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Abstract

Reverence for the dead is a defining human characteristic. Pyramids are no longer in style, but a variety of memorials mark the American landscape, commemorating lives lost in war, exploration, storms, and most recently, lives taken by acts of terrorism. The study of American memorials differs as widely as do the reasons for building memorials. The development of a conceptual model lends insight to the nature of memorials and informs future scholars who may want to investigate this very human phenomenon.

A literature review identified 10 constructs that appeared to be universal to memorials: visitors, memory and meaning, grieving, education, artifacts, names, architecture, costs, sense of place, and a website. These constructs were tested through analysis of 16 memorials that encompass wide temporal and geographic ranges, including the Alamo, Gettysburg, Little Bighorn Battlefield, Wounded Knee, Galveston 1900 Hurricane, USS Arizona, World War II, United States Marine Corps/Iwo Jima, Korean War, Martin Luther King, Jr., Vietnam, National Fallen Firefighters, Space Shuttle Challenger, Oklahoma City, September 11, and Virginia Tech. An analysis of these memorials, beginning with a literature-based case study and supported by interviews with memorial experts, allowed for the construct-based hypotheses to be accepted or rejected.

One of the constructs, cost was rejected, but the remaining constructs, with the possible addition of a memorial champion, the role of the media, social change, and an event or individual to be memorialized, resulted in a conceptual model to the study of memorials and inform those who might wish to develop a memorial.
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Chapter One

Introduction

Let every nation know, whether it wishes us well or ill, that we shall pay any price, bear any burden, meet any hardship, support any friend, oppose any foe, in order to assure the survival and the success of liberty.

—President John F. Kennedy

Our debt to the heroic men and valiant women in the service of our country can never be repaid. They have earned our undying gratitude. America will never forget their sacrifices.

—President Harry S. Truman

Introduction

Memorials are one of the ways we “conserve what is worth remembering and discard the rest” (Savage, 1997, p. 4). The basis of memorials seems to reside at the intersection of memory and history, described by Nora (1989) as follows:

Memory is life, borne by living societies founded in its name. It remains in permanent evolution, open to the dialectic of remembering and forgetting, unconscious of its successive deformation, vulnerable to manipulation and appropriation, susceptible to being long dormant and periodically revived. History, on the other hand, is the reconstruction, always problematic and incomplete, of what is no longer. Memory is a
perpetually actual phenomenon, a bond tying us to the eternal present; history is a representation of the past. Memory insofar as it is affective and magical, only affects those facts that suit it. . . . History, because it is an intellectual and secular production, calls for analysis and criticism. . . . Memory takes root in the concrete, in spaces, gestures, images and objects; history binds itself strictly to temporal continuities, to progressions and to relations between things. Memory is absolute, while history can only conceive the relative. . . . (p. 8)

Before an investigation of the role that memorials play in preserving and interpreting history, it seems appropriate to look at the history of memorial building in the United States.

**History of Memorials in America: Presidential Memorials**

As early as 1783, the Continental Congress proposed a memorial to honor George Washington (Washington Monument, 2008). Nothing came of this proposition and what is today known as the Washington Monument in Washington, D.C., was not begun until 1848 (George Washington, n.d.; Washington Monument, 2008). In Baltimore, however, the first architectural monument to honor Washington was completed by 1829 (George Washington, n.d.; Washington Monument, 2008).

The memorial for George Washington, the first President of the United States of America, often referred to as the “Father of the Country,” began on July 4, 1848, when the cornerstone was laid. Financial problems delayed work on the monument until 1884, when the rebuilding began. The National Washington Monument was dedicated in
February 1885 and opened to the public in October 1888 (George Washington, n.d.; Washington Monument, 2008).

Thomas Jefferson, a contemporary of Washington and the third American president, is also memorialized on the mall of the national capital, across the Potomac River from the Washington Monument. Despite the two men living and serving as contemporaries, the Jefferson Memorial was not completed until 1943 (Introduction, n.d.; Thomas Jefferson, 2004).

Abraham Lincoln, the sixteenth president, is also memorialized in Washington, D.C. Although the Lincoln Monument Association was formed in March 1867, the memorial site was not chosen until 1901, and the memorial was begun only in 1914 and completed in 1922 (Hargrove, 2001; Monuments & Memorials, 2000). The many delays were related to the need for funding, then the selection of the site and the memorial design, and finally, the original design called for a 12-foot bronze statue of Lincoln, which seemed out of scale for the memorial and was replaced by the current 19-foot marble statue. Despite the lapse in time, more than 50,000 people attended the memorial dedication, including many Civil War veterans and Robert Todd Lincoln, the only surviving son of Abraham Lincoln (Monuments & Memorials, 2000; Thomas, 2002).

These memorials, to three of the greatest American presidents, constitute some of the most popular and recognizable memorials in the nation’s capital (Presidential Research Services, 2008).

Another of the country’s most beloved memorials to the presidents, Mount Rushmore National Memorial (Fite, 2003; Glass, 1994; Mount Rushmore, n.d.) in South Dakota, memorializes George Washington (dedicated in 1934); Thomas Jefferson
(dedicated in 1936); Abraham Lincoln (dedicated in 1937); and Theodore Roosevelt (dedicated in 1939). A Sculptor's Studio was constructed in 1939 displaying plastic models and tools used in the building of Mount Rushmore. The site contains interpretive centers, a nature trail, amphitheater, and even an evening light and effects show (Fite, 2003; Kerper, 2000; Mount Rushmore, n.d.). In 1941, insufficient funding ended any new additions. Begun in 1927 and completed in 1941, this memorial, like those described above, has a distinct physical presence (Fite, 2003). Other presidents beginning with Herbert Hoover (1929 to 1933) are memorialized through presidential libraries that are often structured as museums or archives rather than the traditional concept of a library or a memorial (National Archives & Records Administration, n.d.).

**History of Memorials in America: The Dead of War**

In addition to memorializing presidents, Americans have long been committed to memorializing those lost during a war (Barsalou & Baxter, 2007; Boss, 2002; Foster, 1993; Winter, 1995). The first significant American memorial was completed in Baltimore in 1825, commemorating the lives of those lost defending the City of Baltimore from a British attack on September 12, 1814, to September 14, 1814 (Library of Congress, n.d.). The Battle Monument is one of the oldest existing monumental sculptures in the nation today (Library of Congress, n.d.). Another war memorial, commemorating a battle against the British during the Revolutionary War, built at the site of the Battle of Bunker Hill in Charlestown, Massachusetts, was erected between 1827 and 1843 (Bunker Hill Monument, n.d.; Luciano, 2004; National Park Service, n.d.).
Prior to the Civil War, military dead were typically interred in cemetery plots at the post where the soldier was stationed (Bearss, 1993; Grant, 2006; Jessup, 1976). It was not until the Civil War, through an act of Congress and General Order 75 in 1861, that the War Department began recording burials. Congress also ordered military commanders to designate areas at battlefield sites for burying the dead (Grant, 2006; Jessup, 1976). The War Department ordered its commanders to “lay off lots of ground in some suitable spot near every battlefield for the purpose of burying the dead” (Grant, 2006, p. 20). Grant further adds:

Much of the impact of America’s national cemeteries lies in a combination of reverence, curiosity, and, on occasion, morbidness: as landscapes of memory they serve as a reminder that war memorials, and war memorializing, can take many forms, both sacred and secular, public and private, political and personal. (2006, p. 20)

In 1862, Congress authorized the acquisition of land for national cemeteries. Two types were developed, some near battlefields and others near major areas of troop concentration, such as Arlington National Cemetery in Virginia near Washington, D.C., which was dedicated in 1864 (Bearss, 1993; Foster, 1993; Jessup, 1976).

The Civil War and its impact on society helped to establish and promote national memorials and brought about the building of many public monuments (Levinson, 1998; “National Civil War,” 2006). At the time, public monuments were built to serve as historic remembrances, to commemorate the fallen and the living, to be lasting, and intended to “forever be a place for collective memory” (Savage, 1997, p. 4). The view of that time was that a monument “remains a fixed point, stabilizing both the physical and
cognitive landscape. . . to conserve what is worth remembering and discard the rest” (Savage, 1997, p. 4). Here we see that through the horrors and loss of life during war, a growing awareness of the need for memorials resulted (Levinson, 1998; Lomsky-Feder, 2004; Mayo, 1988; Mosse, 1990; “National Civil War,” 2006).

President Lincoln, who was the first to acknowledge the ordinary soldier through a war memorial, proposed some of the memorials dedicated to Civil War events (“National Civil War,” 2006; Rosenberg, 2001; Savage, 1997). In Lincoln’s view, monuments of the day should not only represent the dead, they were representative of the living veterans of war, especially since these living veterans were the motivators in the building of many memorials (“National Civil War,” 2006; Rosenberg, 2001; Savage, 1997). Lincoln’s empathy marked yet another “role” evolving for public memorials.

After Lincoln’s assassination, monuments became iconic symbols of the war that pitted brother against brother (Grant, 2006; Savage, 1997). Over the next few decades, numerous monuments were built across the states that fought for the Union. These memorials included the Defenders of the Union from Bristol, Ohio (1863—erected before the war ended) followed by memorials that were built in eight other Ohio towns in the first four years following the Civil War. In Waterbury, Connecticut, a Soldiers Monument was erected in 1884; in Grand Rapids, Michigan, a Soldiers Monument was erected in 1885, and the Woonsocket Civil War Monument in Woonsocket, Rhode Island in 1870 (“National Civil War,” 2006; Rosenberg, 2001). In some places, the town square or town park was chosen as the location to place a memorial. In other communities, more directly touched by fighting, the ground on which the memorials were built was sanctified by the events and sacrifices that took place. Placement of the memorials on
that ground served to bestow higher meaning on those memorials (Bearss, 1993; Grant, 2006; Rosenberg, 2001).

Grant proposes, "The cult of the fallen soldier, as it emerged in mid-nineteenth-century America, began with the place of burial" (2006, p. 19). It is important to note that monuments were first built in the North, following the tradition that war monuments are most often erected by victors. It was only after Reconstruction that confidence returned to the states that had made up the Confederacy and memorials to the brave fighting men of the South were constructed (Loewen, 2001). It was, in fact, ladies memorial associations that sponsored most of these early Confederate monuments (Loewen, 2001; Rosenberg, 2001).

There was not an immediate change, however, in the understanding and use of memorials, largely because of the time that lapsed between the events memorialized and the construction of a memorial. The majority of Civil War monuments honoring Union dead, 52 percent of the total, were erected in the nineteenth century. In the first decade of the twentieth century, another 21 percent of all Union monuments were erected (Loewen, 2001). Twenty-seven percent of all the Confederate monuments that exist were erected in the first decade of the twentieth century (Loewen, 2001; Rosenberg, 2001).

Gettysburg National Cemetery set the standard for memorials, even creating a separate section for the Unknown Soldier (Grant, 2006). On April 30, 1864, Pennsylvania chartered the Gettysburg Battlefield Memorial Association (GBMA) and by 1890, located more than 300 memorials and monuments throughout the site of the deadly battle fought in 1863 (Rosenberg, 2001).
As memorials were built in the post-war years following 1865, statues and entire buildings were dedicated to honor the soldiers killed. In 1874, Harvard University dedicated an entire Memorial Hall to the efforts of the Union in the conflict between North and South. In 1891, the Memorial Hall of New Orleans, also known as the Confederate Museum, was dedicated to those who lost their lives for the Cause of the Confederacy (Loewen, 2001; Rosenberg, 2001). By the 1890s, following the end of Reconstruction, the United Confederate Veterans (UCV) and the United Daughters of the Confederacy (UDC) were founded and played an integral role in the construction of monuments for both sides, usually depicting a lone soldier with a musket (Loewen, 2001; Rosenberg, 2001).

This expanded view of memorials continued. On July 4, 1894, in Ohio, the Cleveland’s Soldiers and Sailors Monument was dedicated to those who served in the Union in the Civil War (Bennett, 1998). The monument contained 9,000 names inside the structure, memorializing the region’s dead as well as the images of Ohio’s war governors and generals (Bennett, 1998). Additionally, in the 1890s, Congress began to set forth as sacred the site where battles during the Civil War were fought and where the dead were buried. Permanent war memorials and battlefields were established and national military parks with markers to honor the regiments were erected. For example:

Indianapolis’s Soldiers and Sailors Memorial, Boston’s tribute to Robert Gould Shaw and the Fifty-fourth Massachusetts, and the memorials honoring Matthew F. Maury, Thomas J. Jackson, Jefferson Davis, Robert E. Lee, and J.E.B. Stuart on Richmond’s Monument Avenue—became landmarks of late nineteenth-century America. (Bearss, 1993, p. 6)
The impact of war on memorials continued with each subsequent conflict. For instance, after World War I, then known as the Great War, the United States was swept by debates to determine what memorials should be created to honor and remember those who had given their lives in this “war to end all wars” (Hass, 1998; Shanken, 2002; Winter, 1995). Among the groups weighing in on the matter was the War Memorial Committee of the American Institute of Architects and the American Commission for Living War Memorials (sponsored by the Federal Security Agency’s Committee on Physical Fitness). On one side were advocates for traditional memorials: statues, obelisks, triumphal arches, and other commemorative structures. Others proposed expanding the kinds of memorials to include living memorials, such as community centers, libraries, forests, and even roadways that could be marked in some fashion, often with plaques (Hass, 1998; Shanken, 2002). Were these memorials intended to represent not only the past, but a future of peace? Could these indeed be the last memorials of war? Were they memorials to honor the men and women who lost their lives, or were they to be remembrances of the last time countries would raise arms against one another? (Shanken, 2002). Such a debate appears to have been productive as the country contemplated the nature and purposes of memorials, a debate that to a degree continues today and is the focus of this dissertation.

The Tomb of the Unknown Soldier at Arlington National Cemetery in Washington, D.C., was dedicated in 1921 by President Warren G. Harding. It served as a tribute to all American soldiers who lost their lives in World War I (Daines, 2000; Todd, 1976). In 1956, President Dwight D. Eisenhower conducted ceremonies at which two additional nameless soldiers were buried in the tomb, one to represent members of the
armed forces lost in World War II and one to represent those who died in the Korean Conflict. This dedication expanded the scope and functions of the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier and established a general type of memorial that transcended any one war (Daines, 2000; Edkins, 2003; Todd, 1976).

Inevitably, such developments in memorials would also transcend national borders. In 1923, President Warren G. Harding established the American Battle Monuments Commission, which "maintains 24 military cemeteries and 25 memorials, monuments, and markers in 15 countries around the world, including three memorials in the United States" (Nicholson, 2005, p. 43). The overseas American cemeteries are to honor American armed forces that lost their lives on foreign soil. The American Battle Monuments Commission reports:

Presently there are 124,913 U.S. war dead interred at these cemeteries, 30,921 of World War I, 93,242 of World War II, and 750 of the Mexican War. Additionally, 6,149 American veterans and others are interred in the Mexico City and Corozal American Cemeteries. (n.d., p. 1)

Arlington National Cemetery, the best known of the veterans’ cemeteries, is operated by the Army and the Department of Veterans Affairs. Arlington National Cemetery is responsible for other national cemeteries in the United States and remains as one of the most recognizable and hallowed memorials to the casualties of war and military service (Nicholson, 2005). The American Battle Monuments Commission states:

Whether overseas or at home, our commission will honor those who died in service to our nation, not for the sake of nostalgia, but out of respect for their unselfish contribution to the heritage we enjoy. The truism that
“freedom isn’t free” is validated whenever one visits a military cemetery or examines firsthand a memorial to our war dead and those who served. (Nicholson, 2005, p. 44)

History of Memorials in America: Memorials for Other Memories

Memorials also preserve the memories of multiple individuals, often those who are joined in death through wars or other significant losses of life. Galveston, Texas, for instance, is home to a memorial of the 1900 hurricane that killed an estimated 8,000 people in the area, the largest natural disaster in the history of the United States (Larson, 1999). Oklahoma City, Oklahoma, houses the first American memorial to modern terrorism, where empty chairs have been placed to honor each of the 168 who were killed in the 1995 bombing of the Alfred P. Murrah Federal Building (“Oklahoma City National,” 2005). These memorials and many others signify the expanded and diverse meaning and roles memorials have come to occupy in the United States (Barsalou & Baxter, 2007; Foster, 1993; Grant, 2006; Grider, 2001).

History of Memorials in America: The Meaning of Memorials

Perhaps the most famous speech associated with a memorial was given on November 19, 1863, by President Lincoln. He delivered the following words to memorialize the soldiers who lost their lives during the pivotal Civil War battle at Gettysburg, Pennsylvania, in July of that same year (Willis, 1992). Ironically, following a two-hour oration by Edward Everett, the president of Harvard University, Lincoln took the stage at the National Cemetery in Gettysburg and spoke just 278 words that would resonate across the ages:
Four score and seven years ago our fathers brought forth on this continent, a new nation, conceived in Liberty, and dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal.

Now we are engaged in a great civil war, testing whether that nation, or any nation so conceived and so dedicated, can long endure. We are met on a great battlefield of that war. We have come to dedicate a portion of that field, as a final resting place for those who here gave their lives that that nation might live. It is altogether fitting and proper that we should do this.

But, in a larger sense, we cannot dedicate—we cannot consecrate—we cannot hallow—this ground. The brave men, living and dead, who struggled here, have consecrated it, far above our poor power to add or detract. The world will little note, nor long remember what we say here, but it can never forget what they did here. It is for us the living, rather, to be dedicated here to the unfinished work which they who fought here have thus far so nobly advanced. It is rather for us to be here dedicated to the great task remaining before us—that from these honored dead we take increased devotion to that cause for which they gave the last full measure of devotion—that we here highly resolve that these dead shall not have died in vain—that this nation, under God, shall have a new birth of freedom—and that government of the people, by the people, for the people, shall not perish from the earth. (Lincoln, 1863)
Although Lincoln was mistaken about his words being remembered, Gettysburg National Cemetery is a reminder that memorials serve as landscapes of memory, taking on forms both sacred and secular, public and private, political and personal (Bearss, 1993; Foster, 1993; Grant, 2006).

After Lincoln’s speech at Gettysburg, throughout the post-war years of the Civil War (the years of Reconstruction) many memorials were erected to the service of soldiers and sailors, of military leaders, including ranking officers, and of the anonymous men and women who gave their lives for the Union or for the Confederacy (Bearss, 1993; Foster, 1993). Although memorials for the North were built first, those for the South followed the close of the Reconstruction era. In those years, when memorials were built in abundance, the ground on which they were built and their meanings were said to honor the memory of lost causes as well as lost lives (Bearss, 1993; Grant, 2006).

In retrospect, the meanings of the memorials were perhaps as divergent as the causes for which lives were given. Even today, there is little agreement about the role memorials play in remembrance and grief (Schwab, 2004), in emotion and meaning (Gass, 1982), and in linking the tangible experience of a memorial with the intangibles of loss (Frost & Morgan, 1983; Jorgensen-Earp & Lanzilotti, 1998). Some scholars suggest that memorials exist for personal remembrance and grieving—they are important to those who lost sons, fathers, brothers, husbands, and friends (Boss, 2002; Lopez, 1987). Others suggest that memorials are for public remembrance—to keep the memory of service, heroism, and loss alive in our collective memory (Edkins, 2003; Mayo, 1988; Middleton & Edwards, 1990). Still others advocate memorials as artifacts to ensure a person’s place in history (Soffarelli, 2006; Taborsky, 1990).
That concept of ensuring a place in history is reflective of a period when cultural and religious norms were considered and respected.

It may be direct; it may be indirect or muted; it may be drowned in sentimentality or lies, but between the lines of noble rhetoric, through the mass of figurative or sculptural detail, the harsh history of life and death in wartime is frozen in public monuments throughout Europe and beyond. (Winter, 1995, p. 78)

Winter additionally writes:

After August 1914, commemoration was an act of citizenship. To remember was to affirm community, to assert its moral character, and to exclude from it those values, groups, or individuals that placed it under threat. This form of collective affirmation in wartime identified individuals and their families with the community at large, understood both in terms of a localized landscape and a broader and more vaguely defined national entity under siege or threat. (1995, p. 80)

Frost and Morgan (1983) have looked at memorials and suggest it is the physical aspects of memorials that visitors invest with personal and public meaning. The researchers affirm the physical aspects make the world and the losses understandable (Frost & Morgan, 1983; Shapiro & Carr, 1991; Tarlow, 1997).

Following World War I, women war poets began to express their own grief and loss. In Scars upon My Heart, May Wedderburn Cannan, in 1916, penned lines that reflected the motivation of memorials being built in those post-war years:
Since they have died to give us gentleness,
And hearts kind with contentment and quiet mirth,
Let us who live give also happiness
And love, that's born of pity, to the earth.

For, I have thought, some day they may lie sleeping
Forgetting all the weariness and pain,
And smile to think their world is in our keeping,
And laughter come back to the earth again. (as cited in Reilly, C.W., 1981, p. 19)

Whether in words or in marble, memorials are socially constructed and reflect not
just memories of those who have died, but function as a means to examine the past, link it
to the present, and help all touched by the memorialized event to recover from violence
and grief (Barsalou & Baxter, 2007; Edkins, 2003; Foster, 1993; Fritsche, 2001).

**Hypotheses and Research Aims**

The study of memorials has taken different approaches through time. The
methodology proposed for this research has the objective of employing “constructs” to
develop a conceptual model that will allow scholars to better understand and study
memorials. Additionally, the conceptual model will inform the development and testing
of theories and models about memorials. This research is based on the hypothesis that,
despite significant differences in the memorials themselves, there are similar features
(constructs) that serve to define the nature and function of memorials and shape the
tangible and intangible aspects of memorials. The material provided by the literature and by memorial organizations will be used to elicit such determinations and meanings.

Another hypothesis for this research is that memorials, although created at different times and to memorialize various events and individuals, hold different meanings and uses for monument creators, visitors, and those who manage memorials. Because of the diversity of titles for such experts, those interviewed for each memorial will be referred to as "memorial expert" rather than by title. The titles included: Curator, Director, Collections Manager, Public Relations Director, Deputy Superintendent, Vice-President Alumni Relations, Chief of Interpretation and Visitor Services, Senior Advisor to the Museum, CEO, Chief of Staff, Educational Specialist, Historian, Acting Chief of the Division of Visitor Services, Professor of Anthropology, and Superintendent.

Through this research, it will be determined whether, despite these differences, memorials have some shared features (constructs) that resonate with universal efficacy.

By investigating the literature on memorials, building case studies for 16 memorials, and conducting interviews with experts at the 16 memorials, this research was able to discern the constructs that shape our memorials, reflect on why we build memorials, and illustrate how memorials give meaning to those who visit them (Boss, 2002; Kay, 2002; Lifton, 2005; Winter, 1995).

Specifically, this research pursued three main questions:

1. What are the functions of memorials?
2. What are the diversities in memorials?
3. What is the significance of memorials?

The following 16 memorials were used as the basis for research:
M-1. Alamo Memorial (189 killed fighting on the side of the Texans in 1836)
M-2. Gettysburg Memorial (51,000 killed in 1863)
M-3. Little Bighorn Battlefield National Monument (263 killed in 1876)
M-4. Wounded Knee Memorial Museum (175 killed in 1890)
M-5. Galveston 1900 Hurricane Memorial (8,000 died in 1900)
M-6. USS Arizona Memorial (1,177 killed in 1941)
M-7. National World War II Memorial (404,800 killed in WWII between 1941 and 1945)
M-8. United States Marine Corps War Memorial/Iwo Jima Memorial (6,800 killed in 1945)
M-9. Korean War Veterans Memorial (36,940 killed between 1950 and 1953)
M-10. Martin Luther King, Jr. National Historic Site (1 assassinated in 1968)
M-11. Vietnam Veterans Memorial (58,195 killed between 1959 and 1973)
M-12. National Fallen Firefighters Memorial (established 1981; 3,147 lives lost in the line of duty as of March 5, 2008)
M-13. Space Shuttle Challenger Memorial (7 crewmembers killed in 1986)
M-14. Oklahoma City National Memorial and Museum (168 killed in 1995)
M-16. Virginia Tech (33 people, including the gunman, killed in 2007)

These 16 memorials were selected to explore a broad and diverse spectrum of American memorials. The cases selected represent the various types of memorials
including a memorial to an individual, to veterans and casualties of war, to natural
disasters, as well as to terrorism and exploration (McCallum, 1993). They stretch across
the temporal history of the United States throughout the nineteenth, twentieth, and early
twenty-first centuries. So too, these cases reflect the temporal relationship between the
event being memorialized and construction of the memorials insofar as some were built
immediately following an event and others not erected for many years (Gass, 1982;
Howe, 2002; Kay, 2002).

Some memorials, such as Plymouth Rock, were not included in this research
because of the questions that surround Plymouth Rock’s provenance. Plymouth Rock is
not mentioned in sources that are contemporaneous with the landing of the Pilgrims
(1620). Rather, “Plymouth Rock” is mentioned in references no earlier than 1775, when
the Pennsylvania Journal of November 29, 1775, mentions the “same rock our ancestors
first trod” (Pilgrim Hall Museum, 1998, ¶2). Similarly, the “Mayflower,” the ship used
to transport the Pilgrims to the New World, was likely dismantled. A Mayflower
Memorial stands in Southampton, England, commemorating the departure of the
Pilgrims, and a memorial at the cemetery in Cape Cod lists the names of those who died

The memorials chosen were adequately addressed in the scholarly literature.
Because only “experts” were used in the research process, a review of articles on the
Internet and in the popular press further contributed to memorial selection to balance
the lack of input by public who visit memorials. Dozens of other memorials were
considered, but not chosen for a variety of reasons including the difficulty in locating
sufficient scholarly literature.
A comprehensive review of scholarly literature on memorials revealed several features (termed “constructs”) shared by numerous memorials, suggesting a key to understanding. Each of these “constructs” can be tested as a hypothesis and those accepted as valid are used to develop a conceptual model of memorials (Fairey, Lee & Bennett, 2000). This should offer a contribution to the field of study which currently lacks the development of universal testable theories and models, or even a widely agreed upon standard or definition for what constitutes a memorial. The constructs identified from the literature include:

C-1. We the Living: Who Visits Memorials (Clausen, 2004; deRussy, 2007; Grider, 2001)

C-2. Those Left Behind: Memory and Meaning (Edkins, 2003; Fritsche, 2001)

C-3. The Role of Memorials: Public or Private Grieving (Boss, 2002; Jorgensen-Earp & Lanzilotti, 1998; Winter, 1995; Witham, 1998)

C-4. Education: Learning from the Dead (Nora, 1989; Radley, 1990; Sobel, 2003)


C-6. Personalization: Names at National Memorials (Bennett, 1998; Kean, 2007)


C-9. Connectivity: Sense of Place (Grant, 2006; Levinson, 1998; Shapiro & Carr, 1991; Sobel, 2003)


Within each of these constructs, and across the range of memorials described, care was given to note the suggestion by Kavanagh (1989) that memorials, like other objects, are transformed in function at both personal and cultural levels through time. Through such consideration, this research investigated the original intent as well as the changing constructs that shape memorials and determine their use.

Key Terms

A shared vocabulary allows for shared understanding of both the literature and the findings of this study. The following terms are important:

Construct—Meanings created by context and uses are called “constructs,” a version of the sociological/anthropological concept of “social construction.” Through time, constructs are often institutionalized into “traditions” that represent a shared understanding of a social process or cultural artifact. The differences between constructs will improve the understanding and use of concepts (Lissitz & Samuelson, 2007).

Memorial—A memorial is a remembrance, a memory of a person or incident, a time in history or in life, when lives are altered or lost. Memorials are representative of individuals, places, historical times and ideals that are valued by a culture or politics (Blair, Jeppeson & Pucci, Jr., 2000). Further, Tarlow (1997) asserts, “Memorials were built with distinctive prospective memories in mind, namely to remember why they were erected” (p. 116).
Memory—Memory is meaningful in constructing the past for the living and to aid in search for meaning in the future (Weick, 1985). Memory and the everyday objects we own establish a connection with the past (Radley, 1990). Memory is an invisible corridor joining together past, present, and future. It teaches us what to remember; it also teaches us what not to forget. It guarantees us our moment in eternity because it tells us that tomorrow new ways will open and new calls will come. Memory provides us with the joy of going on, with the rapture of the forward look (Geller, 2007).

Monument—Historical monuments erected publicly are reflective of the ideals at the time they were erected (Loewen, 2001). Monuments can be a statue or another structure to commemorate a person, event, or time in history (National Archives, n.d.; National Park Service, n.d.).

National Memorial—A national memorial, while it commemorates an historic person or event, is not necessarily located in an area connected with the person or event it memorializes. Many national memorials are, in fact, located on the National Mall in Washington, D.C. National memorials are owned and administered by the National Park Service, but can also be affiliated with auxiliary organizations that provide funding or additional services to memorial visitors (National Archives, n.d.; National Park Service, n.d.). A list of National Memorials is provided in Appendix A.

National Monument—These landmarks, structures, and other areas of historic or scientific importance are located on land owned or managed by the federal government. National Monuments are protected in the same manner as a National Park, but, by the Antiquities Act of 1906, the president is able to declare, by public proclamation, an area to be a National Monument. This differs in the naming of a National Park that requires

Research Scope

The scope of this study is limited to consideration of memorials in the United States. Within that larger category, this qualitative study included a purposive sample of memorials selected to represent a cross-section by: Chronology; the individuals memorialized; the number of individuals memorialized; the social, historical, and political implications imposed on the memorial; the controversy or lack of controversy that surrounds the memorial; and how the event itself presented the need for the memorial to be built. The ability to generalize the results of this study is limited by the small number of cases and the non-random selection process. The memorials studied, however, were chosen to include a broad range of memorial types and purposes.

The constructs that will be developed through this research and will ultimately comprise the conceptual model are presumed to represent universally shared meanings and uses. They can be generalized to other memorials, although not every memorial must necessarily be defined through every construct. Some constructs might be more appropriate for or applicable to certain memorials (Barsalou & Baxter, 2007). The researcher is aware that the acts of terrorism in the United States, such as the Oklahoma City bombings and the attack on September 11, 2001 at the World Trade Center in New York City, have significantly changed the need and response for memorials. After all, “Memorials to the victims of the terrorist disaster are part of the healing process and should be encouraged” (Miller, 2002, p. 12). As such, future studies should continue to assess the changing or evolving nature of the purposes and types of memorials.
The increase of spontaneous memorials or shrines that arise at the site of tragedies (Grider, 2001; Jorgensen-Earp & Lanzilotti, 1998) suggests that the public need for and understanding of the memorial process is in flux. Such unofficial tributes—from roadside crosses to mementos placed near the home of a deceased celebrity—represent a form of memorial worthy of scholarly study (Grider, 2001; Jorgensen-Earp & Lanzilotti, 1998), but they are beyond the focus of this research which examines official memorials that have registered on the national consciousness. The literature reports the leaving of objects, letters, and other memorabilia at several memorials, but most frequently at the Vietnam Veterans Memorial (Allen, 1995; Associated Press, 2007; Cohn, 2004; Hass, 1998, 1999; Lair, 2005; Thompson, 2007). It is anticipated that these spontaneous memorials may share the constructs developed in this study.

**Research Organization**

The literature reviewed in Chapter 2 is a comprehensive look at memorials and their use and meaning in America. Chapter 3 addresses the methodology used to collect and analyze data, to develop case studies, and to develop constructs that lead to a conceptual model. Conceptual model case studies for each of the memorials are presented in Chapter 4, as are the results of interviews with memorial experts. Chapter 5 presents conclusions about memorials and develops a conceptual model that links the findings from Chapter 4. This will include the implications of those conclusions for visitors and for those who will create memorials in the future, as well as to present the views of the author on the memorial process. A bibliography and appendices conclude the research results.
Chapter Two

Literature Review

*At the going down of the sun and in the morning*
*We will remember them.*
—Laurence Binyon “For the Fallen”

*I came down today to pay respects to two good friends of mine. Go down to visit them sometime. They are on panel 42E, lines 22 and 26.*
*I think that you will like them.*
—Anonymous note left at the [Vietnam] Wall

Introduction

For nearly two centuries Americans have been establishing and visiting memorials, memorializing heroes and presidents from George Washington to the present (Daines, 2000; Gass, 1982; Merchant, 2007). Americans memorialize those who gave their lives in war and other types of military service (Anderson & Cayton, 2004), and memorialize civil servants (Lee & Olshefski, 2002). Most recently, in Oklahoma City, New York City, and Blacksburg, Virginia, Americans have felt the need to memorialize the victims of terrorism and violence (Feldman, 2003; Forgey, 2005; Low, 2004).

While there is no firm agreement by scholars as to exactly what constitutes a memorial, there are formal definitions set forth by the U.S. government. Although the
U.S. government, through the National Park Service, administers 29 National Memorials (see Appendix A), these represent only a few of the memorials that have captured the attention of the country, the president, and Congress, which have designated these sites as National Memorials (National Park Service, 2008). Further, there are 93 National Monuments administered by U.S. governmental agencies including the National Park Service, the Bureau of Land Management, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, the U.S. Forest Service, and the U.S. Department of Agriculture.

Such lists are, however, unsatisfactory since they provide little consistency and no theories or models to test our assumptions about the nature and purpose of memorials (Clausen, 2004; Daines, 2000; Greenberg, 2000). To direct further scholarly study of memorials, this research endeavors to address some of the gaps in existing scholarship and inform the understanding of the functions, diversities, and significance of memorials in the United States.

The goal of this research, beginning with a comprehensive review of the literature on memorials, is to identify common and key features—“constructs”—of memorials. The literature review in this chapter will present a set of constructs and later chapters will discuss how the hypotheses developed from the literature can be tested using two approaches to provide in depth information on 16 memorials. The two approaches are:

1. Literature-based case studies of 16 memorials; and
2. Interviews with experts from the same 16 memorials.

Based on these two tests, the hypotheses will test whether the constructs chosen from the literature are key features of the memorials and will be accepted or rejected.
based on these two tests. Those constructs accepted after application of the tests will be used to construct a conceptual model that will aid in our understanding of memorials.

The process of memorializing an individual or an event is a social construction, a dynamic artifact of cultural practice developed by context and use. As such, this research will discern the constructs that work to shape our memorials and direct subsequent reflection on why we build memorials and how they give meaning to those who visit them (Boss, 2002; Kay, 2002; Lifton, 2005; Winter, 1995). Specifically, this study asks the following:

1. What are the functions of memorials?
2. What are the diversities in memorials?
3. What is the significance of memorials?

Sixteen memorials have been chosen for this study (see Appendix B). They represent a variety of American memorials, including a cross-section spanning the history of the country from the Alamo to Virginia Tech, geographic locations from Washington, D.C., to Pearl Harbor in Hawaii, events memorialized from war to assassination and from space exploration to terrorist attack, and cultural diversity including the Martin Luther King, Jr. National Historic Site honoring an African American and two memorials that honor Native Americans. All of these memorials recognize the sacrifice of human life.

The Constructs of Memorials

Numerous questions surround the building of memorials and their meanings. Are memorials built for memory? Are memorials built for public or for private reasons? Are memorials built for history or politics? Are memorials built for the living or for the dead? Currently, a debate is questioning the functions of memorials, with some detractors of the
Vietnam Veterans Memorial claiming, for example, that the memorial is not to “honor” the soldiers who gave their lives or the actions they took, rather it is “just a reminder that they’re dead” (deRussy, 2007, p. 1).

Memorials can be understood by looking at the defining elements—their constructs—that both shape and have themselves been shaped by memorials. These constructs were developed through a review of the literature (Cohn, 2004; Edkins, 2003; Hennies, 1991; Kavanagh, 1989; Lomsky-Feder, 2004; Mead, 1959; Middleton & Edwards, 1990; Radley, 1990; Shapiro & Carr, 1991) and identified as being central to understanding memorials, and include:

C-1. We the Living: Who Visits Memorials (Clausen, 2004; deRussy, 2007; Grider, 2001)

C-2. Those Left Behind: Memory and Meaning (Edkins, 2003; Fritsche, 2001)

C-3. The Role of Memorials: Public or Private Grieving (Boss, 2002; Jorgensen-Earp & Lanzilotti, 1998; Winter, 1995; Witham, 1998)

C-4. Education: Learning from the Dead (Nora, 1989; Radley, 1990; Sobel, 2003)


C-6. Personalization: Names at National Memorials (Bennett, 1998; Kean, 2007)


C-9. Connectivity: Sense of Place (Grant, 2006; Levinson, 1998; Shapiro & Carr, 1991; Sobel, 2003)


Each of these constructs is described in the following pages. The diversity of opinion regarding the nature of the memorials is presented from the literature.

**We the Living: Who Visits Memorials?** Visitors to memorials are perhaps as varied as are the memorials themselves. The Alamo welcomes 2.5 million visitors each year ("Daughters of the," 2007). Gettysburg attracts 1.8 million visitors, but notes that most of these visitors are "white males and so few are African-Americans" (Buchanan, 2003).

An estimated 4 million visitors see the Vietnam Veterans Memorial, one of the most visited destinations in our nation’s capital, each year (Vietnam Veterans Memorial, 2005). These visitors include veterans from the Vietnam and other wars, survivors who lost loved ones in Vietnam, tourists who have less personal memories of the conflict and a myriad of others who come to remember and to tell their children about the war (Thompson, 2007).

Many of the memorials do not list the number of visitors to their sites and do not provide significant information on visitors. This information was requested during interviews and will be discussed in later chapters. Interest in visitors reflects, in part, the economics of memorials and the cost of hosting visitors. It also reflects possible changes
in the memorial visit when one is surrounded by other visitors or when one is having a solitary experience at the memorial (Cable News Network, 2007).

The changes at Gettysburg, seeking to attract minority visitors, suggest that curators work with the intent of making the memorial relevant, not just to those who fought and lost their lives, but also to the African American community whose enslavement was significant in the minds of many of the soldiers who fought on that battlefield (Buchanan, 2003; Gatewood & Cameron, 2004). It is possible that the data obtained on the number of visitors to a memorial and the visitors' experiences reported by memorial experts will inform further development of this construct.

**Those Left Behind: Memory and Meaning.** Contemporary literature on memorials provides a variety of definitions. According to Kay (2002), “Something there is that loves—that need[s]—a memorial. . . . Memorial makers seek to ease dying through eternal monuments. . . . At its best, a memorial serves the living” (p. 1). Boss (2002) adds, “Finding meaning after a loved one has disappeared also requires continued participation in family and community rituals and celebrations, finding some spiritual or optimistic interpretation, learning to tolerate uncertainty, and participating in storytelling and reminiscing” (p. 40).

The memory and meaning of memorials arise from the details of the events they memorialize. As Lomsky-Feder (2004) suggests, “The nationalized memories constitute the meaning of different wars, the formative events within each war, and the connotation of war as a general theme in the national metanarrative” (p. 83).

It also seems to be the case that cultural environments can affect the framework of memory. Different interpretations of personal memory and history are salient and, as
such, are subject to change by the person recalling the memory of collective stories (Lomsky-Feder, 2004). "Life stories are not only a mechanism with which to elicit silenced voices and construct 'popular memory' (Popular Memory Group 1982), but are also a common practice with which to constitute the hegemonic remembrance" (Lomsky-Feder, 2004, p. 84).

Radley (1990) posits that memory and memorials establish a connection with the past that evoke a sense of their time and place. Such a connection is also part of what Middleton and Edwards (1990) refer to as:

> When people remember things together, seeking to compare and contrast different accounts, to construct and defend plausible versions or to criticize or doubt their accuracy, they articulate the grounds and criteria for what is remembered. Inferential links are made overtly; plausibility is directly invoked. (p. 29)

Kavanagh (1989), in the same vein, refers to the sense of connection as "social remembering," writing:

> The argument is made that social remembering—the collective recounting of a shared past and the commemoration of events which may be prior to each individual's own experience, is not only sustained by the world of objects and artifacts, but is, in part, shaped through the ways in which the world of things is ordered. (p. 53)

Written texts and narratives about memorials are associated with the symbolism attached to the object (Feldman, 2003; Hass, 1999; Katriel, 1996;
Schwab, 2004). Foss (1986) suggests that the objects left at memorials are reflective on our own life, our relationships and our outlook on death.

Cultures differ as to the degree to which artifacts are used in this way, and in modern societies, with their inequalities in ownership of consumption, classes and groups differ in their relationship to things as potentials for remembering past times. Implicit in this argument is the idea that objects may be transformed in their function, both at a personal and cultural level. (Kavanagh, 1989, p. 58)

This transformation of function and of meaning at a memorial is best illustrated at the Little Bighorn Battlefield. The site was originally dedicated in 1879 and named Custer National Cemetery ("Little Bighorn Battlefield," 2006), but by the late twentieth century the memorial was renamed the Little Bighorn Battlefield National Monument, reflecting inclusion of the fallen from both sides of the battle. In 1999, the first markers to honor Native American warriors were placed on the site (Reece, 2008; Unknown Warrior Marker, 2008). This supports the view of Lowenthal (1985), who concludes that memory, "is not to preserve the past, but to adapt it so as to enrich and manipulate the present" (as cited in Middleton & Edwards, 1990, p. 82). For those nineteenth century memorial builders, it was inconceivable that a group of warriors, fighting to maintain their land and lives, could overcome advanced technology and the spirit of manifest destiny that had led Anglo-European settlers to confront Native Americans from Jamestown west (Middleton & Edwards, 1990). The omission of over half of the participants in the battle reflected a time when there was little compassion and less consideration for the memories of defeat to a nation of Native Americans (Ogden, 2007).
Despite the significant change in the story of the Little Bighorn told at the memorial, Whitehead (1959) disagrees that memorials have the potential to “manipulate the present.” Rather, he suggests that memorials are invested in maintaining an unchanging view of the past and of loss:

The art of free society consists in the maintenance of the symbolic code; and secondly in fearlessness of revision, to secure that the code serves those purposes, which satisfy an enlightened reason. Those societies which cannot combine reverence to their symbols with freedom of revision must ultimately decay either from anarchy, or from the slow atrophy of a life stifled by useless shadows. (Whitehead, 1959, p. 332)

Mead (1959) agrees with that stance, suggesting that objects are defined by their space and their physical presence, and that what they represent cannot be manipulated. Mead (1959) writes, “It is of importance to recognize that it is not the character of contact experience in itself that carries with it perceptual reality. It is the successful completion of this portion of the act initiated by the distance experience that gives reality to the physical thing” (p. 142). Time and perception of objects vary, not because of spacing, but by the relationship the individual attaches to the object itself. The permanence of an object involves, “the interrelationship of individuals and their environments” (p. 351).

Whitehead (1959) and Mead (1959) share the perception of an unchanging past that is counter to contemporary scholars for whom exposure to post-modernist thinking suggests that, while the physical structure of memorials may be unchanging, the meanings they hold are not static (Blair, Jeppeson & Pucci, Jr., 2000). It was, however, about this period of perceived permanence, that Mosse (1990) wrote that memorials were
a fixed expression of national pride, strengthening national identity and a nationalist ideology (Hennies, 1991; Mosse, 1990). It was this thinking that coincided with development of Memorial Day as a day to honor the war dead (Memorial Day, n.d.).

Memorial Day was declared a day of national remembrance in 1868, a time to honor the men and women who had died serving their nation. It is a day of "reconciliation; it is about coming together to honor those who gave their all" (Memorial Day, n.d., p. 1). Over the years, the importance of the Memorial Day observance diminished along with the sacred meanings and traditions associated with it (Memorial Day, n.d.; Mineta, 2001). In December 2000, a “National Moment of Remembrance” was declared, requesting that at 3 p.m. on Memorial Day, all Americans . . . voluntarily and informally observe in their own way a moment of remembrance and respect, pausing from whatever they are doing for a moment of silence or listening to ‘Taps’” (Memorial Day, n.d., p.1). At the World War II Memorial on May 29, 2004, President George W. Bush spoke, saying that we honor:

... more than one million Americans have died to preserve our freedom, the more than 140,000 citizens who were prisoners of war, and all those who were declared missing in action. We also honor our veterans for their dedication to America and their sacrifice. (World War II, n.d., p. 1)

The literature is inconclusive in its understanding of the functions and dynamics of memorials as they are shaped by memory and meaning. This reflects, in part, the destabilization of certainty that occurred as postmodernism began to accept multiple truths and recognize the potential for multiple meanings in a single object (deRussy, 2007).
Despite disagreement about the relationship between the value of memory and a permanence of meaning, nearly all writings on memorials invoke these concepts—often paired as has been done in this “construct”—as a significant motivation in the development of a memorial (Barsalou & Baxter, 2007; McCallum, 1993; Mead, 1959; Whitehead, 1959).

The Role of Memorials: Public or Private Grieving. In the hours and days following the April 16, 2007, massacre of 32 students and faculty at Virginia Tech, news media brought the grief and disbelief in Blacksburg, Virginia, to our living rooms (Cable News Network, 2007). The tears and grief were no less haunting when, on August 18, 2007, the university dedicated a semi-circle of Hokie Stones to those killed (Virginia Tech, 2008). The grief exhibited at a memorial, both public and private, was illustrated through photographs, some showing tearful students hugging one another. Yet other photographs evoked a sense of solitude in students standing alone in the midst of crowds (Cable News Network, 2007; Virginia Tech, 2008).

The grief that Americans have so recently seen at Virginia Tech (Virginia Tech, 2008) has long held a significant place in scholarly works on memorials as discussed by Winter (1995), who wrote, “Grief is a state of mind; bereavement is a condition. Both are mediated by mourning, a set of acts and gestures through which survivors express grief and pass through stages of bereavement” (p. 29).

The proliferation of lives lost in war brought families together not only for the mourning process, but for commemoration, too. The National Civil War Memorial Commission (2006) describes monuments for that war as having been built to serve as
historic remembrances, to commemorate the fallen and the living, to be lasting, and intended to “forever be a place for collective memory” (Savage, 1997, p. 4).

Mayo (1988) views memorials as public places for grief, writing that memorials are social and physical arrangements of space to keep alive the memories of those lost in war and the artifact of the memorial is purposeful in meaning: To preserve historical and political experiences and function as centers for ceremonial commemoration. Clewell (2005), speaking at the 6th Annual Symposium on Democracy: Democracy and the Arts, concurs with public use of memorials as symbols and places for grieving, “War memorials typically embody the conventional aims of commemoration; they draw on figurative symbolism in order to redeem the human costs of war and reaffirm social values” (p. 1).

Although grief at memorials may be of a general sort—a public sadness over the futility of war (Mayo, 1988; Savage, 1997) or similar response—it is also personal (Winter, 1995). Grief at memorials is often for the loved one among the many lost. Grief for a specific individual is described by Winter (1995), who wrote that the private grieving could be triggered by names inscribed on a wall. When it is a personal loss, a memorial built to represent the dead, history, the politics of war, or to give the living a sense of indebtedness to those who lost their lives in the war is only one part of the memorial process. Winter (1995) goes on to write, “The memorials serve to comfort the mothers, fathers, wives, sons, daughters, and comrades-in-arms to accept the brutal facts of death in war” (p. 94).

Winter (1995) describes the inevitable grief at memorials, saying, “War memorials marked the spot where communities were reunited, where the dead were
symbolically brought home, and where the separations of war, both temporary and eternal, were expressed, ritualized, and in time, accepted” (p. 98). To Kay (2002), “Memorials are never having to say goodbye” (p. 1).

Daines (2000) seems to refute that claim, suggesting that war memorials, whether a traditional statue of a soldier or a library, are physical objects that can be touched and are unchangeable; perhaps to those who touch them. They are as unchanging as death.

Daines (2000) states that war memorials provide acceptance for loss and offer a way of moving forward in the mourning process. Further exploring the personal meanings of memorials, Daines (2000) suggests that the ritual of reading or touching names at war memorial ceremonies is integral in the healing process. Shapiro and Carr (1991) add that such rituals and symbols are necessary for the living and can help individuals to talk about their loss and work through their emotions. Lifton (2005), however, asserts that it is at memorials that survivors struggle with images of death and dying. “They feel a sense of debt to the dead, a need to placate them or carry out their wishes in order to justify their own survival. Survivors embark on an anguished quest for meaning and form” (p. 2263). Clearly, according to these many accounts in the literature, it is possible to conclude that memorials fulfill a crucial role in both public and private grieving.

Lifton’s (2005) conclusion echoes that of Witham (1998), who states that memorials are constructed for the living in honor of their loved ones, now deceased. Memorials are places where survivors can find solace and begin to rebuild their lives.

Witham (1998) continues her discussion addressing the importance of memorials and specifically references the building of a Nurses Memorial:
And finally, with this recognition, there will be somewhere, not only for these nurses to go, but also for relatives to be able to go to grieve, to heal, to feel, for the nurses that lost their lives in war—that perhaps their spirit has come home. (p. 30)

While Daines (2000) and Shapiro and Carr (1991) agree on the personal aspects of memorials, Winter (1995) acknowledges a dual use—that war memorials are both private and public, where grieving may be individual or collective. The rise of local memorials, the number of artifacts left at memorials, and the traditions that surround visiting a memorial, including the commemoration process itself, underscore the importance of both public and private functions of memorials.

Edkins (2003) concurs with this assessment of both public and private uses for grief, reviewing the significance of memorials built after declared wars are over, finding both aspects especially in looking at the role of town, city, and national governments in the building of memorials. She concludes:

Memorials are places where people can come together to mourn. . . . The commemoration of a traumatic event such as war reflects the way in which personal and social existences are inseparable. What is more significant is not whether the story is collective or personal since the two are entirely interwoven—but how the story is told. Narratives that produce closure, whether in the form of personal identity and life history or in the form of national pride and invincibility, produce a "forgetting" of the trauma itself. (p. 232)
As with memory and meaning, there is little agreement on whether memorials are for private use, public use, or a judicious mixture of the two based on visitor perspective. It seems that, in determining whether the predominant use of memorials is public or private, the situation harkens back to Kant’s (1959) “Sapere aude: Have the courage to use your own understanding” (p. 1).

Education: Learning from the Dead. The National Park Service has educational programs that are offered at many, but not at all, of the 400 National Park Service locations (Interpretation & Education, n.d.). Their programs, called “Interpretation and Education,” allow each student, visitor, and individual to connect with the specific location they are interested in pursuing. The National Park Service suggests, “The goal of all interpretive services is to increase each visitor’s enjoyment and understanding of the parks, and to allow visitors to care about the parks on their own terms” (A Place For, n.d., p. 1).

There are programs for teachers offering lesson plans and curriculum for different grade levels. There are field trip centers at specific national parks, as well as Junior Ranger programs where students have the opportunity to participate in activities at the park while earning a badge, patch, or certificate (The Ranger Zone, n.d.). Educational materials are available from the National Park Service through an array of programs such as a school loan program, guest speakers, a “traveling trunk,” and online “Park Fan” distance learning. In addition, there is a “Web Ranger” program—an interactive website—where students can learn about people, animals, history, nature, parks, and science through games, educational puzzles, and other activities (Interpretation & Education, n.d.). Moreover, volunteers of all ages are important to the educational
component associated with the National Park Service. Volunteers-in-Parks, or as the park refers to call them, “Very Important People,” contribute greatly to the performance of educational experiences at national parks. According to the National Park Service, in the “Fiscal Year 2005, 137,000 volunteers donated 5.2 million hours to national parks at a value of $91.2 million” (Volunteer, n.d., p. 1).

Many memorials include informal educational programs modeled on the practices found in museums and other cultural institutions (Falk & Dierking, 2000, 2002; Hein & Alexander, 1998). Educational media include interpretive signs, handouts, docents (volunteer educators), guided tours, lectures, public presentations, and more. Many times these experiences are integrated with state educational standards and benchmarks as memorial organizations provide teaching aids for school field trips (Bryant, 2005). Increasingly, such materials are made available for home school students, as well as for family learning projects (Falk & Dierking, 2002). Educational programs also serve, potentially, a population that might otherwise have no deeper or more personal connection with the memorial. They might also fulfill a political or activist purpose by interpreting meanings or lessons from the event that occasioned the memorial, a responsibility, as Beckow (1982) states, incumbent on cultural institutions.

In addition to the historical context and details of a memorial that are addressed through educational programming, Mayo (1988) believes that memorials are not just for remembering, but also for questioning war and promoting peace. Mayo (1988) states:

War memorials lose the forcefulness of their meaning when past wars and events are forgotten. A nation may cherish the memory of a particular war,
but when persons and places are forgotten, their monuments are not preserved and honor rituals are no longer held. (p. 75)

In this way, the educational material addresses the philosophical underpinnings that intertwine the memorial with meaning and memory.

**Artifacts: A Physical Connection.** Many who visit memorials leave artifacts. Although there is a long tradition of leaving flowers and flags in cemeteries, the leaving of artifacts at memorials and at spontaneous shrines seems to be on the increase (Cohn, 2004; Grider, 2001), to the point where it might be a defining characteristic of the public’s relationship with memorials.

The importance of artifacts and their representation to the memories of a loved one who is deceased are integral to linking the past to the present (Feldman, 2003). “The past, as it is materially embodied in museums . . . is inescapably a product of the present which organizes it” (Bennett, 1995, p. 129). A museum serves to “commemorate tragedy by collecting and displaying objects” (Feldman, 2003, p. 840). There too, at the museum, one sees that this construct serves multiple purposes such as memory and meaning as well as grieving.

Many of the artifacts deposited at the Vietnam Veterans Memorial will soon be exhibited in a new underground center being built to house artifacts left as tributes to the men and women who died in Vietnam (Cohn, 2004). The range of artifacts is significant. Cohn (2004) tells of photographs, flowers, flags, stuffed animals, combat boots, unit patches, Purple Hearts and other medals, baseball cards, and a myriad of letters and notes. Hass (1998) writes about the messages and notes, saying the notes and letters are ways the living have of “speaking to the dead and to the place of the dead in culture” (p. 58).
Others, writing about the practice of leaving artifacts at the Vietnam Veterans Memorial ask of the array of items left behind, “Are they a statement about what could have been but was lost? Do they symbolize dreams and hopes derailed?” (Associated Press, 2007). Similarly, Tarlow (1997) wrote:

Memorials were built with distinctive prospective memories in mind, namely to remember why they were erected. When flowers are put at the bases of war memorials, as it is customary, they do not only honour and re-confirm their established meanings, but also emphasize as metaphors the regeneration of (the memory of) the dead. (p. 116)

The National Park Service curators at the Museum Resource Center have catalogued more than one million artifacts for the Vietnam Veterans Memorial (Allen, 1995; Cohn, 2004; Hass, 1998; Lair, 2005; Martini, 2000; Sofarelli, 2006). The artifacts include war mementos medals, patches, letters, photographs, and flowers. The range of artifacts is so diverse that the curators responsible for the artifacts are at times unable to understand the meaning, knowing that the meaning existed for the person that placed what Allen (1995) calls “offerings at the wall.” Such feelings on the part of the curators are echoed by Hagopian (1995) writing, “A few of the objects indicate the memorial’s status as a place of honor for treasured objects that, although relinquished, cannot be abandoned” (p. 158).

**Personalization: Names at National Memorials.** One of the significant changes in memorials is the listing of individual names at national memorials (Daniel, 2003; Foss, 1986; Sturken, 1997). Although this was common on local memorials, where the names of soldiers from small towns were memorialized in community memorials, the
Vietnam Veterans Memorial was the first national memorial to include names of all lost in a war (Shanken, 2002). This memorial required prospective designers to follow four criteria: "The design must be reflective and contemplative, it must be harmonious with the site, it must be inscribed with the names of the dead and missing, and it must make no political statement about war" (Vietnam Veterans Memorial, 2005, p. 1).

While the inclusion of names on a national memorial was not common prior to Vietnam, names are now included, for example, at the National Fallen Firefighters Memorial, Oklahoma City National Memorial and Museum, the Space Shuttle Challenger Memorial, and Virginia Tech Memorial (Arlington National Cemetery, 2003; "National Fallen Firefighters," 2003; "Oklahoma City National," 2007; Virginia Tech, 2007). While the trend continues with the proposal for the Flight 93 Memorial in Pennsylvania (Forgey, 2005), names are not included in all proposals for the National September 11 Memorial and Museum at the World Trade Center (Kay, 2002).

Winter (1995) writes, "Touching war memorials, and in particular, touching the names of those who died, is an important part of the rituals of separation which surrounded them" (p. 113). Winter (1995) adds, "Many photographs show mourners reaching out this way, thus testifying that whatever the aesthetic and political meanings which they may bear, they are also sites of mourning, and of gestures which go beyond the limitations of place and time" (p. 113). In that respect, the personalization achieved through the process of including names in the memorial design would also appear to serve other objectives and features of memorials such as memory and meaning, a unique physical design, and the provision of a sense of grieving. In this sense, it seems that the
constructs that define memorials are not necessarily mutually exclusive, but rather might overlap with or serve multiple purposes (Winter, 1995).

This coincides with Haraway's (1989) suggestion that names are the essence of self; names on a memorial invoke personal feelings. For others who touch the names in a similar way, the meanings are different: The names are historical. Both seek to find meaning and memory, but one is private and the other public (Winter, 1995). Both, however, serve connection and closure.

Architecture and Design: Physical Elements of Memorials. Statues of marble and bronze, architectural monuments like those constructed to memorialize George Washington, headstones, tombs, walls, and chairs have all been incorporated in America's memorials (Mack, 2003, p. 91). Water, mirrors, granite, and other surfaces use physical elements to symbolize the concepts of reflection (deRussy, 2007; Lin, 2000a, 2000b; Melvin, Bergdoll, Wilson, Michalski & MacCormac, 2002). What these different physical elements share is that they are all built to endure and that these physical or architectural components of memorials are intended as enduring memories of those lost, as places that allow visitors to reflect on loss (Mack, 2003).

The way in which memorials are built and how they are commemorated is integral to the way they serve to comfort the bereaved. Winter (1995) writes:

In many war memorials there is a fence, doorway, or border clearly marking the distinction between an area adjacent to the monument, a space set apart from the rush of daily life. In some larger memorials, the border described the space set aside for mourners, family members, veterans, or officials,
speaking for the community, who were present during annual
commemorative ceremonies. (p. 96)

The Alamo is an adobe mission whose mud bricks first housed clerics and then
soldiers ("Daughters of the," 2007). Gettysburg, the Little Bighorn Battlefield, Wounded
Knee, and dozens of other memorials were set aside as cemeteries. Other memorials that
commemorate those lost at war include the USS Arizona National Memorial beneath the
waters of Pearl Harbor and formal memorials on the mall in Washington, D.C. (USS
Arizona Memorial, 2008). The Galveston Hurricane Memorial overlooks the sea that
brought the devastating storm to the island (Larson, 1999). The Space Shuttle
Challenger Memorial was erected above the unidentified remains of those killed in the
explosion (Arlington National Cemetery, 2003). The interim memorial at Virginia Tech
("Virginia Tech/We," 2008) was a semi-circle of 32 engraved Hokie Stones—chosen to
symbolize the history of the university as a promise for the future. But in all, the choice
of a location and architectural design help to define the memorial and the act it
memorializes (Melvin, Bergdoll, Wilson, Michalski & MacCormac, 2002).

Significant differences can be found among memorials for American wars,
including World War II and Vietnam. Lin (2000a) says of her black granite design for
the Vietnam Veterans Memorial, "We, the living, are brought to a concrete realization of
these deaths" (p. 1). That is a great distance and contrast in style and in purpose from the
United States Marine Corps War Memorial/Iwo Jima Memorial, with its soldiers in their
heroic pose of hoisting the flag over hard fought ground (Hariman & Lucaites, 2002;
Rollins, 1998).
The Vietnam Veterans Memorial is often criticized for its lack of "people." Lin (2000b) argues, "The wall dematerializes as a form and allows the names to become the object, a pure and reflective surface that would allow visitors the chance to see themselves with the names" (p. 4:14). The reflection there is not intended as a reflection of honor, but to create an overlay of a visitor's own image, reflected on the roll call for the roughly 58,000 who lost their lives in Southeast Asia (Lin, 2000b).

The World War II Memorial took nearly 60 years to be constructed and dedicated. The memorial honors the memory "the war to end all wars" (Dodd, 2002, p. 26). The architect, Friedrich St. Florian, designed the memorial to open a "dialogue between past and present" (Dodd, 2002, p. 27). St. Florian's supporters say, "They have to look forward as well as back to the events they seek to eternalize—otherwise they are not memorials, but epitaphs" (Dodd, 2002, p. 27). Within the open spaces of the National Mall, this memorial uses pillars and landscape elements to create an intimate experience. Bas-relief panels reflect the efforts of Americans at home and abroad in the push to victory.

Throughout the memorials, the use of stars is clearly symbolic. The 4,000 stars represent the approximately 400,000 Americans who gave their lives in the cause of liberty, but also linking visitors with the families who displayed stars for the sacrifice of those serving in the war and to the West Point class of 1915, the class that "stars fell on" in recognition that one-third of the class rose to the rank of general in WWII (George, 2004; "National World War," n.d.; Shanken, 2002).

The changing elements and different physical constructions are a reflection of time and meanings, of fashion and economics. They reflect the event that triggered a
memorial, in the case of battlefield cemeteries (Mack, 2003) or the honor paid to interring the Challenger crew at Arlington National Cemetery (Arlington National Cemetery, 2003). The location and form may be of less importance than, "Memory [which] in these contexts is the acknowledgement of achievement, a method by which the living make an accommodation to absence, and the dead are allowed to live on" (Mack, 2003, p. 103).

The act of terrorism and its aftermath of destruction have forever changed the face of memorials. The Oklahoma City Memorial and Museum honors the memories of the first Americans killed by a homegrown terrorist. The Oklahoma City Memorial and Museum has erected 168 empty chairs on a field where the Alfred P. Murrah Federal Building once stood ("Oklahoma City National," 2007). Dedicated exactly five years after the bombing, the Oklahoma City Memorial and Museum was designed to emphasize the good side of humanity and to offer hope. Kari Watkins, Executive Director of the Oklahoma City National Memorial and Museum relates, "This Memorial and Museum are products of literally thousands of people, from families of those who died on April 19, 1995, to survivors, rescuers, and volunteers" ("Oklahoma City National," 2007, p. 1). The field of 168 chairs, located on the footprint of the Murrah Federal Building and representing those killed in the bombing, are forever empty, a physical reminder of the loss of life at that site (Architectural Models, 2008; Hobbs, 2006). The cast bronze and marble chairs are arranged in nine rows to represent each floor of the Murrah Building.

The National September 11 Memorial and Museum at the World Trade Center is still under development, but the national tour of a precursor exhibit raises public awareness that the terrorist attacks were, "A defining event in this country's history, and we are creating a national symbol that, like the Statue of Liberty, will tell us something
about who we are as Americans” (“National September 11,” 2008, p. 1). Significant disagreements have been reported on possible designs for this memorial. In November 2003, eight memorial designs were proposed, each reflecting a slightly different view of how to link architecture to remembrance (Brustein, 2003). It is interesting to note that, despite the disagreement, many who saw the models reported that they were pleased that all eight designs recognized individual victims and provided a place for reflection and contemplation. It is interesting to note that Brustein (2003) reports, all “made creative use of light” (p. 1).

**Costs: What Price for Memory?** American cultural practices suggest that a life is beyond price. There is, however, a cost for memorializing the dead. Most often, that cost is paid by the living: individuals, foundations, corporations, and other groups that support charitable activities (Kean, 2007). There is a great contrast in cost from the past to the present. The National Mall in Washington, D.C., has memorials that cost as little as $3,192,312 dollars (Stones & Mortar, 2004) to the most recent dedication, the National World War II Memorial in 2004, that cost more than $182 million dollars (Bagli & Dunlap, 2006). Controversy surrounds the building of the National September 11 Memorial and Museum at the site of the World Trade Center in part because it is estimated to cost approximately $1 billion dollars for the memorial and an estimated $80 million for the visitors’ center, making it the most expensive memorial to be built in the United States (Bagli & Dunlap, 2006).

In the case of the Vietnam Veterans Memorial, “More than 275,000 individuals, civic groups, unions, and corporations contributed $8.4 million to the war memorial fund” (Howe, 2002, p. 95). The land for the Vietnam Veterans Memorial was the result
of legislative transfer proposed by Senator Charles Mathias, Jr., Republican from Maryland, requesting two acres of federal land between the Lincoln Memorial and the Washington Monument. The memorial itself was funded through contributions (Vietnam Veterans Memorial, n.d.).

On October 9, 1997, President William J. Clinton signed Public Law 105-58 creating the Oklahoma City National Memorial as a unit of the National Park System and designated the Oklahoma City National Memorial Trust to own and operate the memorial ("The Making Of," 2006). With the law, a $5 million appropriation was to be used on construction of the memorial and memorial museum. That amount was matched by appropriations by the State of Oklahoma and an additional $17 million was raised through private donations ("The Making Of," 2006).

The proposed Martin Luther King, Jr. National Memorial, said to be the final memorial that will be constructed on the mall in Washington, D.C., will need to raise $100 million before construction can be initiated (Cooper, n.d.). They will also need a permit from the Secretary of the Interior or the General Services Administration (Cooper, n.d.). At the time of this writing, almost two-thirds of the money has been raised. The W.K. Kellogg Foundation of Battle Creek, Michigan, recently donated $3 million dollars to the Martin Luther King, Jr. National Memorial Project Foundation, their largest donation to a memorial to date ("Kellogg Foundation Awards," 2008, p. 1). The Martin Luther King, Jr. Memorial will be built across from the Jefferson Memorial and just behind the cherry blossom trees that ring the Tidal Basin. The memorial will be adjacent to the Franklin D. Roosevelt Memorial between the Lincoln Memorial and the Jefferson Memorial (Cooper, n.d.).
The National Coalition to Save Our Mall is attempting to extend the landscape and allocate extended space. "History never stops; there will always be more presidents, heroes, and wars needing to be memorialized" (Neary, 2007, p. 1).

**Connectivity: Sense of Place.** In the past several decades, scholars have developed a new understanding of how "place" is integral in memories (Sobel, 2003). Many memorials are located at the site of the event they memorialize (National Park Service, n.d.) and at these locations, the "sense of place" is evoked by a shared sense of the landscape experienced by those memorialized. At other memorials, located in places far from the event they memorialize (National Park Service, n.d.), landscaping and architectural elements are used to create a similar "sense of place." For example, at the Oklahoma City Murrah Federal Building, the canopy of the Survivor Tree helps recreate the sense of protection usually felt in a structure, perhaps as a symbolic reminder that our national sense of security was also fatally wounded at the Murrah Federal Building (Architectural Models, 2008; "Oklahoma City National," 2008). At the National World War II Memorial on the National Mall in Washington, D.C., the architect used pillars and landscaping to create a separation from the rest of the mall, allowing visitors to be immersed in the symbols at the memorial (National WWII Memorial, n.d.).

In New York City, the memorialization of September 11 is not without controversy. There is a struggle among political powers, economic supporters, survivors and mourners, and local residents who live in the area of Ground Zero, as to the use and importance of "place" in the development of this memorial (Low, 2004). Just as Lincoln (1863) said of our inability to consecrate a site beyond the sacrifice of those who were lost, the importance of locating the September 11 memorial at Ground Zero is contentious.
Is it hallowed ground? At the Oklahoma City National Memorial, the consecrated ground—the footprint of the Murrah Federal Building—where the chairs are located, is fenced so visitors cannot walk across the area ("Oklahoma City National," 2007).

Low (2004) raises questions yet to be answered:

Why have the politically and economically powerful frozen the moment of September 11 for memorialization and co-opted its commemoration, rather than deal with the messy and imperfect ongoing public input into the commemoration process? Why have local meanings and vernacular strategies of memorialization been marginalized and ultimately excluded from the national and municipal discourse? What is the perceived or real threat of recognizing the legitimacy of local residents’, survivors’, and bereaved families’ claims to participate in the decision-making process?

(p. 326)

Although the concept of hallowed ground was first articulated about Gettysburg (Lincoln, 1863), it plays a role in the development of other memorials. For example, the USS Arizona has been left beneath the waves of Pearl Harbor. In part, this reflects the USS Arizona as the resting place for the 1,177 crew members who died on December 7, 1941. To many, raising the ship would have been analogous to desecrating a grave ("USS Arizona Preservation," 2004). The “sense of place” that surrounds the USS Arizona also reflects the mixture of public and private grief discussed above, with the USS Arizona serving first as the gravesite for the crewmen who lost their lives in 1941, and later as a memorial to all who were killed at Pearl Harbor ("USS Arizona Preservation," 2004).
Technology: A Virtual Past for a Virtual Community. There is no question that technology has changed much of life, including the human tendency to memorialize. Schwab (2004) writes:

With the advent of cyberspace, “virtual” memorials on the World Wide Web can be visited at any time. There are freestanding web pages and web rings that link together a number of web memorials with a common theme, such as cause of death. (p. 27)

Roberts (2003) concurs, noting that despite their virtual presence, memorials on the World Wide Web provide a feeling of community and “a sense of place” to visitors (p. 572). Grider (2001) contends that cybershrines originated on the Internet as a response to disasters or other tragedies that were without warning. She believes the virtual shrines serve to be of comfort in the grieving process. Grider (2001) provides examples such as the death of Princess Diana, the Texas A & M University bonfire collapse, American school shootings, and the airplane crash with the Oklahoma State University basketball team that resulted in spontaneous shrines (p. 7). Grider (2001) adds:

Cybershrines, or webpages containing photographs of the material shrines, photo montages, and other associated images as well as websites for lighting virtual candles and virtual condolence books flooded the Internet by the hundreds and perhaps thousands following the terrorist attacks [of September 11, 2001]. (p. 7)

For some memorials, such as the Alamo, the website is more comprehensive than a visitor to the memorial might expect. A graphic design that evokes myths and memories of the American West provides considerable material on history, the heroes of the Alamo, and the battle. It also makes available educational materials designed to meet
Texas State Education Standards for teachers who wish to integrate an Alamo visit into their lesson plans or to expand in-class materials presented (“Daughters of the,” 2007).

The Wounded Knee Museum website presents an interactive experience that offers the virtual visitor multiple views of the tragedy at Wounded Knee. Combining audio and visual experiences, visitors to the website are able to experience the sights and sounds of cultural differences, walking a virtual mile in the moccasins of those whose lives were touched at Wounded Knee. Viewers of the site have left messages, often mentioning the power of the site for education, but also its capacity to stir emotion (Wounded Knee, n.d.). Words including “sad,” “tragic,” “tears,” “sorrowful,” and “emotional” are all repeated in messages left by virtual visitors (“What people are,” n.d.). So, here again, this construct serves multiple purposes such as education, grieving, a site to leave artifacts, and inspiration for virtual messages.

At the National World War II Memorial, there is a computerized World War II registry, designed to document the names of those who participated in the war. There is no charge to place a name in the registry, and individuals can be enrolled through a website (George, 2004), pointing to yet another personalized, interactive, and multi-media element of memorials.

Perhaps no memorial has made greater use of technology than the Vietnam Veterans Memorial. Since the World Wide Web’s expansion in the 1990s, Vietnam veterans have made extensive use of the web to connect with former friends, to publish their own stories, and to organize themselves for various causes (Martini, 2000). The Virtual Wall was put on line in March 1997, and is a non-profit endeavor. It is an interactive website that attempts to take portions of the experience and emotions of a visit
to the Vietnam Veterans Memorial ("The Wall") into homes and schools of Internet
visitors. The second Virtual Wall went online in November 1998, and is a replica of the
wall itself (Martini, 2000). In addition, there is a Vietnam Virtual Archive, an online
collection of over 1.5 million pages of material, promoting an Oral History Project that
invites the public to conduct interviews for transcription and storage in both physical and
digital archives (Lair, 2005).

The Oklahoma City National Memorial and Museum has a multimedia program,
including a video podcast ("Oklahoma City National," 2007). The National September
11 Memorial and Museum at the World Trade Center has an interactive timeline and a
multimedia gallery that allows an online visitor to download and hear individual stories,
view pictures, and experience from afar the aftermath of the bombings ("National

Other memorials, including the Galveston Hurricane Memorial, depend on people
to visit the actual memorial site rather than on a virtual presentation of the history and
people involved. That is not to say these memorials provide a less moving or powerful
experience, or that they do not share significant historic impact, but appear to reflect
funding or other differences in the perspectives and approaches of those who manage the
memorials (Martini, 2000; Roberts, 2003).

Constructs in Conclusion

The constructs here are not all-inclusive, but rather represent those found in
multiple memorials. These constructs are analyzed in Chapter Four and the findings are
presented. The data will be used to compare and contrast the memorials and provide a
final conceptual model from this research.
From the literature review, it is already possible to determine that, even as memorials endure, the meanings invested in them are often changed. The Alamo, now remembered more for its portrayal by Hollywood than for the bravery of its defenders in the face of impossible odds, has evolved from its position as a memorial for the Texas Revolution, to recognition of its importance in Mexico’s battle for independence from Spain and the role it played in settlement and exploration of the region by Europeans (“Daughters of the,” 2007).

Recognition of Native American warriors at the Little Bighorn Battlefield certainly has expanded meaning of the site beyond the days when it was known as Custer’s Last Stand (“National Parks Conservation,” 2003). At other memorials, a reinterpretation of Gettysburg proposed by the National Park Service, seeks to attract a broader visitor base and provide a more inclusive view of the past in looking beyond what happened and exploring the causes of the Civil War (Buchanan, 2003).

In addition to the changes in meaning that are intentionally inclusive, much of the original meaning invested in those memorials may escape our modern sensibilities (Clausen, 2004; Fritsche, 2001; Grant, 2006; Lomsky-Feder, 2004; Schwenkel, 2006). This challenge to researchers is exacerbated by the fact that few memorials are able to provide the extensive documentation that is available for the Vietnam Veterans Memorial, about which much was written during its development (Vietnam Veterans Memorial, n.d.). The Vietnam Veterans Memorial and the temporal placement of the Vietnam War in the last half of the twentieth century provides a greater sense of shared understanding with the builders of that memorial than with the views and motivations of those
memorials constructed prior to the Vietnam War (Anderson & Cayton, 2004; Gass, 1982; Leigh, 2004; Melvin, Bergdoll, Wilson, Michalski & MacCormac, 2002).

These dynamic meanings now being found in memorials reflect, in part, the destabilization of certainty that occurred with postmodernism (deRussy, 2007). It also appears to reflect the mixture of private and public meanings that are inherent in memorials (Carlson & Hocking, 1988; Jorgensen-Earp & Lanzilotti, 1998; Shapiro, 2002).

Chapter Three of this research presents the research methodology used to investigate the memorials. Using those methods, Chapter Four presents the case studies and the constructs, the tangible and intangible elements of memorials that inform and shape the constructs, and the results of the analysis of data collected through the literature and from the memorial experts interviewed in the course of the research. Chapter Five will present the conceptual model and other conclusions of the research.
Chapter Three

Research Design

*Humankind cannot bear very much reality.*
—T.S. Elliot

“The Memorial”

Dear Smitty,
Perhaps, now I can bury you; at least in my soul. Perhaps, now I won’t again see you night after night when the war reappears and we are once more amidst the myriad hells that Vietnam engulfed us in... I never cried. My chest becomes unbearably painful and my throat tightens so I can’t even croak, but I haven’t cried. I wanted to, just couldn’t. I think I can today. Damn, I’m crying now. Bye Smitty. Get some rest.
—Anonymous note left at the [Vietnam] Wall

Introduction

There appears to be as many purposes for memorials as there are memorials themselves. In the United States, memorials are dedicated to leaders, to war dead, to those who lost their lives to nature, to space exploration, and, most recently, to terrorism (Levinson, 1998; Savage, 1997).

Nora (1989) describes memorials as existing at the intersection of memory and history, saying “Memory is a perpetually actual phenomenon, a bond tying us to the eternal present; history is a representation of the past” (p. 8). Grant (2006), for example,
sees memorials as taking “many forms, both sacred and secular, public and private, political and personal” (p. 20). The American Battle Monuments Commission sees memorials functioning to “honor those who died in service to our nation, not for the sake of nostalgia, but out of respect for their unselfish contribution to the heritage we enjoy” (Nicholson, 2005, p. 44). It is clear that the literature points to multiple and varied purposes for and meanings of memorials, but it is the words of President Abraham Lincoln (1863) at Gettysburg that best exemplify the meaning and purpose of memorials for many Americans, “But in a larger sense we cannot dedicate, we cannot consecrate, we cannot hallow this ground. The brave men, living and dead, who struggled here, have consecrated it far above our power to add or detract” (p. 1).

Research methodologies to investigate memorials differ greatly and there appears to be no single approach or any best way to study memorials (Barsalou & Baxter, 2007; Fairey, Lee & Clifford, 2000; McCallum, 1993). Experts at individual memorials, for instance, use evaluations designed to measure visitor use and interaction at a single point in time (Diamond, 1999). Other researchers investigate the reasons memorials are developed (Gass, 1982; Kay, 2002; Middleton & Edwards, 1990), and they have found that memory, grief, and remembrance are often intertwined with history. Yet other researchers seek to understand memorials by investigating the artifacts that visitors leave at memorials, especially at the Vietnam Veterans Memorial in Washington, D.C. (Cohn, 2004; Hass, 1998; Lopez, 1987; Schwab, 2004). All appear to be valid approaches, yet few, if any, studies have attempted to synthesize these various methodologies and pull together the findings to develop theory to explain the function, diverse types, and significance of memorials (Bennett, 1998; Fairey, Lee & Bennett, 2000).
Hypotheses and Research Aims

To determine why we build memorials, how they give meaning to those who visit them (Boss, 2002; Kay, 2002; Lifton, 2005; Winter, 1995), and to ask and answer many other questions, this study asks three research questions:

1. What are the functions (roles and purposes) of memorials?
2. What are the diversities (types) of memorials, including such key design elements as geography, physical properties and political elements, and other differences?
3. What is the significance of memorials, including their use by individuals, groups, and institutions?

The development of research questions was informed by the literature insofar as scholarly studies of memorials suggest these questions are central to understanding memorials. It helps to start with such fundamental questions because the sheer diversity of memorials themselves makes it difficult to study memorials (Blair, Jeppeson & Pucci, 2000; Clausen, 2004; Daines, 2000).

Based on analysis of the descriptions of the memorials provided by the memorial organizations and visitors who have written of their experiences at the memorials, it was possible to identify several key elements that appear to be consistent—and nearly universal—in defining and understanding the development and use of memorials. The researcher’s interviews with experts at the 16 memorials, and a comprehensive review of memorial literature, added significantly to a developing understanding of memorials. The titles of the memorial experts interviewed include: Curator, Director, Collections Manager, Public Relations Director, Deputy Superintendent, Vice-President Alumni
Based on the review of the literature, it was possible to identify 10 elements common to memorials and important to understanding their purpose, diversity, and significance. Termed “constructs,” the 10 developed from the literature review include:

C-1. We the Living: Who Visits Memorials (Clausen, 2004; deRussy, 2007; Grider, 2001)
C-2. Those Left Behind: Memory and Meaning (Edkins, 2003; Fritsche, 2001)
C-3. The Role of Memorials: Public or Private Grieving (Boss, 2002; Jorgensen-Earp & Lanzilotti, 1998; Winter, 1995; Witham, 1998)
C-4. Education: Learning from the Dead (Nora, 1989; Radley, 1990; Sobel, 2003)
C-6. Personalization: Names at National Memorials (Bennett, 1998; Kean, 2007)
C-9. Connectivity: Sense of Place (Grant, 2006; Levinson, 1998; Shapiro & Carr, 1991; Sobel, 2003)

To test the validity of each of these constructs as the essential elements of the purpose, diverse types, and significance of memorials, a hypothesis is developed for each of them. As such, 10 hypotheses were developed and each will be tested in this study to determine their validity. Two methods—case studies of memorials and interviews with memorial experts—will be used to test the hypotheses and determine whether the hypotheses can be accepted or rejected. The hypotheses are:

H-1. Visitors to memorials are important to understanding the function, diverse types, and significance of memorials in the United States.

H-2. Memory is important to understanding the function, diverse types, and significance of memorials in the United States.

H-3. Grieving is important to understanding the function, diverse types, and significance of memorials in the United States.

H-4. Education is important to understanding the function, diverse types, and significance of memorials in the United States.

H-5. Artifacts left at memorials are important to understanding the function, diverse types, and significance of memorials in the United States.

H-6. Names are important to understanding the function, diverse types, and significance of memorials in the United States.

H-7. Architectural design is important to understanding the function, diverse types, and significance of memorials in the United States.
Cost is important to understanding the function, diverse types, and significance of memorials in the United States. Connectivity is important to understanding the function, diverse types, and significance of memorials in the United States. Technology is important to understanding the function, diverse types, and significance of memorials in the United States.

There are more than 160 memorials in Washington, D.C. ("Too Many Memorials," 2007) and perhaps thousands scattered across the United States. Based on the researcher's interest in specific memorial functions and elements, 16 memorials were chosen across a variety of criteria described below.

**Cases: Memorials to be Studied**

Given the research that exists for memorials, there is disagreement within the existing scholarship on memorials as to what constitutes a memorial (Gass, 1982; Grant, 2006). For instance, are spontaneous remembrances placed alongside a highway where a loved one has been lost in an automobile accident considered memorials? (Grider, 2001). What about artifacts lost during a disaster and displayed in a museum? (Schwab, 2004).

Rather than randomly select memorials from the population of memorials that exist across America, the specific objectives of this study are best met through use of a purposive sample. Research methodologists warn that such samples might be vulnerable to selection bias (Fink, 1995). Still, many studies do allow for and employ non-probability samples and, if done correctly, they are considered a valid instrument and procedure. Most non-probability samples are used because of one of two challenges facing the researcher. The first is a study of a hard-to-identify group and the second is
for a pilot study (Fink, 1995; Frankfort-Nachmias & Nachmias, 1996). Since this research on memorials fits both criteria, a non-probability sample was used.

Even though it is not practical and perhaps not feasible to employ a probability sample for the memorials under study in this project, care was taken to select memorials that cover the functions, diversities, and significance of memorials. The selection process was based on a comprehensive review of the literature and memorials were chosen to:

1. Represent the diverse geographic mix of memorials from New York City and Washington, D.C., in the east, to Pearl Harbor, Hawaii, in the west.

2. Represent the chronology of memorials from the nineteenth century to today, from the Alamo in 1836 to the massacre of Virginia Tech students in 2007.

3. Represent various numbers of individuals memorialized from a single individual in the case of the Martin Luther King, Jr. National Historic Site, to seven crew members who lost their lives in the Space Shuttle Challenger disaster to the more than 400,000 Americans who gave their lives in World War II.

4. Represent various groups in American society from Native Americans at Little Bighorn Battlefield National Monument and Wounded Knee Memorial Museum, to those serving in the military during the Civil War, World War II, Korea, and Vietnam, to the civilians who were targets of terrorism in Oklahoma City, New York, and Virginia Tech, to those whose lives were lost in the natural disaster, the Galveston 1900 Hurricane.

5. Include the most popular, best known, most controversial and most often discussed memorials in the literature, such as the Alamo Memorial, Vietnam
Veterans Memorial, Oklahoma City National Memorial and Museum, and the National September 11 Memorial and Museum at the World Trade Center.

Thus, the 16 cases under study represent the broad array of memorial types and functions that are known to most Americans. The literature poses some additional considerations that are beyond the scope of this study. For example, does the placing of a personal item by an individual near a memorial as a way to honor the event or person for whom the memorial is dedicated constitute a separate memorial? (Allen, 1995; Cohn, 2004; Levinson, 1998).

This study is intended to help answer these questions and help define memorials in a more meaningful way than Tarlow’s (1997) frequently used definition, “Memorials were built with distinctive prospective memories in mind, namely to remember why they were erected” (p. 116).

These criteria will allow the research questions to be answered. As such, 16 memorials were selected for the study. They are, in chronological order of the event that inspired the memorial:

M-1. Alamo Memorial (189 killed fighting on the side of the Texans in 1836)
M-2. Gettysburg Memorial (51,000 killed in 1863)
M-3. Little Bighorn Battlefield National Monument (263 killed in 1876)
M-4. Wounded Knee Memorial Museum (175 killed in 1890)
M-5. Galveston 1900 Hurricane Memorial (8,000 died in 1900)
M-6. USS Arizona Memorial (1,177 killed in 1941)
M-7. National World War II Memorial (404,800 killed in WWII between 1941 and 1945)
M-8. United States Marine Corps War Memorial/Four Jima Memorial (6,800 killed in 1945)
M-9. Korean War Veterans Memorial (36,940 killed between 1950 and 1953)
M-10. Martin Luther King, Jr. National Historic Site (1 assassinated in 1968)
M-11. Vietnam Veterans Memorial (58,195 killed between 1959 and 1973)
M-12. National Fallen Firefighters Memorial (established 1981; 3,147 lives lost in the line of duty as of March 5, 2008)
M-13. Space Shuttle Challenger Memorial (7 crewmembers killed in 1986)
M-14. Oklahoma City National Memorial and Museum (168 killed in 1995)
M-16. Virginia Tech (33 people, including the gunman, killed in 2007)
These 16 memorials represent a broad and diverse spectrum of America intended to provide a thorough exploration of the constructs.

Research Design

The steps of the research process are as follows:

1. Review literature on memorials. To that end, a host of sources—periodicals, scholarly journals, books, and websites—was used to study memorials.
2. Identify concepts pertaining to the study of memorials—such as the definition of a memorial—and to develop operational definitions of each of them.
3. Develop research questions and hypotheses based on the literature review.
4. Select memorials for the case studies. Sixteen cases were identified, based on the literature review, for inclusion in this study. These are described and listed in the section on "Cases: Memorials to be Studied" above.

5. Identify the constructs that will constitute the conceptual model of memorials. When reading the literature, an effort was made to identify (1) purpose, (2) diverse type, and (3) significance deemed to be important in defining and describing memorials.

6. Test the constructs through two means: Case studies of the 16 memorials listed above; and telephone and written interviews with memorial experts at each of the memorials included in the study (Chapter Four).

7. Analyze the results of both case studies and interviews to determine if hypotheses can be accepted or rejected (Chapter Four).

8. Develop a conceptual model that includes the constructs that were accepted through the testing of hypotheses (Chapter Five).

Data Collection

Experts at the 16 memorials listed in this study were contacted by telephone, email, and a formal letter. The research project was described briefly and an approximately one-hour telephone interview was requested. To facilitate the interview, each memorial expert received sample questions so as to both have a sense of the research's objectives and to allow them to begin to think deeply about the memorial. The memorial expert was then requested to notify the researcher as to a convenient date and time for the interview. The researcher made telephone calls and, if permission was granted by the memorial expert, the interviews were recorded. Otherwise, the researcher
took notes. Copies of the letters (Appendix C) and the instrument developed for data collection (Appendix D) are available to help clarify the research methods for this study. A 100 percent response rate was achieved for the interviews.

**Summary**

Although the literature about memorials is extensive and ranges along a continuum from the most scholarly to periodicals designed to attract tourism, there is little agreement about a definition of best practices in the investigation of memorials. Few theories or models have been developed to aid scholars in their pursuit of deeper understanding of memorials, as well as the people who create them and the people who use them. The results of this study, and the conceptual model that is developed, will expand and add a new approach to the literature on memorials. As Hass (1999) and Mayo (1988) remind their readers, the development of theory and models is vital if a subject is to mature from a scholarly perspective.

Chapters Four and Five, following, interpret the data collected and use the data in the development of a conceptual model that is explicitly applicable to the 16 memorials studied here, which then may provide new theory for future study.
Chapter Four

Results and Discussion

Look not mournfully into the past. It comes not back again.
Wisely improve the present. It is thine.
Go forth to meet the shadowy future, without fear.
—Henry Wadsworth Longfellow

If this memorial is to serve its total purpose,
it must not only be a tribute to the dead;
it must contain a message for the living...power through unity...
—Enos Poor Bear, Sr., Oglala Lakota Elder

Introduction

The objectives of this research are to study memorials, to better understand why we build them, and to inform those who use memorials, or propose to create new memorials all through the development of a conceptual model. The research is based on the assumption that there are similar constructs that shape the tangible and intangible aspects of memorials, and these will be used to construct the model. Furthermore, this study is based on the assumption that the development of case studies of 16 memorials and material provided by the memorial experts through interviews will be specific to elicit such determinations and meanings. This chapter presents case studies developed from the literature and information derived from interviews with experts at the 16
memorials used in this study. These are followed by a table that presents the importance of the 10 constructs developed from the literature. Finally, this chapter will include a discussion of the 10 constructs; this time presented in the order derived through the interviewer recommendations.

M-1. Alamo Memorial Case Study

Scholarly literature, a review of the memorial website, and an interview with the memorial expert(s) form the basis for the following discussion of the Alamo Memorial in San Antonio, Texas (Table 1).

Table 1. Facts about the Alamo Memorial, San Antonio, Texas.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of memorial</th>
<th>Alamo Memorial</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Location of memorial</td>
<td>San Antonio, Texas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Event memorialized</td>
<td>Battle of the Alamo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larger historic event</td>
<td>Texas Revolution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year of memorialized event</td>
<td>1836</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of individuals lost</td>
<td>189 killed fighting on the side of the Texans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year construction began</td>
<td>1724, Mission San Antonio de Valero</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year declared memorial</td>
<td>1905</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approximate number of visitors per year</td>
<td>2,500,000 each year since the mid 1980s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Website</td>
<td><a href="http://www.thealamo.org">http://www.thealamo.org</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Historical Context.** Remember the Alamo! (Jenkins, 1973). In a unique blending of history and Hollywood, the Alamo has had many uses since its construction in 1724. Located in San Antonio, Texas, the Alamo was built in 1724 as home to Spanish missionaries and their Indian converts and it remained as a mission for 70 years. By 1800, a cavalry unit was stationed there and the Alamo was used by both Spaniards and Mexicans during Mexico’s 10-year battle for independence. The Alamo is memorialized, however, for its role in the Texas Revolution.

In December 1835, as the Texas Revolution began with the intent of establishing a Texas Republic separate from Mexico and the United States, Texas volunteers confronted Mexican troops quartered in San Antonio. After five days of fighting, the Texans were victorious and took occupancy of the Alamo. A few months later, on February 23, 1836, General Antonio López de Santa Anna and his army arrived in San Antonio. The Texans defended the Alamo for 13 days. Greatly outnumbered, hundreds of volunteers gave their lives rather than surrender at the Alamo, a location they saw as key to the defense of the new republic. Among the defenders of the Alamo were men whose names are familiar to most Americans: Jim Bowie, Davy Crockett, and James Butler Bonham (Huffines, 1999; Jenkins, 1973, 1990).

Before daybreak on March 6, 1836, Santa Anna’s soldiers attacked the Alamo, scaling the walls and rushing into the compound. Once inside, the defenders were overwhelmed and, by sunrise, the battle had ended (Bruce, 2004). Despite widespread belief that no Texans survived the battle, the Mexican Army spared the lives of women and children who had been in the besieged Alamo (Jenkins, 1990).
Memorial Overview. The Alamo Memorial Education Department practices "living history," a method of teaching the past through involvement and interaction with visitors. Every year on February 23 and then again on March 6, living history volunteers reenact the Alamo siege and battle, using only guns, devices, and clothing of that time period. No modern devices or attire are worn (The Alamo, n.d.). The Alamo staff reports that the greatest educational challenge is that although visitors know the phrase, "Remember the Alamo," they are unaware of what happened there (personal communication, February 29, 2008).

There are talks given to visitors throughout the day—every half-hour on the hour. Special programs and arrangements are made for large groups and for educators. A "walk-through" tour is also available. The Daughters of the Republic of Texas were granted trusteeship in 1905 to preserve the Alamo Memorial (History, n.d.).

Because of the international visitors, Alamo Memorial brochures are provided in six languages: English, Spanish, French, Italian, German, and Japanese. Based on visitor requests, the staff hopes to add Chinese and Arabic brochures in the near future (personal communication, February 29, 2008).

The Alamo consists of four buildings and the historic plaza they surround, the Shrine, the Long Barracks Museum, the Daughters of the Republic of Texas Library, and the Gift Museum. At the Long Barracks Museum, a 17-minute film produced for the Alamo by the History Channel is presented to visitors. Providing significant "sense of place" or connection with the past, there are several cannons at the Cavalry Courtyard that were used in the original battle. In the late 1990s, an outside amphitheater was built for educational talks (Visitor Information, n.d.).
Perhaps because of the temporal distance or because most visitors know the Alamo through Hollywood interpretations, the emotional impact of reflective memory and meaning are observed less frequently at the Alamo than at some other American memorials. While a few visitors do reflect on the event and the people memorialized, the Alamo staff describes the motivation of most visitors as those seeking a “snapshot moment” as photographic proof that they have been to the Alamo. Visitors appreciate the opportunity to be in the space where the event took place (personal communication, February 29, 2008). Family groups appear to find the most meaning in their visit, as do children visiting with parents or grandparents. The families use the experience to pass on values from an older generation to a younger one, such as the importance of sacrifice for the cause of freedom (personal communication, February 29, 2008).

There is little evidence of grief by visitors to the site, although there is a memorial service in the church during the anniversary of the siege and flowers are sometimes left by the plaques that commemorate the Alamo heroes. Other than flowers, few artifacts are left at the Alamo. More frequently, visitors remove gravel that surrounds the church, assuming that they are carrying away a part of history rather than gravel installed by the Alamo grounds crew to help disperse rainwater (personal communication, February 29, 2008).

Although the names of Alamo heroes are on plaques, the period predates photographic imagery and there are no pictures of the men who gave their lives. Visitors most frequently take pictures of the location and may sign a guest book and leave comments and messages (personal communication, February 29, 2008).
Because the Alamo buildings existed before they became memorials, their architecture and design are based on original use, rather than use as a memorial. The plaques and interpretive materials are designed both as educational and memorial features, but the architecture is preserved in its original state.

There is no cost associated with an Alamo Memorial visit, but there are donation boxes where visitors can make contributions for the maintenance and management of the memorial. The memorial is also supported, in part, by income generated from the gift shop, grants from charitable foundations, and other donations (Visiting the Alamo, n.d.).

As a “destination” for visitors, the Alamo Memorial is most likely a side trip during a visit to downtown San Antonio, Texas. For visitors, who come from beyond the region, the adobe architecture at the Alamo Memorial may impart a “sense of place” and history. The staff believes that many of their visitors have come because of the Alamo Memorial’s proximity to San Antonio’s popular Riverwalk development (personal communication, February 29, 2008).

Like much of the world, the Alamo Memorial has a virtual presence that provides information about the memorial, its location, hours of operation, programs, and significant historic interpretation. For some visitors, for whom a trip to the Alamo Memorial contains elements of a pilgrimage, the Alamo website provides significant opportunity for pre-visit preparation. The staff at the Alamo Memorial reports that the website is used to convey historical information rather than functioning as a virtual memorial: It is for education rather than for memory or for grieving. Staff also reports that visitor perceptions are more greatly affected by popular culture, especially
Hollywood, than at memorials that have a closer temporal link to the present (personal communication, February 29, 2008).

M-2. Gettysburg Memorial Case Study

Scholarly literature, a review of the memorial website, and an interview with the memorial expert(s) form the basis for the following discussion of the Gettysburg Memorial in Gettysburg, Pennsylvania (Table 2).

Table 2. Facts about the Gettysburg Memorial, Gettysburg, Pennsylvania

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of memorial</th>
<th>Gettysburg Memorial</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Location of memorial</td>
<td>Gettysburg, Pennsylvania</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Event memorialized</td>
<td>Battle of Gettysburg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larger historic event</td>
<td>Civil War</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year of memorialized event</td>
<td>1863</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of individuals lost</td>
<td>51,000 at Gettysburg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>More than 600,000 for the entire Civil War</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year construction began</td>
<td>1863</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year declared memorial</td>
<td>1863</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approximate number of</td>
<td>2,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>visitors per year</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Website</td>
<td><a href="http://www.nps.gov/gett/">http://www.nps.gov/gett/</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Historical Context.** The Civil War began on April 12, 1861, and ended on April 9, 1865. In July of 1863, General Robert E. Lee attacked northern forces near the town
of Gettysburg, Pennsylvania. Three days of fierce fighting at the battle resulted in the largest number of casualties in the war, which forever changed the nation and the future of democracy. Of the 600,000 lives claimed during the Civil War, approximately 15 percent of those were lost at Gettysburg ("Gettysburg National Battlefield," 2007).

After the fighting, the Union dead were buried at the Evergreen Cemetery in Gettysburg. Governor Andrew Gregg Curtin asked President Abraham Lincoln to speak at the dedication. A two-minute, 272 word speech on that hallowed ground would become the most famous speech in American history (History & Culture, 2007).

**Memorial Overview.** The National Park Service, in conjunction with the Gettysburg Foundation, is working to restore, preserve, and augment the Gettysburg Battlefield. Returning sections of the battlefield to its 1863 appearance is essential for visitors to experience and appreciate the magnitude of the past ("The New Museum," 2006). A budget of $95 million dollars is allocated for preservation, conservation, construction of a museum, and new exhibits (Project Budget, 2006, p. 1).

Robert Wilburn, President of the Gettysburg National Battlefield Museum Foundation, describes the changes saying, "This is the beginning of a very exciting venture. A venture that I hope will help renew America's appreciation for our common heritage, for the battle that took place here, and its impact on our nation" ("New Museum and," 2007, p. 1). Wilburn adds, "The [new] building is designed to showcase the battlefield, and encourage visitors to go outside and explore the historic landscape. Our goal is to help every visitor better appreciate the significance of what happened here" ("New Museum and," 2007, p. 1).
The new museum, which opened in April 2008, displays portions of the 700,000 text documents, 38,000 historic artifacts, maps, and photographs for the visitors ("Preserving Gettysburg's Hidden," 2006). The Gettysburg Cyclorama painting, newly renovated, will be displayed for the first time in 40 years ("The New Museum," 2006). Visitors will experience the "sights, sounds and emotions of the battle and its aftermath" in the new museum theater ("The New Museum," 2006). The Gettysburg Foundation says that visitors will experience a "sense of place" and comprehend the magnitude of the past, "to more appropriately honor the men who fought there" ("Returning the Battlefield," 2006, p. 1).

The Gettysburg National Military Park estimates that hundreds of thousands of children visit each year ("Educational Opportunities at," 2006). For those who are not able to attend, the Gettysburg Foundation has developed an "outreach program," where electronic field trips enable millions of young students to visit Gettysburg National Military Park each year. In addition, there is a Traveling Trunk Program to teach children about the Civil War and the life of a soldier ("Educational Opportunities at," 2006). Students are able to experience life in one of three regiments in a program titled "Fall Footsteps" where students can learn about leadership, determination, or courage (For Teachers, 2007, p. 1).

The Gettysburg Advisory Committee has determined that expansion of on-ground classrooms is needed to "invite exploration of the issues that divided us as well as the forces that brought about reconciliation in the years and decades following the war. Gettysburg is a powerful symbol for both" ("Educational Opportunities at," 2006, p. 1). There is also a library and research center for visitors and scholars.
Gettysburg rangers find that television and movies influence visitor interest, and a movie or television show can have significant impact on public interest. The Gettysburg curators, who work almost exclusively with researchers, have a more scholarly perspective than might be expected. The educational goal is that all visitors leave knowing Gettysburg was a turning point in the Civil War and a pivotal event in American history (personal communication, February 25, 2008).

When Lincoln (1863) delivered his speech at Gettysburg, he stated that the battlefield was to serve as a memorial for those who sacrificed their lives to preserve the Union. Today, the pastoral atmosphere and natural beauty of the space prevails, obscuring for some visitors, the death and destruction that marked the summer of 1863. Other visitors understand the original intent and are thoughtful and introspective. A few continue to mark the monuments and graves with small flags and flowers (personal communication, February 25, 2008).

Gettysburg is unique in the diversity and number of memorials and monuments that are located in close proximity, with a total of 1,328 monuments, markers, and memorials surrounding the battlefield ("Frequently Asked Questions," 2007). Some memorials, including the Pennsylvania State memorial, have names of battle participants, and visitors are frequently seen taking pictures of this memorial or making rubbings of its surface.

Visitors to the park library often request a copy of an ancestor’s service records. A lobby exhibit includes a wall of names and faces with nearly 250 photographs that are linked to the units where the soldiers served. For those visitors interested in walking in the footsteps of history, Gettysburg is an important destination. For others, for whom the
interest lies in historical fact and not the atmosphere, the Gettysburg website is being improved to include greater depth of content (personal communication, February 25, 2008).

M-3. Little Bighorn Battlefield National Monument Case Study

Scholarly literature, a review of the memorial website, and an interview with the memorial expert(s) form the basis for the following discussion of the Little Bighorn Battlefield National Monument near Crow Agency, Montana (Table 3).

Table 3. Facts about the Little Bighorn Battlefield National Monument, Crow Agency, Montana

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of memorial</th>
<th>Little Bighorn Battlefield National Monument</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Location of memorial</td>
<td>Crow Agency, Montana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Event memorialized</td>
<td>Battle of Native Americans and U.S. Cavalry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larger historic event</td>
<td>Custer’s Last Stand/Battle of Little Bighorn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year of memorialized event</td>
<td>1876</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of individuals lost</td>
<td>263</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year construction began</td>
<td>1879—First Temporary Monument</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1881—Replaced with Permanent Monument</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year declared memorial</td>
<td>1946</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approximate number of visitors per year</td>
<td>300,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Website</td>
<td><a href="http://www.friendslittlebighorn.com">www.friendslittlebighorn.com</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Historical Context.** Whether you know it as “Custer’s Last Stand” or the Battle of Little Bighorn may depend on your age or your ancestry. The memorial near Crow Agency, Montana, commemorates one of America’s most significant battles between Euro-Americans and Native Americans. As the cultures clashed, a bloody battle ensued for two days, June 25 and 26, 1876, and saw the defeat of 12 companies of the Seventh Cavalry by Lakota (Sioux), Cheyenne, and Arapaho warriors (“Indian Memorial at,” 2007).

**Memorial Overview.** The memorials dedicated to the Battle of the Little Bighorn span from 1879, when the first temporary monument was erected, to 1881 when it was replaced with a permanent marble obelisk (Reece, 2008). In 1890, marble blocks were spread throughout the battlefield to identify where the U.S. Cavalry soldiers lost their lives (Reece, 2008).

With congressional authorization in December 1991, President George Bush signed Public Law 102-201 renaming Custer Battlefield National Monument to Little Bighorn Battlefield National Monument (“Peace through Unity,” 1999). A memorial and monument were to be designed to honor the Native Americans who served on both sides of the battle. In 2002, the National Park Service received appropriated funds to build the Indian Memorial (“Indian Memorial Dedication,” 2008). The theme of the 2002 memorial is “Peace through Unity.” Its objective is to serve as a legacy and provide a “sense of place” where visitors, regardless of race, color, or creed, can experience the historic landscape. The memorial honors Native Americans and provides a place where their descendents can celebrate their heritage and contribution to history (“Peace through Unity,” 1999).
As a result of the work of historian Don Rickey, Jr., and the Cheyenne oral historian, John Stands, the first wooden Indian marker was placed on the field in 1958 (Reece, 2008). The marker read, “Lame White Man, a Cheyenne leader, fell here.” After 41 years, on Memorial Day in 1999, granite markers for Lame White Man and Noisy Walking were unveiled (“Memorials Lest We,” 2008). In June 2001, the first Sioux warrior marker for Long Road was dedicated. On June 25, 2003, the first Indian Memorial was dedicated as well as one for the Unknown Warrior. One day later, a warrior marker for Dog’s Back Bone was unveiled (“Memorials Lest We,” 2008).

It took 127 years and an act of Congress, for the Indians to receive a memorial honoring their dead. Poor Bear Jr., a Lakota Sioux Elder states, “We can begin to rewrite history with this memorial if we [western tribes] can get our act together to form a unified effort” (Wilkinson, 2003, p. 1). Darrell Cook, superintendent of the Little Bighorn Battlefield National Monument notes, “This is the first memorial that truly recognizes the conflict between the Indian and non-Indian people in the West” (Wilkinson, 2003, p. 1). At the dedication of the Indian Memorial by U.S. Senator Ben Nighthorse Campbell, a Northern Cheyenne declared, “The time has come to give equal honor to the Indian people who’ve been denied that for so long” (Reece, 2008, p. 3).

The Visitor Center at Little Bighorn Battlefield National Monument is open all year and offers extensive exhibits, a 17-minute documentary film, and a 4.5 mile self-guided tour. From Memorial Day to Labor Day, bus tours are available, as well as special ranger programs (“Little Bighorn Battlefield,” 2008, p. 1).
Once inside the circular memorial, there is water trickling down a wall representing the tears for the warriors and soldiers ("Little Bighorn Battlefield," 2008). Reece, president of Friends of Little Bighorn National Monument, comments, "You get a sense of being there. What’s emotional about Little Bighorn is that you can stand anywhere on the battlefield and landscape that looks much as it did in 1876" (Wilkinson, 2003, p. 2).

Because of the demographics of the 300,000 visitors, the monument staff reports questions are asked about the Seventh Calvary, not about the Native American memorial dedicated in 2003. The common questions may also arise because of the cultural disbelief—both at the time of the battle and today—that the westward movement could temporarily be stopped. Visitors find that the memorial forces them to question the relentless western expansion. Although some come with preconceived notions about the justice, the historical and social context of 1876 must be understood if both sides are to be viewed with compassion (personal communication, February 26, 2008).

At Last Stand Hill, rangers report that some visitors grieve, not necessarily for a familial connection with those who gave their lives, but more for the injustices of the past. Although a stone with the names of the soldiers stands on this hill, the names do not seem to attract the attention of visitors in a way that will be described at the Vietnam Veterans Memorial. Unique to the Little Bighorn Battlefield National Monument are the Native American symbols that are left behind: Prayer bundles and tobacco are often placed as an offering to the spirits. Because of the religious connotations of many of the
artifacts left here, a Northern Cheyenne medicine man removes the artifacts with appropriate attention paid to cultural and religious ceremony (personal communication, February 26, 2008).

Because the memorial is some distance from the interstate highway system, visitors to the memorial have made an intentional decision to visit. From Memorial Day to Labor Day, the one-hour bus tour through the facility, with interpretation provided by rangers, reflects significant changes in the attitudes and understanding of visitors. Not only does the site present a new historical perspective, it has marked a change in national mood or spirit, and an inclusive consideration of Native Americans—and other cultures —whose contributions to American history were ignored for many years (personal communication, February 26, 2008).

There is a website dedicated to the Little Bighorn Battlefield National Monument, which is used to help visitors plan their visits and learn about the battlefield.

M-4. Wounded Knee Memorial Museum Case Study

Scholarly literature, a review of the memorial website, and an interview with the memorial expert(s) form the basis for this discussion of the Wounded Knee Memorial Museum in Wall, South Dakota (Table 4).

**Historical Context.** The Battle at Wounded Knee Creek, also known as the Wounded Knee Massacre, is the last major battle between the Lakota Sioux Indians and the U.S. armed forces. The massacre, which included the slaughter of the tribe’s elderly, women, and children, began as a result of a change in the land treaty where the U.S. government took possession of more Indian land (Reinhart, 2007; “Wounded Knee,” n.d.).
The Seventh Cavalry, under the command of Colonel Forsyth, was sent to move the Sioux to a new location. Four Hotchkiss guns were placed in position, surrounding the Indian camp. After an encounter between a deaf Indian and a soldier, a rifle went off and confusion erupted leading to the massacre (Hill, 1999; Reinhardt, 2007).

Table 4. Facts about the Wounded Knee Memorial Museum, Wall, South Dakota

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of memorial</th>
<th>Wounded Knee Memorial Museum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Location of memorial</td>
<td>Wall, South Dakota</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Event memorialized</td>
<td>The Battle at Wounded Knee Creek</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larger historic event</td>
<td>Manifest Destiny</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year of memorialized event</td>
<td>1890</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of individuals lost</td>
<td>Approximately 300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year construction began</td>
<td>1890</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year declared memorial</td>
<td>1995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approximate number of</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>visitors per year</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Website</td>
<td><a href="http://www.woundedkneemuseum.org">www.woundedkneemuseum.org</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Memorial Overview. The site on which the massacre took place has been designated as a National Historic Landmark (National Park Service, n.d.). In July 1993, the Wounded Knee National Park and Memorial Establishment Act was passed to protect the historical importance of the 1890 Wounded Knee massacre site and the history and culture of the Sioux nation (“H.R. 2435 Wounded,” 1993).
The Wounded Knee Massacre has proliferated in popular culture in books, songs, video games, and movies ("Wounded Knee," n.d.). Controversy still surrounds the stories of Wounded Knee and how the Army discredited the Indians and their telling of the events of 1890 (Barnes, 2008; "Wounded Knee," n.d.).

Like the Little Bighorn Battlefield National Monument, Wounded Knee Memorial Museum has some unique elements, such as the tribal animosity between Native American employees and visitors. These animosities make a visit to the Wounded Knee Memorial Museum difficult for Native Americans who are not members of the Lakota Sioux. Some Cheyenne and other Siouxan tribes feel their cultural stories are shortchanged in the museum narrative (personal communication, February 27, 2008).

The Wounded Knee Museum is a narrative museum, where the exhibits tell the historic story of Native American life from the first contact with Columbus to current Indian issues. Although the focus is on Wounded Knee, there is information on the broken treaties and history of betrayal by the U.S. government (personal communication, February 27, 2008).

In addition, there is a Remembrance Room that honors the victims and allows visitors to be reflective of the past. In the Remembrance Room, there are pictures of the massacre, and it is a common site of somber reflection. The museum accurately uses compelling photographs to add to the sense of realism and history depicting a story of the Lakota people, their struggles, and the massacre on December 29, 1890 (personal communication, February 27, 1980). Museum programs offer students an opportunity to study the past and learn about the Native American people and their culture.
The memorial expert reports that the focus of visitors depends on their cultural background, with descendents asking very different questions and having an experience that differs greatly from those who are not related to the massacred. As the visitors experience the exhibits, many show great emotional pain and are brought to tears. Because some visitors cry for lost ancestors and others cry from anger, the museum provides tissues to visitors (personal communication, February 27, 2008).

Like the artifacts left behind at Little Bighorn Battlefield National Monument, visitors to the Wounded Knee Museum leave tobacco, dream catchers, sage bundles, and even a sacred eagle feather. Because the museum is 90 miles south of the monument, museum staff take such artifacts to the monument (personal communication, February 27, 2008). The museum’s location, in proximity to I-90, was chosen to make the museum accessible to travelers. Its location on the Bad Lands Loop makes it relatively easy for interested visitors to travel to the actual massacre site (“Wounded Knee Museum,” n.d.).

The museum, built in 2003, includes names of those killed. The memorial expert reports that it is not unusual to see visitors make rubbings of the names that are etched in circles of smoked glass. The experience is further enhanced by allowing visitors to “take a feather” to personalize the experience (personal communication, February 27, 2008).

The expert reports that the museum staff understands the power of technology for marketing and that visitors to the website have grown significantly through the years. Of all websites viewed in the course of this research, the website of the Wounded Knee Museum at www.woundedkneemuseum.org resonates with the sounds and story of the massacre. A look at the virtual “guestbook” reveals the impact of the powerful story on
visitors, much like the comments left by visitors to the actual museum (personal communication, February 27, 2008).

M. 5. Galveston 1900 Hurricane Memorial Case Study

Scholarly literature, a review of the memorial website, and an interview with the memorial expert(s) form the basis for the discussion of the Galveston 1900 Hurricane Memorial in Galveston, Texas (Table 5).

Table 5. Facts on the Galveston 1900 Hurricane Memorial, Galveston, Texas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of memorial</th>
<th>Galveston 1900 Hurricane Memorial</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Location of memorial</td>
<td>Galveston, Texas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Event memorialized</td>
<td>1900 Galveston Hurricane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larger historic event</td>
<td>Worst Natural Disaster in U.S. History</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year of memorialized event</td>
<td>1900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of individuals lost</td>
<td>8,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year construction began</td>
<td>2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year declared memorial</td>
<td>2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approximate number of visitors per year</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Website</td>
<td><a href="http://www.1900storm.org">http://www.1900storm.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Galveston newspaper website)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Historical Context. On September 8, 1900, a category 4 hurricane, with winds up to 140 miles per hour, swept across the Gulf of Mexico to devastate Galveston, Texas.
It killed an estimated 8,000 men, women, and children; 6000 deaths in Galveston and 2000 in the surrounding areas. The 1900 hurricane remains the greatest natural disaster to strike the United States (NOAA History, 2004). It is interesting to note that the 1900 Hurricane does not have a name, as names to hurricanes were not assigned until the late 1950s (NOAA History, 2004).

In 1900, Galveston was a flourishing and prosperous city, the largest in Texas, and was often referred to as “the New York of the South” (Beard, 2005, p. 1). The storm all but destroyed the city, with more than one-fifth of Galveston’s residents losing their lives. The storm even swept away an entire orphanage, killing 90 children and 10 nuns (1900 Storm Memorial, 2007).

As rescuers arrived in Galveston, they could hear the screams of survivors trapped in the debris and found thousands dead. In an attempt to clear Galveston, the bodies were taken out to sea and committed to the deep. Unfortunately, the currents of the Gulf washed the bodies back to shore, increasing the horror to survivors and rescuers alike (Larson, 1999). Although little known today, the tragedy at Galveston spurred help from across the nation, including Clara Barton, founder of the American Red Cross. At the time of the hurricane, Barton was 78 years old as she and hundreds of other volunteers traveled to Galveston to aid the people who survived the storm (Larson, 1999).

Memorial Overview. A year after the hurricane, a pink granite stone with the markings “To the unknown who perished in the Storm of Sept. 8, 1900” was dedicated in a ceremony and placed at the Galveston City Cemetery (Sharp, 1999, p. 1). The loss of life and the aftermath of the Galveston hurricane were so traumatic, that it took 100 years
and one day for a memorial beyond the gates of the cemetery to commemorate and honor the lives lost in the storm (Smith, 2008).

On September 9, 2000, a new memorial, "Place of Remembrance," was dedicated to victims of the storm. The 10-foot tall bronze sculpture depicts a mother, father, and child clinging together. The mother is cradling her child and the father has one arm around his wife and one reaching toward the sky. Individual cards with the names of those killed in the storm are in a vault under the sculpture (1900 Storm Memorial, 2007).

The memorial expert (personal communication, February 23, 2008) reported that very few visitors come to see the memorial; it stands on the 13-mile Galveston seawall that runs parallel to the beach, and most visitors to Galveston pass the memorial in their travels. On the anniversary date of the hurricane, flowers are sometimes left at the memorial, but throughout the year, little notice is paid.

Chosen for study because the 1900 Hurricane was responsible for the greatest loss of American lives to a natural disaster, this memorial attracts little attention as compared to most other memorials. The Galveston County Historical Museum provides information on the storm and has created a website for educational purposes, but the memorial itself does little to attract or educate visitors (The 1900 Storm, 2008). This is, in part, an attempt to distance the memory of America's worst natural disaster and focus on positive tourism such as the Texas Seaport Museum and other Galveston attractions (personal communication, February 23, 2008).

The Galveston Historical Foundation offers a movie on the 1900 Hurricane which shows old footage from the hurricane and its aftermath (Galveston Historical Foundation, 2007). The Galveston Historical Foundation provides information on the assistance that
was provided by Clara Barton and other notables of the day. All were quick to assist with the emergency conditions following the storm and to aid rebuilding efforts. The Historical Society reports that Mark Twain dedicated the proceeds of a New York speaking engagement to Galveston.

M- 6. USS Arizona Memorial Case Study

Scholarly literature, a review of the memorial website, and an interview with the memorial expert(s) form the basis for the discussion of the USS Arizona Memorial in Pearl Harbor, Hawaii (Table 6).

Table 6. Facts about the USS Arizona Memorial, Honolulu, Hawaii.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of memorial</th>
<th>USS Arizona Memorial</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Location of memorial</td>
<td>Pearl Harbor, Hawaii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Event memorialized</td>
<td>Sinking of USS Arizona</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larger historic event</td>
<td>Attack on Pearl Harbor that triggered entry of the United States in World War II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year of memorialized event</td>
<td>1941</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of individuals lost</td>
<td>1,177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year construction began</td>
<td>1958</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year declared memorial</td>
<td>1962</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approximate number of visitors per year</td>
<td>1,600,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Website</td>
<td><a href="http://www.arizonamemorial.org">www.arizonamemorial.org</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Historical Context. In a span of nine minutes, more than 1,100 U.S. Navy crewmen on the USS Arizona were lost during a sneak attack by the Japanese on Pearl Harbor. As the catalyst of America’s declaration of war and entry into World War II, the attack on Pearl Harbor is remembered through the words of President Franklin Delano Roosevelt, who called December 7, 1941, “A date which will live in infamy” (Pearl Harbor, 2005; “USS Arizona Memorial,” 2008).

Much of the American fleet, including the USS Arizona, was stationed at Pearl Harbor in Honolulu, Hawaii, because of a growing concern over the power being amassed by Japan. It reflected a deteriorating relationship between the United States and Japan that began with the Japanese invasion of Manchuria in 1931 and continued throughout World War II (USS Arizona Memorial, 2005). After the United States entered World War II in 1941, hostilities in the region continued until Victory over Japan Day (also know as V-J Day) on August 15, 1945 (USS Arizona Memorial, 2008).

Memorial Overview. In 1958, President Dwight D. Eisenhower signed Public Law 85-344 authorizing the construction of the USS Arizona Memorial, but without federal funding. Money was donated from all walks of life. Contributions for the memorial came from those who served, as well as from those whose loved ones were lost on the USS Arizona (USS Arizona Memorial, 2005). Legislation stated the memorial was, “to be maintained in honor and commemoration of the members of the Armed Forces of the United States who gave their lives to their country during the attack on Pearl Harbor, Hawaii, on December 7, 1941,” and not just for those who were killed on the USS Arizona (USS Arizona Memorial, 2005, p. 2). Since 1980, the National Park Service has been in charge of the memorial and the visitor center. In 1989, the USS
Arizona became a national historic landmark, the highest level of national historic significance ("Places - The History," 2006).

The USS Arizona Memorial, which is the most visited site in Hawaii, welcomes visitors from around the world, including more than 1.6 million in 2007. Since the opening of the memorial in 1962, more than 40 million visitors have come to experience the “spirit of remembrance, reflection and reconciliation” (Challenges, 2005; “Pearl Harbor, December,” 2005, p. 2). Brochures are written in 23 different languages. In addition, audio programs are available in English, Chinese, and Japanese ("Places - The History," 2006). In 2007, there was a groundbreaking ceremony for the new Pearl Harbor Memorial Museum and Visitor Center.

The memorial is divided into three sections: The entry and assembly room, the central or middle area, and the Shrine Room where the names of all the men who lost their lives on the USS Arizona are engraved on a marble wall. The middle section is an observation area where ceremonies are often held and it is also the area where many visitors drop flower leis into the water (Pearl Harbor: Remembered, n.d.). At the memorial, an interactive kiosk contains a memorial registry. There is a Wall of Valor, where families and friends are able to create and leave a personal tribute, a message to a loved one, past or present, to someone who served or who is serving now in the defense of our country (News and Events, 2005). The Pearl Harbor Memorial Foundation is actively engaged in a national campaign, seeking oral histories from Pearl Harbor survivors to add to the Wall of Valor.
The USS *Arizona* Memorial Museum Association stresses the importance of education and provides numerous research tools for visitors, educators, and students, stating:

> The future of mankind depends on learning the lessons of history. With every tragic event, we learn and grow. But learning can only happen if the lessons of history are not forgotten. So we must memorialize. We must record those lessons. We must share them with others. We must remember. ("Pearl Harbor, December," 2005, p. 1)

The memorial provides educational programs including a “School Visit Program” where students learn about the attack on Pearl Harbor and World War II (Educational Programs, 2005). The memorial also provides “Witness to History,” a distance video teleconferencing learning program, allowing schools to interact with Pearl Harbor survivors (Educational Programs, 2005).

Despite its historical distance, most visitors recognize that they are in a place of sacrifice. Many visitors exhibit grief or quiet reflection. Some visitors leave flowers at the memorial. Japanese visitors have been noted to leave neurogami—thousands of flowers on a string—that mark their respect and sorrow. For survivors of both sides of the war in the Pacific, the USS *Arizona* Memorial is a place of pilgrimage and of resolution for those who fought (personal communication, March 7, 2008).

The website for the memorial provides historic information that is useful for those who visit. The memorial expert reports that the website does not replace the “sense of place” that is strong for those who stand above the waves of Pearl Harbor (personal communication, March 7, 2008).
M-7. National World War II Memorial Case Study

Scholarly literature, a review of the memorial website, and an interview with the memorial expert(s) form the basis for the following discussion of the National World War II Memorial in Washington, D.C. (Table 7).

Table 7. Facts about the National World War II Memorial, Washington, D.C.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of memorial</th>
<th>National World War II Memorial</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Location of memorial</td>
<td>Washington, D.C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Event memorialized</td>
<td>World War II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larger historic event</td>
<td>World War II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year of memorialized event</td>
<td>1941-1945</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of individuals lost</td>
<td>404,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year construction began</td>
<td>2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year declared memorial</td>
<td>2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approximate number of visitors per year</td>
<td>4,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Website</td>
<td><a href="http://www.wwiimemorial.com">www.wwiimemorial.com</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Historical Context: On December 7, 1941, the Japanese bombing of Pearl Harbor brought the United States into World War II, the second global military conflict in the twentieth century. This deadliest of all wars killed more than 60 million people—many of them civilians—worldwide. Troops saw action in Europe, the Pacific, Southeast Asia, China, the Middle East, and Africa. The Allied powers (U.S., the British Empire,
France, and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) reached eventual victory over the Axis powers (German, Italy, and Japan). Victory over Europe Day (also known as V-E Day) was May 7 and 8, 1945. Victory over Japan Day (also know as V-J Day) was August 15, 1945 ("The World War," 2008).

The war years were a difficult time in America, a country still recovering from the impact of the Great Depression (National World War, n.d.). Many American men served in the war, while at home women left the home to work in factories and other jobs that had traditionally been filled by men. Patriotism was high and a spirit of "can do" nationalism was felt not just by the men serving in the war, but also by those who remained on the "home front." World War II led to the founding of the United Nations in 1945, with the goal of stopping future wars (National World War, n.d.).

**Memorial Overview.** It took nearly 60 years for the National World War II Memorial to be built to honor the 16 million Americans who served in the war, the more than 400,000 who died, and those whose service was on the "home front" (Bush, 2004).

The memorial process began in 1987 when World War II veteran, Roger Durbin, with the help of Representative Marcy Kaptur, began the legislative efforts. Despite two failed attempts and several years of delay, on May 12, 1993, the House and Senate agreed on the proposal. On May 26, 1993, President Bill Clinton signed Public Law 103-32 allowing the memorial to be built. More than $197 million dollars was raised from corporations, foundations, and private donors. The federal government contributed $16 million (Funding, 2003).

Construction on the National World War II Memorial began on September 4, 2001, as designed by architect Friedrich St. Florian and was completed on April 29, 2004.
The National World War II Memorial has 56 granite pillars, representing the 48 states, the seven territories and the District of Columbia, each standing 17 feet tall, and arranged in a semicircle around the plaza. There are two 43-foot arches, one inscribed with the word “Atlantic” and the other with the word, “Pacific.” There is a large Reflecting Pool as well as smaller pools, over seven acres of landscaped gardens and a Freedom Wall that has 4,048 gold stars which are reflected in the pool (“Washington State World,” n.d.). The National World War II Memorial commemorates, “the legacy of the American Revolution and the American Civil War with great crusade to rid the world of fascism” (“World War II,” n.d.).

On April 29, 2004, the National World War II Memorial was opened to the public and on May 29, 2004, President George W. Bush dedicated the memorial to an estimated crowd of more than 140,000, saying:

The scenes of the concentration camps, the heaps of bodies and the hostly survivors confirmed forever America’s calling to oppose the ideologies of death. As we defended our ideals, we began to see that America is stronger when those ideals are fully implemented. (Leonard, 2004, p. A1)

Broadcaster and author Tom Brokaw added, “It has taken too long to erect this monument to symbolize the gratitude of our nation now and forevermore to those who answered the call at home and abroad in the greatest war the world has ever known” (Leonard, 2004, p. A1).

The memorial attracts more than 4 million visitors each year, with larger crowds on those dates most commonly associated with the war: Veterans Day, Memorial Day, and Pearl Harbor Day. As other memorial experts have suggested, for many who visit
this is a pilgrimage to memory. Many come in family groups, on what may be the last family vacation with the generation who fought. The veterans, in particular, mention that it is nice to see their service honored, especially in paying tribute to those who gave their lives for freedom. Because the memorial also honors those who served on the "home front," the sense of contribution is shared by most visitors who have memories of the war. Some of these visitors lay wreaths in different locations around the memorial or float a flower on the reflecting pool. The individual artifacts that are described in the section about the Vietnam Veterans Memorial are not left at this memorial, perhaps because of the generational difference in those who visit (personal communication, March 7, 2008). The lack of personal artifacts at the National World War II Memorial may illustrate the difference between the two groups of veterans, perhaps a generational difference, with the World War II veterans and survivors having a greater sense of formality and reverence about the dead and thus, they generally feel flowers to be an appropriate tribute, but not a pair of combat boots.

The National World War II Memorial has an extensive website. The memorial expert suggested it encourages people to visit the memorial in person, but can be used before and after the visit to deepen the connection with those who served. The website includes a World War II registry of those who served—in any capacity—whether overseas or on the home front. The registry may also be accessed through computers which are available at the memorial in Washington, D.C.
M-8. United States Marine Corps War Memorial/Iwo Jima Memorial Case Study

Scholarly literature, a review of the memorial website, and an interview with the memorial expert(s) form the basis for the discussion of the United States Marine Corps War Memorial/Iwo Jima Memorial at Arlington National Cemetery in Arlington, Virginia (Table 8).

Table 8. Facts about the United States Marine Corps War Memorial/Iwo Jima Memorial, Arlington National Cemetery, Rosslyn, Virginia.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of memorial</th>
<th>United States Marine Corps War Memorial/Iwo Jima Memorial</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Location of memorial</td>
<td>Rosslyn, Virginia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Event memorialized</td>
<td>The Battle of Iwo Jima</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larger historic event</td>
<td>World War II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year of memorialized event</td>
<td>1945</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of individuals lost</td>
<td>6,825</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year construction began</td>
<td>1951</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year declared memorial</td>
<td>1954</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approximate number of visitors per year</td>
<td>1,500,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Website | http://www.iwojima.com  
http://www.nps.gov |
Historical Context. Iwo Jima is an island 660 miles south of Tokyo, with Mount Suribachi on the southern tip of the island, a volcanic cone rising 550-feet at its highest peak. Due to the location of the airfield, it gave Japanese gunners a strategic advantage. On February 19, 1945, the United States Marine Corps sent 110,000 Marines in 880 ships to Iwo Jima, a larger Marine force than to any other battle in the Pacific ("U.S.M.C. War," n.d.). The objective was to take control of the island in order to have a location to service planes and a base to reach the Japanese mainland (The Land Battle, 2005).

As the bloodiest battle of World War II, Iwo Jima took the lives of 6,800 Americans. More Marines received the Medal of Honor on Iwo Jima than in any other battle (Iwo Jima, 2008). A photograph taken by Joe Rosenthal of Marines raising the American flag atop Mt. Suribachi won a Pulitzer Prize for photography and would become the model for the United States Marine Corps War Memorial ("United States Marine," 2008).

Memorial Overview. Working from Rosenthal’s photograph, sculptor Felix W. de Weldon, who served in the U.S. Navy, created a scale model and later a life-size model. On November 10, 1954, the 179th anniversary of the United States Marine Corps, President Dwight D. Eisenhower dedicated the memorial ("Iwo Jima Memorial," 2008).

 Erected near Arlington National Cemetery, the memorial has six 32-foot tall figures, five Marines and one Sailor, raising a 60-foot bronze flagpole from which a cloth flag flies 24 hours a day. This was in accordance with a Presidential [John F. Kennedy] proclamation of June 12, 1961 (The Flag Raisers, 2007, p. 2). The base of the memorial is inscribed with, “In honor and in memory of the men of the United States Marine Corps who have given their lives to their country since November 10, 1775” ("Iwo Jima
Memorial,” 2008, p. 2). Another inscription on the memorial is a tribute to the men who fought for Iwo Jima and the inscribed words are, “Uncommon Valor was a Common Virtue” (Statues, 2007, p. 2). The names and dates of every major engagement involving the Marine Corps are also on the base of the monument.

Nearly 1.5 million visitors come to the memorial each year, especially during Washington’s springtime Cherry Blossom Festival. The memorial expert (personal communication, March 5, 2008) reports that patriotism, rather than sorrow, seems to be the prevailing mood of visitors. While some visitors leave artifacts, notably flowers, signs, and jewelry, more are seen to touch the writing on the memorial and to take photographs. The memorial expert (personal communication, March 5, 2008) remarked that the website was not as interactive and exciting as a visit to the memorial, but that visitors to both the website and the memorial, receive a consistent message about the memorial and its place in history.

M-9. Korean War Veterans Memorial Case Study

Scholarly literature, a review of the memorial website, and an interview with the memorial expert(s) form the basis for the following description of the Korean War Veterans Memorial on the National Mall in Washington, D.C. (Table 9).

Historical Context. The Korean War lasted from 1950 to 1953 and is often called “The Forgotten War.” Many Americans are unaware that it was a war where the United States defended “a country they never knew and a people they never met” (“Korean War Veterans,” 2002, p. 1). Instead they know about the war through the poignancy and humor found in the movie and television series of M*A*S*H (“Women Were There,” 2006).
The reality was far different. Calling it a “police action” or the “Korean Conflict” in order to avoid the necessity of a declaring war by the U.S. Congress, President Harry S. Truman sent troops to help the South Koreans fight the Communist incursion that was above the 38th Parallel (“A Jump Back,” 2002; “Local History, Places,” 2001).

The United Nations joined the effort and before the conflict was over 22 countries had sent troops or provided aid to South Korea. After three years of brutal fighting through bitterly cold winters and oppressively hot summers, on July 27, 1953, “At Panmunjom, the military commanders of the North Korean Army, the Chinese People’s Volunteers, and the United Nations Command signed an armistice agreement” (The Korean War, 2008). The United States and South Korea, however, did not sign the treaty.

Although women have served in the U.S. Army since 1775, the Women’s Armed Services Act of 1948 allowed women to serve in the armed forces in peacetime. Although the numbers for enlistment were low when U.S. troops were sent to Korea, more than 120,000 women and over 1,000 nurses were stationed throughout Korea, Japan, and other Asian countries. Although M*A*S*H became a syndicated television show in the 1970s depicting women in the armed forces, the real M*A*S*H began with the nurses in Korea at the Mobile Army Surgical Hospitals (“Women in the,” 1996).
Table 9. Facts about the Korean War Veterans Memorial, Washington, D.C.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of memorial</th>
<th>Korean War Veterans Memorial</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Location of memorial</td>
<td>Washington, D.C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Event memorialized</td>
<td>Korean War</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larger historic event</td>
<td>Korean War</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year of memorialized event</td>
<td>1950 - 1953</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of individuals lost</td>
<td>54,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year construction began</td>
<td>1992</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year declared memorial</td>
<td>1995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approximate number of visitors per year</td>
<td>3,400,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Website</td>
<td><a href="http://www.nps.gov/kwvm/home.htm">www.nps.gov/kwvm/home.htm</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Memorial Overview. In 1986, Congress authorized legislation to build a memorial for the veterans of the Korean War on the National Mall in Washington, D.C. On July 27, 1995, President Bill Clinton and South Korean President Kim Young Sam dedicated the memorial, designed by Frank Gaylord ("Korean War Veterans," 2007) to "honor members of the United States Armed Forces who served in the Korean War, particularly those who were killed in action, and still missing inaction, or were held as prisoners of war" ("Korean War Veterans," 2007, p. 1).

An array of 19 stainless steel sculptures of soldiers stand at the memorial representing the military branches that served: 14 Army, 3 Marines, 1 Navy, and 1 Air Force, as well as the diversity of the U.S. military with, "14 Caucasians, 3 African
Americans, 2 Hispanics, 1 Oriental, and 1 Native American soldier” (Faces of War, 2002; “Korean War Veterans,” 2007, p. 1). The memorial design originally contained 38 statues, to symbolize the 38th parallel. Space constraints at the memorial site reduced the number to half of that, 19. The statues and their reflections on the wall are together able to reach the symbolic 38 (The Korean War, 2008).

In addition to the sculptures, the wall has 2,400 etched images which are drawn from the faces and actions of the soldiers, sailors, marines, and airmen who fought in the war. An Honor Roll lists the 22 countries in the United Nations that supported South Korea (Korean War Veterans, 2008). Near the “Freedom Is Not Free” inscription, the Pool of Remembrance invites reflection and contemplation (Freedom is Not Free, 2002; “The Memorial,” 2002, p. 1; “Korean War Veterans,” 1999).

The memorial expert (personal communication, March 7, 2008) estimates there are 3.4 million visitors every year to see the Korean War Veterans Memorial, with the highest visitation on Veterans Day, Memorial Day, and various anniversaries of remembrance. Many visitors report a feeling of “awe” related to the dramatic architecture of the memorial. The expert at the Korean War Veterans Memorial contrasts that memorial to the Vietnam Veteran’s Memorial, saying, “Vietnam is for healing, Korea is for reflection and contemplation” (personal communication, March 7, 2008).

A kiosk at the memorial provides a database where visitors may look at the names of all who were killed in Korea. While the visitors use this resource, few leave artifacts behind, although wreaths are sometimes left at the Reflecting Pool. The same database is available through the memorial’s website. Although it cannot capture the scale and dimension of the memorial, especially the striking and dramatic view at night, the
website helps prepare visitors and provides a sense of history for those who cannot visit (personal communication, March 7, 2008).

M-10. Martin Luther King, Jr. National Historic Site Case Study

Scholarly literature, a review of the memorial website, and an interview with the memorial expert(s) form the basis for the discussion of the Martin Luther King, Jr. National Historic Site in Atlanta, Georgia (Table 10).

Table 10. Facts about the Martin Luther King, Jr. National Historic Site, Atlanta, Georgia.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of memorial</th>
<th>Martin Luther King, Jr. National Historic Site</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Location of memorial</td>
<td>Atlanta, Georgia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Event memorialized</td>
<td>Martin Luther King, Jr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larger historic event</td>
<td>Assassination of Martin Luther King, Jr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year of memorialized event</td>
<td>April 4, 1968</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of individuals lost</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year construction began</td>
<td>1968</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year declared memorial</td>
<td>1980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approximate number of visitors per year</td>
<td>650,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Website</td>
<td><a href="http://www.nps.gov/malu/">www.nps.gov/malu/</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

King was born on January 15, 1929, to Reverend and Mrs. Martin Luther King, Sr., at the home that is now a National Historic Site. With a strongly religious childhood and an education in segregated public schools, King would go on to receive his B.A. from Morehouse College in 1948 at the age of 19. King earned another two degrees before the age of 27, as well as a B.D. degree from Crozer Theological Seminary and a Ph.D. from Boston University in systematic theology. His first congregation in 1953 was the Dexter Avenue Baptist Church in Montgomery, Alabama ("Why We Honor," n.d.).

When Rosa Parks refused to abandon her seat on a bus on December 1, 1955, King led the boycott of Montgomery’s segregated buses for more than a year. Later when the Supreme Court outlawed discrimination on public transportation, King emerged as the leader of the civil rights movement (Capture the Dream, n.d.). King’s Southern Christian Leadership Conference and his personal belief in nonviolent resistance made his name a household word as he led marches in Birmingham, Selma, and elsewhere across the nation. It elevated civil rights to a prominent spot in American politics in the 1960s and prompted the passage of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and the Voting Rights Act of 1965. In 1964, at the age of 35, King became the youngest ever recipient of the Nobel Peace Prize (The King Center, 2004).
During the most critical years of the American Civil Rights Movement, King advocated moderation and inclusion. He was silenced in 1968, in Memphis, Tennessee, assassinated at age 39 by James Earl Ray ("Martin Luther King," 2008).

**Memorial Overview.** The Martin Luther King, Jr. National Historic Site includes the King family home, the Ebenezer Baptist Church where King and his father preached, and his tomb ("Martin Luther King," 2008). King’s birthday is an annual national holiday, celebrated on the third Monday in January and is the first to honor an African American ("Why We Honor," n.d.). The King Center was founded by Dr. King’s family and friends. In 1980, by an act of Congress, the Martin Luther King, Jr. National Historic Site was established:

... to protect and interpret for the benefit, inspiration, and education of present and future generations the places where Martin Luther King, Jr., was born, where he lived, worked, and worshiped, and where he is buried. 

... is maintained by the National Park Service, but owns the Birth Home of Dr. King. ("Martin Luther King," 2008, p. 1)

The King Center offers a variety of programs and services, building on Dr. King’s belief in a “Beloved Community,” including: The Beloved Community Network, the Nonviolence or Nonexistence Online Learning Program; the Re-Ignite the Dream Campaign: Building the Beloved Community through Service; the King and the Modern Civil Rights Museum Scholar and Historian Research Programs; the King Papers Project; the Education through Exploration Visitor Services Program; and the Annual Martin Luther King, Jr. Holiday Service Summit (The King Center, 2004, p. 1).
Nearly 600,000 visitors come to the memorial each year, with the highest visitation occurring on King’s birthday, during Black History Month in February, and during August, when many family vacations include a pilgrimage to King’s home. The King Memorial, while serving that role, was never intended to be a memorial; rather it was the home and church of a man whose rise to greatness has led us to treat these sites with reverence. This difference has a profound influence on visitors, many of whom sit in the church, concentrate on sermons, and are moved to tears by the experience of being in a place that has such great meaning to African Americans. Visitors are encouraged to fill out personal note cards and leave them after a visit, but more take pictures in front of the house, the grave, and the pulpit (personal communication, March 6, 2008).

Education is an important part of the King Center’s mission, seeking to ensure young people are aware of the changes in America that have resulted from King’s work and that of others who made—and continue to make—sacrifices for the Civil Rights Movement. Despite this emphasis, the website lacks the impact of a visit to the park and is more often used to help plan a visit rather than provide comprehensive information on King and the events that touched his life (personal communication, March 6, 2008).

Currently, there is an active fundraising campaign for the Martin Luther King, Jr. Memorial to be built—at the cost of $100 million—on the National Mall in Washington, D.C. (Cooper, n.d.; Neary, 2007).

M-11. Vietnam Veterans Memorial Case Study

Scholarly literature, a review of the memorial website, and an interview with the memorial expert(s) form the basis of this discussion of the Vietnam Veterans Memorial on the National Mall in Washington, D.C. (Table 11).
Historical Context. This was a war that, "more than any U.S. War since the Civil War, Vietnam divided America and made us reevaluate our society" (Romo, Zastrow & Miller, 1997, p. 1). Like Korea, Vietnam was a war that was never declared by the U.S. Congress. American involvement in Vietnam began with a trickle of military advisors shortly after the struggle between North Vietnam and South Vietnam commenced in 1959. When President John F. Kennedy took office, there were 800 military advisors and, by November 1963, more than 16,000 American military advisors were on the ground in Vietnam. President Lyndon B. Johnson increased the number to 27,000 by mid-1964. In 1965, U.S. combat troops were sent to support the South
Vietnamese government with a full-scale military action, and by year's end, 80,000 U.S. troops were stationed in Vietnam (Caputo, 2005; Davidson, 1991; Karnov, 1997; "Transcript of President's," 1970, p. 1).

Fighting an unpopular war, the American military presence continued to escalate. Public opinion of the war was tainted not only by the body bags seen on the evening news, but also by disturbing reports of My Lai. In 1968, U.S. soldiers massacred a hamlet of 500 unarmed women and children, an act that would culminate in a guilty verdict for First Lieutenant William L. Calley (Caputo, 2005; Davidson, 1991; Karnov, 1997).

The horrors of Vietnam changed the political climate in the United States allowing Richard Nixon, promising to end the war, to win election over Hubert Humphrey in 1968. With President Nixon at the helm, troop numbers rose to more than 500,000 in Southeast Asia. At home, as Nixon was becoming embroiled in the negative publicity surrounding the Watergate burglary, Dr. Henry Kissinger was crafting the Paris Peace Accord—an action for which Kissinger and Le Duc Tho would win the Nobel Peace Prize. On January 27, 1973, the Treaty of Paris officially ended the conflict. On March 29, 1973, the last American troops left South Vietnam; however, seven-thousand U.S. Department of State employees remained (Caputo, 2005; Davidson, 1991; Karnov, 1997).

Vietnam was swept from public view by Roe v. Wade, the Watergate hearings, a global energy crisis, and the October 1973 resignation of Vice President Spiro T. Agnew. Less than a year remained for Nixon, who resigned in disgrace as president on August 9,

As President Gerald R. Ford settled into the Oval Office, Southeast Asia continued in conflict. In February 1975, Pol Pot and the Khmer Rouge took over Cambodia. Saigon, the capital of South Vietnam, fell to the North on April 30, 1975. More than the troop withdrawals in 1975, the chaotic evacuations of South Vietnamese from the American Embassy became symbols of failed policy in Southeast Asia. In those last two days of the Republic of Vietnam, the sound of American helicopters were again heard, this time as more than 600 U.S. military flights airlifted civilians from the capital. Others who had supported either the United States or the South Vietnamese were forced to flee on fishing boats and trawlers, adding the term “boat people” to the American vocabulary (Caputo, 2005; Davidson, 1991).

**Memorial Overview.** Throughout the war in Vietnam, veterans had returned home to a country in turmoil. Too often, these veterans were faced with people who did not differentiate between their bitterness over the war and the role of veterans. Vietnam veterans were not welcomed home with parades and celebration. They were blamed for their part in a war no one wanted (Caputo, 2005; Davidson, 1991).

Jan Scruggs, a Vietnam veteran, studied counseling on his return to the United States. During his graduate studies, Scruggs developed the concept of a Vietnam Veterans Memorial to honor the veterans. In 1979, Scruggs was joined by several other veterans and they began to build support and raise funds for a memorial ("Who formed the," n.d.).
On July 1, 1980, President Jimmy Carter signed into legislation Public Law 96-297, allowing the building of a memorial near the Lincoln Memorial on the Washington National Mall and Memorial Parks. A national design competition was then launched to create a memorial design that would include four essential criteria:

1. Be reflective and contemplative in character;
2. Harmonize with its surroundings;
3. Contain the names of those who had died in the conflict or who were still missing;

Maya Lin, an undergraduate student at Yale University, won the competition. Her design was simplistic, subtle, and yet very strong in its message. The highly polished granite lists, in chronological order beginning on July 8, 1959, contains the names of the individuals who were killed, were missing in action (MIA), or were prisoners of war (POW) (Lin, 2000b; Vietnam Veterans Memorial, n.d.). Lin describes her own design, saying, "These names, seemingly infinite in number, convey the sense of overwhelming numbers, while unifying these individuals into a whole" (Vietnam Veterans Memorial, n.d., p. 1).

The Memorial is inscribed with the words:

In Honor of the Men and Women of the Armed Forces of the United States who Served in the Vietnam War. The names of those who gave their lives and of those who remain missing are inscribed in the order they were taken from us. ("Who formed the," n.d., p. 5)
Symbols on the wall help to identify the status of the person listed. A diamond marks the names of those who were killed, and whose bodies were recovered; a plus sign indicates names of those missing in action or who were killed and their bodies were not recovered. If a body is later found and identified the plus sign is changed to the diamond sign. It was determined that a circle would be carved if any survivor was found alive. To date, there are no circles ("Who Formed the," n.d.), but names continue to be placed on "The Wall" as a result of deaths from combat-related injuries.

Often the Vietnam Veterans Memorial is referred to as "The Wall" and it is "one of the most visited memorials in the country" ("The Wall that," n.d.). For visitors, "The Wall" is often an emotional experience. This is a memorial that represents death, hope, and resurrection, a wall that divides while uniting ("The Wall," n.d.).

Perhaps because of the divisiveness of Vietnam, some extraordinary educational programs have been developed. "Echoes from the Wall" is a curriculum-based program sent free to middle and high school aged students. Since 2002, the "Teach Vietnam Teachers Network" has helped educate students in middle and high school about the war and its impact on society (Teach Vietnam, n.d.). At the Library of Congress, the Veterans History Project works to collect "oral history interviews, memoirs, letters, diaries, photographs, and other original materials from veterans of World War I, and World War II, and the Korean, Vietnam, and Persian Gulf Wars and the Afghanistan and Iraq conflicts (2001-present)" (Library of Congress, n.d.; Teach Vietnam, n.d., p. 1).

Because of the questions that many visitors have about the war and about the memorial, there are plans to build a Vietnam Veterans Center near "The Wall." Such a center will help visitors understand the historic context of the war. Beyond the facts of
the war and the homecoming of the veterans, it is important that visitors remember the
protests on college campuses, the military draft and its impact on working class
communities, plus the anger and the disillusionment that arose not just from the war,
but from the events of the day (personal communication, February 26, 2008).

Last year nearly 4 million visitors came to “The Wall.” Many sought the name of
a family member or friend. Others came to experience healing. For some, as is the case
with visitors at many of the memorials, a visit to the Vietnam Veterans Memorial is a
pilgrimage of hope, remembrance, and sorrow. For some, the experience has been
overwhelming and visitors have committed suicide at “The Wall.” More frequently, they
leave mementos, what the memorial expert described as “the most obvious sign of private
grieving” (personal communication, February 26, 2008). More mementos such as
medals, unit patches, army boots, letters, and photographs are left at “The Wall” than at
any other memorial. Many take away rubbings of names. For those who remember the
Vietnam War, “The Wall” is their physical tie to the war. Its surface reflects a black time
in American history, a time of jungles, guns, and fallen soldiers (personal
communication, February 26, 2008).

The website about the Vietnam Veterans Memorial, which is provided by the
National Park Service, contains a brief historic overview and other information for
visitors. Many of those who served in Vietnam were the first generation of veterans for
whom the computer was an integral part of life. More survivors of the Vietnam War than
any other war use the Internet—and now the World Wide Web—to stay connected to
each other (personal communication, February 26, 2008). The influence of the Internet
on this group is so significant that on November 10, 1996, Vice-President Al Gore
dedicated a Virtual Wall to allow visitors from all over the world to see and experience the Vietnam Veterans Memorial. It is a commemorative website for those who wish to leave messages, photographs, or remembrances (The Virtual Wall, n.d.).

According to the memorial expert, this Virtual Wall Memorial and the Vietnam Veterans Memorial on the National Mall have changed the national concepts of memorialization (personal communication, February 26, 2008).

M-12. National Fallen Firefighters Memorial Case Study

Scholarly literature, a review of the memorial website, and an interview with the memorial expert(s) form the basis for the following discussion of the National Fallen Firefighters Memorial on the campus of the National Fire Academy in Emmitsburg, Maryland (Table 12).

Historic Context. Since humans began to build structures, they have depended on firefighters. In ancient Egypt, hand-operated pumps were used to fight fires. In Rome, although Nero may have been fiddling as the city burned, there were doubtless others who saved lives and saved property by fighting the fires. In the United States, firefighting formally began in 1648, when New Amsterdam governor, Peter Stuyvesant, had four men inspect chimneys and another eight volunteers patrol the night streets for fires (Hashagan, 1997). Since that time, the number of firefighters who have perished in “Line-of-Duty-Deaths” is not known. However, the National Fallen Firefighters Memorial includes the names of more than 3,147 firefighters who have died in the line of duty since 1981, incorporating the 343 who were killed at the World Trade Center attack on September 11, 2001—the largest single loss of firefighters in any disaster (“National Fallen Firefighters” 2008).
Table 12. Facts about the National Fallen Firefighters Memorial, Emmitsburg, Maryland

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of memorial</th>
<th>National Fallen Firefighters Memorial</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Location of memorial</td>
<td>Emmitsburg, Maryland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Event memorialized</td>
<td>Death of a firefighter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larger historic event</td>
<td>1981</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year of memorialized event</td>
<td>Established in 1981</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of individuals lost</td>
<td>3,147 who died in the line of duty as of March 5, 2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year construction began</td>
<td>1981</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year declared memorial</td>
<td>1981</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approximate number of visitors per year</td>
<td>30,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Website</td>
<td><a href="http://www.firehero.org">www.firehero.org</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Memorial Overview.** The National Fallen Firefighters Memorial, located on the campus of the National Fire Academy in Emmitsburg, Maryland, was designated by Congress on October 13, 1990, as the first permanent national park to honor career and volunteer firefighters. It stands as a “symbol of honor for those who carry on the tradition of service to their communities” (Firefighters Memorial, 2008, p. 1). In October 2007, President George W. Bush visited the National Fallen Firefighters Memorial and praised the commitment of firefighters, stating:

You know, it takes a special kind of person to be a firefighter. It begins with a different sense of direction. When an area becomes too dangerous
for everybody else, you take it over. When others are looking for the
exits, our firefighters are looking for the way in. When the frightened
occupants of a burning building are rushing down the stairwell, our
firefighters are going the opposite direction – up the stairs, and toward the
flames. ("President Bush Visits," 2007, p. 2)

The Memorial is a sculptured bronze Maltese cross that rests atop a 7-foot stone
cairn. An eternal flame, at the base of the cairn, represents the “spirit of the firefighter—
past, present, and future” ("National Fallen Firefighters," 2003, p. 1). As previously
mentioned, there are 3,147 name plaques listing the firefighters who have died in the line
of duty since 1981.

Whenever a firefighter dies in the line of duty, the memorial flags are flown at
half-staff until the firefighter’s local funeral has taken place, which is approximately four
days later ("National Fallen Firefighters," 2003). The brick “Walk of Honor” winds
through the park linking the national monument to the historic Fallen Firefighters

In addition to the central memorial, there is a monument dedicated to those lost on
September 11, 2001. The bronze monument stands 40 feet tall and is called, “To Lift a
Nation,” depicting three firefighters raising the American flag at Ground Zero. The
sculptor, Stan Watts, states, “It honors a moment in the history of our country and
reminds us of the bravery and sacrifice made by our firefighters and by thousands of
citizens, from all walks of life, who selflessly serve humankind in times of need”
("9/11 Memorial," 2003). A new memorial is planned for the firefighters who fall
battling wildfires.
The National Fallen Firefighters Foundation has programs dedicated to honoring the memories of the fire fighting heroes and provides information and assistance to the families and co-workers of fallen firefighters. Scholarships, grief counseling, general information, commemorative programs, and newsletters are available to survivors (National Fallen Firefighters, 2003). Nearly 30,000 visitors come to the campus each year to visit the memorial, often in the summer, and again in October during Fire Prevention Week (personal communication, March 5, 2008).

The National Fallen Firefighters Memorial stands apart from other memorials, with its dedication to heroes whose lives were given in an attempt to save people, property, and the environment. Many who visit this memorial are survivors, or loved ones of those lost, so both public and private grieving is often evident on their faces. Some leave flowers; others bring photographs and letters to the fallen. The memorial supplies crayons and paper for visitors to make “rubbings” of individual names (personal communication, March 5, 2008). Many who visit the memorial do so in the course of training at the National Fire Academy in Emmitsburg, Maryland. Last year, more than 800,000 virtual visitors connected to the website supported by the National Fallen Firefighters Foundation, which provides significantly more information than is available at the memorial.

M-13. Space Shuttle Challenger Memorial Case Study

Scholarly literature, a review of the memorial website, and an interview with the memorial expert(s) form the basis for the following discussion of the Space Shuttle Challenger Memorial in Washington, D.C. (Table 13).
Table 13. Facts about the Space Shuttle Challenger Memorial, Arlington, Virginia.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of memorial</th>
<th>Space Shuttle Challenger Memorial</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Location of memorial</td>
<td>Arlington, Virginia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Event memorialized</td>
<td>Space Shuttle Challenger Disaster</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larger historic event</td>
<td>NASA Space Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year of memorialized event</td>
<td>1986</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of individuals lost</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year construction began</td>
<td>1991</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year declared memorial</td>
<td>1991</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approximate number of</td>
<td>n/a (4,500,000 to Arlington Cemetery)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>visitors per year</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Website</td>
<td><a href="http://www.spaceshuttlememorial.com">http://www.spaceshuttlememorial.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><a href="http://www.arlingtoncemetery.org">http://www.arlingtoncemetery.org</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Historical Context.** In 1957, The Soviet Union launched the first satellite to orbit the earth. *Sputnik I* ignited the “space race” within the larger context of the Cold War. The following year President Dwight Eisenhower signed Public Law 85-568, creating the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA).

By 1961, President John F. Kennedy proposed, “this nation should commit itself to achieving the goal, before this decade is out, of landing a man on the Moon and returning him safely to the Earth” (Kennedy Space Center, 2003, p. 1). On February 20, 1962, John Glenn was the first American to orbit the globe. In 1969, Neil Armstrong
“one small step for [a] Man, one giant leap for mankind” as he walked on the moon (Kennedy History, 2008, p. 1). While Kennedy’s vision had come to fruition, it was not without fatalities. In 1967, astronauts Gus Grissom, Ed White, and Roger Chaffee died in their command module making pre-flight tests on the launch pad (Kennedy History, 2008).

For nearly 20 years, the United States explored space without incident. Then, on January 28, 1986, the worst accident in the history of the American space program occurred. The Space Shuttle Challenger exploded 74 seconds after liftoff, killing six crewmembers and a high school teacher. With thousands watching from the launch site at Cape Kennedy, Florida, and millions watching on television, the Challenger exploded into a ball of fire 10 miles from earth. Francis R. Scobee, Michael J. Smith, Ronald E. McNair, Ellison S. Onizuka, Judith A. Resnik, Gregory B. Jarvis, and civilian schoolteacher, Sharon Christa McAuliffe, perished on the twenty-fifth shuttle flight.

Identified remains were given to the families for proper burials of those who died. Commander Francis R. “Dick” Scobee, pilot Michael J. Smith, and the unidentified remains of the remainder of the crew, were buried in Arlington National Cemetery (Visitor Information/Arlington, n.d.).

**Memorial Overview.** The remains of 16 astronauts are buried at Arlington National Cemetery, including seven from the Space Shuttle Challenger. The unidentified remains from the Space Shuttle Challenger were buried under the Space Shuttle Challenger Memorial, a stone which includes face portraits of the seven Challenger astronauts. Engraved on the stone are the words, “In Grateful and Loving Tribute to the

An additional memorial to the *Challenger* astronauts is located at Kennedy Space Center, Cape Kennedy, Florida. In 1991, President George W. Bush dedicated the Space Mirror Memorial that honors all 24 U.S. astronauts who have lost their lives in the space program (Kennedy Space Center, 2008).

The two memorials differ in many ways. At Arlington National Cemetery, visitors interested in the *Challenger* may request information at the Visitor’s Center, where brochures and guidebooks are designed to help visitors find graves of interest (Arlington National Cemetery, n.d.). In contrast, at NASA Kennedy Center in Florida, formal educational programs about space and space exploration are presented at the memorial and at the U.S. Astronaut Hall of Fame. They address curriculum requirements set forth by the Sunshine State Standards and benchmarks for different grade levels and provide materials on site and by request to Florida educators (Kennedy Space Center, 2008).

More than 4.5 million visitors come to Arlington National Cemetery each year, some to attend funerals and others to honor the dead who have been interred at the cemetery since the Civil War (personal communication, February 27, 2008). At most of the memorials and monuments in Arlington National Cemetery, the dead are recognized by name. The seven portraits on the *Challenger* memorial serve to personalize the loss. The leaving of artifacts has diminished in the years since the *Challenger* disaster. Each season brings fewer flowers, crew patches, coins, and lapel pins. There was an increase in both visits and artifacts left at the time of the Space Shuttle *Columbia* disaster in 2003,
but today much of the raw emotion seen at the memorial has been replaced by a somber awareness (personal communication, February 27, 2008).

The Arlington National Cemetery website is visited by three distinct groups: Students doing research; visitors planning a tour of the cemetery, and those whose trip to Arlington is to attend a funeral. The site is valuable for all three groups, and the virtual memorials at the website can provide a view of the memorials and the cemetery for those who cannot visit.

M-14. Oklahoma City National Memorial and Museum Case Study

Scholarly literature, a review of the memorial website, and an interview with the memorial expert(s) form the basis for the following discussion of the Oklahoma City National Memorial and Museum in Oklahoma City, Oklahoma (Table 14).

Historical Context. On April 19, 1995 at 9:02 a.m., America was forever changed. A terrorist bombed the Oklahoma City Alfred P. Murrah Federal Office Building, killing 168 people, including 19 children at a daycare center in the building. More than 700 were injured, including many of the rescuers (“Behind the Scene,” 2007; Oklahoma City National,” 2007).

Timothy McVeigh, a member of the radical right-wing militia movement, former soldier, and American citizen set off 4,800 pounds of ammonium nitrate from a truck parked outside the building. The explosion collapsed the nine-story building and created a 30-foot crater (“Oklahoma City National,” 2007). Within minutes firefighters, on and off duty, were called to action; police, paramedics, and even the survivors responded to the need for assistance and rescue that lasted for 16 days. On May 4, 1995, rescue and recovery efforts were halted (“Oklahoma City National,” 2007).
Table 14. Facts on the Oklahoma City National Memorial and Museum, Oklahoma City, Oklahoma.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of memorial</th>
<th>Oklahoma City National Memorial and Museum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Location of memorial</td>
<td>Oklahoma City, Oklahoma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Event memorialized</td>
<td>Terrorist Bombing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larger historic event</td>
<td>Terrorism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year of memorialized event</td>
<td>1995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of individuals lost</td>
<td>168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year construction began</td>
<td>1998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year declared memorial</td>
<td>2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approximate number of visitors per year</td>
<td>300,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Website</td>
<td><a href="http://www.oklahomacitynationalmemorial.org">www.oklahomacitynationalmemorial.org</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Memorial Overview.** Little more than a year after the bombing, in September 1996, the Oklahoma City National Memorial Foundation formed a private funding Task Force and began to solicit for designs to build the memorial. In July 1997, designers Hans and Torrey Butzer and Aven Berg from Germany were chosen to build the memorial ("A Decade of," 2005).

To fund the memorial, President William J. Clinton signed Public Law 105-58, designating Oklahoma City National Memorial to own and operate the memorial as a unit of the National Park System ("The Making of," 2006). By signing the law, $5 million in
federal funds was matched by another $5 million from the State of Oklahoma. Another $20 million was raised through private donations, including the “168 Pennies Campaign” that asked school children to collect and contribute one penny for each victim (“Oklahoma City National,” 2007, p. 20).

On April 19, 2000, five years after the bombing, President Clinton took part in the memorial dedication ceremonies (“Oklahoma City National,” 2007). The Outdoor Symbolic Memorial, open and available to the public 24 hours a day, is erected on a 3.3-acre site. It includes “168 glass based chairs, Gates of Time, a 318-foot Reflecting Pool, Survivor Chapel, Rescuers’ Orchard, Children’s Area and the Survivor Tree” (“The Making of,” 2006, p. 4). The Survivor Tree withstood the impact of the bombing and has become a symbol affirming that, “the spirit of this city and this nation will not be defeated; our deeply rooted faith sustains us” (Survivor Tree, n.d., p. 1). The Memorial is an interactive learning museum, a narrative telling the story of “those who were killed, those who survived and those changed forever” (“The Making of,” 2006, p. 4).

As a visitor enters the museum, the Oklahoma City Mission Statement is carved into the granite and reads:

We come here to remember those who were killed, those who survived and those changed forever. May all who leave here know the impact of violence. May this memorial offer comfort, strength, peace, hope and serenity. (“Oklahoma City National,” 2007, p. 1)

The Memorial Museum allows visitors to listen to the sounds of the disaster, see photographs of the 168 who were killed, and use interactive computer screens to learn more about each victim (“Oklahoma City National,” 2007; Visitor Guide, n.d.).
An important building block for healing is the “Project Hope Bears,” that provides plush teddy bears to children throughout the United States that are victims of violence. In addition, and to spread the feeling of hope, there is an “I Am Hope” project that delivers donated toys to children who are victims of political terror (Education & Programs, 2006).

The memorial expert reports that 300,000 people visit the memorial each year. More than 100,000 pay admission in order to enter the museum. To ensure that visitors feel safe and are able to visit at any hour, full-time security is in place on the memorial grounds. To date, the memorial has recorded visitors from every state and 35 countries. While there is a diversity of visitors, they are joined by a single question, “How could an American do this?” (personal communication, February 21, 2008).

Despite the 300,000 visitors per year, many local residents have not visited the memorial. It is still too emotional for them. There is a wide range of emotion exhibited by visitors, where some seem shattered, and even unable to stand. Some visitors seem to relive the experiences as they begin to cry and withdraw from others. The museum includes a “Gallery of Honor” that moves many to tears. Families have been allowed to select personal items to include in acrylic boxes beneath the picture of each victim (personal communication, February 21, 2008).

In addition to this formal collection of artifacts, visitors leave other tokens at the memorial. License plates, toys, jewelry, a stroller, flags, and even shoes have been left on the chairs or at the fence. Some of the first responders have left their jackets at the memorial fence. Toys are collected and given to other children who are victims of violence. Because so many visitors wanted to leave messages, a chalkboard was placed
so that visitors can write about their feelings. In the children’s area of the museum, virtual “paint brushes” are available for children who wish to illustrate what they are experiencing (personal communication, February 21, 2008).

Although the impetus for the memorial was an act of terror, its purpose is to send people away with a message of hope. The memorial tells the story not only of terrorism, but of how a community came together and healed (personal communication, February 21, 2008).

M-15. National September 11 Memorial and Museum at the World Trade Center

Case Study

Scholarly literature, a review of the memorial website, and an interview with the memorial expert(s) form the basis for the following discussion of the National September 11 Memorial and Museum at the World Trade Center, New York, New York (Table 15).

Historical Context. The date is September 11, 2001. For most Americans, the reminder of that date is all that is necessary to bring back the memories, the fear, and the anger at the “nineteen terrorists [who] hijacked four planes and killed 2,974 people at the World Trade Center in New York City, the Pentagon outside Washington, D.C., and in a field near Shanksville, Pennsylvania” (“National September 11,” 2008, p. 1).

The World Trade Center complex was reduced to rubble. Americans began to hear about Ground Zero, where rescue teams worked first on rescue and then on recovery, which would ultimately last for nine months. That day, September 11, 2001, will forever “stand as a defining moment in history, an event that continues to impact individuals and local, national, and international communities” (National September 11, 2008, p. 1).
Table 15. Facts about the National September 11 National Memorial and Museum at the World Trade Center, New York, New York.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of memorial</th>
<th>National September 11 Memorial and Museum at the World Trade Center</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Location of memorial</td>
<td>New York City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Event memorialized</td>
<td>Terrorist attack on the World Trade Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larger historic event</td>
<td>Terrorism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year of memorialized event</td>
<td>2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of individuals lost</td>
<td>2,974</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year construction began</td>
<td>March 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year declared memorial</td>
<td>In construction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approximate number of visitors per year</td>
<td>Projecting 5,000,000 per year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Website</td>
<td><a href="http://www.national911memorial.org">http://www.national911memorial.org</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This was not the first attack on the World Trade Center, but has become a reminder that we did not learn from the February 26, 1993 attack when Islamist terrorists detonated explosives adjacent to the underground parking lot ("National September 11," 2008). That is not to minimize the loss of the six who were killed and 1,000 who were injured in 1993 ("National September 11," 2008). It does not diminish the efforts to rebuild and restore damages, and the fact that security was heightened. It is only that the horrors of September 11, 2001, were not just of terrorists who hijacked planes and attacked their targets, but it was an attack on America’s sense of security.
In the moments following the attack, New York City firefighters and police responded. In heroic attempts to save lives, the New York Fire Department lost 343 of their own, the Port Authority Police Department lost 37, and the New York Police Department lost 23 (“National September 11,” 2008, p. 1).

**Memorial Overview.** While all Americans share the horror, reaching agreement on how to memorialize the lives that were lost has been arduous. A national design competition led to the selection of *Reflecting Absence* by Michael Arad and Peter Walker. There are two pools for reflection, surrounded by the names of those killed in both World Trade Center attacks, and the others who were killed in Washington, D.C., and Pennsylvania (“National September 11,” 2008; The Arrangement of,” 2008). Kiosks around the pools will assist visitors to locate names.

The Memorial Plaza will be on eight acres of land, surrounded by 400 trees, designed to express, “both the incalculable loss of life and its consoling renewal, a place where all of us come together to remember from generation to generation” (“Building a National,” 2008, p. 1). The remaining eight acres will include stores, the Freedom Tower, Performing Arts Center, and the World Trade Center Towers 2, 3, and 4 (“Building a National,” 2008). The Museum, designed by Davis Brody Bond, LLP, will display artifacts and use interactive exhibits to create a repository for remembrance and education.

Artifacts for the museum have been collected from the spontaneous memorials that arose immediately following the attack. “The collections we preserve provide a palpable and immediate connection to the stories we are privileged to tell and to the
people behind those stories” (“National September 11,” 2008; Preserving Memory, 2008). The goal is to tell as many of the stories about the attack as possible.

The memorial is planned to open on September 11, 2011. Projections estimate 5 million visitors each year, suggesting the memorial will be as significant to New Yorkers and visitors to the city as the Statue of Liberty and Times Square (personal communication, February 27, 2008).

The memorial design was chosen to create a “sense of place” that would connect visitors with the event and the place. Whether it will be successful depends not just on the structure, but on the perspective of visitors. For New Yorkers, there will always be the absence in their skyline of the iconic towers. They may have a greater “sense of place” and of loss. For those who are not familiar with the skyline before the attack, the memorial seeks to create a similar “sense of place” (personal communication, February 27, 2008).

September 11, 2001, changed Americans’ lives and perspectives on the world. The purpose of the memorial and museum will be to honor those whose lives were taken by the terrorists, the loved ones they left behind, and all of us who share the burden of remembering that day (personal communication, February 27, 2008).

**M-16. Virginia Tech Case Study**

Scholarly journals, a review of the memorial website, and an interview with the memorial expert(s) form the basis for the following discussion of the Virginia Tech Memorial in Blacksburg, Virginia (Table 16).
Table 16. Basic information on the Virginia Tech Memorial, Blacksburg, Virginia.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of memorial</th>
<th>Virginia Tech</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Location of memorial</td>
<td>Blacksburg, Virginia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Event memorialized</td>
<td>Shootings of 33 - Students, faculty and the gunman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larger historic event</td>
<td>School Violence and Shootings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year of memorialized event</td>
<td>2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of individuals lost</td>
<td>33 (including the perpetrator)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year construction began</td>
<td>2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year declared memorial</td>
<td>2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approximate number of visitors per year</td>
<td>200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Website</td>
<td><a href="http://www.vt.edu/memorial">www.vt.edu/memorial</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Historical Context.** Virginia Tech (Virginia Polytechnic Institute), founded in 1872, is a university in Blacksburg, Virginia. In 2007-2008, Virginia Tech’s enrollment was 27,572 undergraduate, graduate, and professional students on a campus with more than 100 campus buildings. “Through a combination of its three missions of learning, discovery, and engagement, Virginia Tech continually strives to accomplish the charge of its motto: *Ut Prosim* (That I May Serve)” (“About Virginia Tech,” 2008, p. 1).

The tragedy has had significant impact on security at Virginia Tech and campuses across the country.

**Memorial Overview.** Within hours of the killings, students at Virginia Tech began to spontaneously place “Hokie Stones” in a semi-circle on the campus lawn. The stones—of Appalachian limestone—represent the foundation of the university, in both symbolic and architectural senses, and serve to link university traditions from past to present (personal communication, March 6, 2008).

Labeled with the names of students and faculty who had been killed, the 32 stones served as a spontaneous memorial. In August 2007, four months after the shootings, permanent Hokie Stones, each weighing three-hundred pounds, replaced the temporary ones. At the memorial dedication ceremony, Charles Steger, the school’s President, gave grieving families the original Hokie Stones (personal communication, March 6, 2008).

In addition to the Hokie Stones, there was an immediate outpouring of gifts and artifacts. Plush toys, ornaments, flowers, cards, letters, wristbands, and anything with the Virginia Tech emblem was laid near the stones. Artifacts were sent from around the world with the request the gifts be placed near the memorial stones. Representatives from the Library of Congress visited Virginia Tech to help the university determine how to display, store, and record the many artifacts (Owczarski, 2008, p. 1). “In addition to being a tremendous source of support and strength for the university community, these items are a rich source of material about how we grieve and the effect this tragedy has had on people around the world” (Owczarski, 2008, p. 2).

In the few short months since the shootings, the university estimates that more than 200,000 visitors have come to the memorial. Some are students and their families,
but many Virginia Tech alumni have returned to campus to pay their respects. They
grieve for the school, students, and faculty who were killed, and for the violence that will
forever shape the college memories of all who were on campus (personal communication,
March 6, 2008).

Perhaps because the shootings were so recent, grief is a common site at Virginia
Tech. There are many tears and people in groups walk around the stones, walking, but
not talking. Those most closely touched by the tragedy often stand apart from the others.
They share proximity, but their grief is private (personal communication, March 6, 2008).

The site has a prevailing sense of reverence. This is evidenced in the changes that
have been brought about by a shared respect of the site. In the hours after the first Hokie
Stones were erected, candles were placed on the stones and dripping wax defaced the
stones. The campus is united in a way that preserves the dignity of the site, and together
the students, faculty, and administrators have reached a consensus of the boundaries that
this requires (personal communication, March 6, 2008). There is no doubt that this
ground has been hallowed by blood and the tears that continue to follow the shootings.

The university has made some changes to the memorial site. Landscaping, a
walkway, and lighting have been added. The university announced their plan to be
closed on the first anniversary of the shootings. A candlelight vigil will be held for
Virginia Tech students and their families (personal communication, March 6, 2008).
Doubtless, this will be but the first of many commemorations to memorialize the victims.

The university’s website (www.vt.edu) includes a remembrance page that lists
the names of those killed, and more than 36,000 people from around the world have sent
their condolences, thoughts, and prayers. Photos, videos, and other mementos are
included, notably phone numbers for counseling. In the words of Nikki Giovanni, Virginia Tech Distinguished Professor, poet, and activist, “We will continue to invent the future through our blood and tears and through all our sadness . . . We will prevail . . .”

**Constructs: Testing the Hypothesis**

In addition to the information obtained through the interview with experts at the 16 memorials, each interviewer was asked to assign a ranking to the 10 constructs, based on the importance of the construct in understanding his or her memorial. Table 17 shows the rankings for all 16 memorials.

It was expected that the memorial experts would offer varying rankings based on the diversity of memorials chosen for the study, but it was hypothesized that the constructs would prove valuable in understanding the memorials. Nearly half (7) of the memorial experts chose “Memory and Meaning” as the most important construct to understanding their memorial and its use. An equal number (7) felt that their websites were the least important construct. Four memorial experts listed both “Memory and Meaning” as the most important and “Technology (websites)” as the least important. The overlap between those two groups (4) is perhaps indicative of the usefulness of the constructs to understanding memorials. Any variation in responses might be explained by the diversity of memorials and the many functions they fulfill.

Table 17. Results of construct ordering obtained through interviews with memorial experts.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ranking</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Values</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ratings</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Note: Results of construct ordering obtained through interviews with memorial experts. The rankings at the bottom of the table are the summation of individual responses and are from 1 (most important) to 10 (least important). Please note that memorial and construct names have been shortened to allow a visual comparison of results presented in this table.

The case studies and interviews were used to test the hypotheses developed for each of the 10 constructs. In all cases, the interviews with the memorial experts provided insight far beyond those found in the literature. In addition to helping inform the conceptual model forwarded in Chapter 5, these also serve to support the need for further scholarly investigation of memorials.

To test the validity of the 10 constructs, each was worded as a hypothesis for this research:

H-1. Memory is important to understanding the function, diverse types, and significance of memorials in the United States.

H-2. Education is important to understanding the function, diverse types, and significance of memorials in the United States.

H-3. Connectivity (sense of place) is important to understanding the function, diverse types, and significance of memorials in the United States.

H-4. Grieving is important to understanding the function, diverse types, and significance of memorials in the United States.

H-5. Visitors to memorials are important to understanding the function, diverse types, and significance of memorials in the United States.
H-6. Names are important to understanding the function, diverse types, and significance of memorials in the United States.

H-7. Architectural design is important to understanding the function, diverse types, and significance of memorials in the United States.

H-8. Artifacts left at memorials are important to understanding the function, diverse types, and significance of memorials in the United States.

H-9. Cost is important to understanding the function, diverse types, and significance of memorials in the United States.

H-10. Technology is important to understanding the function, diverse types, and significance of memorials in the United States.

**Testing the Hypotheses**

The following pages are the synthesis of literature and interview information, arranged by hypothesis in the order informed by memorial experts.

**H-1. Those Left Behind: Memory and Meaning.** Hypothesis 1 states that memory is important to understanding the function, diverse types, and significance of memorials in the United States. This hypothesis corresponds to Construct 2, “Those Left Behind: Memory and Meaning” and is listed first to represent its ranking by memorial experts (see Table 17; Edkins, 2003; Fritsche, 2001).

The words memory and memorial share the same Latin root meaning “mindful.” With this basis in meaning, it is consistent that memory was the highest priority for seven of the memorials in this study and was ranked as the most important construct overall based on the memorial experts' rankings (see table 17). So too was it rated as important by all memorial experts. At the Alamo Memorial, Gettysburg Memorial, Galveston 1900
Hurricane Memorial, USS *Arizona* Memorial, National Fallen Firefighters Memorial, Space Shuttle *Challenger* Memorial, and Virginia Tech, memory was ranked as the highest priority (1st of 10) (see Appendix E for information on the interviews).

With the memorials that place the greatest value on memory, the Alamo Memorial, Gettysburg Memorial, and the USS *Arizona* Memorial represent lives sacrificed in battle for the cause of freedom. At the Galveston 1900 Hurricane Memorial, we remember lives that were swept away by the force of nature. At the National Fallen Firefighters Memorial, the memory is of a brotherhood who sacrificed their lives to protect others. At the Space Shuttle *Challenger* Memorial, our memories reflect the national pride for the accomplishments of the brave men and women who answered the call of exploration and adventure. And finally, at Virginia Tech, the memory is still painful in part because the massacre there was so recent and so useless (see Appendix E for information on the interviews).

The war memorials generally hoped to trigger a specific memory in their visitors. At Gettysburg Memorial, it is the memory that brother fought against brother in a bitter and bloody war to preserve the United States. At Little Bighorn Battlefield National Monument, it was the memory that Native Americans had won a victory and forever changed the nation’s understanding of manifest destiny. At the National World War II Memorial, it is the memory that the overwhelming casualties of the war and the sacrifices on the home front were “the price of freedom.” At the Korean War Veterans Memorial, the most important memory is that this should not be the “forgotten war” and, to a lesser extent, the lesson that “freedom is not free” (see Appendix E for information on the interviews).
At the Vietnam Veterans Memorial, the memories are more complex. At all war memorials it seems likely that veterans relive their memories of fighting and fear, and of loss and loneliness. Before the black wall was built, many Vietnam veterans remember coming home to a hostile country and a war they could not fight to win ("Coming Home: The," 1999). Those memories are bitter and help to explain the need for healing mentioned by the memorial experts at both the Vietnam Veterans Memorial and the Korean War Veterans Memorial. For those who did not fight and did not lose a family member or a friend, but have memories of the war years, the Vietnam Veterans Memorial serves as a memory of national disillusionment (see Appendix E for information on the interviews).

At National Fallen Firefighters Memorial, family members leave with the memory that their loved ones belonged to a brotherhood of heroes. Since September 11, 2001, visitors who may never have known a firefighter remember the bravery exhibited that day and understand the sacrifices given freely by these public servants (see Appendix E for information on the interviews).

Because the Wounded Knee Memorial Museum, Vietnam Veterans Memorial, and the National Fallen Firefighters Memorial, use the names of those lost, many visitors are seen making "rubbings." Although battles rather than individuals are listed on the Iwo Jima memorial, visitors make rubbings at that memorial as well. The collection of these tangible memories has become so prevalent that the memorial expert interviewed at the National Fallen Firefighters Memorial reported they even make crayons and paper available to visitors to make rubbings (see Appendix E for information on the interviews).
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At Oklahoma City National Monument and Museum, the importance of memory was ranked fourth of the ten constructs for this study. The memorial expert related that the most important memory for visitors is that it is not just strangers who are terrorists; rather, the perpetrators of terror do not always come from far-off. Oklahoma City National Memorial and Museum forces us to remember that fear can be cloaked in many costumes. More than two decades before Americans knew the name of Timothy McVeigh, they knew a cartoon character named Pogo who delivered the lasting memory from Oklahoma City, “We have met the enemy and he is us” (see Appendix E for information on the interviews; Kelly, 1972).

H-2. **Education: Learning from the Dead.** Hypothesis 2 states that education is important to understanding the function, diverse types, and significance of memorials in the United States. This hypothesis corresponds to Construct 4, “Education: Learning from the Dead” and is listed second to represent its ranking by memorial experts (see Table 17; Nora, 1989; Radley, 1990; Sobel, 2003).

Most memorials include a component of education in their mission statements. This is the case for all memorials that are managed by the National Park Service (See Appendix A). Education is a priority ranked highly by many of the memorials in this study. For instance, Little Bighorn Battlefield National Monument, Wounded Knee Memorial Museum, and the National September 11 Memorial and Museum at the World Trade Center ranked it first of the 10 constructs. All but five interviews, the USS Arizona Memorial, United States Marine Corps War Memorial/Two Jima Memorial, National Fallen Firefighters Memorial, Oklahoma City National Memorial and Museum, and
Virginia Tech rank education in the top half of their priorities. None rank it lower than eighth out of 10 (Virginia Tech). (see Appendix E for information on the interviews).

The memorials take diverse approaches to their education mission, which include interpretive signage, educational exhibits and dioramas, brochures, and tours by docents or paid staff. It is also generally recognized that visitors to such locations also learn from other visitors (Falk & Dierking, 2000, 2002; Hein, 1998).

At the National Fallen Firefighters Memorial, the memorial expert reported that the memorial has changed the way Americans think about firefighters. The memorial’s website provides significant insight into the lives of firefighters, underscoring the danger faced in the line of duty (see Appendix E for information on the interviews). With the potential for loss of life by those who serve as firefighters, the website addresses grief at home and in the workplace. It provides resources and information for those who are forced to rebuild their lives after the loss of a loved one. In providing this information and in serving not just as a reminder, but as a strong support for the survivors, the website of the National Fallen Firefighters goes far beyond other memorial websites and far beyond that anticipated when this study was initiated (see Appendix E for information on the interviews).

Education is of such significance at the United States Marine Corps War Memorial/Iwo Jima Memorial that, despite its ranking (6 of 10), staff members at Arlington National Cemetery receive interpretive training and are taught that communication with visitors is essential to the mission of the memorial (see Appendix E for information on the interviews).
With the single exception of Virginia Tech, all memorials are concerned with an accurate presentation of the historic context of the events memorialized. At Little Bighorn Battlefield National Monument, the memorial expert reported that many visitors come with preconceptions of right and wrong, preconceptions that staff members seek to address by presenting a contextual view that provides a more generous interpretation of participants, their motivations, and their realities, on both sides of the conflict. This reflects yet another facet of the education mission of memorials (see Appendix E for information on the interviews).

The sheer number and complexity of messages, interpretations, and lessons is a challenge at many memorials. For example, in addition to striving for historic accuracy in presenting the events of King’s life, the Martin Luther King, Jr. National Historic Site is committed to presenting information about ideas and events that were pivotal in King’s personal development including nonviolence, civil rights, racism, and segregation (see Appendix E for information on the interviews).

Perhaps the most extensive education efforts at any of the memorials in this research were those provided by the Vietnam Veterans Memorial. In addition to onsite tours and educational programs delivered by memorial staff and volunteers, this memorial provides curriculum-based lesson plans and additional information through the Teach Vietnam Teachers Network (Teach Vietnam Teachers, n.d.). A member of the Teachers Network commits to serve one academic year as a contact for educators in his or her state and disseminates appropriate educational information on the Vietnam War. The memorial supports two educational efforts called “Echoes from the Wall” and “Echoes from the Mall.” The first is a curriculum kit sent to every middle school and
high school in the United States that is a member of the Teachers Network program. It provides not only history lessons, but educational material on leadership, citizenship, and character. The second is a field trip guide for schools in close proximity that are able to visit the Vietnam Veterans Memorial (Interpretation and Education, n.d.; Teach Vietnam, n.d.). Clearly, education is a significant priority for the Vietnam Veterans Memorial (see Appendix E for information on the interviews).

Although the techniques of and emphasis on education may vary from memorial to memorial, all memorial experts mentioned the importance of an understanding of the events and their historical context. All memorial experts seemed concerned that visitors understand and have sympathy for the lives that were taken.

H-3. Sense of Place. Hypothesis 3 states that connectivity is important to understanding the function, diverse types, and significance of memorials in the United States. The hypothesis corresponds to Construct 9, “Connectivity: Sense of Place” and is listed third to represent its ranking by memorial experts (see Table 17; Grant, 2006; Levinson, 1998; Shapiro and Carr, 1991) and so too does it reflect the emphasis that “place-based” education has come to receive at memorials and other cultural institutions (Sobel, 2003).

The memorial experts ranked “sense of place” anywhere from their first priority—as was the case for Oklahoma City National Memorial and Museum and the United States Marine Corps War Memorial/Iwo Jima Memorial—to as low as eighth, which was the case for the Vietnam Veterans Memorial (see Appendix E for information on the interviews).
At the Alamo Memorial, the memorial expert suggested that visitors appear to
develop a “sense of place” from the adobe architecture, a feeling that is unusual to those
who do not live in regions with historic Hispanic influence. For the Gettysburg National
Military Park, the memorial expert reported that visitors seem to discover a “sense of
place” when looking at the empty sweep of the grassy fields. Likewise, at the Little
Bighorn Battlefield National Monument, the memorial expert related that the sense of
place comes from the memorial theme, Peace through Unity. At the USS Arizona
Memorial, the memorial expert described the “sense of place” coming from the empty
waves that move across the sunken ship. So too, at the National September 11 Memorial
and Museum at the World Trade Center, the memorial expert described the “sense of
place” that will come from the chosen design, Reflecting Absence (see Appendix E for
information on the interviews).

Despite the obvious belief that “sense of place” is important—and present—at the
memorials in this study, there is little agreement on the source of that feeling. At the
Alamo Memorial and at the National September 11 Memorial and Museum at the World
Trade Center, memorial experts suggested it is the design or unique architectural
elements that create that sense. At Gettysburg National Military Park and at the USS
Arizona Memorial, the memorial experts felt that the sense of space and emptiness—the
silent echo of the lives that were lost in the place—serve to create the feeling. Similarly,
at the Little Bighorn Battlefield National Monument, the memorial expert suggested it
was the theme that created a “sense of place” for visitors (see Appendix E for information
on the interviews).
At the Martin Luther King, Jr. National Historic Site, and particularly at the Ebenezer Baptist Church, the “sense of place” resounds with reverence. It is here that visitors want to practice the “laying on of hands” that was one of King’s important traditions in ministering to his flock. The church, often filled with King’s voice delivering a sermon, not only provides a “sense of place” for visitors, but a sense of connection that is a defining element of a visit to the memorial (see Appendix E for information on the interviews).

The Oklahoma City National Memorial and Museum considers “sense of place” the highest priority during a visit. The memorial expert reported that the feeling is strong among visitors. Within the museum, the importance of place is developed through multisensory exhibits: Sight and sound are used to recreate the bombing, the horror, and the rescue. A “sense of place” is also developed through tactile opportunities such as sitting in a memorial chair, standing in the shade of the Survivor Tree, or touching the fence that separated the horror from daily life during the months of recovery from the bomb that destroyed the Murrah Federal Building (see Appendix E for information on the interviews).

These disagreements have, perhaps, more to do with differing understandings of the phrase “sense of place” than with the fact that all memorials, in some manner, create a “sense of place.” Although there are differing meanings to the phrase “sense of place,” this research intends it to mean that there is an intangible link of identity between the events being memorialized and the visitor to the site.

With this definition, it was anticipated that memorials built on the site of the events they memorialize would have significantly greater “sense of place” than the
memorials built at locations far from the happenings. This would leave one to presume that, for instance, the memorials at the National Mall in Washington, D.C., and other memorials built at some distance from the events they memorialize would create much less “sense of place” than, as examples, the Alamo Memorial, Gettysburg National Military Park, Little Bighorn Battlefield National Monument, Galveston 1900 Hurricane Memorial, USS Arizona Memorial, Martin Luther King, Jr. National Historic Site, Oklahoma City National Memorial and Museum, the National September 11 Memorial and Museum at the World Trade Center, and Virginia Tech (see Appendix E for information on the interviews).

This is not, however, reflected in the responses from all of the memorial experts. An example of this can be seen with the memorial expert at the United States Marine Corps War Memorial/Two Jima Memorial in Arlington National Cemetery, who ranked “sense of place” as the most important of the constructs for that memorial. Of those memorials built on the place being memorialized, it was the Galveston 1900 Hurricane Memorial that ranked “sense of place” as the lowest (7 of 10) (see Appendix E for information on the interviews).

H-4. The Role of Memorials: Public or Private Grieving. Hypothesis 4 states that grieving is important to understanding the function, diverse types, and significance of memorials in the United States. This hypothesis corresponds to Construct 3, “The Role of Memorials: Public or Private Grieving” and is listed fourth to represent its ranking by memorial experts (see Table 17; Boss, 2002; Jorgensen-Earp & Lanzilotti, 1998; Winter, 1995; Witham, 1998).
Grief is usually understood to be intense sorrow—a period of overwhelming emotion—that follows the death of a loved one. The pain of grief is tempered by the passing of time, but never really goes away and thus might be expected to be an important construct to understanding memorials (Romanoff, B.D. & Terenzio, M., 1998; Shapiro, E.R., 2002).

Based on years of research with patients going through the process of grieving, Kübler-Ross (1969) described grief as existing in stages of emotion. Despite her generalizations, she notes “grieving is as individual as our lives” and may “return in waves” when least expected (Kübler-Ross, 1969). The stages defined are:

1. Shock stage: Initial paralysis at hearing the bad news.
2. Denial stage: Trying to avoid the inevitable.
3. Anger stage: Frustrated outpouring of bottled-up emotion.
5. Depression stage: Final realization of the inevitable.
6. Testing stage: Seeking realistic solutions.
7. Acceptance stage: Finally finding the way forward.

With the insight that the work of Kübler-Ross (1969) provides, the depth of grief that is exhibited by visitors at a memorial may be a combination of the depth of loss, the strength of emotional connection of the living for the dead, and the time that has passed. The public or private aspect of the grief may be related to the memorial, but is more likely related to the needs of the grieving individual. Some individuals contain their grief, internalizing an emotion they are hesitant to share. Yet others facing the same loss find comfort in sharing their grief with others, seeking the support of either friends or
strangers bound only by their shared experience of the memorial (Jorgensen-Earp, C.R., & Lanzilotti, L.A., 1998; Boss, P. 2002).

At the Vietnam Veterans Memorial, for example, grief is the highest ranked of all the constructs (1st of 10). Whereas, Gettysburg National Military Park and the National World War II Memorial rank grief as one of the lowest priorities (9th of 10, and 8th of 10, respectively). Since it has been nearly 150 years since the Civil War, none of the visitors to the battlefield at Gettysburg personally knew the soldiers involved. On the other hand, much less time has elapsed since World War II. The lack of emphasis on grief at that memorial is related to that memorial’s dedication not only to those who died, but also to those who survived and still remember life in the armed services and on the home front (see Appendix E for information on the interviews).

The Alamo Memorial, based on an event that occurred in 1836, is so distant that few visitors display any signs of grief. The memorial expert even remarked that there is an “absence of reverence” for many visitors to the Alamo. This is yet another instance of the importance of time in the notion of grief (see Appendix E for information on the interviews).

At other memorials to more current events, tears of grief are a common observation. The memorial for the most distant event where tears were reported was at the Wounded Knee Memorial Museum. Honoring the 175 killed, tears are so common here that the memorial expert reported that the museum even leaves boxes of tissues for visitors who appear to cry both in grief and in anger. This act of crying is much greater than reported at any other memorials, underscoring the importance of interviewing or
surveying visitors to gain a more complete understanding of the use of memorials (see Appendix E for information on the interviews).

War memorials often bring tears to both veterans and to the families who lost loved ones. At the National World War II Memorial, the USS Arizona Memorial, and the United States Marine Corps War Memorial/Iwo Jima Memorial—all commemorating events from the 1940s—tears are not uncommon, but are more often shed by women who lost a loved one than by the veterans who grieve for lost comrades. Each visitor expresses grief in his or her own way (see Appendix E for information on the interviews).

At the Vietnam Veterans Memorial, grief is often tinged with anger and with the pain that still remains. Here the grief is more often private, perhaps related to the personal connection created by the names on the memorial. At the National World War II Memorial, visitors appear reflective and their emotion is often displayed through tears (see Appendix E for information on the interviews).

Tears are also commonly seen at the Martin Luther King, Jr. National Historic Site, either at the church or as people listen to the hope and promise of King’s speeches. The presence of King’s tomb on this site may also trigger additional feelings of grief, along with the fact that his death was only four decades ago and the struggle for equality continues (see Appendix E for information on the interviews).

At the Oklahoma City National Memorial and Museum, where little more than 10 years have passed, grief is both public and private. The memorial expert reported that the museum, where visitors hear the sounds of the explosion, of cries, and of a helicopter, grief is most frequently expressed privately, as if, in the horror of the moment, the grief must be internalized. As the visitor moves beyond this initial area, and enters exhibit
galleries that address the rebuilding of Oklahoma City and ends with a message of hope, grief is more often observed to be shared. In the “Gallery of Honor” at the museum, grief is symbolized by 168 acrylic boxes, each with personal artifacts and a picture of the loved one killed in the bombing. For the families and friends who selected those items as the perfect reminder of their loved ones, the grief is intense. And yet, there is a generosity of spirit that has led the survivors to share their private loss with visitors who did not lose a child, parent, sibling, spouse, or friend. In making their losses public, these survivors have helped a nation grieve and begin to make its way from shock to acceptance (see Appendix E for information on the interviews).

The same stages of grief, from shock to acceptance, will no doubt be seen at the National September 11 Memorial and Museum at the World Trade Center. Between now and its scheduled opening in 2011, the nation will continue to grieve, but currently lacks a memorial upon which to focus that grief (see Appendix E for information on the interviews).

The massacre at Virginia Tech happened more recently than the events related to any of the other memorials in this study. What is known of the grief at that memorial is fresh in our memories, preserved through photographs and etched in our memories by the extensive media coverage it received. While some visitors to the memorial, especially Virginia Tech students, seek to console and be consoled by their classmates, others stand alone, presenting a tableau of the differing expressions of loss (see Appendix E for information on the interviews).

The profound grief at Virginia Tech is still closer to the “shock stage” described by Kübler-Ross (1969) than to the successive stages that move one toward recovery and
acceptance. Memorials are a place for both public and private emotions as reported by memorial experts and scrutinized through mass media coverage.

**H-5. We the Living: Who Visits Memorials.** Hypothesis 5 states that visitors to memorials are important to understanding the function, diverse types, and significance of memorials in the United States. This hypothesis corresponds to Construct 1, “We the Living: Who Visits Memorials” and is listed fifth to represent its ranking by memorial experts (see Table 17; Clausen, 2004; deRussy, 2007; Grider, 2001).

The importance of visitors was ranked as the highest priority for the National World War II Memorial, Korean War Veterans Memorial, and Martin Luther King, Jr. National Historic Site (1st of 10). On the other hand, the Space Shuttle Challenger Memorial ranked visitors lower than did the other memorials (9th of 10) with other memorials ranking the importance of visitors somewhere between these extremes (see Appendix E for information on the interviews).

All memorial experts had a number of comments to make about their visitors. Experts at the Alamo Memorial and the Gettysburg Memorial shared a similar outlook, noting that the interests of visitors to both sites were often shaped by movies and television, with visitors’ questions closely tied to popular culture depictions of the history or events memorialized. The Alamo Memorial expert also noted that family groups, such as children with parents or grandparents, often used the visit as an opportunity to talk about moral values in order to inculcate children with the values and valor displayed by the heroes of the Alamo (see Appendix E for information on the interviews).

There was one major similarity about the visitors to war memorials that have living veterans. Visits to the National World War II Memorial, Korean War Veterans
Memorial, and Vietnam Veterans Memorial were all described as “pilgrimages” by veterans. Beyond that description, however, there was divergence in the descriptions of the visitors. For the National World War II Memorial, the general perception was that visitors understood that the war was the price their generation paid for freedom—a feeling apparently shared by both veterans and those who experienced World War II on the home front, to veterans of Korea, often called the “unknown” or “forgotten” war. The importance is both to understand and to remember. For the veterans of the Vietnam War, who came home to a country in turmoil over the war, visitors seemed to be seeking the recognition for their service that they did not receive at the time of their initial homecoming (see Appendix E for information on the interviews).

The Martin Luther King, Jr. National Historic Site expert spoke of the families that visited the site, mentioning that many families choose the memorial as the place for family reunions, perhaps a gesture of appreciation to the man who led the fight during the Civil Rights Movement (see Appendix E for information on the interviews).

Little Bighorn Battlefield National Monument and Wounded Knee Memorial Museum had unique perspectives on their visitors, noting that tribal connections not only influenced those who visited, but also the preconceptions that Native Americans brought with them to the memorials (see Appendix E for information on the interviews).

The location of the National Fallen Firefighters Memorial, on the campus where fire training is conducted, certainly influences the demographics of visitors. This location increases the number of campus visitors who have a professional association with firefighting. Additionally, the frequency with which multiple generations in a family take
up careers in firefighting will further influence the makeup of visitors to the memorial (see Appendix E for information on the interviews).

The range of rankings on the importance of visitors may reflect the differing positions held by the memorial experts. Some explicitly mentioned they did not have contact with visitors, a situation that would provide a very different understanding of visitors from those memorial experts whose daily work at the memorial involved interaction with visitors. Although many of the memorials do not have a large staff, those who interact with visitors often work different hours than the experts. For these memorial experts, visitors may be better known from reports that show only the number of visitors, than from the conversations and observations that provide the greatest insight into the experiences of visitors.

**H-6. Personalization: Names at National Monuments.** Hypothesis 6 states that names are important to understanding the function, diverse types, and significance of memorials in the United States. This hypothesis corresponds to Construct 6, “Personalization: Names at National Memorials” and is listed sixth to represent its ranking by memorial experts, (see Table 17; Bennett, 1998; Kean, 2007) and is largely, though not correctly, linked to the Vietnam Veterans Memorial.

Shakespeare has Juliet (2004) speak of Romeo, saying,

> What's in a name? that which we call a rose

> By any other name would smell as sweet (II, ii, 1-2)

Shakespeare to the contrary, humans invest in names with a great deal of meaning. Expectant parents spend hours pouring over books of names, looking for the perfect name
to help launch their child with an identity that speaks of success, family, faith, or the
child as a unique individual (Wattenberg, 2005).

Given our traditions of naming, it is understandable that names and the
personalization that is a part of memorials make memorials so emotionally moving
for visitors. The Vietnam Veterans Memorial was the first national memorial to make
extensive use of names. Lin (2000b) the memorial designer, provides, “These names,
seemingly infinite in number, convey the sense of overwhelming numbers, while
unifying these individuals into a whole” (p. 1). Lin’s inclusion of more than 58,000
names (58,191 when dedicated and 58,256 as of 2007) was the first time names were
used on such a scale (Vietnam Veterans Memorial, n.d.).

Many memorial experts suggested the inclusion of names is an important function
of the memorial. For example, the experts at Little Bighorn Battlefield National
Monument, National Fallen Firefighters Memorial, Space Shuttle Challenger Memorial,
Oklahoma City National Memorial and Museum, and Virginia Tech all rank the inclusion
of names as the second most important aspect of their memorial. Only at Wounded Knee
Memorial Museum and Martin Luther King, Jr. National Historic Site are the uses of
names ranked as having very little importance (9th of 10). Despite that, the Wounded
Knee Memorial Museum includes two circles of glass in which the names of the victims
are etched, serving to attract visitors to both touch the names and take photographs of the
names. It is to be expected that naming is not important at the King site because it is
dedicated to one individual, not a group (see Appendix E for information on the
interviews).
At some memorials, including the Alamo Memorial, USS *Arizona* Memorial, National World War II Memorial, and the Korean War Veterans Memorial, names are not included on the memorials, but a virtual census of the dead is available, often at kiosks located near the memorial and through the memorial websites (see Appendix E for information on the interviews).

The Galveston 1900 Hurricane Memorial expert stated that the names of the storm victims who were identified or reported as missing are contained in a box buried beneath the monument. At Wounded Knee Memorial Museum not only are the lost named, but the memorial expert revealed that "we give [visitors] a feather that is how it is personalized from us" (see Appendix E for information on the interviews).

At the Space Shuttle *Challenger* Memorial in Washington, D.C., the names and faces of the seven astronauts are included on the monument. Some visitors know and honor all seven. For many visitors, however, it is Christa McAuliffe—America's "teacher in space"—whose name is etched in their memory and who receives the most attention (see Appendix E for information on the interviews).

Names are also a part of the National Fallen Firefighters Memorial, National September 11 Memorial and Museum at the World Trade Center, and Virginia Tech. Oklahoma City National Memorial and Museum goes beyond names. In the "Gallery of Honor," tributes to all 168 victims include names, images, and an acrylic box. The memorial organization has invited family and friends to leave artifacts of meaning. The boxes for each of the victims contain baby shoes, toys, and even a pacifier; one woman's family remembers her with a hat and a tube of red lipstick; while another contains a military badge (see Appendix E for information on the interviews).
Lin’s comment (Vietnam Veterans Memorial, n.d., p. 1) on the names, which are seemingly infinite in number at the Vietnam Veterans Memorial, is an obvious chord that touches not just the visitors at “The Wall,” but visitors at all memorials. It is the same for who visitors who seek a link with family members and with strangers: all find new meaning from times and circumstances that demanded life and now demand tribute.


Hypothesis 7 states that architectural design is important to understanding the function, diverse types, and significance of memorials in the United States. This hypothesis corresponds to Construct 7, “Architecture and Design: The Physical Elements of Memorials” and is listed seventh to represent its ranking by memorial experts (see Table 17; Cohn, 2004; Forgey, 2005; Melvin, Bergdoll, Wilson, Michalski & MacCormac, 2002).

Architecture at memorials is diverse. The Galveston 1900 Hurricane Memorial is a statue. The Vietnam Veterans Memorial is a wall. Some memorials, like the Little Bighorn Battlefield National Monument, have had significant changes through the years, with shifting markers, first with wooden crosses (1879), then stone grave makers (1881). It was not until the 1960s that a visitor center was built, the result of Libby Custer leaving her husband’s memorabilia to the Memorial. Throughout these changes, the Memorial also witnessed a changing perspective as the event came to be understood from both the Army and the Native American viewpoints (see Appendix E for information on the interviews).

At Virginia Tech, a spontaneous memorial of small Hokie Stones was erected almost immediately, and has now been replaced with 300-pound Hokie Stones—one for
each victim. There are memorials with various architectural features such as names and others with pictures such as those at the Space Shuttle Challenger Memorial. The National World War II Memorial has neither names nor pictures—not even the images of those memorialized in the general fashion found at the Korean War Veterans Memorial, where the statues are representative of the Armed Services and the racial and cultural makeup of those who served (see Appendix E for information on the interviews).

With this diversity, there is little wonder that the emphasis on architecture ranges from high (2" of 10) at the Alamo Memorial, the National World War II Memorial, and the Korean War Veterans Memorial, to lowest (10" of 10) at the Space Shuttle Challenger Memorial (see Appendix E for information on the interviews).

Many modern memorials have been created through design competitions. The most recent of these was the design competition for the National September 11 Memorial and Museum at the World Trade Center. The 5,201 entries to the competition, from 63 countries, had many elements in common. A proposal to the panel that communicated most strongly of the tragedy of September 11, 2001 was chosen. The new memorial being built is titled Reflecting Absence (Arad & Walker, 2004).

The outdoor memorial at Oklahoma City National Memorial and Museum was also the result of a competition, with 624 entries submitted for consideration. It was the work of Hans and Torrey Butzer and Sven Berg, whose design envisioned 168 empty chairs, that was chosen by a panel that included civic leaders, design professionals, as well as rescuers, survivors, and family members of those killed in the attack on the Murrah Federal Building (Knapp, n.d.).
The Vietnam Veterans Memorial design was also chosen through a competition and had 1,421 entries. A panel of eight professional artists and designers selected the winning entry, which was submitted by a college student, Maya Lin (2000b). Like the Vietnam War, the memorial stirred controversy. Early detractors of the project criticized the selection of an Asian woman as the designer while others noted the inclusiveness of the selection; others described the monument as a scar on the ground. Some were critical because of its plain, modern design and its black color, which is understandable given the fact that these architectural elements certainly separated the Vietnam Veterans Memorial from the white marble that distinguishes much of the nation’s capital. The wall, sloping beneath ground level, was seen by some as a metaphor for burying the memories of the war (Blair, Jeppeson & Pucci, Jr., 1991, 2000; Foss, 1986; Howe, 2002; Wagner-Pacifici & Schwartz, 1991). Today, as perhaps the most visited war memorial in the United States, criticism about the memorial design is largely silenced and the black wall, with its view toward the Washington Monument, stands as a symbol of a dark time in America’s past, rather than an insurmountable barrier to the nation’s future (see Appendix E for information on the interviews).

Memorial architects typically incorporate symbols into their designs. At the National World War II Memorial, the stars—each representing 100 Americans who gave their lives—are reminders not only of those lost, but of the families who displayed stars in windows throughout the country (George, 2004; National Park Service, n.d.; Shanken, 2002). What is known today as “the greatest generation”—those who served at home and in the armed services during World War II—are perhaps the last generation to want an allegorical memorial. At this memorial, their shared symbolism speaks more loudly than
words. The beauty of the memorial and its surroundings are higher priorities than the educational mission that is emphasized at memorials that mark more recent events (see Appendix E for information on the interviews).

At the Korean War Veterans Memorial, commemorating the first police action undertaken by joint forces from United Nations member states, names on the memorial recognize the countries that sent troops to join American soldiers. Some of the symbolism may be too esoteric to be easily recognized by visitors. The 19 soldiers, depicted as statues of stainless steel, are doubled in number by the reflecting wall, thus creating 38 images, a symbol of the 38th parallel that separates North Korea from South Korea (see Appendix E for information on the interviews).

At the Oklahoma City National Memorial and Museum, sections of the fence that separated the disaster from daily life in the aftermath of the attacks have been incorporated into the memorial architecture. The same is being planned for the National September 11 Memorial and Museum at the World Trade Center. The memorial expert at Oklahoma City National Memorial and Museum reports “we never knew the fence would take on a life of its own” (see Appendix E for information on the interviews). The fence plays a cathartic role for the community as the place where people leave pictures and artifacts not just connected with the bombing of the Murrah Federal Building, but of war, of illness, and of loss of every kind (see Appendix E for information on the interviews).

General architectural features, based on their occurrence at many memorials, have near universal meaning. The commonly used phrase of “reflection” is more than a metaphor. Reflections on the polished granite at the Vietnam Veterans Memorial put
the image of the living against the names of the dead. The same type of stone reflecting wall at the Korean War Veterans Memorial with 2,400 photographs etched into its surface serves as a mirror that visually incorporates the visitors themselves into the images of war.

The Washington Monument, on the National Mall in Washington, D.C., is frequently photographed with its majesty doubled by the adjacent reflection pool. Reflecting pools are also a part of the National World War II Memorial and Korean War Veterans Memorial. At the Oklahoma City National Memorial and Museum, water not only reflects, but is used to soothe the visitors. At the planned National September 11 Memorial and Museum at the World Trade Center, water will also be reflective, but will function as a curtain that separates the living from the building footprints where so many died (see Appendix E for information on the interviews; Arad & Walker, 2004).

Although water is nearby at both the Galveston 1900 Hurricane Memorial and the USS Arizona Memorial, images are not often reflected because of the movement of the tides.

Size matters in memorials, lending emphasis to the size of the loss that has been suffered. The Lincoln Memorial, for example, is enhanced by the fact that the seated statue of Lincoln is 19 feet high, an architectural element that is central to that structure. At the Korean War Veterans Memorial, the stainless steel platoon of statues is heroic in scale, standing at 7-feet 3-inches tall. The Galveston 1900 Hurricane Memorial, with father, mother, and child, portrays the family only from the waist up to the father’s outstretched fingertips, and is 10-feet tall. The United States Marine Corps War Memorial/Iwo Jima Memorial and a similar statue of firefighters raising a flag at the National Fallen Firefighters Memorial are both larger than life. Yet, designers for the
Oklahoma City National Memorial and Museum used small child-size chairs for the youngest victims, an element that is very emotionally difficult for most visitors to view (see Appendix E for information on the interviews).

Materials used for memorial construction are carefully selected. Stone, bronze and other metals, as well as concrete and glass, are all used in many different ways by memorial designers. The use of stainless steel for the statues at the Korean War Veterans Memorial was intended to evoke a ghost-like quality, especially when viewed at night. For Lin (2000a), at the Vietnam Veterans Memorial, the black granite is reflective, as mentioned above, but the black stone absorbs heat from the sun, which provides a soothing warm touch to visitors on all but Washington’s coldest days (see Appendix E for information on the interviews).

The hours of darkness may be the most difficult for the survivors—those whose lives must go on despite the loss of a loved one. Therefore, lighting at memorials becomes an important and integral part of the architectural design. At the Korean War Veterans Memorial, lighting does add to the ghostly quality of the steel statues. At Oklahoma City National Memorial and Museum, the glass bases of the chairs are lit to enhance a feeling of emptiness and loneliness (see Appendix E for information on the interviews).

At the memorials to terrorism in Oklahoma City and New York City, a sense of loss or absence is integral to both. It is a unique architectural challenge. What can be built to represent absence? The chairs at Oklahoma City show—168 times—“an empty chair at a dinner table, [where] we are always aware of the presence of a loved one’s absence” (Linenthal, 2001, p. 218). The National September 11 Memorial and Museum
at the World Trade Center has chosen the design, *Reflecting Absence*. Amid a tree-filled
oasis in the city, water will be used to mark the footprints—and thus the absence—of the
World Trade Center Towers and all of the souls lost that day (Arad & Walker, 2004).

Many memorials are open to the sky, often with elements reaching upward as
seen in the sculpture of the family at the Galveston 1900 Hurricane Memorial. Although
not included in this study, the Space Mirror Memorial at the Kennedy Space Center in
Florida is dedicated to all astronauts who have given their lives, including those on the
Space Shuttle *Challenger*. A 42.5 foot high and 50 foot wide mirror-finished granite
memorial, etched with the names of all the astronauts who have given their lives, reflects
the sky, both day and night. It serves as a reminder of the dangers of space exploration
(Astronaut Memorial, 2003; Space Mirror Memorial, n.d.). The importance of the sky at
a memorial is made explicit at the Space Shuttle *Challenger* Memorial at Arlington
National Cemetery, where High Flight, a poem by World War II pilot John Gillespie
Magee, Jr., etched in granite, concludes with the words:

> And, while with silent, lifting mind I’ve trod
> The high untrespassed sanctity of space
> Put out my hand, and touched the face of God.


Landscaping, especially the planting of trees, is often a significant focus in the
architectural design of memorials. One such example is the Survivor Tree at the
Oklahoma City National Memorial and Museum which “bears witness to the violence . . .
and now stands as a profound symbol of human resilience” (Linenthal, 2001, p. 218).
Much like the cherry trees planted around the tidal basin in Washington D.C., which were donated as a gesture of friendship from the people of Japan to the United States in 1912, landscaping around the Korean War Veterans Memorial includes the “Rose of Sharon,” the national flower of South Korea, which was planted to honor all who served to fight against the spread of Communism (“Korean War Veterans,” 1999).

Landscaping, whether to provide dappled light or to create shade for those who visit a memorial, is both practical and symbolic. The proposed planting of 400 trees at the National September 11 Memorial and Museum at the World Trade Center is intended to create an “oasis” in Manhattan. The trees will be deciduous—dropping their leaves each fall and budding with new promise each spring—a reminder to visitors that life is a cycle of death and rebirth (Arad & Walker, 2004). Trees are commonly used for both public and private memorials to the extent they are described by the Arbor Day Foundation as “living monuments” to a loved one (Arbor Day, n.d.). Trees are also explicit reminders that loved ones live, as Petrarch penned, “in memory ever green” (Petrarch & Young, 2005).

**H-8. Artifacts: Personalizing the Memorial Visit.** Hypothesis 8 states that artifacts left at memorials are important to understanding the function, diverse types, and significance of memorials in the United States. This hypothesis corresponds to Construct 5, “Artifacts: Personalizing the Memorial Visit” and is listed eighth to represent its ranking by memorial experts (see Table 17; Hass, 1998; Lopez, 1987; Schwab, 2004).

Although there are long traditions of leaving flowers and flags at burial sites, the prevalence of artifacts left at memorials has grown significantly since the construction of the Vietnam Veterans Memorial (Hass, 1998, 1999; Lopez, 1987; Schwab, 2004). It is a
practice that has been adopted by the public in the growing development of spontaneous memorials (Grider, 2001; Jorgensen-Earp & Lanzilotti, 1998).

The importance of artifacts left at memorials is high (ranked 2\textsuperscript{nd} of 10) at six of the memorials. The Martin Luther King, Jr. National Historic Site is a memorial that encourages visitors to fill out and leave cards with personal messages; whereas the Gettysburg National Military Park explicitly discourages the leaving of artifacts. The Korean War Veterans Memorial also discourages the leaving of artifacts, which they rank as the least important (ranked 10\textsuperscript{th} of 10) construct to their memorial (see Appendix E for information on the interviews).

At the Vietnam Veterans Memorial, where millions of artifacts have been left since the memorial opened, artifacts are not only valued (ranked 3\textsuperscript{rd} of 10), but they are saved and catalogued. These artifacts are destined for inclusion in a Vietnam Veterans Memorial Visitors Center (Cohn, 2004; Hass, 1998; Lair, 2005; Thompson, 2007). Similarly, artifacts left at Ground Zero in New York City and at the Murrah Federal Building in Oklahoma City are an integral part of those memorials (see Appendix E for information on the interviews).

The artifacts left at Little Bighorn Battlefield National Monument and Wounded Knee Memorial Museum share a unique distinction. Many of the artifacts left at these memorials are religious in nature, including feathers, tobacco, money, sage bundles, and other religious artifacts of meaning to Native Americans. The religious meanings of these artifacts necessitate particular care in their handling and removal. At Little Bighorn, a Northern Cheyenne medicine man works with the memorial to remove the religious artifacts and to care for them in an appropriate ceremony. Because the museum
is some distance from the memorial, artifacts left by visitors at Wounded Knee Memorial Museum are collected and moved to the memorial site (see Appendix E for information on the interviews).

Wounded Knee Memorial Museum and the Martin Luther King, Jr. National Historic Site give unusual artifacts to visitors. At Wounded Knee Memorial Museum, visitors are given a feather that they may take with them or leave to honor the fallen. At Martin Luther King, Jr. National Historic Site, visitors are given cards and invited to write a message that will be left at the memorial (see Appendix E for information on the interviews).

Toys and other items are left in abundance at Virginia Tech. Many of those are collected and distributed to children whose lives have been touched by violence (see Appendix E for information on the interviews).

According to the memorial experts, artifacts left at memorials—even those memorials where the practice is rare—are more likely to be placed on days of significance at the memorial such as anniversaries of the event, Memorial Day, and Veterans Day.

**H-9 Costs: What Price for Memory.** Hypothesis 9 states that cost is important to understanding the function, diverse types, and significance of memorials in the United States. This hypothesis corresponds to Construct 8, “Costs: What Price for Memory” and is listed ninth to represent its ranking by memorial experts (see Table 17; Cooper, n.d.; George, 2004; Neary, 2007).

The cost of memorialization has changed through the years. The Lincoln Memorial dedicated in 1922 on the National Mall in Washington, D.C., was originally
budgeted for $2 million and was constructed for $3 million (Stones and Mortar, 2004). Currently, the Martin Luther King, Jr. Memorial is planned for the National Mall after an estimated $100 million is raised (Cooper, n.d.). The Oklahoma City National Memorial and Museum, built between 1998 and 2000, cost $29.1 million. The rising cost of memorials is illustrated by the National September 11 Memorial and Museum at the World Trade Center, estimated to cost $1 billion by its projected opening in 2011.

According to the memorial expert, cost was ranked highest (5th of 10) by the Galveston 1900 Hurricane Memorial. The reason for this high rating at Galveston was that there was little available money to construct a memorial. In the case of the United States Marine Corps War Memorial/Iwo Jima Memorial, the same ranking (5th of 10) was related to the cost (and priority) of maintaining a bronze memorial that has been in place since 1954 (see Appendix E for information on the interviews).

Experts at other memorials—The Alamo Memorial, Little Bighorn Battlefield National Monument, Wounded Knee Memorial Museum, Martin Luther King, Jr. National Historic Site, and the Space Shuttle Challenger Memorial—ranked costs as the least important (10th of 10) for their memorials. In some cases, such as the Alamo Memorial and the Martin Luther King, Jr. National Historic Site, this is related to the memorials having had previous uses and the structures were in place when they were named as memorials. The Little Bighorn Battlefield National Monument and Wounded Knee Memorial Museum both received federal funding and therefore costs did not play a significant role in the development of those memorials. Likewise, the memorial expert for the Space Shuttle Challenger Memorial, located in Arlington National Cemetery and modest in dimension and decoration, indicated that its low cost of development may
account for the low ranking of cost (10th of 10). Oklahoma City National Memorial and Museum, which received about one-third of its construction costs from the federal government and the State of Oklahoma, was, according to the memorial expert, committed to building the memorial within the budget. Thus, they also ranked cost as the lowest consideration (10th of 10) (see Appendix E for information on the interviews).

The memorial at Virginia Tech is a refreshing note of sympathy and generosity. The University reports that 28,000 donors have given $8.6 million in response to the campus massacre. The memorial expert reported that the University has been fortunate in that its memorial was constructed with minimal costs. Virginia Tech staff donated its labor in development of the memorial. The Hokie Stones were also donated, as was the lighting for the memorial. Of all of the memorials selected for this study, the Virginia Tech memorial expert spoke of the outpouring of emotion and sympathy which translated directly into volunteered time and materials for their memorial (see Appendix E for information on the interviews).

Hypothesis 10 states that technology is important to understanding the function, diverse types, and significance of memorials in the United States. This hypothesis corresponds to Construct 10, “Technology: A Virtual Past for a Virtual Community” and is listed last to represent its ranking by memorial experts (see Table 17). Rating of this construct, identified from the literature (Martini, 2000; Roberts, 2003) and from the websites that most memorials provide for prospective visitors, was intriguing.

The Wounded Knee Memorial Museum expert ranked its virtual presence higher (5th of 10) than any other memorial. Certainly, that emphasis on a virtual presence
is reflected in the creative use of technology on the site, the exceptional quality of art and photography, the depth of information provided, and the subtle use of music and other audio effects. Notable on the site is the use of Native American symbolism in ways understandable to all virtual visitors. The efficacy of this site in presenting both the history and the heart of the Wounded Knee Memorial Museum story is reflected in the website’s guest book that includes phrases such as: “Moving,” “done with respect,” “awesome and tragic,” “silent and thoughtful,” and “excellent” (see Appendix E for information on the interviews).

At the opposite end of the spectrum, the Galveston 1900 Hurricane Memorial does not have a website or other virtual presence to support the memorial. The only image of the memorial is posted by a photography company, rather than by the memorial organization. An extensive site on the 1900 Storm is posted by the Galveston County Daily News. Other websites by Galveston organizations make mention of the event, but the Memorial itself does not have a dedicated website (see Appendix E for information on the interviews).

In addition to the low priority that the Galveston 1900 Hurricane Memorial places on a virtual presence, seven of the memorials in this study ranked a virtual presence as their lowest priority (10th of 10). The rankings came from the Gettysburg National Military Park, United States Marine Corps War Memorial/Iwo Jima Memorial, Vietnam Veterans Memorial, National Fallen Firefighters Memorial, National September 11 Memorial and Museum at the World Trade Center, and Virginia Tech (see Appendix E for information on the interviews).
The Vietnam Veterans Memorial expert ranked its virtual presence (http://www.nps.gov/vive/) as its lowest priority (10th of 10). As with most memorial websites hosted by the National Park Service, this site helps visitors prepare to visit the memorial on the National Mall in Washington, D.C., but lacks significant content that is commonly found on websites at memorials such as Wounded Knee (see Appendix E for information on the interviews).

In addition to the website provided by the National Park Service, the Vietnam Veterans Memorial is supported by the Virtual Wall, an online memorial (http://www.virtualwall.org/) dedicated by Vice-President Al Gore on November 10, 1996. The Virtual Wall was created as a central location for “remembrances, poems, photos, letters, and citations honoring those named on the Vietnam Veterans Memorial Wall in Washington, D.C.” (Martini, 2000). The Virtual Wall reminds its visitors that the website does not provide a complete list of all casualties. Rather, the names they provide lead to a memorial written by someone who had a personal connection with the person being remembered. The Virtual Wall sends visitors seeking a complete list of names from the physical memorial to “No Quarter: Vietnam Casualty Search Engine” (www.no-quarter.org). At the Virtual Wall, visitors can find some of the power and poignancy of the memorial in Washington, D.C.

Three memorials—the National World War II Memorial, Space Shuttle Challenger Memorial, and the Martin Luther King, Jr. National Historic Site—ranked a virtual presence as their fifth, sixth, and seventh priorities, respectively (see Appendix E for information on the interviews). Although the National World War II Memorial has a website provided by the National Park Service (www.nps.gov/nwwm), a more
comprehensive virtual presence is available at: www.wwiimemorial.com. This site includes photographs, a registry for all who served—both in the war and on the home front—message boards, and educational material.

The Space Shuttle Challenger Memorial has a virtual presence provided by Arlington National Cemetery (www.arlingtoncemetery.net/challengr.htm). A brief history of the Challenger disaster is given, photographs are provided, and biographies of the astronauts are included. Despite this, the headers to all Challenger materials remind virtual visitors that the information is being provided by Arlington National Cemetery: “Where Valor Proudly Sleeps.” Other memorials to the astronauts of the Challenger, including the one at Kennedy Space Center in Florida, have limited online information beyond a description of the Florida memorial (see Appendix E for information on the interviews; NASA, 2008).

Like many of the memorials, the Martin Luther King, Jr. National Historic Site has multiple virtual presences. The official Martin Luther King, Jr. Historic Site, provided by the National Park Service, provides limited information (www.nps.gov/malu). The King Center, the partner organization that manages the site in conjunction with the National Park Service, has a comprehensive and creative presentation of history, King’s speeches, the meaning of the Martin Luther King, Jr. Holiday, and all activities of the King Center (www.thekingcenter.org).

Although not highly ranked by the experts, the virtual presence of the Oklahoma City National Memorial and Museum (www.oklahomacitynationalmemorial.org), the National September 11 Memorial and Museum at the World Trade Center (www.national911memorial.org), and Virginia Tech (www.vt.edu/remember) are all
examples of how virtual memorials are able to impart more than information, linking together a virtual community of concern, interest, and remembrance (see Appendix E for information on the interviews).

Like other constructs and hypotheses discussed above, the presence of a virtual memorial and the use of technology to create that presence differ greatly in approach, intended use, and efficacy. Wounded Knee Memorial Museum, Oklahoma City National Memorial and Museum, and Virginia Tech make effective use of technology to tell the stories of their memorials and to bring more than mere information to their virtual visitors. All three manage to evoke the intangible feelings of grief and memory. Three memorials that provide virtual materials in addition to official websites—the Virtual Wall of the Vietnam Veterans Memorial, the National World War II Memorial, and the King Center website linked to the Martin Luther King, Jr. National Historic Site—show that organizational partnerships can provide meaningful benefits to virtual visitors.

Conclusion

Case studies for the 16 memorials selected for this research underscore the differences that represent a broad cross-section of American memorials. The history of each differs greatly, as does the context. Despite this, the majority of the memorials (10 of 16) were created to commemorate an event that can be placed within a larger historical context: The Texas Revolution at the Alamo; the Civil War at Gettysburg; manifest destiny at both the Little Bighorn Battlefield National Monument and the Wounded Knee Memorial Museum; World War II at the USS Arizona Memorial and the United States Marine Corps War Memorial/Iwo Jima Memorial; the Civil Rights Movement at the Martin Luther King, Jr. National Historic Site; space exploration at the Space Shuttle
Challenger Memorial; and terrorism at Oklahoma City National Memorial and Museum, and the National September 11 Memorial and Museum at the World Trade Center. Three of the memorials chosen—National World War II Memorial, the Korean War Veterans Memorial, and the Vietnam Veterans Memorial—are overarching, cover all the battles, and all of those lost in those three wars. The Galveston 1900 Hurricane Memorial is a reminder of a natural disaster. The National Fallen Firefighters is a memorial built to honor those who serve. Virginia Tech commemorates a senseless massacre on a college campus.

Although these differences are significant, the memorials themselves share many traits and characteristics. These similarities support the universal contributions made by the constructs identified from the literature on memorials. Memory and “sense of place” are constructs evoked in visitors. Sometimes these feelings arise from the architectural design, the education programs, the use of names on a memorial, or the leaving of keepsakes and other artifacts. Many visitors experience grief at the memorial, although this may not be related to the visit, but rather to the depth of loss, the strength of connection of the living for the dead, and the time that has passed. Technology, in particular the use of websites to provide parallel information, to extend the memorial to those who cannot visit the physical location, or to help visitors prepare for a visit is an element of importance for experts at the majority of the memorials.

Cost of the memorial seems immaterial to the experience. Whether $1 billion is spent for the National September 11 Memorial and Museum at the World Trade Center, or whether the time and materials that make up the Virginia Tech Memorial were volunteered, it is the event, the loss, and the remembrance that touch the visitor most
significantly. The only time that cost becomes an issue is in those cases, from the
Washington Monument and Lincoln Memorial to the Martin Luther King, Jr. Memorial
planned for the National Mall in Washington, D.C., where funding shortages postpone
the construction of memorials.

The common elements in the case studies and the common constructs derived
from the literature were confirmed in interviews with memorial experts. The insights
provided by the memorial experts, without exception, has informed the development of
the conceptual model that will be presented in Chapter Five. This model will include the
constructs, now reordered to reflect the ranking of the memorial experts in terms of how
they were found to be most important in the testing above. The significant value of the
conceptual model, however, will be to guide future research and to guide those who wish
to develop a memorial.
Chapter Five

Conceptual Model and Conclusions

I've learned that people will forget what you said, 
people will forget what you did, 
but people will never forget how you made them feel.
—Maya Angelou, Poet

America was not built on fear. 
America was built on courage, 
on imagination and an unbeatable 
determination to do the job at hand.
—President Harry S. Truman

Introduction

A comprehensive literature review identified 10 constructs as important to understanding memorials. These were tested against case studies of the 16 memorials selected for this study, memorial websites, and data supplied by experts employed at the memorials. The constructs accepted in the tests as important were re-ordered as ranked by the memorial experts (Table 18). Further, the acceptance or rejection of the hypotheses correlating to each construct is noted in Table 18.

Constructs Accepted

The acceptance or rejection of the hypotheses is based on the ranking of constructs by memorial experts and the case studies. The hypotheses that were
accepted as valid will be discussed first, and then the rejected construct (cost) will be explained.

Table 18. Hypotheses in order informed by memorial experts.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypotheses in order informed by memorial experts</th>
<th>Accept</th>
<th>Reject</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H-1. Memory and Meaning</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H-2. Education</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H-3. Connectivity (sense of place)</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H-4. Grieving</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H-5. Visitors</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H-6. Names</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H-7. Architectural design</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H-8. Artifacts</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H-9. Cost</td>
<td></td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H-10. Technology</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The hypotheses/constructs (noted in shortened format) appear in the order ranked (from most important to least) by experts at the 16 memorials. Note, however, that the ranking is not directly tied to the acceptance or rejection of the hypotheses for the conceptual model to follow.
Hypothesis 1. Those Left Behind: Memory and Meaning. Memory is the most significant of the constructs involved in the development of a memorial. In the literature and the interviews with memorial experts, memory and meaning resonate as the primary purpose behind the memorials studied. The importance of memory goes far beyond memorials, as is seen in the motto of Quebec, Je me Souviens—We remember. Alexander (2007, ¶17) suggests this phrase is shorthand for “We remember how it used to be and we will not forget.” Je me Souviens, though coming from different roots, is not far from the poem, Remember, by Holocaust survivor Sasha Semenoff:

We must always remember;
We must never forget;
We shall always remember;
We shall never forget.

We remember our father;
We remember our mother;
We remember our sisters and brothers;
We remember the children who were much too young to die.

The importance of memory in history, religion, and in the development of memorials and monuments is a dynamic concept. The memorial experts interviewed in the course of this research spoke of the differences in memory from the allegorical generation of World War II to the more prosaic memories of the generation that either protested or fought in the Vietnam War. In the former, there are symbolic memories, such as the stars of the National World War II Memorial that are intended to evoke a
variety of memories of victory, pride, and a nationalism that linked all involved. For those who served during the Vietnam War, with its faceless and often hostile homecoming for many of the veterans, the inclusion of names in “The Wall” is a pivotal memory that serves as a reminder of specific individuals, of loved ones, rather than memories of an era that most would wish to put behind them.

The Korean War, “the forgotten war,” bridges the gap between the two. At the Korean War Veterans Memorial, heroic statues of troops appear to trudge beneath the weight of their weapons and the war. These soldiers from the Korean War are not the heroes of the Second World War’s “Greatest Generation;” they more nearly share the anonymity of veterans from Vietnam War, but they knew the triumph of victory and the bitterness of defeat.

A number of the memorials provide reflective areas, silence, and other peaceful elements as a way to capture memories; it is not always the case. At the Oklahoma City National Memorial and Museum, visitors to the museum experience first the sound of the bomb, the cries of the victims, and the calls of the responders. Oklahoma City National Memorial and Museum has chosen not to leave memory to the solitude of the empty chairs. Rather, the museum visit is more reminiscent of Dylan Thomas’s lines “Do not go gentle into that good night. . . . Rage, rage against the dying of the light” (Thomas, 2003). The Oklahoma City National Memorial and Museum not only wants their visitors to remember those lost, but to remember emotions such as the horror, anger, and hatred that reverberated in the moments and months following the bombing.

**Hypothesis 2. Education: Learning from the Dead.** Education is an integral part of most memorials. For those memorials from more distant years, education
provides a link between the past and the present. At the Alamo Memorial and the Gettysburg Memorial, the education programs seek to provide, respectively, a reminder of the founding of the United States and of the sacrifices that generations who marched long ago made for the causes of independence and the preservation of the Union.

At the Native American memorials for the Little Bighorn Battlefield and Wounded Knee, education plays a prominent role in the memorial experience, especially for those whose families and cultural histories were not touched by the conflicts that are remembered in these places. Through this education mission, visitors are able to share the significance and meaning of the events.

The extensive education programs provided through the efforts of the Vietnam Veterans Memorial are probably indicative of the feeling that the truth of their story will best be told by those who served. Certainly at the Vietnam Veterans Memorial and at those built to commemorate events after that war, memory and education are conflated. At the National World War II Memorial, one leaves with separate impressions: Memories of sacrifice and lessons of history. But, at the Vietnam Veterans Memorial, memorial experts wanted their visitors to leave with contextual memories—an interweaving of memory and education. A similar phenomenon is present in the education programs for the memorials to terrorism, where the lessons of hatred for America learned during those frightful events are among the most important memories one can take away from the attacks at the Murrah Federal Building in Oklahoma City and at the World Trade Center in New York.

**Hypothesis 3. Connectivity: Sense of Place.** "Sense of place" is created most easily at those memorials that stand at the site of the events they memorialize. Certainly
the Alamo, Gettysburg, the USS Arizona, Martin Luther King, Jr. National Historic Site, and the Oklahoma City National Memorial and Museum employ not just the place, but its sense to more vividly tell their stories of loss. Other memorials are equally effective at creating the same "sense of place" at a much greater distance. With the snap of the American flag, the United States Marine Corps War Memorial/Iwo Jima Memorial takes visitors to that day when Marines overcame the Japanese forces in the Pacific. So too, both the soldiers at the Korean War Veterans Memorial and the infinite stretch of names at Vietnam Veterans Memorial evoke a sense of those wars far beyond what their architectural elements would suggest.

Despite the importance of "sense of place," there are memorials that do not seem to stir visitors. At Galveston, the greatest lost of American life to a natural disaster, the sense of the storm and its fury are better felt at dozens of other places around the island. Examples of this include homes that survived the storm—and are marked by water lines far up the first floor walls—and at the museums in Galveston.

**Hypothesis 4. The Role of Memorials: Public or Private Grieving.** This construct, observed at every memorial, is as much a function of the memorial visitor as the memorial itself. Grief is a personal outpouring based on the individual who visits, but it is an emotion that can be shared with strangers, whose own grief may be triggered by the tears of another person.

According to Kübler-Ross (1969), grief lessens with the passing of time, but small reminders can swamp a person with a wave of grief. Seeing the name of a loved one on the Vietnam Veterans Memorial may bring tears and a renewed sense of loss, but no more than hearing the favorite song of a loved one, or the scent of a favorite food.
The expression of grief, both public and private, seems a feature of the individual who, touched by a memorial visit, may choose to reach out in grief or to turn inward with memories. Perhaps the most fascinating expressions of grief at memorials were related by the experts from the Oklahoma City National Memorial and Museum. The fence, integrated into their memorial, is the site where visitors leave expressions of grief over those loved and lost in the Murrah building bombing. It has also become a site to mark grief over other losses. The expert mentioned that visitors left photographs and other artifacts at the death of Dale Earnhardt, a race car driver killed February 2001. Other artifacts suggest less public losses, with news articles and photographs marking the loss of family members and friends. This indicates that the Oklahoma City National Memorial and Museum has become a central location for community grief: A public site for private grieving that extends far beyond one tragedy, very much hallowed ground—as Lincoln declared at Gettysburg.

**Hypothesis 5. We the Living: Who Visits Memorials.** Memorials are built for the living and, as such, visitors to memorials are integral elements of the memorial function. A number of the memorial experts spoke of the need for adequate parking, lighting for night-time viewing, and other elements to make a memorial accessible. In the case of Oklahoma City National Memorial and Museum, the concern for visitors was based not just on accessibility, but on the knowledge that a visit to the memorial is emotionally difficult and some area residents report they have been unable to confront the place and the feelings a visit will evoke.
At the National World War II Memorial, visitors are more distant from the events, both in time and place. For those, a floating wreath on a reflecting pond is a way for the living to visit and to make peace with the past.

**Hypothesis 6. Personalization: Names at National Memorials.** In the close relationship between cemeteries and memorials, especially those memorials located in cemeteries such as the Space Shuttle Challenger Memorial, names have always played an important role in memory and recognition. Communities and small town memorials to long-ago wars very often included the names of those lost. It was the Vietnam Veterans Memorial, however, with its seemingly endless list of names, firmly memorialized a roll call of the dead. This element of naming seemed to trigger recognition for the Vietnam generation. For them, names are integral to acknowledge those lost and their place both in history and in memory. For those lost on September 11, 2001, whose bodies were never recovered, the names at the memorial are intended to provide a physical place to remember and to visit.

The importance of names at several memorials goes far beyond the names engraved in stone. At anniversaries of events, many memorials read the names of the dead. At the Vietnam Veterans Memorial, that reading of names, last done for the twenty-fifth anniversary of the memorial, took 65 hours over a four-day period, and required the commitment of 2000 volunteers who read the more than 58,000 names on the memorial.

**Hypothesis 7. Architecture and Design: The Physical Elements of Memorials.** Architecture and design have changed significantly throughout American history. The white marble edifices of Washington, Lincoln, and Jefferson on the National
Mall in Washington, D.C., stand in stark contrast to the black marble of the Vietnam
Veterans Memorial. Despite these differences, there are architectural elements that seem
near universal. Plants, including the “Survivor Tree” at the Oklahoma City National
Memorial and Museum, the oasis of 400 trees planned for the National September 11
Memorial and Museum at the World Trade Center, and the Korean national flowers at the
Korean War Veterans Memorial all add a sense that, despite the changing seasons, life
goes on in an endless cycle.

The use of reflective surfaces, including water, glass, granite, and stainless steel,
are also metaphors not just for emotional reflection, but they serve to overlay the image
of a visitor on the memorial. In a sense these reflective surfaces create the feeling that,
while we may never again see those who have been lost, we can stand with them.

**Hypothesis 8. Artifacts: Personalizing the Memorial Visit.** Artifacts left at
memorials are part of a human tradition that may have begun with the Neanderthals who
buried flowers and stone tools with their dead. Clearly, the pyramids of Egypt were filled
with items placed in the grave to ensure the pharaohs lacked for nothing in the next
world. For many years, American traditions dictated flowers or flags as the appropriate
token to mark remembrance or reverence. This practice was so common that many parts
of the United States referred to Memorial Day as Decoration Day, when families went to
decorate not just the graves of those who died in service to the country, but to all who
have gone before.

The Vietnam Veterans Memorial very quickly began to attract a new kind of
artifact. It is common for visitors to leave pictures, letters, military badges, and medals.
Some of the artifacts left at “The Wall” are personal keepsakes that hold no meaning for
outsiders. Yet others, such as combat boots that are left behind, reflect a generation who refer to their memories as "baggage"—and often baggage they would wish to leave behind. The practice of leaving a variety of artifacts has continued, and is commonly seen at spontaneous shrines that appear on a roadside, at the site of tragedy, or at the home of one who has been lost.

Hypothesis 10. Technology: A Virtual Past for a Virtual Community. Call it technology, a virtual memorial, or just a website, these elements of memorials seem to have greater importance than their ranking by memorial experts would otherwise suggest. Numerous experts, especially those for memorials associated with the National Park Service, spoke of the need to add significantly to their online materials, recognizing the insufficiency of their virtual memorial and acknowledged the importance of memorial websites. This virtual presence is of sufficient importance that other groups have created online resources—most notable are the websites developed for those interested in National World War II Memorial and The Virtual Wall that functions in conjunction with the Vietnam Veterans Memorial.

The low ranking for technology may also be the result of the interviews with memorial experts. It seems possible that the websites would have greater significance for visitors, especially those who cannot travel to a memorial. In the case of the Korean War Veterans Memorial, a virtual visitor spoke of the online material as important. The visitor's father fought in Korea, but, like many who fought in that war, has now reached the age where the father was not physically able to make a trip to the memorial.
Constructs Rejected

The nine constructs discussed above seem to share universal importance at memorials, both to the memorial experts and to the visitors. They resonate with veterans and with the families of whose soldiers did not return. Why then does this research lead to the rejection of cost?

**Hypothesis 9. Costs: What Price for Memory.** The cost of the memorial seems immaterial to the visitor at a memorial. Will a visitor to the National September 11, 2001 Memorial and Museum at the World Trade Center feel their experience is enhanced because of the $1 billion price tag estimated for that memorial? Will this memorial elicit more tears and pull more heartstrings than the Virginia Tech Memorial, constructed largely with donated materials and volunteer labor?

**The Conceptual Model: Considerations**

The conceptual model for a memorial must begin with an event: A battle or a war, an accident, an assassination, or an act of terrorism. Memorials have been built for fires, floods, and storms. They are in place for wrecks of ships, trains, and planes.

The events at Oklahoma City and Virginia Tech immediately led to spontaneous memorials that provided clues to important design elements of the eventual permanent memorial: The use of the fence at the Oklahoma City National Memorial and Museum and the use of Hokie Stones at Virginia Tech. These two memorials also have in common the speed with which they were erected. Memorial experts suggested that this serves survivors to a greater degree than memorials, such as the National World War II Memorial, built long after the event they memorialize. That is not to suggest these
delayed memorials should not be built, but that the purposes they serve are often better met sooner than later.

Although cost was not considered an important construct, it becomes a deciding factor in the timing of memorial construction. The ongoing challenge of raising $100 million for the Martin Luther King, Jr. Memorial planned for the National Mall in Washington, D.C., illustrates the problem when the design exceeds the generosity of those interested. This is not just a modern problem, but was mentioned in the literature on both the Washington Monument and the Lincoln Memorial.

In keeping with the early design competitions that determined the style for our nation's capital, including the White House, the Vietnam Veterans Memorial, and memorials since then, design competitions continue to be an effective way to develop a meaningful memorial. The panels who judge the competition face controversy and criticism, but the impact of the design at the Vietnam Veterans Memorial and of the empty chairs at Oklahoma City National Memorial and Museum confirm the value of the process.

The pairing of a memorial with a museum is becoming increasingly common. The pairing is now being suggested for the Vietnam Veterans Memorial, with a visitor center to exhibit the artifacts left behind by visitors. The museum is an integral part of the visitor experience at Oklahoma City, and a museum is planned with the memorial at the former site of the World Trade Center. To ensure this pairing is understood, it would seem best that a memorial is defined as an outdoor architectural element; the museum is indoors and meets the common definition of museum as an institution that collects, conserves, and exhibits artifacts, provides access to the collection for research by scholars.
and staff, provides an array of educational and experiential activities, and welcomes visitors (Alexander, 1995). In combining the two, the memorial and museum complex provide a broader and more comprehensive interpretation of the history.

The Conceptual Model

The conceptual model and corresponding steps and constructs that are necessary to create a meaningful memorial are presented in Table 19. This model has been developed by a thorough consideration of the literature, case studies, and the interviews with memorial experts that provided valuable insight into the process.

Additional Constructs

Even though they were not emphasized in the literature, there are additional possibilities for constructs that may contribute to the understanding of all memorials and the development of successful memorials. They include:

1. A champion to promote awareness and support for establishing a memorial
2. The role of the media
3. Memorials for social change
4. Event or individual(s) that attract public attention
Table 19. Conceptual model (with constructs that are considered in each step).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Order</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Constructs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Memorialize individual(s) or event</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Observe spontaneous memorial elements, preserve artifacts, interview all stakeholders, consider if elements of the spontaneous memorial are appropriate for long-term (e.g., Virginia Tech)</td>
<td>H-5 Visitors, H-6 Names, H-8 Artifacts, H-10 Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Locate champion for memorial</td>
<td>H-10 Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Find support and location if other than event site</td>
<td>H-10 Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Design competition</td>
<td>H-1 Memory, H-2 Education, H-3 Connectivity, H-5 Visitors, H-8 Artifacts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Select architectural design</td>
<td>H-6 Names, H-7 Architecture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Continue to seek support and input</td>
<td>H-10 Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Build and open memorial</td>
<td>H-1 Memory, H-2 Education, H-3 Connectivity, H-5 Visitors, H-6 Names, H-7 Architecture, H-8 Artifacts, H-10 Technology</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Champions. Although champions are mentioned in the literature, the importance of their efforts was not sufficiently emphasized to warrant adding it as a construct. The most successful national memorials have, however, had champions. In some instances, this champion has been an individual who will speak to legislators, ask for donations, make a significant gift, capture the attention of the media, or promote the idea of a memorial and bring the idea into public awareness. The champions for memorials have included veterans, family members and friends, survivors, public officials, corporate officers, religious leaders, and others.

In the year after the assassination of Martin Luther King, Jr., his widow, Coretta Scott King, founded the Martin Luther King, Jr. Center for Nonviolent Social Change in the basement of the home the couple had shared. Her efforts would eventually become the multi-million dollar facility near King’s birth home and the Ebenezer Baptist Church where he preached.

Another spouse, Elizabeth Custer, wife of George Armstrong Custer who died in the Battle of the Little Bighorn in 1876, provided impetus for the development of the museum at the Little Bighorn Battlefield National Monument. She donated much of her husband’s memorabilia to the monument contingent on the building of a visitor’s center and museum at the site.

It was a veteran, Roger Durbin, who started the process that would become the National World War II Memorial. Durbin’s mention of a memorial to U.S. Representative March Kapur of Ohio in the late 1980s led her to sponsor legislation to build a memorial. It took several years of work before the legislation passed in 1993, and ground was not broken until 2001—the year after Durbin died of cancer.
Another veteran, Jan Scruggs, who had served in Vietnam, launched the effort to build a memorial to the veterans of that war (Ashabranner, 1998). In 1979, feeling that the country had neglected and betrayed those who served, Scruggs solicited the support of Senator John Warner (Virginia), Senator Charles Mathias, Jr. (Maryland), Senator Gary Hart (Colorado), and Senator Jake Garn (Utah), who believed a memorial, would promote a period of reconciliation in a country divided over the war (p. 3).

The Vietnam Women’s Memorial also had a single champion, Diane Carlson Evans, a former Army nurse who served in Vietnam. Her efforts to memorialize—beyond the names of the eight women on the wall—led to the dedication of the Vietnam Women’s Memorial in 1993 (“The Vietnam Women’s,” 2007).

A “champion” is not always an individual. In the case of the development of the Oklahoma City National Memorial and Museum, it was an entire community that championed the development of this memorial for their community. More than 350 people served on the task force that included survivors, rescuers, family members of those killed, and community officials.

The lack of a champion does not always defeat the development of a memorial. The development of the National September 11 Memorial and Museum at the World Trade Center has been a political tug-of-war between New York City, the State of New York, the New York Port Authority, and the Lower Manhattan Development Corporation, as well as federal agencies seeking to wrest economic control over the development of a memorial. But the memorial will likely be built.

The Role of the Media. Investigations of the role the media plays in tragedies would provide useful information. The instantaneous coverage by the media that brings
disaster and tragedy into our living rooms creates a consciousness of these events to a much greater extent than at any time in history. A comparison of school disasters, for example, might look at the role of media in response to the Virginia Tech massacre and to the Bath School Disaster in 1927. In Bath, Michigan, a disgruntled school board member bombed the public school, killing 45 and injuring 58.

Certainly media coverage played a significant role in America’s worst shipping disaster. Most people know of the Titanic, where 1,512 lives were lost, but few know about the riverboat Sultana whose sinking would kill 1,547. How could this loss of life, especially since most of those who died were Union soldiers rescued from Andersonville prison camp, be forgotten? Most historians suggest that Lincoln’s death, within two weeks of the Sultana sinking, so consumed national attention that the nation’s worse marine disaster did not register in the national consciousness (“Death on the,” 1997).

Memorials for Social Change. Some events have further impact than the loss of life and construction of a memorial. These are events of such significance that they change national legislation and national habits. Undeniably, any person who travels by air since September 11, 2001, has experienced the changes in airport security that result from that tragedy. The Titanic, mentioned earlier, led to changes in regulations concerning lifeboats and other safety equipment required on passenger ships.

A school explosion, in New London, Texas, killed 300 to 425 children in 1908. Although the event is long forgotten, the results of this tragedy have saved lives ever since. The natural gas explosion responsible for the tragedy led to the mandated addition of thiols (an odorous material) to otherwise invisible and odorless natural gas.
The Triangle Shirtwaist Fire, in 1911 in New York, was responsible for the death of 148 garment workers. This tragedy led to legislation requiring better working conditions and factory safety standards that would help change the lives of sweatshop workers. The same proved true for numerous tragedies in coal mines, and successive deadly tsunami's on the big island of Hawaii in 1946 and 1960 resulted in changes in coastal development and the advent of an early warning system.

As was noted in discussions about the Little Bighorn Battlefield National Monument and the Wounded Knee Memorial Museums, other memorials address and have sometimes sought to change prejudices and perceptions. One such memorial commemorates the contributions of Japanese-Americans in World War II. The contributions of 442nd Infantry, the most decorated unit of the war, are memorialized at Evergreen Cemetery in Los Angeles, California, with the words of General Eisenhower, “Those who lie here gave their lives that this country, beset by its enemies, might win out of their sacrifice, victory and peace. We, who are in their debt, salute them” (“The Eisenhower Presidential,” n.d., p. 1).

Although often neglected in studies of memorials, the United States has numerous memorials to disease. They mark deaths to yellow fever, cholera, and influenza—epidemics that have taken hundreds of thousands of lives. More recently, with the loss of over a half-million people to AIDS, a memorial quilt has been made which serves not just of remembrance; it has increased public awareness about the disease. The quilt has helped to raise more than $4 million for direct services for people with AIDS.

Events to be Memorialized. If “disasters” can be measured in terms of lives lost, there are two important tragedies in the latter half of the twentieth century that have not
been memorialized. In 1979, the crash of a DC-10 aircraft, American Airlines Flight 191, at O'Hare Airport, Chicago, Illinois, killed 275. In 1981, a walkway collapse at the Hyatt-Regency Hotel in Kansas City, Missouri, killed 114. Dozens—perhaps hundreds—of other memorials mark tragedies of lesser magnitude.

The absence of memorials to these two disasters suggests that it may be important to investigate why some tragedies are memorialized, but others are not. What is it that these events share? They were both in the Midwest. They took place only two years apart. The crash of Flight 191 took place on Friday afternoon of Memorial Day weekend, 1979, and many of the victims were aboard with holiday plans. The Hyatt-Regency collapse happened during a tea dance. Could the similarities between vacations and a party negate the need to memorialize those lost? Without research, one can only speculate, but the Chicago memorial for the Excursion Steamer Eastland, a pleasure steamer responsible for the deaths of 884 in 1915, suggests that is not the case.

The National Transportation Safety Board (NTSB) attributed the crash of Flight 191 to damage caused by a maintenance practice instituted by American Airlines without the approval of McDonnell Douglas. After the NTSB findings, the federal government fined American Airlines $500,000 for improper maintenance procedures although the insurance settlement for replacement of the aircraft was $25 million.

The walkway collapse at the Hyatt-Regency Hotel in Kansas City was the result of a design change during construction of the building. The change exacerbated problems in the original design, resulting in the fourth floor walkway to hold only 30 percent of the minimum load requirement. After the collapse, the engineers who had approved the final drawings were convicted of gross negligence, misconduct, and
unprofessional conduct. The engineering firm, although cleared of criminal negligence, lost its license to practice engineering.

Is it possible that the finding of human error confounds memorial construction? That is not the case for the Great Train Wreck of 1918 in Nashville, Tennessee, where a memorial stands to the 101 people who died in this country’s deadliest rail accident. That accident, caused by an error of railroad employees, resulted in a head-on collision.

**Future Research**

With the United States embroiled in a war in Iraq and fighting in Afghanistan, involved in space exploration, and threatened by both natural disasters and terrorism, Virginia Tech is not the final memorial our country will want or need to build. There is little doubt that our determination to overcome tragedy will continue to be tested.

Scholarly testing of the conceptual model developed in this research will aid in our collective understanding of the functions, diversities, and significance of all memorials. In addition to research testing the validity of this model, this model will likely prove helpful in studying and understanding other memorials. Moreover, this model can be improved upon through a larger, more representative sample of memorials to be studied. Research could also be expanded to include international memorials, which will provide additional insights into the memorial process, the use of memorials, and the constructs they share, with the conceptual model forwarded in this study providing a template for such research.

Interviews with memorial experts could be expanded far beyond the experts at the 16 memorials interviewed for this study. And finally, a thorough study that involved all memorial stakeholders would add significantly to future research. There is no doubt
much can be learned from veterans and survivors, the first responders who played such an important role at the Oklahoma City bombing and the World Trade Center attacks, those whose lives are touched directly, and those whose lives are touched through television. Memorial visitors, who come for history and education, rather than those who seek the memory of a loved one, would provide different perspectives that might shape future memorials, more fully inform the process and outcomes of the conceptual model, and confirm or reject the constructs selected through this study. Questionnaires and interviews should be administered to both on-site and online visitors to memorials, and observations of memorial visitors could provide additional insights.

Another area of study that may lend insights into the memorial process is the naming of streets, highways, and buildings. Although such structures are sometimes named for donors, many are named to recognize and remember. The impact of this is evident in the number schools named for Space Shuttle Challenger astronaut, Christa McAuliffe, the "teacher in space." Many communities with an African American population have named a street for Martin Luther King, Jr., and there are municipalities across the nation that have streets named to recognize the presidents and political figures.

A more thorough study of spontaneous memorials and shrines should add further understanding of the memorial process. In the case of Virginia Tech, the spontaneous memorial of a semi-circle of Hokie Stones ended up solidifying the memory of the event and those whose absence will always be felt and serving as the framework for a permanent memorial. There are countless such spontaneous memorials erected along roadsides where loved ones were lost in a traffic accident to items placed at the site of a
tragedy in the crucial minutes and days following the event. The study of these practices might both expand and clarify our perception of memorials and the memorial process.

Post-script. My interest in memorials began at Kent State University. In researching this topic, I have discovered far more than I anticipated. A shared inability to articulate what we need at a memorial, what we see, and what we hope, has made this study difficult. Having suffered a personal loss in the past year has made me more compassionate and understanding of the complex issues of love, loss, honor, history, faith, and future. I hope the work presented here will encourage interdisciplinary investigations of memorials, looking at the functions and significance they fulfill that are public and private, as well as at once sad and celebratory. I suspect that those researchers, too, will find as have I:

The world will little note, nor long remember what we say here,

but it can never forget what they did here (Lincoln, 1863).
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National Memorials

The national memorials listed below are maintained by the National Park Service. An asterisk (*) marks those memorials in this study.

- Arkansas Post National Memorial
- Arlington House, the Robert E. Lee Memorial
- Chamizal National Memorial
- Coronado National Memorial
- DeSoto National Memorial
- Federal Hall National Memorial
- Flight 93 National Memorial
- Fort Caroline National Memorial
- Fort Clatsop National Memorial
- Franklin Delano Roosevelt Memorial
- General Grant National Memorial
- Hamilton Grant National Memorial
- Jefferson National Expansion Memorial
- Johnstown Flood National Memorial
- *Korean War Veterans Memorial
- Lincoln Boyhood National Memorial
- Lincoln Memorial
- Lyndon Baines Johnson Memorial Grove on the Potomac
- Mount Rushmore National Memorial
*Oklahoma City National Memorial and Museum
Perry’s Victory and International Peace Memorial
Roger Williams National Memorial
Thaddeus Kosciuszko National Memorial
Thomas Jefferson National Memorial
*USS Arizona Memorial
*Vietnam Veterans Memorial
Washington Monument
Wright Brothers National Memorial
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Study Memorials

The 16 memorials listed below were used in this study. Those maintained by the National Park Service and designated as national memorials are marked by an asterisk (*).

M-1. Alamo Memorial
M-2. Gettysburg Memorial
M-3. Little Bighorn Battlefield National Monument
M-4. Wounded Knee Memorial Museum
M-5. Galveston 1900 Hurricane Memorial
M-6. *USS Arizona Memorial
M-7. National World War II Memorial
M-8. United States Marine Corps War Memorial/Iwo Jima Memorial
M-9. *Korean War Veterans Memorial
M-10. Martin Luther King, Jr. National Historic Site
M-11. *Vietnam Veterans Memorial
M-12. National Fallen Firefighters Memorial
M-13. Space Shuttle Challenger Memorial
M-14. *Oklahoma City National Memorial & Museum
M-15. National September 11 Memorial and Museum at the World Trade Center
M-16. Virginia Tech
Appendix C

Letter to Memorial Contacts
The purpose of this letter is to request a brief telephone interview to discuss the [name of memorial]. I am a Ph.D. candidate at Lynn University in Boca Raton, Florida. As part of my dissertation, I am attempting to identify key elements common to most public memorials. Your assistance would be both greatly appreciated and instrumental in completing my dissertation.

If you or another administrator with [name of memorial], are available for an interview, please let me know by [date]. I can be reached by telephone at [home telephone number], email at [email address] or by your returning the self-stamped and addressed letter to me with the form enclosed, whichever is your preference. Please indicate a time or date before [date], that will best fit your schedule for the interview.

I will respond by both mail and telephone to confirm the scheduled date and time that will be convenient for you for the interview. The mail confirmation will also include the Lynn University IRB consent form with a self-stamped envelope for you to please return the signed consent form. The interview will take 30 minutes or less.

In addition, I am requesting permission to tape record the interview for the sole purpose of assuring that your comments are reported accurately. If this is not acceptable to you, I would still like to interview you, but will not record the telephone call. In the interview, I will ask you questions about what you believe to be the key elements that describe [name of memorial]. To facilitate your preparation, I am enclosing a copy of the questions that will be asked during the interview.

The interview will be used solely for research purposes in the completion of my doctoral dissertation. If you would like to have a copy of the completed dissertation, I will be happy to forward one to your attention.

Thank you in advance for your time and kind consideration.

Sincerely yours,

Mona D. Greenberg
Ph.D. Candidate
Appendix D

Instrument Used in Data Collection
Based on a review of the scholarly literature on memorials the following have been identified as the key elements of memorials. After reviewing the list, please identify on the last page the most important to the least important. Thank you in advance for your kind participation. The following questions will be asked during the telephone interview:

A. We the Living: Who Visits Memorials
   1. Approximately how many visitors a year visit your memorial?
   2. Are there specific days or times of the year that bring more visitors?
   3. Do you see more individuals, families, school groups, tourists or locals visiting your memorial? Are any demographic records kept on the types of visitors?
   4. Are there consistently asked questions? If so, do the questions mirror something about the visitors or about the memorial?

B. Those Left Behind: Memory and Meaning
   1. Do you believe visitors obtain the same experience from the memorial as that which was intended by the designers?
   2. If there are differences in visitors' experiences, what are they?
   3. What sets your memorial apart from other memorials?
   4. Has any research been conducted to determine the response of visitors to the memorial?

C. The Role of Memorials: Public or Private Grieving
   1. What specific feelings or emotions do visitors express?
   2. Do you see consistent behaviors by visitors that you interpret as reflection?
   3. Are there visible signs of private grieving? If so, what are they?

D. Education: Learning from the Deceased
   1. Do you have an educational element in your mission? If so, what is it?
   2. How do you provide that education to visitors?
      • Signs
      • Handout pamphlets that visitors receive at memorial entry
      • Docents (volunteer educators who provide informal educational programs)
      • Formal programs in classroom or auditorium
      • Videos
   3. What is the major lesson visitors take from your memorial?
   4. Are books and other educational items sold on site?

E. Artifacts: A Physical Connection
   1. Are artifacts commonly left at your memorial? If so, what types of artifacts are commonly left at the site?
   2. Are the artifacts purchased at the site by visitors or do they bring them from home?
   3. Do visitors ever attempt to take an artifact away with them and if so, what kind?
F. Personalization: Names at National Monuments
   1. If your memorial has individual names listed on it, are the visitors touching a specific name or taking rubbings of the name?
   2. If there are pictures of individuals memorialized, do visitors photograph those images?
   3. How do visitors personalize their experience at your memorial? For example, do they touch the memorial or take rubbings of a name, leave a photo...?
   4. Does your memorial encourage visitors to personalize their experience? If so, in what ways are visitors permitted or encouraged to personalize their visit?

G. Architecture and Design: The Physical Elements of Memorials
   1. How long after the event for which the memorial was named was the memorial built?
   2. Are any new additions or museums planned to be added to your memorial? If yes, please expand on the addition(s).

H. Costs: What Price for Memory?
   1. Do you solicit donations and donors? If so, who are the donors (both large and small) and why do they give?
   2. What is the approximate breakdown of public versus private sources of funding?

I. Connectivity: Sense of Place
   1. Is the location of your memorial a “destination” in and of itself or is it something that people pass in the course of everyday life?
   2. In what ways does this impact how you promote the memorial and the nature of your programming?
   3. Is there a shift in purpose or use over time? Does personalization precede in importance as time passes and generations pass?

J. Technology: A Virtual Past for a Virtual Community
   1. Do you believe that your website (virtual memorial) has affected the importance of visiting a memorial in-person versus through a computer screen?
   2. Does the website differ in any significant way from the memorial?
   3. How many visitors come to the website? Can you characterize these virtual visitors in any way and are they similar to or different from actual visitors?
Please rank in order of importance: 1 = Highest and 10 = Lowest

A. We the Living: Who visits memorials? (The types of visitors to the memorial)

B. Those Left Behind: Memory and Meaning (The preserving of memory for whom the memorial is dedicated)

C. The Role of Memorials: Public or Private Grieving (The notion of private grieving fostered by the memorial)

D. Education: Learning from the Deceased (The educational mission of the memorial)

E. Artifacts: A Physical Connection (The artifacts left at the memorial)

F. Personalization: Names at National Memorials (The importance of names on a memorial)

G. Architecture and Design: The Physical Elements of Memorials (The principal architectural and design elements of a memorial)

H. Costs: What Price for Memory? (The cost of maintaining a memorial)

I. Connectivity: Sense of Place (The intended ambiance at your memorial)

J. Technology: A Virtual Past for a Virtual Community (The change in technology and its affect on your memorial)

Final questions

1. Do you believe that the particular list of functions are or are not appropriate to your memorial?

2. Are there any aspects of your memorial that you would like to add and/or delete?

3. Is there anything that you would like to expand upon or add that was not covered?

Thank you for your time and kind consideration in participating in this research.
Appendix E

Study Memorials

Dates of Interviews with Confidential Contacts
Appendix E

Study Memorials

Dates of Interviews with Confidential Contacts

The 16 memorials listed below were used in this study and the dates of interviews with confidential contacts. Those memorials maintained by the National Park Service and designated as national memorials are marked by an asterisk (*).

M-1. Alamo Memorial—February 29, 2008
M-4. Wounded Knee Memorial Museum—February 27, 2008
M-5. Galveston 1900 Hurricane Memorial—February 23, 2008
M-8. United States Marine Corps War Memorial/Iwo Jima Memorial—March 5, 2008
M-10. Martin Luther King, Jr. National Historic Site—March 6, 2008
M-12. National Fallen Firefighters Memorial—March 5, 2008
M-13. Space Shuttle Challenger Memorial—February 27, 2008

M-16. Virginia Tech—March 6, 2008
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