnson City, TN.
Legionnaires could use to continue to serve their country in ways that aligned with their own experiences and the objectives of their national organization. World War I forever changed the social, physical, and memorial landscapes of Johnson City.

The American Legion was able orchestrate their two versions of World War I memorialization due to the community’s increasing dedication to, and orientation around, Great War veterans throughout the 1920s and 1930s. Extensive medical and legal veteran infrastructures existed in Johnson City prior to the war, but had to adapt in order to meet the new needs of the Great War veterans returning home. The establishment of the American Legion Kings Mountain Post No. 24 in 1919 marked the beginnings of an entirely new social veteran infrastructure that resulted in the construction of the two Great War memorials. These three infrastructures developed in Johnson City following WWI in order to support the returning soldiers as they reintegrated into the community. The city’s dedication to caring for Great War veterans became a central part of the community, and its memorialization of the conflict followed suit. The Legionnaires capitalized on the fact that they were held in high esteem by the community in order to garner support for their memorialization projects. As a result, by 1935, the American Legion developed a form of Great War memorialization that addressed the community’s commemorative needs and better represented the community’s deep conviction to Great War veterans.

As Johnson City’s support for Great War veterans became more extensive, so did its memorialization of the war. The second World War I memorial in Johnson City was designed in a way that made it accessible, paired it with a prominent municipal location, included all of the community’s Great War dead, and utilized nationalistic iconography. These four factors allowed the second World War I memorial in Johnson City to be a public centerpiece for the entire
community while the first served as a private memorial marker of the city’s World War I dead. By 1935, Johnson City had fully oriented itself around supporting Great War veterans, and the Legionnaires in Johnson City designed a memorial that was representative of that relationship.

Chapter 1 of this paper explores how deeply rooted traditions of supporting veterans within the community helped facilitate the construction of veterans’ Great War memorials. This chapter establishes both the origins of the memorials and the origins of Johnson City’s development into a community focused on supporting Great War veterans. Chapter 2 examines how the geographic placements of the memorials affected how they served the community. It explores the question of how accessible the memorials were to the community, and explains how partnerships with municipal spaces affected the memorials’ commemorative and civic purposes. Chapter 3 analyzes the scopes and designs of the two Great War memorials in order to explain how stylistic choices influenced their uses. Lastly, Chapter 4 demonstrates how a memorial’s initial functions can impact its subsequent use. It looks at how the two World War I memorials were dedicated, the traditions formed by their initial receptions, and what implications that had for future generations of use.

The study of Johnson City’s two World War I memorials complicates our understanding of memorials’ functions by analyzing how the circumstances surrounding their creations impact how they were used. Uses, for the purpose of this study, primarily refers to the memorials’ capacities to be used for commemoration, but with the recognition that memorials serve non-commemorative, civic functions as well. Analyzing their purposes goes beyond looking at the possibilities of the memorials’ potential roles in remembrance, and focuses on how the memorials’ year-round uses, both immediately and beyond, were impacted by the geographic, stylistic, and human factors surrounding their consecrations. These factors are explored
thematically in this paper in order to effectively investigate how memorials are designed to address specific community needs. Answering the question: how do the memorials themselves and the larger community that surrounds them impact one another?

Johnson City is a case study where two memorials were constructed in the same city, by the same private institution, commemorated the same conflict, and were erected less than fifteen years apart. Nevertheless, each memorial is a product of its own time that addressed the community’s needs at the time of its creation. Yet, the differing styles and placements of the two memorials mirrored the city’s growing dedication to veterans and veteran care. As World War I veterans’ affairs gradually became a more central part of the community, so did their efforts to memorialize the conflict. During the Interwar Years, veteran infrastructures were created and expanded in Johnson City in order to better address the developing medical, legal, and social needs of Great War veterans. Each memorial and its uses represent a point in the city’s development into a community oriented around Great War veterans between 1918 and 1935.

The factors explored when analyzing how the two World War I memorials in Johnson City were used inevitably reveal what made the memorials relevant, or important, to the community surrounding them. Additionally, the factors also reveal how privately constructed memorials were made usable by the public. Fundamentally, these are considerations that can be applied to analyzing the functions of all memorials, but this type of analysis applies most directly to war memorials since there are nationally recognized commemorative holidays that apply to them. Holidays that perpetuate their uses with annual commemorative traditions that impact how new generations perceive and interact with the memorials. These two World War I memorials were both products of collective memory, and perpetuators of collective remembrance. They serve as snapshots that reveal key moments of Johnson City’s gradual development into a
community committed to addressing the needs of Great War veterans as the community
transitioned from privately honoring the war dead to collectively commemorating their
sacrifices.
Chapter 1

Community Support: Veteran Infrastructures and Memorial Creation

On November 11, 1935, a small group of Gold Star Mothers pulled a sheet off of a large statue depicting a World War I American soldier. This unveiling was the climax of the dedication ceremony of the Doughboy memorial in Johnson City. While this moment was the pinnacle of the day’s festivities intended to celebrate the American Legion’s new Great War memorial project, it was also the culmination of Johnson City’s journey to becoming a community dedicated to World War veterans. This memorial signified the city’s recognition of how it had built upon historic legacies of supporting Civil War veterans and reoriented itself to address the needs of Great War veterans. This memorial was a physical testament of how a community had redefined its identity in response to World War I.

In Johnson City, TN, the community supported efforts to memorialize and commemorate the First World War because of the community’s longstanding dedication to those who had served in the armed forces. It did not come necessarily from the desire to commemorate the conflict itself. The community facilitated the privately constructed memorials, but did not desire the memorials so much as it wanted to support veterans in their endeavors. Johnson City demonstrates that deep traditions of community support for veterans can lead to the creation of memorials, but does not necessarily mean that the community will actively use them once they are constructed.

---

9 “Senator McKellar to Give Armistice Talk,” Johnson City Press-Chronicle (Johnson City, TN), November 10, 1935, pg. 11.
10 Ibid.
11 Ibid.
The placement and design of the two Great War memorials in Johnson City are indicative of the community’s level of support for veterans at the time of their dedications. In 1922, the community was still developing and reorienting veteran infrastructures around Great War veterans, but by 1935 Johnson City had fully formed medical, legal, and social infrastructures for them. As veteran infrastructures in Johnson City became more extensive, so did the community’s memorialization of the conflict.

The two World War I memorials in Johnson City were the result of a deeply rooted, communitywide devotion to supporting veterans after service. The origins of which go back as early as the Civil War. This dedication to veterans led to the development of three subsequent types of veteran infrastructures in Johnson City. The first type was medical care, the second was legal assistance, and the third was social organization. The third type, social organization, was directly responsible for the creation of the two memorials dedicated to the Great War. The social veteran infrastructure in Johnson City followed the precedents set by the previous two, and was all part of an orderly expansion of veteran support systems that developed in a sequence of individual episodes that were intended to meet different veteran needs as they were identified over the years. Supporting veterans’ recovery and reintegration was, and continues to be, a deeply engrained facet of Johnson City’s community.

The First World War shook American communities to their core. Over 110,000 members of the American armed forces died in just over nineteen months. Furthermore, over four million American soldiers returned home to a nation that was struggling to reconcile and process the
Great War and all its terrors.¹⁵ These men quite literally carried the burdens of the conflict with them as they returned home. For them, the horrors of war extended far beyond the armistice signed on November 11, 1918. They had to face the aftermath: the physical, psychological, and emotional traumas that persisted. The young men who returned to Johnson City after the First Great War were no exception, and the community responded to their needs accordingly.

Jay Winter, a historian who specializes in Europe in World War I, noted that, “the search for ‘meaning’ of the Great War began as soon as the war itself.”¹⁶ The nature of the fighting, level of mobilization, and global scope of the war shocked the world. World War I forced the American people to not only deal with but also make sense of the tremendous loss of life and persisting legacies of the conflict that they were so far removed from geographically.

Washington County, TN and its 1,122 Great War survivors were not exempt from this phenomenon or the injuries of war.¹⁷ Fifty-eight husbands, sons, and fathers from Washington County did not return with their comrades.¹⁸ This communal loss would have lasting social and physical impacts on the community.

The soldiers who did return to Washington County from the battlefront found aid in their reintegration and healing process. Johnson City, TN had been the most significant urban center of Washington County since the latter part of the nineteenth century. By 1890, Johnson City and its wards accounted for approximately twenty-five percent of Washington County’s total

---

¹⁸Johnson City-Washington County, TN Veterans’ Memorial Foundation, Veteran’s Memorial, November 11, 2011.
population. As a result, the aid that returning World War I veterans found was located in the urban population center of Washington County. Coincidentally, the assistance they found was not too far away from the mobilization grounds in downtown Johnson City where they gathered and trained before shipping overseas. Downtown Johnson City served as a metaphorical gateway of both their exodus to, and return from, the war.

This aid surrounding downtown came from the “veteran-centric” community that was comprised of pre-existing medical and legal infrastructures in Johnson City, TN. These aid

---
20 Museum at Mountain Home, “An army camp set up in downtown Johnson City during WWI ca. 1918” photo, East Tennessee State University Quillen College of Medicine, visited August 17, 2016.
21 Ibid.
systems were made up by the National Home for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers Mountain Branch and a Johnson City lawyer, Thomas Highley Morris. With great success, the soldiers’ home provided healthcare and rehabilitation services to veterans, and Morris helped veterans and their families with their war risk insurance claims. While these systems helped soldiers with the physical and psychological traumas of the war, veterans still lacked a way to express the complicated feelings and emotions that they had about the war. It was not until the formation of a social infrastructure for veterans in Johnson City, TN that they found their opportunity to cope emotionally.

Veterans’ interactions with the National Home for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers Mountain Branch and Thomas Highley Morris helped pave the way for the creation of the two World War I memorials created during the 1920s and 1930s by helping establish a very large veteran population in Johnson City both pre- and post-World War I. Many veterans from the Tri-Cities area, and beyond, came to the soldiers’ home for medical care and came to see Morris to apply for war service benefits. These services significantly helped soldiers both physically and psychologically as they reintegrated into society as men changed by war, but it was not until the creation of the American Legion in 1919, which served as the catalyst, that the process began that resulted in turning a significant veteran presence within the community into physical memorials.23

The National Soldiers’ Home and Thomas Highley Morris served as the gravitating forces that pulled veterans to Johnson City. The resulting high volume of veteran traffic to and

---

23 United States Congress, “An Act To incorporate the American Legion” (September 16, 1919), Sixty-Sixth Congress, Session I, Chap. 59, Statutes of the United States of America (pg. 285), accessed October 31, 2016, https://books.google.com/books?id=by8PAAAAYAAJ&pg=PA285&lpg=PA285&dq=To+promote+peace+and+good+will+among+the+peoples+of+all+the+nations+of+the+earth;+to+preserve+the+memor+yal+of+the+Great+War+off+1917-1918&source=bl&ots=p3ZdkC2mSH&sig=gWITM999Vl_-vYB2A7VYz8KD2w&hl=en&sa=X&ved=0ahUKEwjZ24yEsorQAhVERCYKHb61DZ0Q6AEIIHTAB#v=onepage&q&f=false.
through the city is what helped establish it as an important location for World War I veterans during their rehabilitation and reintegration following the war.\textsuperscript{24} By 1920, the veterans housed at the soldiers’ home comprised approximately ten percent of Johnson City’s total population.\textsuperscript{25} This figure does not account for the additional veterans in Johnson City who lived outside of Mountain Home or those who came to town on a temporary basis to receive medical services or legal advice. Veterans and veteran care were a significant part of the Johnson City community.

The veterans that were circulating within Johnson City following World War I filled the ranks of the American Legion Post No. 24 when it was founded in 1919. At the time, American Legion membership was contingent on having served in World War I.\textsuperscript{26} Members found camaraderie and a sense of belonging as they had shared a lot of the same experiences. To commemorate these experiences and their camaraderie for the brothers in arms, both living and gone, the post began memorializing the conflict in the 1920s. The constructions of the two World War I memorials in Johnson City, TN at the beginning of the twentieth century were the direct results of the emergence of a social veteran infrastructure in a community where extensive medical and legal veteran infrastructures had long preceded it.\textsuperscript{27}

\begin{footnotes}
\item[25] Ibid.
\item[26] United States Congress, “An Act To incorporate the American Legion” (September 16, 1919), Sixty-Sixth Congress, Session I, Chap. 59, Statutes of the United States of America (pg. 285), accessed October 31, 2016, https://books.google.com/books?id=by8PAAAAYAAJ&pg=PA285&lpg=PA285&dq=To+promote+peace+and+good+will+among+the+peoples+of+the+United+States+and+all+the+nations+of+the+earth;+to+preserve+the+memory+of+the+Great+War+of+1917-1918&source=bl&ots=pZdkC2mSH&sig=gWITM99VL_-vYB2A7YYzJ8iKD2w&hl=en&sa=X&ved=0ahUKEwjZ24yEsorQAhVERCYKb6iDZ0Q6AEIHTAB#v=onepage&q&f=false.
\item[27] United States Congress, “An Act To incorporate the American Legion” (September 16, 1919), Sixty-Sixth Congress, Session I, Chap. 59, Statutes of the United States of America (pg. 285), accessed October 31, 2016, https://books.google.com/books?id=by8PAAAAYAAJ&pg=PA285&lpg=PA285&dq=To+promote+peace+and+good+will+among+the+peoples+of+the+United+States+and+all+the+nations+of+the+earth;+to+preserve+the+memory+of+the+Great+War+of+1917-1918&source=bl&ots=pZdkC2mSH&sig=gWITM99VL_-vYB2A7YYzJ8iKD2w&hl=en&sa=X&ved=0ahUKEwjZ24yEsorQAhVERCYKb6iDZ0Q6AEIHTAB#v=onepage
\end{footnotes}
Veteran Medical Infrastructure

The beginnings of veteran medical care in Johnson City, TN predates the city itself.\textsuperscript{28} Toward the end of the Civil War, President Abraham Lincoln put a resolution before Congress to establish soldiers’ homes. He believed that the volunteer soldiers of the Union deserved to be taken care of given everything they had sacrificed during the Civil War.\textsuperscript{29} On March 3, 1865, the resolution passed, and National Homes for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers were established.\textsuperscript{30}

These homes were intended to address the diverse needs of those who had served the nation either in the war of 1812 or in the conflicts that followed.\textsuperscript{31}


\textsuperscript{29} Museum at Mountain Home, “Congressman Walter Preston Brownlow” exhibit, East Tennessee State University Quillen College of Medicine, visited August 17, 2016.

\textsuperscript{30} United States War Department, “The National Home for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers” (March 3, 1865), The Military Laws of the United States: 1915 (pg. 571-572), accessed October 31, 2016, https://books.google.com/books?id=DSALPRmdJIMC&pg=PA572&lpg=PA572&dq=That+all+honorably+discharged+soldiers+and+sailors+who+served+in+the+war+of+rebellion+and+the+Spanish+American+War,+and+the+Mexican+War,+who+are+disabled+by+age,+disease,+or+otherwise,+and+by+reason+of+such+disability+are+incapable+of+earning+a+living,+shall+be+admitted+into+the+Home+of+Disabled+Volunteer+Soldiers.&source=bl&ots=6hlzVd6GnG&sig=rKJs9TI79byZNQkPFd1RigIzxMs&hl=en&sa=X&ved=0ahUKEwi3jem31lVQAhUs1oMKHd4hDeEQ6AEIITAB#v=onepage&q&f=false.

\textsuperscript{31} United States War Department, “The National Home for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers” (March 3, 1865), The Military Laws of the United States: 1915 (pg. 571-572), accessed October 31, 2016, https://books.google.com/books?id=DSALPRmdJIMC&pg=PA572&lpg=PA572&dq=That+all+honorably+discharged+soldiers+and+sailors+who+served+in+the+war+of+rebellion+and+the+Spanish+American+War,+and+the+Mexican+War,+who+are+disabled+by+age,+disease,+or+otherwise,+and+by+reason+of+such+disability+are+incapable+of+earning+a+living,+shall+be+admitted+into+the+Home+of+Disabled+Volunteer+Soldiers.&source=bl&ots=6hlzVd6GnG&sig=rKJs9TI79byZNQkPFd1RigIzxMs&hl=en&sa=X&ved=0ahUKEwi3jem31lVQAhUs1oMKHd4hDeEQ6AEIITAB#v=onepage&q&f=false.
It was not until the act was amended in 1901 that the soldiers’ home in Johnson City was officially commissioned. The amendment in 1901 was primarily due to the efforts of one man, Congressman Walter Preston Brownlow. This amendment marked the beginnings of Johnson City’s development into a veteran-centric community as it established the earliest systematic form of veteran infrastructure.

Senator Brownlow approached Congress and made his case for a soldiers’ home in his home county. Despite being from Jonesborough, another town in Washington County, Brownlow campaigned for the home to be placed in the more urban and significantly larger Johnson City. Brownlow appealed to Congress on the grounds that many men from Washington County had volunteered and served with the Union. In fact, Brownlow was so successful in pleading his case that Congress pledged four times the original amount that Brownlow requested for the construction of the home. The National Home for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers Mountain Branch was born, and it would come to exceed Brownlow’s dreams and expectations as he served as the branch’s local manager.

When the facility opened to the first patient in 1903, the massive grounds and administration of the soldiers’ home were designed in a way that would house, govern, and aid

---

33 Museum at Mountain Home, “Congressman Walter Preston Brownlow” exhibit, East Tennessee State University Quillen College of Medicine, visited August 17, 2016.
34 Veteran-centric, as it is used both by local historians and the organizations within Johnson City, is used to demonstrate to closeness between the veteran community and larger community. This is characterized by a deep community effort to support and honor veterans, a dense population of veteran support organizations, and annual commemoration exercises to those who served both living and gone. As I understand it, it is a term that pointedly describes a critical component of Johnson City’s culture that helps explain the contexts around the creations of the two World War I memorials.
37 Ibid.
disabled Union veterans who could no longer support themselves due to war injuries. As such, buildings were constructed that helped the veterans maintain a sort of normalcy and regularity in their otherwise disrupted lives. There was a chapel, band stand, theater, dormitories, and even a mess hall that could hold over one thousand people at a time.

The soldiers home began as a place focused on providing for Civil War soldiers, but subsequent reform quickly turned the grounds into a care center for World War I veterans. The initiatives of The National Home for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers Mountain Branch were to assist those who had served with a deep care for the men who had fought for their country. The home in Johnson City was the ninth and final facility of its kind in the United States. The Congressionally funded Union care facility remained largely the same until World War I, but changed quickly as the conflict ensued. Even before the end of World War I, the soldiers’ home started transitioning into a soldier’s hospital to meet the needs of the returning veterans.

---

38 Museum at Mountain Home, “Congressman Walter Preston Brownlow” exhibit, East Tennessee State University Quillen College of Medicine, visited August 17, 2016.
39 Ibid.
40 F.J. Cutter, “Great Dining Hall, National Soldiers Home, Tenn.” photo, East Tennessee State University Quillen College of Medicine, visited August 17, 2016.
42 Ibid.
Following the passing of the *War Risk Insurance Act* on October 6, 1917, the National Soldiers’ Home officially changed its membership requirements to include those who were serving and had served in World War I.43 The influx, and needs of, World War I veterans led to the eventual transformation of the soldiers’ home into a national sanatorium in 1921.44 This transition culminated with the expansion of the medical facilities so that it could accommodate 1,000 more beds for disabled World War I veterans.45

The soldiers’ home in Johnson City has a long history in the community. Despite being initially intended to serve Civil War veterans, the home had to change its objectives, expand its facilities, and become more inclusive when World War I veterans entered the picture. Mountain Home had to revamp and reorient itself around the physical and psychological needs of the significant World War I veteran population, and changed from a soldiers’ home into a hospital to do so.

The adaptations by Mountain Home set a precedent for subsequent veteran infrastructures and the community alike. World War I veterans were to be aided and supported as they reintegrated. Veterans’ needs went beyond medical care and other types of veteran infrastructures developed organically during the following years to address those needs.

**Veteran Legal Infrastructure**

Medical care was the first type of assistance available to veterans following World War I in Johnson City, but with medical care comes medical expenses. As a result, financial aid became the next form of veteran need in Johnson City. The Bureau of War Risk Insurance

---

offered hope and aid to both veterans and their families. Veterans who were physically or psychologically injured from the war could seek monetary compensation from the bureau to help cover medical costs, day-to-day expenses, etc. In the event of death or disability, as a result of service in World War I, veterans and their families could be eligible for benefits that could help them manage their situation better. The insurance application and claims process could be quite prohibitive to average citizens, but legal help was available to the World War I veterans in Johnson City. Thomas Highley Morris’ law practice specialized in war risk benefits proceedings and attracted ex-soldiers from all over the nation as a result. Morris spearheaded the legal infrastructure that helped contribute to an already extensive veteran population in Johnson City.

Morris’ office was located on Spring St. just off Johnson City’s Main St. His central location in town was where he helped over one hundred veterans and veteran families with their insurance claims during his time serving the veteran community. The Bureau of War Risk Insurance was originally founded in 1914 to protect U.S. commerce during the outbreak of World War I, but as the war progressed war risk insurance grew to cover death and debilitations caused by World War I to veterans and their families. War risk insurance was extremely important to thousands of American families in the aftermath of World War I. In Johnson City, it was especially important for veterans who needed to afford medical care, prosthetics, or psychiatric care at Mountain Home.

The pre-existing veteran legal infrastructure at the end of World War I served much of the same functions as, and overlapped with, the veteran medical infrastructure in Johnson City. They both helped veterans overcome physical and psychological injuries of the war, but

---

46 Thomas Highley Morris Papers, Archives of Appalachia, East Tennessee State University, Johnson City, TN.  
emotional coping was something that veterans would have to do as a group as they reconciled their wartime experiences.

**Veteran Social Infrastructure**

Much like the medical and legal veteran infrastructures, the establishment of a social veteran infrastructure in Johnson City, TN was the result of Congressional action. Congress incorporated the American Legion on September 16, 1919. Excitement over the new organization jump-started the establishment of veteran social infrastructure in Johnson City before the official Congressional action. Initially, the American Legion was formed by members of the American Expeditionary Force who met in Paris earlier in 1919. This early caucus set the pace for the new patriotic organization that would permanently change the social and physical landscape of Johnson City.

Approximately one month after Congress incorporated the American Legion, the Kings Mountain Post No. 24 was officially established in Johnson City, TN. The Kings Mountain Post in Johnson City, TN held its meetings at the Johnson City Chamber of Commerce at the corner of Tipton and Spring St. This location was practically next door to Morris’ law firm. Most of the veteran infrastructure present at the time of the social infrastructure’s formation was further away from downtown. The post’s central location made it easily accessible by the public and continued

---


50 Guy May and Fred Estes eds., *American Legion History: Department of Tennessee 1919-1933*, (Knoxville, TN: The American Legion Department of Tennessee, 1933) pg. 12-17.

Founded on October 3, 1919, the American Legion Kings Mountain Post received the number 24 because it was the 24th post established in Tennessee.

the trend of veteran infrastructures residing on the main roads through town despite not having its own building. The original charter for the post was only signed by twenty-seven men. This was a relatively small amount given the fact that over one thousand men returned to Washington County from World War I just the year previous, and Post No. 24 was the first in Washington County, TN. By the end of the calendar year membership had grown to 37 and would nearly triple to 107 by the end of the next.

Kings Mountain Post No. 24 was dedicated to the ideals of the organization. The initial charter stated one of the purposes of the American Legion was “to preserve the moeires and incidents of the Great War of 1917-1918.” Kings Mountain Post No. 24 held true to the mission statement with regards to preserving the memory of the Great War and cementing the camaraderie of brothers in arms who served. The post put off constructing its own building, and first constructed World

---

52 American Legion Kings Mountain Post No. 24 Charter, 1919, American Legion King’s Mountain Post No. 24 materials.
53 Guy May and Fred Estes eds., American Legion History: Department of Tennessee 1919-1933, (Knoxville, TN: The American Legion Department of Tennessee, 1933) pg. 17-18.
54 United States Congress, “An Act To incorporate the American Legion” (September 16, 1919), Sixty-Sixth Congress, Session I, Chap. 59, Statutes of the United States of America (pg. 285), accessed October 31, 2016, https://books.google.com/books?id=by8PAAAAYAAJ&pg=PA285&lpg=PA285&dq=To+promote+peace+and+good+will+among+the+peoples+of+the+United+States+and+all+the+nations+of+the+earth%3B+to+preserve+the+memories+of+the+Great+War+of+1917-1918&source=bl&ots=p3ZdkC2mSH&sig=gWITM99VL_yB2A7VYJ8iKd2w&hl=en&sa=X&ved=0ahUKEwjZ24yEsorQAhVERCYKb6lDZ0Q6AEIHTAB#v=onepage&q&f=false.

The full mission statement reads, “To Promote peace and good will among the peoples of the United States and all the nations of the earth; to preserve the memories and incidents of the Great War of 1917-1918; to cement the ties of love and comradeship born of service; and to consecrate the efforts of its members to mutual helpfulness and service to their country.”
War I memorials for Johnson City and Washington County respectively.\textsuperscript{55} It was not until 1939 that the local legion post finally had its own building and meeting space.\textsuperscript{56}

With the cooperation of the community, the American Legion post, the core of the social veteran infrastructure in Johnson City, took the shared experiences of its members and integrated them into the national guidelines provided by their organization in order to create memorial spaces that could be used by them to preserve and commemorate the memories of those who lost their lives in WWI.

\textbf{Community Support and Memorials}

The establishment of Kings Mountain Post No. 24 ultimately gave veterans a third way to process and reconcile their wartime experiences and losses: remembrance. In memorialization, veterans found another outlet of coping as they furthered their own rehabilitation in a place that had already contained medical and legal infrastructures to aid in their reintegration. The veteran community enjoyed the support of the larger community both in everyday life and in their memorialization efforts, but it was not enough to inherently make the memorials they created publicly useful.

The first World War I memorial constructed in Johnson City, TN was dedicated on July 4, 1922.\textsuperscript{57} The city supported the Legion’s memorialization in 1922, but it was not until a full year later in 1923 that the park that the memorial resided in was officially placed under the care of the American Legion by the Johnson City Board of Commissioners.\textsuperscript{58} The park was not only

\textsuperscript{55} Grover C. Hixson ed., \textit{A Brief History of Kings Mountain Post No. 24}, (American Legion Department of Tennessee, 1952), pg. 19-38.
\textsuperscript{56} Ibid, pg. 38; American Legion Kings Mountain Post No. 24, “The Hut was Erected 1938-1939” photo, American Legion King’s Mountain Post No. 24 materials.
\textsuperscript{57} “Memorial Day Service Planned at Legion Park,” \textit{Johnson City Press-Chronicle} (Johnson City, TN), May 28, 1978.
\textsuperscript{58} Johnson City Board of Commissioners, “Regular Meeting February 14, 1923,” \textit{Minutes of the Board of Commissioners}, Vol. 9, pg. 575, City of Johnson City Records Collection, Archives of Appalachia, East Tennessee State University, Johnson City, Tennessee.
turned over to the post, but was renamed in their honor as well thanks to the Commission’s decision spearheaded by Johnson City’s Mayor, William B. Ellison.\textsuperscript{59} American Legion Post No. 24 had the support of, and was endorsed by, the city as the park was given to them with the sole purpose of maintaining a memorial space to commemorate the Great War.\textsuperscript{60}

Much like the first memorial, the American Legion once again had the support of the community when constructing the second World War I memorial in Johnson City. Specific individuals from within the American Legion post and Board of Commissioners did not spearhead the second memorial to the same extent as they did for the first. Instead, the two institutions worked together as whole organizations in order to facilitate the planning and construction of the memorial.\textsuperscript{61} The American Legion post approached the Board of Commissioners with a plan and an offer. They wanted to construct a World War I memorial entrance for the city’s new football stadium at no cost to the city.\textsuperscript{62} The Board of Commissioners did not simply hand over the community space that the memorial would be located on like they did for American Legion Park. Instead, their cooperation came in the form of supervised

\begin{flushright}
The resolution reads, “Be it resolved by the Board of Commissioners of the city of Johnson City, Tenn. [t]hat the public park located between the intersection of Southwest Avenue, Locust and Parker Streets be, and the same is hereby, named and designated as the “American Legion Park” and the same is hereby turned over to the custody of the Kings Mountain Post, of Johnson City, to be beautified, improved and kept as a memorial to World War Veterans.”

\textsuperscript{59} Johnson City Board of Commissioners, “Regular Meeting February 14, 1923,” \textit{Minutes of the Board of Commissioners}, Vol. 9, pg. 575, City of Johnson City Records Collection, Archives of Appalachia, East Tennessee State University, Johnson City, Tennessee.

\textsuperscript{60} Ibid.

\textsuperscript{61} Grover C. Hixson, ed., \textit{A Brief History of Kings Mountain Post No. 24}, (Johnson City, TN: American Legion Department of Tennessee, 1952), pg. 36.; and Johnson City Board of Commissioners, “Regular Meeting on the 14th of February 1935,” \textit{Minutes of the Board of Commissioners}, Vol. 14, pg. 496-497, City of Johnson City Records Collection, Archives of Appalachia, East Tennessee State University, Johnson City, Tennessee.

\textsuperscript{62} Ibid.
approval rather than giving them the space. After much cooperation, the Doughboy statue was unveiled on November 11, 1935.

Both memorials had the support of the community when they were constructed, were erected on public land, and came at no cost to the city, but only the second one was used for commemoration. It was not until the construction of the second WWI memorial in 1935 that the community support for veterans transitioned into a community desire to interact with the memorials. The community shifted from supporting veterans’ building projects to utilizing them. This shift was demonstrated by the methodological differences of the two memorials. Differences that made the second memorial usable by the larger community for commemoration. Differences that demonstrated how the community’s identity had come to revolve around supporting veterans.

By 1935, the firmly established medical, legal, and social infrastructures in Johnson City demonstrated that supporting Great War veterans had become a central part of the community. The city found ways to support veterans, but needed a space where they could gather to commemorate the sacrifices of those who were not fortunate enough to become veterans. The dedication ceremony of the second memorial was a physical declaration of Johnson City’s commitment to supporting Great War veterans. World War I caused Johnson City to rebrand itself as a veteran-centric community as it reoriented to support World War I veterans and developed a form of memorialization that reflected how the focus of the community’s veteran-centric identity had shifted from Civil War veterans to Great War veterans.

63 Johnson City Board of Commissioners, “Regular Meeting on the 14th of February 1935,” Minutes of the Board of Commissioners, Vol. 14, pg. 496-497, City of Johnson City Records Collection, Archives of Appalachia, East Tennessee State University, Johnson City, Tennessee.

“Now, therefore, be it resolved by the Board of Commissioners of the city of Johnson City, Tennessee. That the Kings Mountain Post No. 24 of the American Legion be granted the privilege and authority to build and construct an entrance to Roosevelt Stadium in accordance with the plans hereto attached, and in accordance with the terms of this resolution, as a memorial to the World War dead from Washington County.”

64 “Spirit of the American Doughboy”, 1935, Johnson City, TN.
Chapter 2

Memorial Spaces: Accessibility and Municipal Partnerships

Johnson City’s progression into a community oriented around supporting Great War veterans is demonstrated by the placements of its two World War I memorials. The memorial at American Legion park was, and still is, located outside of the city’s active thoroughfares. While the Doughboy statue stands on ground that has been more valuable and accessible to Johnson City residents throughout the twentieth century and beyond. When the first memorial was constructed in 1922, Johnson City’s reorientation around Great War veterans was in its infancy and the memorial was placed on the periphery of the community as a small private marker honoring the Great War dead from Johnson City. By 1935, Johnson City had redefined its veteran-centric nature and the community focused memorial was placed at the heart of the city where community events and commemoration would revolve around it. Supporting Great War veterans had become a central component of Johnson City life, and the new memorial that the veterans constructed was given a central location within the community as a result.

Accessibility and Proximity

The fastest way to make a memorial accessible is to connect it to everyday life in the community. In the case of Johnson City, everyday life revolved around the two roads that ran parallel to one another through town. Those roads, Market Street and Main Street, have been the epicenter of Johnson City life since the early twentieth century.65

Views like the one of West Market Street in the picture above were common. Cars, shops, and civic buildings like City Hall, seen in the right of the picture, lined the road. These streets were more than simply the main thoroughfares of Johnson City. They were the social and civic centers for all Johnson City residents. Historically, both the larger community and the veteran community revolved around, and gravitated to, the two streets.

The first edition of World War I memorialization that the American Legion orchestrated in Johnson City was geographically disconnected from both the larger community and the veteran community. The memorial was placed in a park that sat adjacent to Southside Elementary School in an area affectionately known as “Tree Streets” off Southwest Avenue.

---

67 Ibid.
At the time of the memorial’s dedication, Tree Streets was a residential district of Johnson City that had little to do with the everyday lives of either the larger community or veterans of Johnson City. Southwest Avenue was well south of both Market Street and Main Street. Outside of the school and churches located there, the area attracted little traffic.

In 1922, the park in Tree Streets seemed like an appropriate location to construct a memorial for two reasons. It was available, and it had served as a victory garden for a brief time during World War I. The park itself was not a significant municipal site for Johnson City as it was an empty lot in the middle of a residential area on the periphery of town. The community was not particularly attached to the park since it served little purpose besides breaking up the residential blocks of the Tree Streets area. Outside of its time as a victory garden, the small park was simply an unnamed municipal lot until the American Legion took it over in 1923.
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70 Ibid.
71 Johnson City Board of Commissioners, “Regular Meeting February 14, 1923,” Minutes of the Board of Commissioners, Vol. 9, pg. 575, City of Johnson City Records Collection, Archives of Appalachia, East Tennessee State University, Johnson City, Tennessee.
The park on Southwest Avenue was not a significant location for the majority of Johnson City residents, but it would have been for the veterans of World War I. The boulder took the small lot on the outside of town and turned it into a shrine for their fallen brothers in arms. This land not only served as a symbolic show of support for them during the war as a victory garden, but now also supported them after the war by providing them with a serene space they could use to privately pay their respects and process their wartime experiences. The park, and the memorial in it, were never intended to be a focal point of the community or a grand commemoration space. Instead, it was a small private marker intended to honor those who gave their lives in the Great War. Those who Johnson City did not have the opportunity to help.

Unlike its predecessor, the Doughboy statue was not distanced from everyday life in Johnson City and was erected just off Main Street in 1935. It was placed on one of the main thoroughfares of the city where the people of Johnson City would encounter it during their everyday routines. Placing the Doughboy statue just off Main Street made the memorial much more accessible, but it also made it much more visible as well. People would have passed the statue on their way into town, during their everyday errands, etc. This helped prevent the memorial from disappearing from public sight and memory. The Doughboy memorial was placed in a more accessible and visible location than its predecessor because it was intended to be a community centerpiece.

Placing memorials on the main thoroughfares through town was quite common in East Tennessee during the 1900s. Knoxville, the largest population center in East Tennessee at the time, had its very own Doughboy statue situated just north of Gay Street on Fifth Avenue.

72 “Biggest Celebration of Independence Day,” Johnson City Chronicle (Johnson City, TN), July 5, 1923, pg. 6.
74 “Over the Top”, 1921, Knoxville, TN.
and Main Street served as two of the primary roads that Knoxvillian life revolved around. In addition to facilitating everyday life, Gay Street also served as the epicenter for various community exercises like parades.\footnote{75 “World War I Parade,” Thompson Photograph Collection, Calvin M. McClung Historical Collection-Digital Collection, Knox County Public Library, last modified October 27, 2015, accessed August 11, 2017, http://cmdc.knoxlib.org/cdm/singleitem/collection/p265301coll7/id/6736/rec/53.}

Cities and towns all across the United States have centered their commemorative activities around the main thoroughfares in their downtown areas. As a result, memorials built near them were both outgrowths and promoters of memorial traditions. Johnson City was much like Knoxville in that the veterans who constructed the Doughboy statues placed them adjacent to where the community’s parades took place. In the case of Johnson City, parades centered around the heart of downtown.\footnote{76 Ibid.} The ranks of the demonstrations proceeded down Market and Main while using the neighboring side streets to double back.\footnote{77 “Gigantic Parade Feature Armistice Program,” \textit{Johnson City Staff} (Johnson City, TN), November 9, 1925, pg. 1.} During the 1920s, thousands of Johnson Citians
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would line the streets to observe the commemoration spectacles happening approximately three-quarters of a mile from where the Doughboy would stand in 1935.79

After its construction, the statue quite literally changed the course of commemoration in Johnson City since the festivities would both gravitate to and orient around the memorial’s location.80 Meanwhile, the boulder at American Legion Park was only about a half of a mile from where those exact same individuals stood. The boulder was in fact closer than the Doughboy to where commemoration exercises had taken place in Johnson City, but was never intended to be a space for public commemorations.

The medical, legal, and social veteran infrastructures in Johnson City surrounded Market Street and Main Street. The sole deviation to this trend was the boulder memorial constructed off Southwest Avenue. Its location is marked by point “3” on the map on the next page. The boulder was not intended to be a centerpiece of public commemoration, so there was no need for it to be in close proximity to veterans or the veteran infrastructures of Johnson City. The Doughboy, however, needed to be near the heartbeat of the community and the individuals who would be using it for commemoration in order to be an effective space for collective remembrance. Johnson City’s commemoration exercises and memorialization of World War I were both public affairs in that they were open to the entire community, but they were led by a private veteran institution. As a result, the Doughboy statue’s placement, marked by point “6”, followed the historic trend of veteran infrastructures surrounding Market Street and Main Street.

---

80 “Legion Parade and Grid Game on Slate Today,” Johnson City Chronicle (Johnson City, TN), November 11, 1936, pg. 1.
Veteran medical infrastructure is both the oldest type of veteran infrastructure and the first point encountered analyzing the map from left to right. The grounds of Mountain Home begin at point “1” with the National Cemetery bordering Main Street, and extend to the cluster of buildings marked by point “2”. The property was quite large. It needed to be spacious in order to treat, house, and host the thousands of veterans that utilized the Veterans Administration’s facilities. Its immense size can give the impression that it extends out and away from the city, but the relationship that the community had with Mountain Home was the exact opposite. The National Soldiers’ Home was an integral part of the community that both the veteran and non-
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81 U.S. Geological Survey, *Jonesboro, Tenn.*, 1935 ed., scale 1:24,000, 7.5 Minute Series (Topographic), USGS Historical File Topographic Division, accessed August 15, 2017, https://ngmdb.usgs.gov/img4/ht_icons/Browse/TN/TN_Jonesboro_147883_1935_24000.jpg; U.S. Geological Survey, *Johnson City, Tenn.*, 1935 ed., scale 1:24,000, 7.5 Minute Series (Topographic), USGS Historical File Topographic Division, accessed August 15, 2017, https://ngmdb.usgs.gov/img4/ht_icons/Browse/TN/TN_Johnson%20City_147862_1935_24000.jpg. This map was compiled from two USGS maps based on 1935 data. The line approximately a quarter of the way in from the left is where the two borders meet. Beyond joining the two datasets, I also illustrated the map in order to serve as a visual resource to aid in understanding the geographic spacing of key placed outlined in this paper. Market Street and Main Street are the two roads outlined in red. Also, points 1 through 6 mark the administrative buildings at Mountain Home, the National Cemetery on Mountain Home’s grounds, the boulder memorial at American Legion Park, Thomas Highley Morris’ law office, the American Legion Kings Mountain Post constructed in 1939, and the Doughboy memorial at Roosevelt Stadium. This visual is intended to help demonstrate the proximity of veteran infrastructure to the main roads of Johnson City, and how Market and Main streets served as the primary arteries of life in Johnson City.
veteran populous that lived outside of the grounds interacted with regularly.\textsuperscript{82} This relationship was both literally and figuratively bound by the entrance at the front of the grounds that intersected Main Street.

Tracing Main Street, the lower road outlined in red on the map, leads to Thomas Highley Morris’ law firm. Point “4” marks its location. His firm was the next type of veteran infrastructure that developed in Johnson City: legal. Once again, the veteran infrastructure borders Main Street. This point also effectively marks where the first meeting place for the American Legion Kings Mountain Post No. 24 was located since it was practically next door to Morris.\textsuperscript{83} Both of these types of veteran infrastructure, legal and social, were in the very center of the community.

Reading the map from left to right reveals that veteran infrastructures in Johnson City developed in an ordered sequence that progresses both chronologically and geographically through town. Extending from the westernmost reaches of the city to the easternmost. The three veteran infrastructures all bordered Main Street up until the American Legion’s first attempt to memorialize World War I. This memorial was a deviation from a tried and true model. Veteran infrastructures placed on Main Street were accessible, visible, and connected to everyday life. As a result, they themselves were usable. The American Legion recognized how important it was for their new commemoration space to be in close proximity to veterans. That was why they chose

\textsuperscript{82}“Wounded Veterans to Profit by ‘Forget-Me-Not Day,’” \textit{Johnson City Chronicle} (Johnson City, TN), November 10, 1923, pg. 1; “Poppy Day Money Brings Cheer to World War Vets,” \textit{Kingsport Times} (Kingsport, TN), May 28, 1931, pg. 3; “Soldiers Home Lists Program for Armistice,” \textit{Johnson City Chronicle} (Johnson City, TN), November 11, 1939, pg. 8.

\textsuperscript{83} That meeting place was the rise of veteran social infrastructure: the third and final type of veteran infrastructure in Johnson City. This was the veteran infrastructure directly responsible for the construction of the two World War I memorials. The boulder at point “3” and the Doughboy at point “6” were outgrowths of the American Legion’s formation.
to place their new commemoration space on Main Street and then subsequently place their own permanent meeting space across the road from it at point “5”.

**Municipal Partnerships**

The differences between the geographic placements of the two World War I memorials in Johnson City were stark, but they were similar in one regard. Both memorials were placed in relatively new parts of the city. The two locations were separated from one another geographically, but were both less than twenty-five years old at the time of the individual memorials’ constructions. Johnson City’s urban development reveals that not all city annexation and expansion was equal. The larger community and the Board of Commissioners in Johnson City both recognized that the land the Doughboy stood on was much more valuable to the community than the land that comprised American Legion Park. It would serve a much more integral role to the community and was a more significant municipal space.

A memorial’s usability can be greatly increased by connecting the memorial to a significant municipal site within the community. Associating memorials with other activities besides commemoration allows them to become part of larger, more dynamic memorial spaces. The spaces move beyond sacred shrines and become a part of the community that serves a purpose beyond commemoration and remembrance. They move beyond only being interacted with on Memorial Day, Veterans Day, or anniversaries, and become a relevant part of the everyday life of the community as well. Pairing memorials with significant municipal sites

---


makes them more usable and relevant to the community year-round in both the short- and long-term.

When the Legion dedicated its first Great War memorial, it did not own or maintain the park, but was still able to erect the memorial without any approval process due to the community’s lack of investment in the area. Opposition to the memorial was nonexistent as the community cared about supporting veterans, and did not care about the small scrap of land neighboring Southside Elementary School. It was simply an unused municipal lot that was not a valuable part of the larger community, and the Johnson City Board of Commissioners recognized this. As a result, the Board of Commissioners motioned to turn the park over to the American Legion on February 14, 1923.\textsuperscript{86} Over seven months after the Legion placed the memorial in the park. This was an easy decision for the board since the park had not yet been put to use by the city, but still required maintenance and upkeep. The park was a sunk cost in the budget. There was no need to oppose the construction of a memorial in a location they did not care about. The Board of Commissioners benefitted from surrendering the park. The American Legion would not own the land, but it was turned over with the understanding that the park was to be “beautified, improved, and kept as a memorial to World War veterans.”\textsuperscript{87} Mayor Ellison, President of the Johnson City Board of Commissioners, favored this partnership because he saw Johnson City as a progressive city capable of tremendous growth, and he was able to reallocate a small portion of the city’s resources toward his other city programs by delegating the municipal park over to the

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{86} Johnson City Board of Commissioners, “Regular Meeting February 14, 1923,” \textit{Minutes of the Board of Commissioners}, Vol. 9, pg. 575, City of Johnson City Records Collection, Archives of Appalachia, East Tennessee State University, Johnson City, Tennessee.\\
\textsuperscript{87} Ibid.
\end{flushright}
Legion. In fact, he was the one who put forth the motion that led to the creation of “American Legion Park.”

The Doughboy memorial constructed off Main Street in 1935 was placed on land much more valuable to Johnson City than the land that the first Great War memorial was. As a result, the memorial could not simply be put up without approval like the first one had been. The Board of Commissioners were much more involved and invested in the design and construction process for the Doughboy than they were for the boulder. On February 14, 1935, the American Legion Kings Mountain Post No. 24 approached the Johnson City Board of Commissioners and offered to construct the entrance to the city’s new football stadium “without cost to the city.” The Board of Commissioners was eager to accept the free entrance, but required design plans to be submitted and approved before giving the American Legion the “privilege and authority” to build the project.

Roosevelt Stadium was only one of numerous ongoing Works Progress Administration projects in Johnson City, but it was one of the WPA projects that the Johnson City Board of Commissioners cared the most about. The area that the first memorial was erected in was a fringe municipal park, but Roosevelt Stadium was to be the city’s new centerpiece of community
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92 Joyce and W, Eugene Cox, History of Washington County Tennessee, (Johnson City, TN: Washington County Historical Association, 2001), pg. 502; and Johnson City Board of Commissioners, Minutes of the Board of Commissioners, Vol. 15, pg. 71, 74, 77, 82, 93, 124, 132, 164, 178, 316, 395, City of Johnson City Records Collection, Archives of Appalachia, East Tennessee State University, Johnson City, Tennessee.

One of the ongoing WPA projects was the revamping of East Main St. This was the main thoroughfare to the stadium and Doughboy memorial. Main Street was the vein that connected the various veteran infrastructures in Johnson City.
and sporting events. Ultimately, the board did approve the memorial entrance submitted by the American Legion, and the Doughboy was unveiled on November 11, 1935.

The board’s level of oversight for the second memorial shows that they were much more invested in the new stadium project than they were the municipal park that did not even have a name prior to the American Legion taking it over. They recognized that this was prime real-estate on East Main Street where the memorial would be seen regularly and engaged with by the public. This location was more valuable to the city than American Legion Park, and it was invaluable to ensuring regular use of the second Great War memorial. Roosevelt Stadium was a significant municipal location for Johnson City as soon as its gates were opened. The stadium would be the site of various community events like football games, motorcycle races, and commemoration exercises. The Doughboy’s partnership with the stadium created numerous
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96 “Football Game Tonight,” Johnson City Press (Johnson City, TN), October 6, 1944, pg. 8; “Motorcycles to Race at Memorial Stadium,” Johnson City Press-Chronicle (Johnson City, TN), July 4, 1948, pg. 6; “In Memoriam,” Johnson City Press (Johnson City, TN), November 11, 1987.
reasons for individuals in Johnson City to interact with it since they had to pass it every time they entered the stadium.  

World War I memorials all across the ‘Volunteer State’ were paired with municipal locations during the twentieth century. The municipal locations that shared space with the memorials were almost as diverse as the memorials themselves, but the types of partnerships that World War I memorials had with civic features are comprised of two main groups: cases where the memorial and the municipal feature were one and the same, and cases like Johnson City where memorials were added on to a municipal location or feature.

The municipal locations of the two memorials in Johnson City supported an important component of life for Johnson Citians: recreation. For them, recreation served a myriad of functions ranging from mere entertainment to promoting a healthy nation. The boulder commemorating World War I was part of a recreational park, and the Doughboy was part of a larger recreational venue. As such, the municipal partnerships of the memorials in Johnson City tapped into the values of both the local community and the nation. The memorials’ ties to recreation extended their uses beyond commemoration, and those ties made them much more usable than they would have been as standalone memorials solely intended for remembrance. Johnson City’s veterans developed Great War memorial sites that were increasingly more usable by the community, and more representative of the community’s increasing dedication to supporting veterans. Roosevelt Stadium was at the center of Johnson City’s civic and commemorative functions.

98 “Recreation Important Aspect of War Effort, Says WPA Man,” Johnson City Chronicle (Johnson City, TN), April 6, 1942, pg. 3.
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The civic functions of the two World War I memorials in Johnson City were connected in that they both pertained to recreation, but the similarities of the two end there. The Doughboy was part of a municipal space that served a much more significant role to Johnson City recreation than American Legion Park did. Roosevelt Stadium was the premier recreation center of Johnson City. It was the home to both Milligan College’s and Science Hill High School’s weekly football games, served as the site of the annual Armistice Day football game, and housed other recreation events like motorcycle races intended to entertain Johnson City’s residents. Both memorials were in recreation spaces, and the community valued recreation, but Roosevelt Stadium offered a more novel form of recreation. The types of activities that could be carried out at American Legion Park were not unique or specific to the location since picnics, playdates, and lounging could be conducted virtually anywhere, but there was only one place in Johnson City to watch Milligan College play. There was only one place to go watch the motorcycle races. Roosevelt Stadium was a recreation space that offered prescribed programs for the community while American Legion Park offered the possibility of recreation. The former incentivized citizens to visit the space, while the latter simply offered them the opportunity.

The fact that Roosevelt Stadium was a venue for events helped it become a community centerpiece in two ways. It helped draw the community into the memorial space year-round for various programs, and it made it a much more suitable location for commemoration exercises. Johnson Citians had been using Main Street and Market Street for their commemoration parades since the end of the World War. With the construction of the Doughboy statue in front of Roosevelt Stadium, Johnson City gained a commemoration space that both tied into the parade
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route and provided an effective venue for the thousands watching the parade. Individuals watching the parade would follow the procession to its end point at Roosevelt Stadium, would prepare to hear the scheduled orator, and then would watch the wreath-laying ceremony. American Legion Park could not be used in the same way because it simply was not big enough. If the ceremony had been in American Legion Park, individuals would have flooded the residential area, and they would have been further from town when the festivities were over. This protocol was used for the initial dedication of American Legion Park, but was unsuccessful, unfeasible, and not repeated. American Legion Park was not meant to be a public commemoration space. Roosevelt Stadium, however, was designed and placed in a way that aligned more closely with the commemoration traditions already in place in Johnson City. The very nature of the Doughboy memorial’s geographic placement better served the commemorative needs of the community, and better reflected how Great War veterans had become a central focus of the community.

**Geography and Usability**

The most usable memorials are ones that use geography to their advantage. The American Legion post in Johnson City put their new Doughboy memorial in a place that it could be visited, appreciated, and reached with greater ease. A place that was geographically close to the other veteran infrastructures in Johnson City. A place where the memorial could be used. This was a direct contrast to the boulder in American Legion Park whose location did not need to be in the center of town for it to serve as a memorial marker.

Pairing the second World War I memorial with a significant municipal location increased the Doughboy memorial’s usability by connecting it to the non-commemorative functions of the
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municipal space it resided in, and bolstering its ability to be used for commemoration due to the design of its surrounding municipal space. The geographic placement of the Doughboy statue allowed it to serve the needs of Johnson City by creating a dynamic memorial space that was used for both commemoration and community events.

When the Doughboy was erected in 1935, both veterans and the memorial they were creating were central components of the community. Johnson City’s esteem for veterans inevitably shaped the city’s memorial and physical landscapes. The second memorial’s much more valuable location was a physical acknowledgement of how the community had centered itself around veterans. Veteran infrastructures, and veteran memorials were meant to be central components of Johnson City life. The priorities of the community determined the futures of the two memorials by determining their respective geographic locations and uses.
Chapter 3

Scope and Style: Inclusivity and Adaptability

World War I memorial creation by veterans in Johnson City, TN occurred in two episodes during the first third of the twentieth century. These two episodes, one in 1922 and one in 1935, marked entirely different versions of memorialization and changes in memorial construction. The differences demonstrate a trend of increased inclusiveness in the scope and style of the Great War memorials in Johnson City that helped democratize the memorial spaces and incorporate more individuals. The Johnson City WWI memorials transitioned in their memorial use with the increased politicization of the second memorial. The first memorial was largely devoid of national narratives and symbology where the second memorial was constructed and used with values related to nationalism, patriotism, and Americanism in mind. These changes mark a transformation in what the memorials were used for, a shift in collective memory surrounding the Great War, and a change in the attitudes of the community. Johnson City had become a place that addressed World War I veterans’ needs. It had become a place that needed a more evocative memorial before the veterans or larger community could effectively utilize WWI memorials for commemoration. The city needed a new memorial that better addressed the needs of World War veterans in the same way that it strove to.

Inclusivity and Scope

When a memorial’s scope is too broad, it can actually hurt the usability of a memorial. The same can be said for memorials with too narrow of a scope. Either case forces individuals to question whether or not the memorial is genuinely tied to what they wish to commemorate, or can lead to the desire for a new memorial that better encompasses their interests. The individuals seeking to use the memorial must see a justifiable connection between its subject matter and their
intent. In Johnson City, the first memorial’s scope was narrow because the veteran community in the city was still developing and growing. By 1935, the veterans operating within Johnson City came from areas both inside and outside of the city limits. The community needed a memorial whose scope extended beyond the city limits as well before they could use it for community commemoration. As a result, the second Great War memorial in Johnson City was designed with an expanded scope that applied to more veterans in the community, and better reflected the city’s new identity based around caring for those who served in the Great War.

When the memorial boulder was placed on Southwest Avenue, it was small both in size and scope. The memorial blended into the landscape, and the small plaques with a few names on them went largely unnoticed by the community. The loved ones and comrades who were named on the American Legion Park memorial were limited to those from Johnson City who had served in the Great War and lost their lives. The tablet contained the names of George Bowman, Fred Campbell, Robert Cooke, Lester Harris, Harrison Hopson, Hobart Jones, Raymond Jones, Thurman Leach, Patrick Lovelace, Orville Michell, Claude Pugh, George St. Clair, Lawrence Smith, Edie Wade, and James Wheeler. While it was a relatively short list of fifteen young men, the names carried much more weight than that of the physical boulder and plaque they were listed on despite the fact that they only comprised about .001% of the population. The ideals driving the memorial were not simply about how many individuals the community lost, it was
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about the unquantifiable sacrifice those men made for their country. Their permanent absences may have gone unnoticed by many in the community, but the memorial intended to make sure that the fact that they died for their country would not. This memorial prioritized loss of life over service as it was dedicated to the men that “made the supreme sacrifice for liberty, humanity, and country.”

It was not created in honor of veterans. It was created in honor of those who were not fortunate enough to become veterans.

Commander Adam B. Bowman of the American Legion was the one who spearheaded and ultimately chose to commemorate the park to the World War I dead from Johnson City, TN. Commander Bowman was a Washington County native that served in the U.S. Navy during the war.

He and his post membership committees personally sought out new members in order to grow the Kings Mountain Post No. 24. Their efforts resulted in a 66% increase in membership from the previous year, and the large influx of dues helped finance his memorialization project. A project that both applied to his interests and experiences and honored his fallen fellow soldiers from Johnson City.

The first World War I memorial became an outdated model of Great War memorialization rather quickly. The memorial did not apply to the majority of the veteran community operating within Johnson City. Many of the veterans who came there for medical care, legal care, American Legion meetings, etc. were from outside of the city and its wards, and so were the casualties of World War I that they cared about. The boulder outside of Southside
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Elementary did not represent them, or a scope that encompassed their lost neighbors and friends. Johnson City’s listed dead at American Legion Park only accounted for about 25% of Washington County’s total World War dead.\(^{110}\) It left out forty-three men from the areas surrounding Johnson City. Forty-three husbands, sons, friends, and neighbors.

The memorial in American Legion Park was not suited for public commemoration because it was not designed to be. Only a small portion of the community would have personally known those who did not return, and the community did not yet need a public commemoration space. Instead, the sacrifices of the soldiers were honored in newspaper ads listing the World War I dead.\(^{111}\) The newspaper ads listing the boys lost to the Great War had an advantage over the memorials in that they did not require community participation to the same degree that going out and physically interacting with the memorial would have. The spirit of commemoration was present in the community, but it did not yet need a dedicated commemoration space. The community used other means to collectively remember Johnson City’s Great War dead.

When the Doughboy was unveiled in 1935, it was more actively received by the public. This memorial donned a memorial placard honoring those who lost their lives from Washington County, TN.\(^{112}\) This memorial’s expanded scope ensured that the memorial space would be better suited for commemoration than its predecessor. It included both those who were honored before, and those who were left off the memorial in American Legion Park. This key design change between 1922 and 1935 democratized World War I commemoration for both the veteran and non-veteran communities in Johnson City. This change reflected how the community focused on the needs of Great War veterans had grown.

---

\(^{110}\) Veterans Park WWI Monument, 1922, Johnson City, TN; Johnson City-Washington County, TN Veterans’ Memorial Foundation, Veteran’s Memorial, November 11, 2011.

\(^{111}\) “They Live in Our Memory,” Johnson City Staff (Johnson City, TN), May 30, 1923, pg. 7.
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The nature of the new memorial remained largely the same as the first one in that it honored those who had died in service during World War I. It differed from the first memorial, however, in that it shifted from pertaining to only a handful of local families, and extended to memorializing those lost from the community at large. This helped ensure that more people related to and cared about the subject matter of the memorial. This was a memorial for the dead that was to be used by the living.

Commemorating war dead had been a longstanding tradition in Johnson City. Each year, individuals would go out and decorate the graves of fallen soldiers on Memorial Day. The two
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memorials to World War I were a natural outgrowth of these already established traditions intended to pay homage to sacrifice.\footnote{“Memorial Day,” \textit{Johnson City Chronicle} (Johnson City, TN), May 28, 1922, pg. 11. “These men whom we are to honor on Memorial Day have all done something for us, inasmuch as by their lives or by their deaths they have done something to make this a greater and a better country to live in. Therefore it is nothing more than decent for us to render them whatever honor we can.”} The boulder at American Legion Park was not used for commemoration, and the Doughboy was used for Veterans Day instead of Memorial Day.\footnote{The reason I differentiate between Memorial Day and Veterans Day is because the holidays have two very different aims. Memorial Day is for those who died during service, and Veterans Day is for those who were fortunate enough to survive service.} A memorial to those who died in service does not inherently lend itself to honoring those who lived, and one would expect a memorial used on Veterans Day to commemorate service, not death during service. This seemingly odd implementation was due to how the experiences of the Legionnaires determined both the scope and intent of the memorial’s use on Veterans Day.

In order to be in the American Legion, one had to have served in World War I.\footnote{United States Congress, “An Act To incorporate the American Legion” (September 16, 1919), Sixty-Sixth Congress, Session I, Chap. 59, \textit{Statutes of the United States of America} (pg. 285), accessed October 31, 2016, https://books.google.com/books?id=by8PAAAAYAAJ&pg=PA285&dq=To+promote+peace+and+good+will+among+the+peoples+of+the+United+States+and+all+the+nations+of+the+earth;+to+preserve+the+memor+y+of+the+Great+War+of+1917-1918&source=bl&ots=p3ZdkC2mSH&sig=gWITM99V1L_-vYB2A7VYZj8iKD2w&hl=en&sa=X&ved=0ahUKEwjZ24yEsorQAhVERCYKHb6lDZ0Q6AEIHTAB#v=onepage&q&f=false.} To them, the people regularly around them having served in the Armed Forces was not an exceptional distinction, but the norm. The exception among their comrades were those who died in service, and they sought to honor the missing with the memorials. They did this by assigning meaning to the deaths of their friends and fellow soldiers. The fact that the soldiers died in war was not exceptional in and of itself. That is the nature of war. The significance of their deaths stemmed from the idea that the Great War was fought for the “utopian ideal” of ending all war.\footnote{Marc Ferro, \textit{The Great War: 1914-1918}, (London, United Kingdom: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1973), pg. 8.} An idea that was rampant in the wake of the conflict.\footnote{Ibid.} This idealistic justification for isolationist America’s entrance to World War I permeated society following the conflict, and the
American Legion’s membership body of Great War veterans used it to justify and make sense of the deaths of their lost comrades. The veterans leading the community commemoration exercises used the memorial to renew commitment to the nation as they sought to serve in new ways as civilians. The veterans symbolically took up the mantle of their deceased comrades by using taglines like, “They DIED for Peace; We Who LIVE Must Preserve It!!!” The Legion’s memorialization of their lost brothers in arms could not make their deaths honorable. The men had already brought honor upon themselves with their sacrifice. Instead, it paid homage to their sacrifice while delineating a cause for it. The husbands, sons, fathers, and friends that had been lost from Washington County paid the ultimate sacrifice in order to ensure peace and prosperity for their loved ones. This memorial was used as a reminder of the sacrifices that the Washington County Doughboys made, and it was up to the community to finish the job that the soldiers could not see through.

The American Legion and larger community had to use and talk about the Doughboy memorial in a certain way in order to make it usable for Veterans Day. Its scope did not inherently lend itself to the holiday. Yet, the memorial to the dead was being used annually on a holiday for survivors. The boulder was similar in that it honored the dead, but was not used for commemoration. The difference between their uses was in fact due to the two memorials’ differences in scope. The boulder at American Legion Park honored only a quarter of the larger community’s Great War dead. Johnson City did not solely belong to those within the city limits.
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122 The idea that memorialization by the living cannot bring any additional honor to those who died in conflict for their nation is one that has run deeply through American culture. One of the most notable examples of this is President Lincoln’s Gettysburg Address, “But, in a larger sense, we can not dedicate -- we can not consecrate -- we can not hallow -- this ground. The brave men, living and dead, who struggled here, have consecrated it, far above our poor power to add or detract.” Abraham Lincoln, “Gettysburg Address,” speech, Gettysburg, PA, November 19, 1863.
It was Washington County’s urban hub, and people from throughout the area used Johnson City during their day-to-day routines. By expanding the Doughboy memorial’s scope, the American Legion made the memorial much more inclusive of, relevant to, and usable by the entire community operating within Johnson City. It became a community memorial meant to honor those who sacrificed their lives for the sake of protecting and preserving the community and nation. The Doughboy memorial at Roosevelt Stadium was both a prompt for remembrance, and a challenge to protect the peace that the soldiers had died for.

**Adaptability and Design**

The scope of a memorial impacts its usability in that it indirectly identifies an audience for the memorial by directly declaring who or what the memorial applies to. The audience becomes those who care about who or what is being memorialized. Shifting the focus from the individuals’ actual deaths and associating them with a higher purpose greatly increases the usability of the memorial, but that is not enough to ensure memorial use by itself. The design of the memorial must compliment and align with the scope declared on it. In terms of physical material, the plaque or inscription that declares the scope of the memorial is often only a small portion of the whole. The rest of the memorial must be usable as well. The Doughboy needed to be more evocative than its predecessor in order to be useful for commemoration.

The stylistic nature of a memorial can either strengthen or weaken a memorial’s usability. A memorial is most usable during the immediate time following its dedication when the memorial’s design closely aligns with and reinforces its declared scope, but a memorial is most usable in the long-term when it utilizes iconography that can be applied and adapted to similar subsequent episodes. The design of the boulder memorial in American Legion Park did not reinforce its scope or utilize iconography, but the design of the Doughboy memorial in front of
Roosevelt Stadium managed to do both. It was designed in a way that lent itself to memorializing the notion of sacrificing one’s life for the sake of the nation’s peace and prosperity. This made it more usable because it aligned with the memorial’s scope, tied into the American Legion’s ideologies, and utilized romanticized nationalistic iconography.

The first World War I memorial in Johnson City was rather rudimentary in design in that it lacked symbology, or any other kinds of visuals. The memorial only used text to convey its message. It was there to honor the Johnson City World War dead. Its aesthetic design is representative of the limited resources that the fledgling post of a newborn national organization would have. At that time, Kings Mountain Post No. 24 was financed solely upon membership dues and proceeds from minstrel shows. The memorial was made up of two bronze plaques affixed to a boulder about three feet by four feet in size. The memorial was not a flashy
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centerpiece of the park. In fact, the simplistic memorial was placed on the perimeter of the lot where it faded into the landscape.

In many ways, the boulder resembled a gravestone. The sacrifices of the men commemorated on it seemed to be metaphorically laid to rest once the rock was in place. Neither the American Legion nor the larger community interacted with the memorial in an organized manner. A space had been carved out to honor the memories of the Great War dead from Johnson City, but it was not a space that would be used to publicly commemorate them. The memorial was simply a marker of the war dead, and eventually both the boulder and the names on it would be forgotten.

It was nearly fifteen years before Johnson City got a World War memorial aesthetically designed to be actively used by the community. The Doughboy memorial utilized a common nationalistic sculpture that was incorporated into approximately 130 memorials across the nation during the 1920s and 1930s. The pressed copper statue was a larger-than-life-size depiction of a World War I American soldier charging forward with rifle and grenade in hand. Barbed wire and stumps meant to symbolize the ‘no man’s land’ of trench warfare surround his feet with an inscription that reads “Spirit of the American Doughboy” below him. As an addition, even more barbed wire and rocks comprised the base supplied by the American Legion on which the statue stood originally.
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The wording and plaque on the new memorial at Roosevelt Stadium was very similar to the previous one at American Legion Park, but this new memorial utilized visuals much more than its predecessor. It was not simply a marker acknowledging the fact that individuals from the community had been lost in the Great War. It was a place where the community could collectively honor their sacrifice.

The Doughboy memorial was a recognizable form. The statue was prevalent across the United States, the base harkened to World War battlefields, and the image of a Doughboy had become both a patriotic symbol for the nation and a personal identifier for veterans. In many ways, the Doughboy in Johnson City is an example of memorial consumption in Interwar America. The consumptionist nature of the statue was furthered when the Doughboy memorial
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lost one its few unique features in 1947 when its base comprised of rubble and barbed wire was replaced. The new base, seen below, came as part of an effort to update the grounds of stadium since the community had outgrown its capacity.

These efforts were led by Forrest Morris, the head of Memorial Stadium Inc. The nonprofit raised money in order to modernize and upscale the entire grounds. It was during this renovation that the stadium’s name was officially changed from Roosevelt Stadium to Memorial Stadium. The base of the memorial was changed to match the new style of the grounds with no
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opposition from the community. This is due to the fact that the base was never the focus of the memorial. The focus had always been the statue.

The veterans in Johnson City took various memorial components and compiled them in a way that aligned with their understanding of World War I. The parts that comprised the memorial were not sacred, but this did not make the memorial any less genuine. It assimilated various visually familiar, mass-produced parts in order to create a complete, usable memorial for the community. Much like the ground that the memorial stood on, the memorial’s commemorative value did not come from its physical components but rather the metaphysical meanings assigned to the statue by the community.

According to Earl D. Goldsmith, America’s leading expert on the Doughboy statues, the sculptures are mostly significant due to the national respect for the soldiers that died in World War I that they represent. This interpretation is largely colored by the messages on the plaques paired with the numerous Viquesney memorial statues. Many of which, like the Doughboy in Johnson City, prioritized loss of life over service. They sought to use the memorials to assign a meaningful justification to the deaths. In the 1920s, however, not everyone believed that the Doughboy statue conveyed genuine meanings of remembrance and were against engaging in or encouraging others to participate in a commercial memorial industry. This was due in large part to the fact that the statue was also used by the American Legion to honor the Legionnaires
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killed by members of the Industrial Workers of the World during a violent Armistice Day clash in 1919.\textsuperscript{145} The Legion used the statue to honor the fallen, but also connected it to what they argued was a patriotic crusade against radicalism in Interwar America as the IWW had been associated with Bolshevism and disloyalty to America.\textsuperscript{146}

The Legion’s use of the memorial to commemorate a violent clash on American soil further separated the memorial from what it had come to mean to those utilizing it for Great War commemoration. The commercial nature of the statue was evident in that it was a mass-produced icon that was recognizable in both memorial landscapes as a statue and in living rooms as a stand for decorative lamps, but now the sacredness of the depiction of the Doughboy in battle was brought into question since the sculpture had been used to honor individuals outside of WWI.\textsuperscript{147} The Legionnaires killed by the IWW were in fact Doughboys because they had served in the Great War, but they were not in service when they died. The memorial was used to honor something that its visuals did not depict.

Despite the qualms of some, their concerns did not prevent many from using and utilizing the sculpture for memorials. This was due in large part to the incredible ad campaigns detailing Viquesney’s statue.\textsuperscript{148} Advertisements for the statue claimed that constructing one would boost
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business, was the very essence of soldier battlefield spirit, and that the American Legion Memorial Committee had even endorsed it as a “100% representation of the American Soldier as he really was.” The mass-produced imagery of American doughboys was spreading all across Interwar America. Including other areas in East Tennessee.

The veterans in Knoxville, TN erected their own Doughboy memorial that predates Johnson City’s. This memorial, seen in the righthand portion of the photo, was erected in front of Knoxville High School in 1921.

This Doughboy is very similar, but it is not Viquesney’s “Spirit of the American Doughboy” statue. This statue is John Paulding’s “Over the Top.” While this Doughboy statue was not the exact same as the one in Johnson City, they were so similar that the American public often could not tell the difference and lawsuits were filed against Viquesney for copying the likeness of Paulding’s statue. The public, however, was more interested in what the statues stood for.
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rather than differentiating the minute details between the two figures. Much like Johnson City, the Doughboy memorial in Knoxville was also dedicated to war dead. Its scope was quite broad as it was dedicated to all those who had served since the Mexican War in 1846. Both Paulding’s and Viquesney’s statue were associated with sacrifice in battle due to the memorials that utilized them. Knoxville demonstrates an extreme example where the visuals of the memorial represent an entirely different context than its scope. The flexible nature of the iconography and representation of what American soldiers did in battle was what allowed the Knoxville memorial to encompass numerous previous conflicts, and the Johnson City memorial to incorporate subsequent ones. The statue was a visage of an American soldier at that point in time, but the memorialization focused on what the soldier was doing rather than what he looked like.

The scopes associated with the Doughboy statue made it adaptable, but the nationwide recognition of its form made it usable for commemoration. Individuals from all over the United States would have recognized the statue and what it stood for because they had seen it elsewhere. People knew what it was and how to use it since there were precedents established for its use by other similar memorials across the nation. The form of the memorial was recognizable by veterans and nonveterans alike. For World War I veterans, it was a depiction


\[\text{153 Ibid.}\]

that they could literally identify with for they themselves were Doughboys. More specifically, for the Legionnaires, it was a physical form they could relate to personally that also represented the values and objectives of their organization. The Doughboy had become an icon that symbolized the organization itself.155

The leadership of Kings Mountain Post No. 24 would have been familiar with the image of the Doughboy on a personal and organizational level. Commander Lawrence Nave was in charge of the Legion Post in Johnson City when the Doughboy statue was erected.157 He himself was an Army Infantryman during the First World War.158 The visage of the soldier depicted in copper was intended to be the spirit of his role in the war: “The Spirit of the American
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In addition to the personal associations that Legionnaires could form with the memorial, the statue’s visage had also became a symbol of the Legion that was used to promote the values of the organization.

Americanism is a foundational pillar of the American Legion that is oriented around the indoctrination of patriotism and good citizenship in the community. Americanism oriented toward developing love for God, country, and the flag is the core of the American Legion’s community outreach programs targeted at youth and beyond. In line with these objectives, memorialization has been a key component of their Americanism programs since the early twentieth century. The ultimate goal of such memorialization efforts has been to create “living memorials.” These memorials include “war memorials created in the form of parks, recreation centers, community buildings, etc.…” because “…memorials that live will build a stronger and healthier citizenship.” The two memorials in Johnson City align with the aims of Americanism as a national objective of the Legion, but only the Doughboy memorial was able to engage the public. Its focus on the larger community, and use of nationalistic icons to encourage patriotic dedication of citizens reinforced what was being memorialized on its plaque. The style of the memorial aligned with its scope in a way that made it useable for commemoration ceremonies that challenged the community to continue the work of their fallen loved ones. It was the obligation of the community to commemorate the Doughboys’ sacrifices, and to pick up the mantle of preserving peace and prosperity in the nation.
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The Doughboy in Johnson City demonstrates that a memorial does not have to be completely original in order to be usable for commemoration. It does, however, need to be visible and adaptable. The boulder was an original design developed by the American Legion in Johnson City. There are Great War memorials similar to it across the nation in that other locales have used boulders for memorials, but there is not another one exactly like it. It was literally grounded in the community as the material it is comprised of was sourced locally. Contrarily, the Doughboy statue was part of a national trend of memorial consumption that was incorporated into the community. The visual icons, and identities associated with them, assigned further meanings to the memorial in a way that simple text could not. Its nationalistic design increased community investment, and the design’s national origins did not make the memorial any less genuine to the community. The memorial symbolized the sacrifices of those who went to war for their community and nation while using a visage that aligned with the very actions it memorialized. This was a memorial that both veterans and nonveterans in Johnson City could use together. This memorial was a way that the community could further orient itself around those who had served in World War I. The community could continue the work that they had started.
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Chapter 4

Commemoration and Persistence: Initial Receptions and Tradition Formation

The geographic and stylistic differences between the boulder memorial dedicated in 1922 and the Doughboy memorial erected in 1935 demonstrate two very different versions of Great War memorialization that are revealing of social contexts surrounding their respective creations. Similarly, the differences in how the memorials were used or unused for commemoration is telling of how the community intended to interact with them and what purposes the memorials would serve. Johnson City had developed into a veteran-centric community physically and metaphorically oriented around Great War veterans. The Doughboy’s location and design represent the community’s need for a memorial space where they could commemorate World War I. It was the memorial that allowed the veterans and nonveterans in Johnson City to collectively remember the conflict.

The initial receptions of the two Great War memorials in Johnson City demonstrate how they were intended to be interacted with for years to come. The dedication ceremonies of the two memorials managed to both create new and bolster old holiday commemoration traditions for both veterans and nonveterans in Johnson City. The Doughboy memorial was more publicly received by the public than the boulder at American Legion park, and its initial use established sustainable traditions that could be carried out annually while the boulder was not formally interacted with initially or in subsequent years. How the Doughboy memorial was used originally made it more usable and adaptable in the future as it satisfied the community’s need for an effective commemoration space both initially and for many years to come. By 1935, the community was ready to join together with the veterans that it reoriented itself around in order to collectively remember the sacrifices of those lost to World War I.
Initial Receptions

There was no grand dedication ceremony for the boulder at American Legion Park when it was put in place on July 4, 1922. There was, however, a dedication ceremony when the park was officially handed over to the Legion. This ceremony took place on July 4, 1923 as part of a very elaborate Legion sponsored Fourth of July celebration. The Legion intended to host the largest Fourth of July celebration ever held in Johnson City with festivities carried out all day long. There were morning and evening baseball games, a parade that followed, the dedication of American Legion Park, a boxing match at Mountain Home, and fireworks to conclude the evening. The Legion-sponsored Fourth was a huge success. Thousands of people from the surrounding areas came to Johnson City for the festivities. The *Johnson City Chronicle* reported that there were “no less than 4,000 automobiles in Johnson City.”

The throngs of people loved the various entertainments offered and thought that the baseball games, boxing match, parade, and fireworks were tremendous displays of patriotism. While thousands enjoyed the various programs throughout the day, the highlight of the festivities for the American Legion was the dedication of American Legion park. This was the ceremony that cemented the Johnson City Board of Commissioners’ decision from their February meeting in which they decided to turn the park over to the Legion for the purpose of maintaining a World War memorial. The few hundred in the audience that made the trek from Main Street to Southwest Avenue heard speeches from local Legionnaires, were read the Declaration of
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Independence, watched a tribute to the Gold Star mothers, witnessed Mayor W. B. Ellison entrust the Legion with the park, and listened to an address from Governor Ben Hooper.\textsuperscript{172} It was an elaborate affair, but the boulder memorial itself was not a part of the ceremony.

The ceremony was not about the memorial. It was about dedicating the park. The ceremony was intended to honor the Johnson City men who died in World War I, but it did not utilize the memorial meant to do the same. This was largely due to the fact that the individuals involved with dedicating the park recognized that the community did not yet need a formal commemoration space. As such, it did not matter that the memorial resided in a fringe park that was not well-suited for commemorative uses or planned community functions. Governor Hooper even remarked in his speech that the park would “not be a place of mournful recollection…”\textsuperscript{173} The park was a beautification project more so than a memorial space. The focus was on how the park would be a place “…where the twitter of birds, the humming of bees and the glad laughter of little children will abound.”\textsuperscript{174} This park aligned with the Legion’s Americanism campaign in that it resembled a living memorial with a civic function, but neglected the memorial and focused solely on its role as a park. Instead of using the memorial, the Legion planted trees to honor the lost Doughboys.\textsuperscript{175} The memories of the Great War dead were being laid to rest as each tree was buried. Governor Hooper thought that the trees were a fitting memorial to the boys stating that, “No marble shaft could so truly typify and memorialize our mountain men.”\textsuperscript{176}

The ceremony dedicating American Legion Park did not establish commemoration traditions that could be replicated in the following years. In fact, the ceremony set a precedent
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that the memorial itself was not to be used for commemoration, and that the park was a memorial space simply intended to exist as an acknowledgment of the lives lost in World War I. The day’s activities were designed in a way that did not establish traditions in which they would use the memorial or park annually. In terms of sheer practicality alone, the Legion could not expect to plant fifteen trees each year in honor of each of the soldiers. Additionally, the ceremony itself was only a small portion of the day’s festivities, of which the memorial played no part. The memorial was not used initially, and would remain unused in the following years. It was not a significant part of the day’s activities or the park itself. While the park did serve its intended purpose outlined in the ceremonies, those functions did not include being used for commemorative activities. The park, and the memorial in it, would remain part of an empty grass lot in a residential neighborhood, and Johnson City’s Fourth of July festivities would return to focusing on the entertainment programs and sporting events happening in Johnson City’s downtown and at Mountain Home in the following years.\footnote{177 “Big Fourth of July Celebration Program Planned by Legion,” \textit{Johnson City Chronicle} (Johnson City, TN), July 2, 1924, pg. 1.}

The dedication of the Doughboy memorial in 1935 was vastly different than that of the protocols surrounding the dedication of American Legion park, but the events surrounding its dedication were quite similar to the Fourth of July festivities of 1923. The Legion once again sponsored the day’s happenings, and they chose to do so on a holiday like they had previously. Except this time, it was Armistice Day rather than the Fourth of July.\footnote{178 “Senator McKellar to Give Armistice Talk,” \textit{Johnson City Press-Chronicle} (Johnson City, TN), November 10, 1935, pg. 11.} Once again, the day was packed full of activities. There was a parade, a football game, an American Legion conference,
and a ball to finish the night. The highlight of the day, however, was the unveiling of the city’s new Great War memorial at Roosevelt Stadium.

The beginning of the dedication ceremony was marked by the parade’s arrival to the stadium at precisely 11:00am. The parade was met with the sound of “Taps” as it reached the grounds. The bugle song was meant to honor those lost in the Great War and the signing of the armistice in 1918. Much like the dedication of American Legion Park, a state representative gave an address as part of the ceremony. Senator Kenneth D. McKellar dedicated the statue shortly after 11:00am on November 11, 1935. After his speech, Gold Star mothers pulled off the sheet covering the statue.
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While the order of events was similar, the dedication of the Doughboy at Roosevelt Stadium was much different than that of American Legion Park because the memorial was the focus. In 1923, the American Legion dedicated a park where a memorial already existed. The exact opposite happened in 1935 as a memorial was dedicated where the stadium already stood. This was the first time that the public was able to interact with the seven-foot-tall Doughboy.\textsuperscript{187} Since it was the public’s first interaction with the memorial, the American Legion was able to set an example for how the memorial was to be used. They established a tradition where the community would utilize the memorial in a way that could be repeated each year.

Each Veterans Day, the American Legion Kings Mountain Post No. 24 would hold a ceremony that mirrored its initial use. A speech would be made about the sacrifices of the men honored by the statue, names would be read, and a wreath would be placed at the base of the statue as the climax of the day’s festivities.\textsuperscript{188} This tradition was perpetuated over the years as collectively remembering the fallen soldiers on Veterans Day became a ritualistic part of the holiday festivities. It was as much part of the day as the annual Armistice Day parade was. These annual rites and practices helped the memorial stay relevant to the community’s commemorative practices since the memorial was held in high esteem as the focal point of the day. The Doughboy’s subsequent uses throughout the twentieth century purposefully followed the precedent established in 1935.

Veterans and nonveterans both demonstrated a willingness to prioritize and engage with the memorial in a more direct way than they did in 1922. Their willing interaction with the memorial was due in part to the shift in collective memory surrounding the Great War, but was

\textsuperscript{187} “Senator McKellar to Give Armistice Talk,” \textit{Johnson City Press-Chronicle} (Johnson City, TN), November 10, 1935, pg. 11.
\textsuperscript{188} “Wreath Place on Doughboy Statue,” \textit{Johnson City Press-Chronicle} (Johnson City, TN), November 12, 1946, pg. 1; “In memoriam,” \textit{Johnson City Press} (Johnson City, TN), November 12, 1987, pg. 1.
more directly tied to how Johnson City had further oriented its identity around supporting Great War veterans. The wounds, impressions, and memories of the World War were still fresh when the 1922 memorial was erected, and the community was in the early stages of redefining itself. By the time the Doughboy was unveiled, both veterans and nonveterans had time to heal, reconcile, and make sense of the First World War, and the new memorial was designed in a way that addressed their need for a commemorative space.

The American Legion was very aware of this national and local shift in perception of the war and sought to capitalize on it. When the Legion advertised the Armistice Day festivities in 1935, they ran an ad stating, “They say wars always occur in the second generation. They say the memory is too vivid in the minds of the first generation following those who participated.” This suggests that the memorial at American Legion Park was not intended to be used for commemoration because of emotional reasons beyond the geographic and stylistic obstacles facing it. The public was not ready, so it was designed to satisfy different community needs. The ad then goes on to talk about how the soldiers’ sacrifices preserved peace and prosperity, and that it was up to the community to finish the job that the soldiers could not. The rhetoric of this ad was similar to the way that the American Legion talked about the sacrifices of the World War dead at American Legion Park, but this time they explicitly acknowledged memory and how it changes over time. They were ready to engage those memories and use commemoration as part of the healing process.

The Legion in Johnson City knew that the collective memory surrounding the Great War had changed. They explicitly acknowledged that the memories were too vivid immediately
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following the war, and that by 1935 the community had changed in a way that allowed it to engage and confront those memories in ways that they could not before. It was time that they “take this opportunity to pay tribute to those who died for peace…”\textsuperscript{191} Johnson City’s memorial and physical landscapes had changed in such a way that the community was now ready for a Great War memorial space to serve as a central part of the city.

The Legion recognized that they could use those changes to their advantage when trying to get the public to use the Doughboy memorial beyond its dedication. As a result, the American Legion chose to unveil its new memorial on a commemorative holiday dedicated to veterans rather than the national celebration of patriotism. The veteran-centric community would receive their new Great War memorial that was created by veterans on a holiday dedicated to veterans. The unveiling of the Doughboy was a physical marker that represented the merging of the memorial and urban landscapes of Johnson City. This memorial was a physical embodiment of the community’s orientation around Great War veterans.

Contrarily, dedicating American Legion Park on the Fourth of July did not establish community traditions. The Fourth in Johnson City had always been a holiday of sporting events, picnics, patriotic sermons, and playful revelry.\textsuperscript{192} A memorial had no place among the various high-spirited entertainments. To use Governor Hooper’s words, there was no place for “mournful recollection.”\textsuperscript{193} Unveiling the Doughboy on Veterans Day, however, signified that there were ways for both veterans and nonveterans to serve after the war. It was their obligation to make
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sure that those killed in the Great War did not die in vain. It was their responsibility to both commemorate and carry on.

The Doughboy was a community centerpiece, and its placement and design aided in the formation of commemoration traditions that would utilize it. The physical location of the Doughboy ensured that the statue would remain a relevant part of the community. Additionally, the municipal space it was partnered with was better suited for hosting commemorative ceremonies. Individuals watching the parade could simply follow along to the next portion of the day’s programs and watch the American Legion’s exercises at the Doughboy. The scope and design of the memorial helped ensure that the Doughboy would be usable initially and adaptable in the future. The Doughboy’s placement and design were what made it usable for annual commemoration while the boulder’s placement and design allowed it to serve as a memorial marker of the city’s Great War dead. Their initial uses aligned with their designs and were representative of how they would address the needs of Johnson City in the future.

**Persistent Traditions**

Looking at how the memorials were used originally helps explain why and how they were or were not used throughout the twentieth century. The Doughboy’s geographic and stylistic advantages allowed it to become a central piece of Veterans Day ceremonies and community events for years to come while the boulder’s design and placement allowed it to serve as private memorial dedicated to loss. The initial uses of the two memorials directly shaped how they would be interacted with for years to come by setting precedents that fell in line with the other commemorative traditions in Johnson City.

---
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The scopes of the two World War I memorials in Johnson City focused on the dead from the conflict. The nature of what they commemorated aligned more closely with Memorial Day than it did Veterans Day or the Fourth of July, but the latter two were the holidays that the American Legion chose to dedicate the memorials on. To ensure its use, the American Legion had to use and talk about the Doughboy in a specific way that helped bridge the gap between its subject matter and the purposes of Veterans Day. The boulder memorial’s purpose and subject matter did not align with the Fourth of July like the Doughboy did with Veterans Day. As such, the dedication of the park was more about setting apart space for the war dead rather than establishing commemorative traditions. The preexisting traditions for Memorial Day, Veterans Day, and the Fourth of July helped cement the two memorials’ roles in the community.

The Doughboy’s primary functions revolved around Veterans Day and community events, but it did occasionally serve as the centerpiece for other festivities. The Doughboy was used on a handful of occasions over the years for Memorial Day services, but it was often for smaller ceremonies and never on a consistent basis. When it was used, it was used in a way that mirrored its Veterans Day traditions. For example, in 1951, a handful of Gold Star Mothers placed a wreath against the Doughboy’s base, a protocol borrowed from Veterans Day services held at the statue, and conducted a small ceremony honoring their lost loved ones.\(^{196}\)

---
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Despite the Doughboy’s occasional use, Mountain Home had been the center of Johnson City’s Memorial Day services since 1910.\(^{197}\) The festivities typically included a parade marching to the grounds, an oration given by either an administrator from Mountain Home or a state representative, and a wreath placing ceremony commenced to the sound of a band or tributary gunfire.\(^{198}\) The organization of the ceremonies closely resembled what the American Legion did at both the dedication of American Legion Park, and the various Veterans Day events held at Roosevelt Stadium. They were similar, but there was a key difference in the ceremonies. The Memorial Day traditions at Mountain Home revolved around laying the dead to rest rather than picking up where they left off. Those who executed the Memorial Day rites played the role of pallbearers rather than reinforcements. Each year, the graves in the National Cemetery at Mountain Home were decorated and a wreath was placed against their reproduction of the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier.\(^{199}\)

The nature of the two holidays’ ceremonies were entirely different. Memorial Day in Johnson City was about laying the memories of the dead to rest. As a result, Mountain Home
used graves and tombs for their commemoration. The nature of the holiday aligned with the facilities at Mountain Home since the national cemetery was there. The preexisting tradition of observing Memorial Day at Mountain Home obstructed the two Great War memorials’ potential uses for the holiday. The commemoration ceremonies in Johnson City were acts of collective remembrance organized around the community coming together. Using either of the two World War I memorials on Memorial Day would have split the community. The community would have had to decide between the competing services honoring their war dead, and it is very likely that the preexisting traditions at Mountain Home would have greatly overshadowed anything the American Legion would have planned since the annual Memorial Day festivities at Mountain Home drew thousands each year. It would not have made since to associate either of the Great War memorials with Memorial Day regardless of their intended roles since Johnson City already had Memorial Day traditions.

The American Legion Post No. 24 gave each of its Great War memorials a better chance at being used by associating them with holidays other than Memorial Day, but the boulder memorial at American Legion Park still fell victim to holiday traditions. The scope of the memorial did not align with the nature of the holiday. The memorial focused on the Great War dead, and the Fourth of July in Johnson City had always been a patriotic celebration comprised of various revelries and entertainments.²⁰⁰

The Doughboy memorial managed to stay relevant to the community thanks to the sustainable traditions formed around it. It was frequently used for both community events and Veterans Day exercises following its dedication. People would file into the stadium grounds to
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watch football games, motorcycle races, orations, and wreath laying ceremonies for years to come. The fact that the Doughboy was located on Main Street and partnered with Roosevelt Stadium kept it relevant, and its scope and style made it adaptable. The long career of the Doughboy memorial was also due to the American Legion’s wise choice to associate the memorial with soldier sacrifices and how the community can continue to serve after the guns go silent. The memorial was well suited for future Veterans Day commemoration exercises because the Legion had associated it with an adaptable purpose. The Doughboy challenged the community to honor the sacrifices of those who died in service. The memorial encompassed more than just the Great War dead from Washington County. It represented the community’s dedication to honoring and helping those who had served in the Great War.

The rest of the twentieth century brought more wars, deaths, and veterans. Collective memory of World War I and the public’s perception of war would be in constant flux as the years passed. World War II, the Korean War, the Vietnam War, and the Gulf War each brought its own memories, injuries, questions, losses, and victories. The frequency of use fluctuated, but the Doughboy memorial was used in the same capacity with the same traditions commemorating the same ideals. The community was supposed to honor those who died for their community.

---

and nation. The memorial’s scope, however, had to shift and change in order to reflect those leading the commemoration ceremonies.

The Doughboy memorial’s uses stayed largely unchanged because the same private veteran institution led the commemoration ceremonies involving it each year for the same holiday. It was an adaptable tradition carried out by a continuously operating institution in a community that was constantly adapting to the needs of its veteran community. The American Legion’s use of the memorial remained the same, but the scope of the organization and the memorial they used needed to grow in order to stay relevant. The American Legion expanded to encompass veterans from each conflict as they arose, and the memorial came to represent the soldiers who died in each of the conflicts. The memorial’s meaning was unofficially democratized in parallel to the ever-extending membership of the American Legion. With each passing conflict, the American Legion grew in number, and the memorial gradually came to represent the sacrifices of soldiers in other conflicts as the public’s perception of what a veteran was expanded. Johnson City did not have memorials to the other wars, so the Doughboy became a representation of wartime sacrifice during World War I and beyond.

It was not until 1974 that the Doughboy memorial’s scope was officially changed to encompass the conflicts since its dedication in 1935. The Doughboy’s memorial placard represented the veterans that the community cared about once again. The American Legion followed suit with the original dedication of the Doughboy when they organized the rededication in 1974. Similar to 1935, the local Legion post sponsored the day’s festivities. They organized a parade followed by a ceremony where Gold Star Mothers would rededicate the memorial after
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hearing the local ROTC band and some orators.\textsuperscript{205} In line with the original dedication, the American Legion also prioritized the memorial over the other festivities. Advertising the grand event as “Doughboy Day.”\textsuperscript{206} The memorial was still dedicated to Washington County’s war dead, but now explicitly covered a few more conflicts.

![Dedication Plaque](image)

The rededication of the Doughboy did have an unintended consequence. It reignited interest in the first Great War memorial erected in Johnson City. Ultimately leading to its own rededication in 1978.\textsuperscript{208} The rededication of the Doughboy brought the public’s attention back to the memorials themselves. The Doughboy had served as a community centerpiece and commemoration site for so long that it had simply become part of the activities and the original
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purpose of it had been overlooked. Its changing meaning throughout the twentieth century had eclipsed its original scope. Likewise, the original intent of the boulder memorial at American Legion park had also fallen out of the general public’s perspective, but for a different reason. It was forgotten because it was not used. Not because it had outgrown its original designs. On May 30, 1978, the Great War memorial to Johnson City’s dead was rededicated, but its scope did not change like the Doughboy’s did. Instead, they simply replaced the two plaques that had been missing for many years with a new one.

The resurgence in interest in the two memorials did not spur any additional use of the boulder memorial, and the community continued to use the Doughboy each year like they had. The uses of the two memorials were once again made clear by their rededications. The Doughboy was to serve as a symbol of soldiers’ sacrifices and the ways that Washington County could honor their sacrifices, and the boulder was meant to be a Great War memorial to Johnson City’s dead. One was intended to grow and adapt in order to change with the times, and the other was rigid dedicated marker placed by the community.

The uses of the two Great War memorials in Johnson City revolved around commemorative and civic functions. They remained free from noncommemorative purposes like Legion post anniversaries or anti-war protests. They were simply small parts of municipal locations that were assigned deeper significance during commemorative holidays. The holidays that each memorial was associated with placed constraints on the memorials’ functions, and
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exacerbated their geographic and stylistic advantages or disadvantages. Ultimately, their initial receptions established traditions that laid the foundation for the memorials’ futures. Used and unused.

The initial uses of the two memorials represented Johnson City’s progression to orienting around Great War veterans, and the more adaptable nature of the Doughboy allowed it to incorporate other conflicts in the future as the community continually adapted to meet the needs of veterans. The rededication of the boulder did not incorporate more conflicts because it was to remain a memorial placard acknowledging the community losses during the Great War, but the rededication of the Doughboy once again demonstrated that it was a memorial intended to address the needs of the veterans that Johnson City oriented around at that point in time. As Johnson City’s identity changed once again, so did its commemoration space dedicated to wartime sacrifice.
Conclusion

The differences between the two Great War memorials in Johnson City are staggering. One became a community centerpiece while the other was forgotten and vandalized. The location of the memorial at Roosevelt Stadium made it both accessible and relevant to everyday life. Additionally, the expanded scope and style of the Doughboy memorial allowed it to serve more individuals since it was more inclusive and adaptable. Despite the fact that both memorials were created in the same city by the same people in honor of the same conflict, the Doughboy’s various advantages allowed it to be used for commemoration while its older counterpart stood solemnly as a memorial marker that preserved the memory of those lost to World War I.

Analyzing factors like accessibility, municipal functions, scope, design, and commemorative traditions provides a more complete look at how World War I memorials served, and were relevant to, the public. The origins, locations, scopes, designs, and meanings of American World War I memorials are extremely diverse, but they can be unpacked in order to better understand the memorials themselves, their uses, and what made them significant to their local communities initially and beyond. In the case of Johnson City, the two memorials were the result of a community’s deep dedication to veterans. World War I changed both the physical and memorial landscapes of the community.

On January 26, 2016, the United States World War One Centennial Commission unveiled its proposed design for a national Great War memorial in Washington D.C. The commission seeks to honor the forgotten war since it is the only major U.S. conflict that does not have a

---

memorial in Washington. This memorial is what the organization intends to use to pay tribute and give a voice to a lost generation of U.S. soldiers. They are seeking to “rekindle Americans’ collective memory” surrounding the conflict.

The push to commemorate a conflict that has been memorialized by many smaller monuments across the nation poses a unique challenge for both the commission and the nation. Many question whether a World War I memorial is necessary. Some question the form that the memorial should take. Others are concerned with what the memorial will mean to a nation made up of individuals who have no personal attachments to, or memories of, the war. All of these discussions revolve around the memorial’s dedication, but few look beyond that.

We must first know what World War I memorials have meant to, and have done for, the American public in order to construct a World War I memorial that is meant to represent the values expressed in the various smaller memorials across the nation. A deeper awareness of what has made World War I memorials relevant historically provides insight to the questions being asked about the proposed memorial’s purpose and meaning. This new memorial seeks to do what so many others have done before it: honoring those who “served and died in World War I.”
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this new memorial means to align with its predecessors, there needs to be a careful analysis of the geographic, stylistic, and human factors surrounding the World War I memorials across the nation. The challenge that the nation faces now with memorializing World War I is born of the same struggle that Americans faced historically when memorializing the conflict. They had to find ways to make the memorials relevant despite the fact that the memorials themselves were so divorced from their subject matter. Then, the biggest challenge was geography, but now, the fact that one hundred years have passed makes time a factor as well.

The Doughboy memorial demonstrates how the memorial and urban landscape of a community can reflect the community’s values, attitudes, and initiatives. That is why it was designed to be used for commemoration. That is why it has been such a central component of Johnson City. There is no such thing as a universal collective memory about World War I. The nation’s experiences with World War I are too diverse for that to be true, but by looking at the Great War memorials across the nation there is the possibility of having a national World War I memorial that is usable if the conflict and its legacies still matter to Americans today. Johnson City shows that it is possible to design a Great War memorial suited for collective remembrance by tapping into the community surrounding it and its connections to World War I. Much like Johnson City, the decisions made now directly impact the memorial’s future and what it will mean to the next generation of Americans as society’s current understanding of World War I will alter the urban landscape.
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