

The District's Last Battle of the Great War: The DC War
Memorial and Contemporary Issues of Representation
on the National Mall

Joseph Sherren
ARTH 599: Monuments and Memorializing in U.S. Art from 1870 to the Present
Spring 2015, George Mason University

The District of Columbia War Memorial is one of the many examples of local monuments constructed to commemorate the war dead from the First World War. It was placed in a location, one chosen from many, that was rising in prominence in the 1920's and would become the symbolic center of the country. However it was given to the memory of the District. Due to the location's meteoric rise in prominence since the 1980's, in part because of Maya Lin's Vietnam Veteran's War Memorial and the Korean War Veteran's Memorial a decade later, legislators in the early 2000's pushed to have the monument refurbished to better fit with the memorial landscape that grew around it fifty years after dedication. The memorial not just predates, but belies its significant location; it is a local monument on the National Mall dedicated to the 499 war dead from the District. Further, it is a monument to World War I where there are few of them in the capital, and it belongs solely to the District which, yet, does not have full legislative representation on the national level. Seventy years after the dedication of the memorial, issues over statehood came to light with the push to re-dedicate the memorial, demonstrating the significance the memorial grows during its life.

This paper will examine memorials in the wake of World War I, introduce the District's war memorial and also briefly compare some of the other prominent examples of war memorials that commemorate the Great War. The District's memorial is unique in form as well as its origins and so I will discuss how funds for the memorial were raised as well as some of the issues of representation that rise from the memorial becoming a reality on the National Mall in the 1930's. Then I will discuss the attempt to rededicate the memorial in the early 2000's. This includes the

social and political battle that ensued and what the memorial means today surrounded by predominately national memorials. The DC War Memorial is an anomaly for the National Mall, it was never conceived of as a national monument, and it did not fit all of the anachronistic commemorative tropes of the late-nineteenth century and forged its own significance partly due to the commission that made the monument possible in the first place and the position it occupied as a center for the District's representation debate. By virtue of opportunity—access to the site on the National Mall primarily—it is one of the local commemorative efforts of World War I that had national visibility.

World War I and the Commemorative Effort

American involvement in the Great War did not come until several years after its initiation and after the majority of the fighting had taken place throughout Europe. Because of this casualties were lower than other allies. A memo issued from the Graves Registration Service in 1919 calculates the figures of American casualties: 34,063 killed in action, 14,215 died of their wounds, 23,210 had died of disease, and 4,588 died from other means. The memo goes on to note an additional 4,102 missing in action, and so the “total overseas losses for the American Expeditionary Forces (AEF) were documented at that time at 80,178.”¹ Modern calculations place the American casualties closer to 323,018 (comprising of 116,516 killed, 204,002 wounded, 4,500 taken prisoner but does not include those missing in action) however that is still only about 7.1 percent of the mobilized

¹ Budreau, 2010:19

force.² Current calculations notwithstanding, the figures available in the 1920's showed how America managed to exit the Great War relatively unscathed compared to the devastation seen by Central Powers. They had 67.4 % of their total fighting force considered casualties by the end, and other allies such as the British Empire (35.8 %) and Russia (76.3 %) and France (73.3%) just to name a few.²

The scale of American casualties of the Great War bore greater resemblance to the Civil War with its over 600,000 war dead. Greater than the more recent Spanish-American War, a three month long conflict in 1898 that resulted in only 4, 108 casualties.² This is a component of why the effort more closely resembled Civil War commemoration. The prominent commemorative efforts focused on battlefield memorial and for the best and most extensive example of this, see the Gettysburg battlefields, as well as locally significant monuments.

National visibility, especially a nation being reformed through civil war, was not a significant concern and so "before World War I the only monument to common war dead in the capital was the Navy Monument, erected (in the words of its inscription) 'in memory of the officers, seamen, and marines of the United States Navy who fell in defense of the union and liberty of their country. (1861- 1865)'"³ This traditional form of commemoration for the scale of militarization and loss carried through to the twentieth century modern war with an important variable: the international battlefield.

²https://www.pbs.org/greatwar/resources/casdeath_pop.html, n.d

³ Savage, 2009: 237

When faced with the international battlefield, that traditional mode of commemoration was stuck in the American social psyche. Battlefield memorials and cemeteries with chapels and monuments were petitioned for in the United States after the Great War. This also brought many other issues to the fore such as repatriation of the bodies of war dead as well as ownership of the memorial site, a concern that implies upkeep and management. "World War I set a precedent for governmental standards for overseas cemeteries and memorials. Established by Congress in 1923, the American Battle Monuments Commission (AMBC) planned and funded the building of 11 memorials and cemeteries in Europe after the Great War."⁴ They initiated and oversaw "the construction of a grand scheme of national monuments on the former battlefields."⁴ Overseas cemeteries and memorials served a very distinctive nationalistic purpose; they asserted American dominance and patriotism over the site of a decimated country. However there was little effort to exercise this patriotism in the capital or on another national level. The United States had come out of the war relatively unscathed and poised to become the dominant world power. However commemoration on the visible national stage was still relatively non-existent.

The main commemorative effort was set on the local stage. "Many towns chose to connect their remembrance of the First World War dead with those of the Civil War by adding names to monuments already occupying central locations"⁵ in the town. They did so for continuity and understanding, in order to place their dead

⁴ Mayo and Hoeflich, 2010: 308

⁵ Budreau, 2010: 138

within the context of the clearer glory narrative, a facet of the national narrative adopted in early twenty first-century America. The commemorative effort was based in the desire to memorialize victory in these distinctive public settings rather than just death, it was important to keep the belief of victory and that symbolic significance as opposed to commemorating the death of Americans. Victory was especially important at a time in war memory that was particularly ambivalent towards our participation in the war in the first place. This cultural mindset is exercised in the desire for isolationism on the international stage as well as ultimate ambivalence towards involvement elsewhere, but more particularly “ambivalence towards [the country’s] rising position in international affairs.”⁶ The ambivalence discussion was a small, but dynamic debate that carried on and bled out into the populace despite the overwhelming local support of veterans. “This harmonious façade masked deeper concerns and [that] pervasive ambivalence that was occurring nationally about the war, its ultimate gains, and the most appropriate way to honor the dead.”⁷

On large scale, such as the publically visual monuments, an important shift occurred. This shift is marked by the transition of the commissioner’s desire for a prominent sculptor and a significant figure to a clever architect or landscape designer. Out of this shift, the viewer was to navigate constructed elements rather than be stationary and view a portrait sculpture. As Kirk Savage stated, “the real action was elsewhere,”⁸ and the didactic value of the site was the site itself. The

⁶ Budreau, 2010: 104

⁷ *Ibid*: 146

⁸ Savage, 2009: 197

Great War was on a scale such that towns, cities, and even counties wanted their own monument to commemorate and memorialize the memories of members of the community.

Despite the noticeable shift, there were still conservative enclaves that clung to commemorations of valor and honor. Realism served in their commemorative sculptures at a time when hyper-nationalism and the overwhelming fear of radicalism was at its peak in 1919 and 1920 despite the national ambivalence. These sculptures were made to celebrate the common soldier in accessible and authentically heroic terms. This is the cultural and artistic climate that gave birth to the E.M Viquesney Fighting Doughboy monument with dedication dates beginning in 1921 and over 130 sculptures dedicated in about 30 years. With these commemorations though, there was a push to give names to the soldiers rather than reliance on a single person's image for the community, which was largely the case with the Doughboy sculptures.

The familiar way of commemorating the First World War was through the Doughboy in town squares or adding names to Civil War Monuments in prominent local locations, highlighting valor and sacrifice and couching understanding in the terms of the Civil War. The Great War was on a scale such that towns, cities and even counties wanted their own monument to commemorate and memorialize the memories of members of their community in a similar way. The DC War Memorial, a temple in the Ash Woods, would appropriately "applaud deeds of value"⁹ in a way

⁹ Wingate, 1995: 164

that the Doughboy could not, further it was the site of a personalized living memorial.

Among other World War I memorials, the DC War Memorial is both nuanced and untouched by contemporaneous controversy. Other important World War I memorials more closely reflect the heavy-handed sentiments of “God and Country.” These memorials tend not to separate faith and war memory. Some prominent examples of these types of memorials that include God and country motifs as well as victory motifs include, most importantly the Kansas City Liberty Memorial and the Pershing Park Memorial.

The DC War Memorial escaped the heat of controversy surrounding memorials as well. The Harvard University’s memorial to commemorate their dead in 1927 was caught up in a controversy regarding who should be commemorated. In the old mode, that of figural statuary, the University commissioned a classical pietà “depicting a dying crusader being cradled by his mother” from Malvina Hoffman.¹⁰ The question of who should be commemorated was raised and lacking substantial criteria for the memorial, university officials remained nonplussed by the student challenge for the memorial being solely for the remembrance of those who served for the Allied Forces. This is significant as four former students of Harvard had been killed serving in the German Army, causing outrage as they were to be part of the totally inclusive monument. The dispute was finally settled by 1928 when University President Lowell insisted “the memorial would honor the Allied dead, but

¹⁰ Budreau, 2010: 143

a plaque containing the names of the German soldiers would be placed nearby within the memorial building.”¹¹

The DC War Memorial is an anomaly for World War I memorials in that it does not call on the ideals of God and Country as heartily, neither was it embroiled in controversy regarding who should be commemorated. It commemorates the men and women from the District, from all branches of military service, who fought and died in the Great War. Taken in concert, it was still only a part of the commemorative effort set forth by the District.

The DC War Memorial

The DC War Memorial commemorates the men and women from the District, from all branches of military service, who fought and died in the Great War. It is a simple and elegant memorial, seeming to belie its significance as the first memorial erected in West Potomac Park as well as the District’s only dedicated memorial on the National Mall. However it was just a part of the commemorative effort set forth by the District.

In 1920, the District planted 530 Norway maple trees along 16th street between Alaska Ave. and Varnum Street in northwest. Accompanying each tree was a stone marker with a copper medallion bearing the name of each of DC’s fallen soldiers. However, in 2010 only two markers were still standing.¹² This 530 is significant because it was the confirmed dead reported from the District, a figure

¹¹ *Ibid*: 144

¹² Brown, 2012: 2

that held at least until 1922 when a *Washington Post* article capitulated the claim. Despite there being earlier reports of 535 dead. However for the DC War Memorial, the 530 member list for the tree memorial was whittled down to the “official” 507 which was then further shrunk to the 499 currently listed on the DC War Memorial dedicated in 1931. The full circumstances are up to debate, but a committee was established to compile that official list, a committee composed of Major General Anton Stephan, Major Gist Blaire, Frederick H. Brooke (architect of the monument), B.C. MacNeil, and Colonel Nevitt. This list was made publically available on September 20, 1931 in *The Washington Star*, about three weeks before the dedication ceremony.

The architect of the DC War Memorial, Frederick H. Brooke, worked closely in association with Nathan Wyeth and Horace W. Peaslee. Brooke’s plan was officially marked to be the DC War Memorial in a small copse in West Potomac Park called Ash Woods in 1924. The memorial is made of white marble, quarried from Danby, Vermont. It is in the form of a Doric temple, in contemporary literature it is even referred to as the temple or the shrine in Ash Woods. The capitals on the 12 columns supporting the dome are of the Doric order, which is resting on a podium approximately four feet off of the ground. There are sparse decorative motifs, they are the inscriptions on the platform stating the intent of the memorial, the dedication statement that states how funds were raised, mentions the dedication by President Hoover on Armistice Day of 1931, as well as the significance of the cornerstone. There is also included the name of each person killed in the course of World War I presented solely in alphabetical order. Significantly, the names have no

rank or branch attached to them, no descriptors that differentiate between men, women, and those of higher or lower rank.

Between blocks of names there are low relief medallions of the branches of the military to which these people belonged including the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard, and finally additional low relief medallions for the District of Columbia and a commemorative carving with the inscription “The Great War for Civilization.” Around the entire drum of the dome is the inscription “A memorial to the armed services from the District of Columbia who served their country in the World War” with a relief carving of the eagle carrying arrows perched above the eight stairs on the pool-side of the side. In the center of the floor inside of the dome is a twelve-pointed star of darker stone and a circular brass plaque in the center with six stars outside of a hexagon that contains the eagle motif seen on the drum.

The memorial is unique in that it does not stand in the center of a large plaza or is not walled off from its surroundings. It is very self-consciously placed within a “memorial grove of fine hardwood native trees.”¹³ The grove is made up of large elm trees about 50 feet around the memorial, then tulip trees a little farther out; oaks, beech, and elms were then planted between the tulip trees and elms. This design for the memorial’s grove was approved by James L. Greenleaf, a distinguished landscape architect and former member of the Fine Arts Commission¹³ and further shows an example of the experiential site memorial Savage was discussing came to prominence in the 1920’s.

¹³ Richards, 2002

The memorial was dedicated on Armistice Day, November 11, 1931. On the day, the 77-year old John Philip Sousa, wearing his Navy uniform, led the Marine Band. The interior of the memorial was made specially to hold the 77-member band. The site was constructed to be a bandstand and it was a successful bandstand for nearly forty years. Those in attendance at the dedication concert made note “that extraneous noises were minimal and the location offered plenty of grassy space for audiences who enjoyed unlimited nearby parking”¹⁴ as well. After the dedication, concerts were moved from the Sylvan Theater to the new memorial, the first program beginning on June 2, 1932 when the United States Marine Band opened to an audience of 2000.¹⁵ Captain Taylor Branson led the band, later stating “Washington never before has had so ideal a place for our park concerts. The acoustics are all that could be desired and the setting is superb.”¹⁶

The living memorial was a new mode of memorializing and in the era where the most common commemorative effort was anachronistic liberty monuments or the Viquesney Doughboy, the living memorial garnered criticism. “The living memorial advocates argued it better honored the dead to create things that were of benefit to the society, to invest in institutions that represented the ideals for which the soldiers had fought and died. Opponents of the living memorial thought this was a ruse to avoid paying for a real monument.”¹⁶ Interestingly, note use of the word “real,” in that only a *real* American would want a traditional memorial to reflect the

¹⁴ Budreau, 2010: 140

¹⁵ Richards, 2002

¹⁶ Kennicott, 2014

meaning of the soldier's sacrifice. However, the DC War Memorial was an important investment, one that took time and great care.

How the Memorial Came to Be

The campaign for the construction of the Memorial began immediately after Armistice. The Noyes family, particularly brothers Frank and Theodore, spearheaded it. Frank, the chairman of the memorial commission and the president of the Evening Star Newspaper Company and Associated Press, led the charge on the memorial. His brother, another force in the memorial's beginning, led a dual campaign to pass a Constitutional amendment for the District. Theodore, the editor-in-chief of the *Washington Star* newspaper had published a series of arguments for the Constitutional amendment to give the District's citizens representation in Congress and members in the presidential Electoral College. The Noyes were among the loudest and most fervent supporters of both the District's statehood and the erection of the memorial, advocating for the memorial's prominent location in a, then, marshy grove on the National Mall which the Federal Commission of Arts would grant in 1924.

With the plan of the Memorial becoming a reality with the passage of Resolution 28 in 1924, the resolution that named Brooke's structure the official memorial and the site in Ash Woods, funding for the ample construction costs began. The majority of funds came from DC residents and school children. The Superintendent of the schools, Dr. Frank W. Ballou "and members of the Board of Education, made preparations to involve the 70,000 school children by asking each

to contribute 5 cents.”¹⁷ Each child who contribute their nickel was awarded with a button with the number “535” on it, then representing the list of War Dead, and a sketch of the memorial to be constructed.

With half of the Noyes’s plan becoming a reality, they pushed harder for the Constitutional amendment. But it would not be passed until 1961, 30 years after the dedication of the memorial and approximately 15 years after the death of the Noyes brothers. The Amendment granted District residents the right to vote for three electors for President, equal to the number granted to the least populated state. The District’s visual representation and the lobbying efforts based on the memorial may have even helped to propel this amendment forward, the memorial demonstrating the residents of the District were a civil society that staked a claim in the nation’s victory in World War I with their own sacrifice.¹⁸ So the Noyes got part of their Amendment and secured their memorial with the national visibility and acknowledgement. However the memorial sat, largely ignored for approximately 30 years after the parks need for a public bandstand died out. It would eventually fall into disrepair and relative obscurity until an Arlington lawyer named Edwin Fountain “jogged past a small but oddly moving structure hidden by trees on the south side of the Mall.”¹⁹

The Attempt to Re-Designate the DC War Memorial

¹⁷ Richards, 2002

¹⁸ Budreau, 2010: 8

¹⁹ Kelly, 2011

The push to rededicate the World War I memorial started with Edwin Fountain. He helped to found the Memorial Foundation in 2008 with the belief that the United States is lagging far behind the efforts of its allies in France and Britain when it comes to marking the centennial of the war. Fountain claims “we would never have had advocated for a national memorial from scratch here on the Mall,”²⁰ a proposition that would be, if not improbably then highly unlikely. The Commemorative Works Act of 1986 and the 2003 amendments limiting new construction on the National Mall and Memorial Park after the groundbreaking of the National World War II Memorial would effectively prevent the erection of any new monuments. With this in mind, Fountain goes on to say of the DC War Memorial “because this one was here, we thought it could be appropriately rededicated.”²¹

The proposed rededication and re-designation, enacted by Congressman Ted Poe of Texas, would include not just cleaning and refurbishing the current memorial but adding bronzes or other “minimal adornments”²² to the site. Their propositions, for the most part, left the memorial unchanged save for the refurbishments. Any additions to the memorial and the site, Fountain believes, would be in spirit of “upgrading the existing DC Memorial, and that we also remember the rest of the 4,734,991 Americans that served by dual naming the Memorial area.”²³ While not completely erasing the identity of the District’s soldiers, the national narrative of aggrandizing American conflict would ultimately take precedent in light of the

²⁰ Fountain, *Why or Why Not*, 2013

²¹ Fountain, *Why or Why Not*, 2013

²² Howell Jr., 2011

²³ Fountain, *Why or Why Not*, 2013

Memorial's neighbors. The name would be changed to become the "National and District of Columbia World War I Memorial," honoring both national and District soldiers.

With the proposal of these plans and others over a period of several years, House Resolution (H.R) 928 would push for this effect. The fear of this erasure propelled the DC War Memorial to become a rallying point for DC voting rights. Organizations, citizens, and political entities and legislators alike felt these revisions serve as erasure of DC's distinctive presence at the symbolic core of the United States.

To residents and organizations such as the Association of the Oldest Inhabitants in the District of Columbia (AOI), the DC Memorial is a symbol of the District's autonomy. The push to rededicate and re-designate the memorial is perceived as an attack against any representation the District has gained thus far. The city repeatedly lobbies for full autonomy over its affairs and voting rights in Congress that go beyond the Presidential Electoral College. The relationship between the federal and city governments is fragile because of this, held together by the tenacious Eleanor Holmes Norton, the District's non-voting member of Congress. The move to overtake the War Memorial further represents another way for the federal government to take away any national representation and recognition of the District as an autonomous entity.

Due to the years-long push, the Memorial has become embroiled in a controversy, one it had, thus far, managed to stave off. Because of this, the memorial has taken a symbolic significance, hinted at previously in the Noyes brothers, but

coming to the fore. With the memorial's increased significance, then Mayor Vincent Gray and Congresswoman Norton liken the attempt to an affront against the city that must pay federal taxes and submit its laws and budget to Congress for approval even though its residents do not have full voting rights on Capitol Hill.

Fountain and those pushing for this re-designation claim the desire not to federalize the memorial "but ask to add to its site as we develop a bigger picture of World War I for all of America."²⁴ The Foundation and others do take into account some of the other monuments and memorials in DC that commemorate World War I. One of the prime alternatives is the memorial for General Pershing called "Pershing Park."²⁵ The memorial is an entire city block near the White House and is within the Washington Monument's northern axis, it is even already termed a national memorial dedicated to World War I. This, among other examples, is deemed either too inaccessible or otherwise inappropriate for the National World War I Memorial. Fountain, on his Foundation's webpage, sees for the site of the DC War Memorial as appropriate for the national memorial because of the proximity to other prominent war memorials. Adding the memorial to this list would seem to bolster the overall national narrative of aggrandizing American conflict, and as Fountain refers to it "closing the circle"²⁶ on the Mall's west end with the major war monuments in the twentieth century that include the Vietnam Veteran's War Memorial, the Korean War Veteran's Memorial, and the National World War II Memorial.

²⁴ Fountain, *Why or Why Not*, 2013

²⁵ Brown, 2011: 1

²⁶ Fountain, *Why or Why Not*, 2013

The west end of the National Mall rose to prominence after the mid-1980's with the dedication of Maya Lin's Vietnam Veteran's War Memorial and the Korean War Memorial a decade later. Taken with the Lincoln Memorial, not part of the commemorative circle but the important anchor on the west end, the memorials serve as important commemorative modes that embody sacrifice for the national narrative. By 1982 this solidified "when the Vietnam Veterans Memorial opened on the National Mall, something had shifted in the way we remember our wars. A national memorial, prominently placed on the nation's most symbolically significant public space, came to seem like an essential dignity offered to veterans, and the families and memory of those who gave their lives."²⁷ Most significant for Fountain's purpose, though, is the National World War II Memorial. The commemorative effort and purpose of the west end of the mall changed with the passage and dedication of the National World War II Memorial.

The national narrative of aggrandizing American conflict is most prominent in the National World War II Memorial, which serves an important foil for the DC War Memorial's current state. Although, ostensibly, of similar ilk with the neo-classical appearance, the narrative each memorial spins are opposite. The DC War Memorial does not diminish the sense of sacrifice, it underscores it with the listed names, identifying and personalizing every member of the armed forces who perished. The World War II Memorial eschews this personalization or victimization of the war-dead most prominently through the use of anonymous stars that represent large numbers. Additionally, the inscriptions of dramatic quotes from

²⁷ Kennicott, 2014

personages of World War II does not attest to the virtues of service and sacrifice in its holistic view in the same way the DC War Memorial does.

The monuments themselves are in opposition to one another. However Fountain wishes to draw the two in together, his link between the two wars serves as the lynchpin of his argument: “The World War I is the most forgotten of this nation’s wars, yet it sowed the seeds of World War II, and as noted, it marked the emergence of the United States as a global power, and as a defender of democratic allies against forces of totalitarianism and aggression.”²⁸ The argument solidifies through the lens of adding the DC War Memorial to the national narrative of America as the great world power through defense and, despite his claim, aggression. A sentiment diametrically opposed to the spirit of World War I commemoration and the spirit of the DC War memorial.

Despite their best tactics, the push for this re-dedication was a failure. Fountain and the Foundation employed rhetoric that characterizes the negotiations as “stymied in political talk.”²⁸ This echoes his frustration in the matter. With the passage of House Resolution 346 in July of 2011, The DC War Memorial was protected stating “The District of Columbia War Memorial should remain a memorial dedicated solely to the residents of the District of Columbia who served in World War I.”²⁹ This resolution is based on the grounds that “either adding a new national World War I Memorial in the vicinity of the District of Columbia War Memorial or re-designation of the District of Columbia War Memorial as a National

²⁸ Fountain, *Why or Why Not*, 2013

²⁹ Norton, 2011

World War I Memorial would violate... the 'Commemorative Works Act.'"²⁹

Ultimately the War Memorial stands as it was dedicated in 1931, stepping in as a national symbol of some aspect of the District's autonomy and representing the District on a national symbolic level.

The DC War Memorial is an encapsulation of the values of post-World War I commemorative style, complimented by the other memorials scattered throughout the District. "World War I is very well memorialized throughout the nation's capital and surroundings, in style that is less grand, more local and more connected to the people and organizations who fought the war."³⁰ Reducing the amount of unnecessary distillation that happens with a more centralized memorial, the loss suffered and the meaning of the war then becomes generalized and generic. The argument for the National Mall site boils down to visibility, its centrality, and its accessibility.

The memorial is one of the many examples of the local monuments constructed to commemorate the war dead from the First World War. It followed the mode of a living memorial, providing a prominent site of remembrance for the war dead that the public utilizes. Nearly 80 years after its initial dedication, it has been embroiled in controversy and subsequently foisted as the rallying cry for the District's voting rights initiative. The same initiative the leaders of the commission that constructed the memorial stood for demonstrating an underlying continuity in causes. A push in 2008 sought to rededicate the memorial and make it a national

³⁰ Kennicott, 2014

monument in order to better and more appropriately serve its prominent location on the National Mall and complete the commemorative circle which includes the Vietnam Veteran's War Memorial, the Lincoln Memorial, the Korean War Veteran's Memorial, and the National World War II Memorial.

Because the Memorial had become a prominent rallying point in the District and other reasons, the initiative was voted down. Instead, the DC War Memorial was cleaned, rehabilitated, and landscaped with approximately \$2mil. of American Recovery and Reinvestment Act funds and opened with a ceremony in 2012.³¹ Phillip Kennicott, art and architecture critic for the *Washington Post*, stated it best as when the capital's monuments are "taken together, the monuments of WWI bear witness to a more complex, nuanced, and dynamic relation to memory than the great, overscaled, grandiose memorials we tend to build today."³² The rededication and addition to the District's War Memorial would have not only erased the District's sole national representation at the symbolic core, but served to homogenize the nuance and complexity of the monuments and war memory of World War I in much the same way the National World War II Memorial has.

³¹ Brown, 2012: 1

³² Kennicott, 2014

Works Cited

- The AOI. "A National World War I Memorial," May 23, 2011.<http://www.oidc.org/uploads/1/1/8/5/11853240/a-national-world-war-i-memorial.pdf>.
- Brown, William. *Press Release for the DC War Memorial Rededication*, May 22, 2012.<http://www.oidc.org/uploads/1/1/8/5/11853240/press-release-dc-war-memorial-may-28-2012.pdf>.
- . *Remarks of AOI President Bill Brown for the 76th Annual Memorial Day Observance*, May 20, 2012.<http://www.oidc.org/uploads/1/1/8/5/11853240/remarks-for-memorial-day-2012.pdf>.
- . "Response to World War I Memorial Project," August 19, 2011.<http://www.oidc.org/uploads/1/1/8/5/11853240/response-to-world-war-i-memorial-project.pdf>.
- . *The District of Columbia War Dead, 1917-1918*, May 2012.<http://www.oidc.org/uploads/1/1/8/5/11853240/wwi-list-narrative-for-web-site-5-28-2012.pdf>.
- Budreau, Lisa M. *Bodies of War: World War I and the Politics of Commemoration in America, 1919-1933*. New York: New York University Press, 2010.
- Doss, Erika Lee. *Memorial Mania: Public Feeling in America*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2010.
- Fountain, Edwin. "The Quest." *National World War I Memorial Foundation*, 2013.<http://wwimemorial.org/quest/>.
- . "Why or Why Not?" *National World War I Memorial Foundation*, 2013.<http://wwimemorial.org/why-or-why-not/>.
- Howell, Jr., Tom. "D.C. Fights for World War I Memorial Balks at Plan for National Recognition at Its Mall Location." *The Washington Times*, November 10, 2011.<http://www.washingtontimes.com/news/2011/nov/10/dc-fights-for-wwi-memorial/?page=all#pagebreak>.
- Kelly, John. "D.C.'s WWI Memorial Causes 21st-Century Battle." *The Washington Post*, March 29, 2011.http://www.washingtonpost.com/local/dcs-wwi-memorial-causes-21st-century-battle/2011/03/29/AFZLX44B_story.html.
- . "D.C.'s WWI Memorial Causes 21st-Century Battle." *The Washington Post*, March 31, 2011.http://www.washingtonpost.com/local/dcs-wwi-memorial-causes-21st-century-battle/2011/03/29/AFZLX44B_story.html.
- . "District's World War I Memorial Will Not Be National Memorial." *The Washington Post*, September 12,

2012.http://www.washingtonpost.com/local/districts-world-war-i-memorial-will-not-be-national-memorial/2012/09/12/60ecc088-fce8-11e1-8adc-499661afe377_story.html.

———. “District’s World War I Memorial Will Not Be National Memorial.” *The Washington Post*, September 12, 2012.http://www.washingtonpost.com/local/districts-world-war-i-memorial-will-not-be-national-memorial/2012/09/12/60ecc088-fce8-11e1-8adc-499661afe377_story.html.

Kennicott, Philip. “Memorials to World War I May Be Less Obvious, but More Meaningful.” *The Washington Post*, August 8, 2014, sec. Museums.http://www.washingtonpost.com/entertainment/museums/memorials-to-world-war-i-may-be-less-obvious-but-more-meaningful/2014/08/07/f1b934c0-19ba-11e4-9e3b-7f2f110c6265_story.html.

Mackaman, Douglas Peter, and Michael Mays, eds. *World War I and the Cultures of Modernity*. Jackson, MS: University Press of Mississippi, 2000.

Mattingly Urges All to Aid in Building Memorial to the District of Columbia’s War Veterans, Both Those Who Fell and Who Survive -- Adds His Own Contribution to Patriotic Fund.” *The Washington Post (1923-1954)*, April 25, sec. EDITORIAL SOCIETY.<http://search.proquest.com.mutex.gmu.edu/docview/149722240/abstract/9A45CCFFC2A54D09PQ/1?accountid=14541>.

Mayo, James M., and Michael H. Hoeflich. 2010. “Commemorating God and Country in American War Memorials: Symbolic Evolution and Legality.” *Environment & Behavior* 42 (3): 303–17. doi:[10.1177/0013916510361869](https://doi.org/10.1177/0013916510361869).

ROBERT E. MATTINGLY, Judge. 1926. “Judge National Capital Planning Commission. *Memorial Trends and Practices in Washington, DC*, 2012.[http://www.ncpc.gov/DocumentDepot/Planning/NCPC Memorial Trends Practice Report.pdf](http://www.ncpc.gov/DocumentDepot/Planning/NCPC_Memorial_Trends_Practice_Report.pdf).

Norton, Eleanor Holmes. 2011. *Resolution Expressing the Sense of the House of Representatives That a National World War I Memorial Should Be Established*.http://www.oidc.org/uploads/1/1/8/5/11853240/hres_346_-_2011_nortons_bill.pdf.

PBS. “WWI Casualty and Death Tables.” *The Great War Resources*, n.d.https://www.pbs.org/greatwar/resources/casdeath_pop.html.

Poe, Ted. *Legislation to Establish a World War I Commission*, 2012.

Richards, Mark David. “District of Columbia Service in World War One and the DC World War Memorial.” *Mark David Richards*, May 26, 2002.<http://www.dcwatch.com/richards/020526.htm>.

- Rockefeller. *A Bill to Establish a World War I National Memorial Commission*, 2011.[http://www.aoidc.org/uploads/1/1/8/5/11853240/wwi mem nmac letter to senate 8-2-20110001.pdf](http://www.aoidc.org/uploads/1/1/8/5/11853240/wwi_mem_nmac_letter_to_senate_8-2-20110001.pdf).
- Savage, Kirk. *Monument Wars: Washington, D.C., the National Mall, and the Transformation of the Memorial Landscape*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2009.
- The Association of the Oldest Inhabitants of D.C. "DC War Memorial Controversy." *The DC War Memorial Controversy and the Centennial of World War I*, 2014.<http://www.aoidc.org/the-dc-war-memorial-controversy--the-centennial-of-world-war-i.html>.
- Wingate, Jennifer. "Real Art, War Art, and the Politics of Peace Memorials in the United States after World War I." *Public Art Dialogue* 2, no. 2 (October 2012): 162– 189.
- Winter, J. M. *Sites of Memory, Sites of Mourning: The Great War in European Cultural History*. Studies in the Social and Cultural History of Modern Warfare 1. Cambridge ; New York: Cambridge University Press, 1995.