Monuments and Memorials of America

Monuments and Memorials of America

Civic Remembrances, Public Appreciation

i.

CONTENTS

Part Three: Mapping It Out -- A Taxonomy   46

Introduction

This project, a registry of America's monuments and memorials, is an on-going, nation-wide historical study. The registry has the following goals, to systematically identify, describe, and classify American monument-making initiatives, explore for meaning among the data contained in the registry, and communicate findings and conclusions.

To help achieve these goals, the registry employs tools of information technology. The project resides on and communicates by means of an internet-based website. Also, the registry uses relational database software to help categorize, manage, extract, and study its observations about America's public sector monuments and memorials. This database tool, dominated by its controlled vocabulary, effectively predetermines the central structure of the registry.

The text that follows these introductory comments functions at two different yet complementary levels, the technical and the emotional. Technically, the writing serves as a practical guide, as an instruction set to ourselves: this is how we develop and maintain the registry. Emotionally, our instruction set seeks to nurture in people feelings about America's civic monuments and memorials, feelings that they are meaningful within the fabric of American life and that they should be available to all who avail themselves for learning, insight, and enjoyment.

Part One: The Journey -- Towards an Assessment

At Water's Edge. The scene we are preparing to photograph is set in a small town park, next to the waters of a grand pond. Standing camera in hand before a gracefully curved stone bench, with a top as smooth as the waters of the pond, we begin to advance on the bench, moving slightly to our left, toward a rough-hewn boulder. It displays a memorial plaque. The plaque shares with us a poem that, in part, declares

> Montauk is seagull stare
> And knotwood eyes
> Wooded hopes of face and limb
> Eroded embryos of time
> Contoured from the restless current
> Dinosaurs drifted into fancy's shape.

Our registry entitles this monument, located in the town of Montauk at the eastern tip of Long Island, New York, "Poem to Melchionna." The memorial dedicates Hy Sobiloff's poem to the memory of Robert Hastings Melchionna, M.D.

We press a button, and the camera's shutter opens to capture the sun's light illuminating the memorial's poem.

Intent. The purpose of this registry, a continuing project, is to identify America's memorials and monuments, like the one above, construct a framework about them, and extract findings from both framework and content. (When there is no chance for confusion, the project uses the terms memorial and monument either interchangeably or alone.)

It seems plain when one takes a moment to look around that there is a societal willingness to memorialize people, things, and events. The town of Montauk and Mr. Sobiloff, with their "Poem to Melchionna," appear to be doing just this. We build monuments and leave markers along our parallel tracks of time and life. Some of America's memorials and monuments are substantial and ornate and others small and plain; but, whatever their appearance, they prompt us to recall people and places. They also want to encourage us to say thank you, for we are the beneficiaries of efforts, sacrifices, and accomplishments made by others before us, as noted in our monuments. Indeed, it seems no matter the location, culture, or social backdrop, once groups of people settle in places to live their lives, they have demonstrated over extended periods of recorded time this fundamental willingness to remember, praise, and give thanks. More specifically, when we dig deeply into the historical soil of the United States in particular, we note its memorializing opportunities began to take seed over 500 years ago.

During the first 250 years or so, those seeds seem to have been incubating in the soil of nation- and society-building. And regularly since then, we appear to have created memorials such as "Poem to Melchionna." The intent of this registry will be to develop information about how we Americans use monuments and memorials to show gratitude to people, places, and things that have been, and will likely continue to be, notable in our history. Also important is the assumption that people do indeed take the time and devote the resources to offer their appreciation to those who went before. Assuming that we do express our thanks, how do we? In addition, what does all this say about not only the honored, but also we who do the honors? To discover, to track down the answers to these kinds of questions, we set off on this journey into the social and historical experience of America.

Motivators. Why do we do this – gather data and collect photographs about the monuments and memorials of America? How do we explain to ourselves, as well as others, why we should devote precious and ever dwindling resources to this activity of collecting and classifying? What do we gain from a national registry? And what do we do with our findings? These questions spur us to dig deeply into ourselves and demand a response. The outcome, the response, is that we have discovered we have an irrepressible curiosity about

- the evolution of American values.

- the history of America as viewed through the eyes of an enduring cultural activity -- memorial-building.

- the sociology and politics of memorial-making alongside the arts and crafts of memorial design and maintenance.

- future opportunities for the management of monuments as a part of the country's evolving historical preservation initiatives.

- research related to the intellectual, management, and technical challenges associated with the interplay of US history, artistic design, and social anthropology.

We examine these responses about monuments and memorials, below, in more detail.

A. <u>American Values</u>. Our study of the monuments and memorials of America will doubtless provide insight into American values -- what we as a society have revered in the past, and what we may likely prize in the future. These monuments are the stories of America, of why and how we as Americans have said thanks to one another across many generations. Our opportunity for inquiry in this area of US history seems substantial. We might compare it to opening a vessel that has naturally been collecting social sediments from across America and American society for the past 500 years. With this data and from this information, we believe we may learn about the American character in ways

that both satisfy and instruct -- or as importantly, do not satisfy, but instruct nonetheless. Either way, we feel the opportunity to learn about ourselves as both individuals and a society is here, and it can be we who benefit.

B. <u>Stories and Stars</u>. Growing out of these comments on American values, we may ask ourselves, what stories do our memorials tell us, and who "stars" in them? Who is it that we tend to honor, and what stories do they tell us about themselves and us? Perhaps we make enduring statements about specific themes as well as more topical ones that may have addressed local issues for a particular moment. Some stories and stars seem to dominate for extended periods, where others appear to move in and out of favor. To try to answer these questions, the project systematically gathers and codifies certain data about our monuments which it believes will provide us insight into our American characters and their stories, the good as well as the not so good. Hopefully, with this certain knowledge of the past, we believe we may be able to learn about and assist ourselves in the future.

C. <u>Perseverance</u>. Taken as a group, monuments once installed seem capable of remaining with us for extended periods. They persevere. Nonetheless, while a monument may not change, times and people invariably do. How is it that in America, where 15 minutes today seems like a long time, memorials seem to be so long-lived? Is there something about the original installation process --

convoluted, painful and, indeed, wearisome, as it can sometimes be -- that

permits them to stand such tests of time? Might there be an element of group or

institutional inertia? Or perhaps 500 years is not such a long period of time;

maybe our sense of the past is not capable, yet, of recognizing the truly

historical. Our hypothesis here is that the public has bought into the establishing

process, owns a piece of its memorials and monuments. As American society

publicly births its monuments, using typically fundamental and sometimes flawed

democratic processes, its child, for better or for worse, will always be its child.

These memorials are ours, just as the democratic process is ours. This

hypothesis may come under special challenge should the dominant or prevailing

forces which created and mothered the memorial subsequently change; we

consider this more below, under historic preservation.

A corollary and technical question, one associated with monument

beginnings, is how do we create them in the first place? Collecting data about

memorials may help us address certain practical issues. For example, it may

assist us as citizens to answer the following: where to situate our memorials and

monuments so that we have continuing access to them, and how to design them

so they are in settings where we can enjoy them? A related and equally

important approach recognizes that some memorials, or markers, need to be

wherever they are, based on a past happening, because that happening is what

the memorial is acknowledging. Recognizing this, how do we get to these places,

these markers, wherever they are, and do we find the setting conducive to enjoying the monument and enriching ourselves?

    D. <u>Historic Preservation</u>. An important motivation behind this study of monuments and memorials relates to what is popularly called "historic preservation," known more formally as the cultural heritage conservation field. By cultural heritage conservation the project means, first, the social and dynamic processes of perceiving, interpreting, and valuing the products of our lives and, second, doing something about them. The project assumes our memorials are culturally significant objects and believes as a result that they should be properly and efficiently conserved. In order to achieve these ends, we must set the heritage conservation process in motion. The registry begins to do this initially by identifying memorials and monuments. This accomplished, it assesses the memorials we identify by asking and answering questions such as:

- Are some memorials in greater, general need of help than others?
- Which monuments might require restoration and what resources are available?
- Are some memorials more important than others -- how would we know and how would we judge?
- Which are our oldest, or our most aesthetically pleasing monuments?

- Do some towns seem to have more or fewer memorials than others: why might this be so, is the difference significant?

- How long does it take us to conceive of, decide upon, construct, and dedicate a memorial? Is it quick, is it slow – what do we mean by quick and slow? Can we define these terms?

- Once built, how well are we maintaining our monuments?

- Comparing national to community memorials: do these two types have different roles to play? If they do, what are they and, indeed, why should the roles be different? Does the community-based memorial, in fact, underpin the national? Does the community memorial actually permit the national monument, such as the Washington Monument, to exist and thrive in the first place? Or, might it be the other way around?

Our survey should help us identify answers to these kinds of questions as well as assist us in validating some of our hypotheses.

Given all this, the study submits that monuments are by definition culturally significant heritage objects and sites. Assuming the supposition is true, what we do with our monuments, depending on how we perceive them, is multi-faceted. Following are several suggestions:

- Use them as educational tools of behavior as well as historical fact.

- Promote their aesthetics by maintaining them effectively, repairing them (assuming they need it), and promoting them.

- Accentuate them as tourist drawing-cards for a community.

- Tap into them as cornerstones of economic or real estate development and revitalization.

- Emphasize them as centers of civic activity and community pride.

In each of these cases, the memorial, the monument, is where we may collectively renew our faith in one another and pause for a moment in our frenetic lives to honor those who preceded us, intending to leave us for the better.

E. Research and Scholarship. America's monuments and memorials embody feelings from within us and extract facts from the world about us. Be the monuments big or little, local or national, old or new, ornate or plain, inspiring or infuriating, delightful or depressing, exciting or boring: these symbols embody in their scope, depth, and persistence a core of intellectual curiosity that will drive our efforts in this pursuit. We must continue to mine and to take advantage of this core by carrying out research and encouraging scholarship.

Toward these ends, our task is to challenge, overcome, and then make allies of several intellectual, technical, and management problems and opportunities. For example, the project intends to take advantage of the *Draft International Core Data Standard for Archaeological Sites and Monuments,*

established by CIDOC, the International Committee for Documentation of the International Council of Museums. In the basic structure of our research, we will try to incorporate CIDOC's guidelines on such things as names, numbering, location, type, dating, condition, and referencing; see Appendix A for a cross-walk between CIDOC's applicable core data standards and the project's by-item tie-back to them. As the registry expands, there are other CIDOC provisions that may become doable and could be included, such as site relationships and their qualifiers. We believe our recognizing these international guidelines may lead to a system of memorial classification in the US that not only promotes efficiency and heightens insight for we Americans, but also might link the intellectual and technological aspects of our work to those of others and other cultures.

The use and role of rapidly evolving information technologies will undoubtedly carry us effectively into the future. Yet, it will also challenge our capabilities and resources to best take advantage of the science of computing.

And last, the work of such national projects as Save Outdoor Sculpture! (SOS!), a joint undertaking of Heritage Preservation and the Smithsonian American Art Museum, points up the substantial organizational complexity that ventures such as this must face and overcome to reach its goals. However, by doing so the registry will contribute to, as well as enlarge, the research and scholarship in this area of historical study.

Conclusion. At some point, our journey will have advanced to a place where a material number of memorials and monuments have been identified, studied, computed, and included in our project's treasury. This body of knowledge will help us better understand human motivation and societal needs, advance intellectual scholarship, and stimulate personal enjoyment. We believe that when the project reaches this point it also will have uncovered the following.

Collectively, the stories and subjects of America's memorials and monuments document and preserve the personal, group, and institutional contours of the American social experience, especially the nation's perception of its citizens and its historical journey forward since the late fifteenth century. The stories and subjects of our memorials do these things for better or for worse, and almost always poignantly. Summarized more plainly perhaps, we believe our project will show that the American people have received and will continue to receive what they deserve.

Let us now return to the beginning, to the start of our journey. Wherever this trek is leading, how do we intend to follow? We are packing up our bags, charging up our laptops. We will also need transport -- our project will need an engine. And on top of this, it will also need a guide, a map. Let us move on to a consideration of both, the engine and the map.

Part Two: Our Search Engine –Technology Old and New

In planning to head off on this journey, what do we need to take with us? Personal effects? Tools? Laptop computer? But, what about an internet service provider, camera, soap, toothbrush? During the trip into American's historical frontier of monuments and memorials, we need to perform two basic tasks: first, we need to function; second, we need to think. Given these needs, we want things for the body and things for the mind. With respect to our physical, bodily needs, we call upon the services of many everyday things like a car, aircraft, our feet, a suitcase, an operational entity, other organizations, and people. As regards our people, our surveyors, we need to instruct them in the ways of our project and our project's tools. These pages are instructions to ourselves. First, though, we must service the mind, especially our historical intellect and its sensitivities.

Our "mind" tools are going to center around computing and, then, what we style differentiation -- the comparing and contrasting of thoughts. For a second tool, we need to agree upon word meanings that link integrity to common sense,

and limit distinctions through recognition of limitations. Limitations are a special reality tool for our project due to the increasing prevalence of the Snowflake Complex. By definition, in working with computers, one can effortlessly slip into the fantasy that everything in this world, and maybe others as well, is possible; with a computer on the desk or in the pocket, it seems there is little that one cannot address, that one cannot accomplish. Indeed, we come to believe that if we just had the right computer we could describe and count all of the falling snowflakes about us, hence the phrase. To prevent our drifting off into counting snowflakes, the project intends to recognize and honor limitations with respect to time, space, variety, the impenetrability of human creativity, and the challenge of coordinating group activity toward achieving an individual end. Any one of these several limitations might dash efforts at identifying the memorials and monuments of America, gathering data about them, and drawing conclusions from the data.

The major tool we will need to help meet our mindful needs is *computing power*. This study of America's monuments and memorials, an on-going research effort, employs tools of both information systems and the social sciences to identify, describe, and draw conclusions about our nation's public remembrances. Within this realm of computing, we will be working with both hardware and software, the internet and access to it, and as well a website, digital imaging, and, perhaps most importantly, database programming. The

survey gathers data about and photographs each memorial or monument, and using standard database software, stores its observations on a server linked to a website, along with its images. For the study's purposes, the utility of a computerized, databased foundation lies in one of its basic structural properties, its controlled vocabulary. This repeated uniformity of construct as applied against our nation's many and varied memorials essentially creates a new, unified, and coordinated result. Out of this new creation, the survey attempts to extract understanding, tries to measure American values by means of studying the influence of the nation's memorials and monuments on our American way of life. Now, let us summarize our intellectual needs. As a construct our database, centered on the topic of American memorials and monuments, is a collection or set of pre-planned observations stretched across a framework of differentiated questions related to the topic.

Certainly, there will be challenges along our way. An early barrier is a definitional one: what exactly is a memorial or a monument? How do we describe it? Which memorials might we include or exclude from our database? Our second hurdle leans toward the epistemological: how do we know a memorial exists in order to try to determine whether or not to include it? Not all monuments are created equal; not all monuments are called, say, the Jefferson Memorial. As monuments cannot themselves reach out and tell us where they are, obviously we need to extend ourselves and our search to identify them, wherever they may

be. So, let's assume we have decided what a memorial is and where one might be located, then a third obstacle would be how to bring the memorial into ourselves, consider the space in which it is situated, touch it, experience it, learn about its history, create a lasting and assessable visualization of what we have experienced that we can share with others? Our final challenge is to put the various data we gather in some kind of rational order. The project needs to put it into a form that we ourselves can learn and then exchange with others.

Let us return to a question raised in the paragraph above, about inclusion or exclusion of a monument from the database. The survey identifies by specific title each monument that it includes in the database for study. The operative phrase here is "includes in the database for study." Which monuments does the survey include? Indeed, what is a monument? We must make sure, as best we can, that the answer to this question is clear to everyone, subscribed to by everyone, including the study's surveyors. By and large, we suspect the answer to this is not clear, certainly not as clear as it needs to be. First, there seem to be many objects that, if only at the unconscious levels of popular culture, Americans might consider to be monuments and memorials – for example, sculptures, trees, forests and benches, as well as parks, rocks, stones, buildings, and stained glass. Do we include all of these different things? If yes, why? Because somebody out there thinks they are memorials, and should be included? If no, why not? Because the study's surveyors say so? Second, and extending the

point further, we believe there may be objects out there that we might want to include in our study as memorials, though they might not seem like obvious candidates for inclusion.

To address this inclusion/exclusion condition, the study sets criteria to evaluate either its inclusion or exclusion of an individual memorial or a type, or class, of memorial. The survey applies these criteria to a site and completes its evaluation process, which we discuss below. If the site fits the criteria and should be included in the survey, we turn to the survey instrument and its item entitled IDENTIFICATION, described below, to assign an individual **Database Number** and to **Title**, or name, the site. (A survey ITEM is stated in underlined capitals; individual elements within an ITEM are placed in bold, e.g., **size**.) While this identification technique responds to the need for identifying included sites, what specifically are the survey's criteria for a site's being either included or excluded?

To be included, a given site needs to meet or fall within, as appropriate, the following conventions, which:
1. Define monument.
2. Define "American" monument.
3. Delimit public (vs. private) monuments.
4. Describe societal confirmation process.
5. Circumscribe the place and use of markers.

6. Note special monument sites.

7. Define the distinctiveness inclusion.

8. Define the usefulness exclusion.

9. Exclude state and national registries of historic places.

10. Exclude personal recognition awards.

11. Include federal and state memorials and monuments.

Before we address each of these conventions, we need to offer a caution. As previously noted, the study uses a database to contain the output of its observations. This could lend to the data an appearance of distinctiveness that gently masks, or disguises, the process by which a surveyor assesses each memorializing opportunity. To wit, the process looks less like either/or and more like a continuum. It is important therefore to the study's fundamental integrity that the surveyor accomplish the following: bridge the space between a person's perception that monument interpretations fit tidily into individual baskets and the fact that any given memorial is a continuous amalgam of a memorial's multitudinous parts. Said another way, while things may not always be what they seem, it is nonetheless important for the study's honesty that the observer feels that what seems to be is, in fact, an accurate representation. The project offers this same caution as regards consistency across a surveyor's many, different memorial observations. Let us examine each of our inclusion/exclusion criteria.

Convention 1: Define Monument

What is a monument, exactly, and how does the project characterize it? For the project's purposes, a monument is an object that at once identifies and recalls as well as honors and thanks some one or some thing. It also contains both a herald and a form. What is a herald, a form? A herald is the message on the memorial. It is the engraving that is a part of the object we are considering for inclusion in the project as a memorial. This written message that identifies and recalls may be of any length and might include numbers, dates and/or words that indicate who or what the memorial is honoring or commemorate the person or thing being remembered. Also, the message may express through its words a title for the memorial. A memorial's form, to continue with our characterization of a memorial, occupies space and is the visual centerpiece of the remembrance (and its herald may or may not be integrated into the form). It should be made of durable and permanent materials, as may be appropriate to the monument (See below, <u>ITEM #28: NATURE OF THE</u>

MEMORIAL). Examples of a memorial's form would be a statue, boulder, armament, bust, earthworks, fountain, plaque. The project specifies that there are by design two types of memorial or monument models: one we call integrated; the other, parallel. The study elaborates on both types below, under ITEM #7: DESIGN TYPE.

Comment. A memorial conveys its message in both its physical design and commemorative language. To be included in the study, a potential memorial needs both of these elements, **herald** and **form**, and not one or the other. When the survey confronts an object occupying space and wanting to be a memorial – in other words, it likely conveys a **Form** of some kind – but the object does not contain a **Herald**, then by definition the survey excludes this object. Take a work of sculpture, for example, or some other artistic design displayed in a public space, but with no accompanying **herald**: for the purposes of this study, we do not include it as a memorial.

Considering other aspects of this convention, a **herald** is not the same thing as a destination announcement or site identifier, e.g., the name of a community or the title of a place such as a housing complex. If for some reason these facts were present, yet the memorial were not excluded, we would include a message in the COMMENTS/NOTES section (ITEM #32) of the survey describing why this particular memorial is being included when it does not

apparently satisfy our definition for inclusion. Finally, the project does not

maintain a log of those memorials that have been considered and excluded.

Convention 2: Define American Monument

For this survey, America includes its states, currently 50 in number, Washington, D.C., and its overseas territories – Guam, American Samoa, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands.

Comment. As this is a study of the memorials and monuments of America, it would seem obvious that we need to define what we mean by America. With respect to the seas or waters reasonably associated with the areas mentioned above, while our definition above may not imply them it nonetheless does include them. And, it includes, as well, American-based websites – with the meaning of "American" as drawn above. There are a number of American war memorials situated overseas. Prime examples are those administered by the American Battle Monuments Commission (ABMC), which recalls the battles of the Armed Forces where they have fought since World War I, but there are others as well. These are not included in the survey, as they are not situated within the US and its territories as defined. (Those administered by the ABMC that are situated in the US the study does include.) There is an opposite but not dissimilar situation:

foreign countries may erect memorials in their lands dedicated to things or

people American; these too the study does not include.

Consideration 3: Delimit Public (vs. Private) Monuments

The location of the place of the memorial is in the public domain, and the place is available to the public. This availability does not have to be 24 hours per day, seven days per week, nor does it have to be at no charge; otherwise, however, the site must both relate and be available to the public on an equal-footing basis.

Comment. The study generally does not include memorials on the grounds of churches, temples, mosques and other such structures. Also, it does not include memorials which private institutions erect on the organization's private property. On the other hand, a public body may sanction a memorial on private space to a person connected with that space; these the survey includes. Similarly, the survey includes situations in which private institutions erect memorials for public persons on their private property; here, the sponsor subjects the memorialization undertaking to a societal confirmation process, as below, and assures public access to the memorial.

Convention 4: Describe Societal Confirmation Process

The project includes public, or civic, memorials; it does not include private ones. Most times, the difference between these two types is obvious, as when a memorial is situated on public property in front of a town hall. In these cases, the project assumes the monument is a public one and is by definition included in the project. However, there are times when the situation may not be obvious. In these cases, the project requires that the memorial's development has passed through what the project styles a societal confirmation process. What does this mean? It needs to be either apparent or discovered that the memorial's **SPONSORS** (see below for a definition) subjected their proposal to consideration by conclave-like public assemblies or individuals that gave the effort its blessing, thereby making the monument, by definition, a public one. Such assemblies or individuals could include, as examples, representative citizens of a community, members of service clubs like Rotary or the

American Legion, branches of government or its subdivisions, e.g., a local parks department.

Comment. Privately, a person or persons need not seek the appropriation or permission of the public to memorialize something; they may do it themselves, assuming they have the interest and personal resources. However, in order to move things into the public realm, the public needs in some way to be involved. The definition of societal confirmation process, above, typically includes either the input of those not directly responsible for the memorial consideration and/or non-aligned members of the community who publicly share information about the undertaking. This provides opportunity for public response. The definition implies the inclusion of private citizens in the public service – the appropriate numbers and kinds of private citizens. The database would not include therefore memorials that do not include an obvious flavoring of this process or are carried out in a manner that seems inappropriate to the time and place in which one developed the memorial.

An example of a situation in which the survey may need to have invoked this interpretation is the following:

The sponsor's funds are private, and the space in which the monument is to be installed is private; at the same time, however, the monument seems equally available to the public. For such a memorial to be included in the survey, it must have gone through a social confirmation process.

Contrariwise, an example of a situation that does not rise to this process standard is this: people (defined as more than two) contribute personal or private funds to memorialize trees or benches, either alone or perhaps as part of a larger, clearly public memorializing effort. However, by definition, these types of individual memorials are excluded, as they are private memorializing efforts; each, individually, is likely not to have been subjected to a societal confirmation process. Rather, if the SPONSORS contribute a certain amount of money, the remembrance is automatically included. (In addition, these kinds of memorializing efforts do not likely rise to meet the project's distinctiveness inclusion, defined below.) Note well, however, that not all trees and benches are automatically excluded; the survey examines each situation individually.

If reconciliation is an important actor in memorial-making, along with remembering and honoring, then this process of societal confirmation will have a meaningful part to play.

Convention 5: Circumscribe the Place and Use of Markers

Something styled and/or perceived as a marker may reach the standing of memorial or monument. An example of such a marker would be a mile marker along the Boston Post Road (the old King's Highway) which stretches between the cities of New York and Boston.

Comment: A marker reaches into the memorial category if it contains both **Herald**, which memorializes what it is marking, and **Form**, which exhibits the contained **Herald** and embodies or embraces the actual mark. A specialized form of marker is the time capsule, which marks not space but time; to qualify, the considered marker must also exhibit **Form** and **Herald**. The study does not include markers without **Herald**; old or new, these may still, and just, be functioning as markers. In these cases, while a specimen may contain some number or letter which are the reason for the mark -- the marker information -- it has not been installed to memorialize as defined above. Also not included are directional, identification, or interpretative signs erected by governments and

historical groups, signs that provide information about what happened at a

subject place in the past. This class of marker fails to meet two of the project's

definitions, the <u>usefulness exclusion</u> and the <u>distinctiveness inclusion</u>; see more

below.

Convention 6: Note Special Monument Sites

Memorials by nature and by classification are situated in places, and to assist a surveyor the study purposely defines the following places as special: those situated under water, up in space, or on the internet. How will the study consider for inclusion and treat these kinds of special memorial candidates? We comment on each in turn.

For an under-water candidate to be included in the study, the body of water in which it is situated must be in either American or International Waters, as defined by the International Maritime Union.

In the case of outer space, the place where the memorial under consideration is situated must be either under American control, not unlike the case with US territories, above. Or, if not this, then the space is at least not under the control of some other governing body with respect to which the US has no meaningful influence.

The project treats memorials situated on the internet which want consideration for inclusion as follows. Though not subject to

space limitation-potentials, already mentioned, internet-site candidates must nonetheless meet the criteria outlined above in <u>Convention 4, Societal Confirmation Process</u>; the people and entities involved in the process must themselves be situated in the US or its territories.

<u>Comment.</u> There are, and/or will be, times when memorials that merit consideration are situated under water, up in space, or on the internet. Our task here, other things being equal, is to reconcile our need-determinates relative to this class of locations to see that they square with *Convention 2*, above, which holds that by definition American monuments include only those situated in the US and its overseas territories.

In the case of underwater objects, using the International Maritime Union's definition seems helpful.

In terms of space -- or places or things not on Earth -- using a control proof that rises at least to a level of the American territories, above, seems satisfactory for the present.

Last, virtual sites on the internet in fact and by definition are not physical places. Given this, it seems helpful to qualify these "non-sites" using *Societal confirmation process* criteria, which necessitates predominately American public situations, input, and influence. Finally, we remind that this reference to the internet relates to those sites that exist <u>only</u> on the internet; internet sites that

function as a resource information tool for an otherwise-included memorial are

not the focus of this *Convention*; instead, see below at <u>ITEM #28: LOCATION</u>,

especially **Website**.

Convention 7: Define the Distinctiveness Inclusion

There is something unique, one-of-a-kind about a site's memorial that sets it apart, whether it is its story, subject, design, setting, sponsors – something is different. For example, a grave is one thing; a cemetery is another. Likewise with a tree vs. a woodland. Failing this distinctiveness hurdle, the memorial under consideration may not be eligible for inclusion in the database.

Comment. For a given site, the project does not attempt to evaluate much less criticize a memorial's artistic qualities. Because there are a number of objects does not mean the product will be viewed either favorably or unfavorably from an artistic perspective. However, the study does insist that there be but one object – or, at least, only a couple of objects -- whatever its artistic merits.

More specifically, there are several classes of **Forms** that by definition fail to meet this characteristic and are not included in the study. They are groups of trees, benches, and head stones. Also not included are situations where a marker is placed under or near an already-existing tree. Here, the marker for the

individual, or whatever the honoree, is not necessarily related to the tree itself. It is more a naming opportunity. Somewhat related people and communities have constructed parks with many trees, and then separate markers remembering individual people are situated beneath each of the trees. People donate the trees to parks in memory of loved ones whose names are then inscribed on tablets or plaques beneath them. The survey does not count these markers individually; but rather, it counts them as a group, assuming the group as a whole is memorialized at the group level. The reasoning is similar to a World War II plaque with fifty names on it. The study does not consider each name as a separate memorial; rather, it counts the site, the plaque, as one. On the other hand, there could be circumstances where the memorialization of a tree may be a most appropriate addition to the database. For instance, if a tree expert, a naturalist, or an event associated with a specific tree – say, the signing of a treaty under a tree -- were being memorialized, then a tree being dedicated in his, her, or its honor would likely be appropriate. As well, where on a stand-alone basis a tree is planted to memorialize a person and it is so marked, in and of itself, then this effort would be counted in the database as one site and named for the person on the marker.

Convention 8: Define the Usefulness Exclusion

The possible memorial to be included in the database exists only for its own sake. Its sole utility, its only function must be to serve as a monument, memorial, or marker, as defined.

Comment. Regularly, society chooses to remember people and things by naming in their honor buildings, bridges, roadways, airports and other functional things associated with the activities of daily living. These kinds of memorializations are not included in the study as they are by definition too utilitarian. In other words, they exist in the first place to provide a service, to assist people in their day-to-day lives; not an unimportant consideration; however, they do not exist primarily, much less solely, to offer thanks and remembrance, the subject of this project.

Indeed, this situation does not stretch into the heart of our study. This particular naming technique seems to lend itself to the following interpretation: "We've got this good building, so we may as well name it after a good person." The resources – space, materials, talent, and operations – are already being

made available to meet daily societal needs; the battle to allocate these precious resources has been fought. Basically, this is a remembering technique whereby society, quite understandably, takes advantage of needs and initiatives related to its own daily activities and appends to them the name and memory of someone. As well meaning and as helpful as this is, the memorialization initiative appears adjunctive, and perhaps subordinate, to the function. Contrast this to convincing society to dedicate its resources to a monument solely and for no other reason than to remember someone or to gratefully recall a good deed – this is different. This says: Nothing exists. Something may want to exist. Is the reason to bring this something into existence compelling enough to move society when it does not have to move? Because if society does not bring a given monument into existence, in the short-term, certainly, nothing appears to happen to society as a consequence of its own inertia. It seems to take great personal effort and initiative to overcome this inertia. The societal effort to do so, and the consequent placement of a public monument suggest both initiatives are worthy of note and study.

Convention 9: Exclude State and National Registries of Historic Places

The database does not intend to duplicate any national or state historic building registries. Therefore, an item listed in such a registry is unlikely to appear in this study as a memorial. Nonetheless, the study does not by definition rule out a historic unit included in such a registry; the site may have something to offer relative to this project.

Comment. The study excludes these wonderful sites for two reasons. With respect to the study itself, these sites do not seem to rise above our **usefulness exclusion**, above. Indeed, they seem to be used for a lot of (good) reasons. Also, there is already much time, effort, and other resources devoted to the registries and their subjects. Our struggle would be duplicative at best.

The project as a whole, on the other hand, should be viewed to complement or extend the national and state registries mentioned above. From time to time, a historic unit that is registered may also serve as a

memorial, or memorials may be situated on or be a part of a historic site.

Here, the memorial itself will be counted and categorized as being situated

on a historic site, but the study does not intend to include the historic site

itself as a memorial.

Convention 10: Exclude Personal Recognition Awards

The project excludes plaques and trophies that serve as recognition awards in honor of someone's personal services to the community.

Comment. An example of this convention might be as follows: A local service club presents a plaque to someone for contributing to the life of the community; the recipient mounts the award on the wall of his or her office at work or at home. While this example does embody some flavoring of the public recognition process, the main reason for ruling out this class of recognition is that by and large its display sites tend to be too private, personal, and individualized -- not publicly available. Occasionally, one might find these kinds of recognition awards in the corridors of public buildings, but not typically. As the project cannot predict with enough confidence that this class of item would usually be displayed in publicly available space as well as subject to adequate public recognition review, it excludes it by definition.

Convention 11: Include State and Federal Monuments and Memorials

Regardless of the many definitions, guidelines, considerations, and comments mentioned above, the survey includes as a memorial all those entities that our federal and state governments officially title memorial or monument.

Comment. It is likely that some federal- and state government-designated monuments might not fit as tightly into the survey's inclusion and exclusion considerations as the project would desire. For example, at the federal level, designations of some of the memorials made through the Antiquities Act of 1906 (formally known as An Act for Preservation of American Antiquities) come to mind. However, not to include these as a class could, we believe, create confusion on the part of our users. This project is about memorials and monuments. And if the National Park Service, for instance, has been calling some particular, well-known place a monument for many years, yet that place is not included in this project, some of our users might become confused and lose

confidence in the study's basic integrity. Said another way, the federal government has powerful publicizing capabilities, especially when broadcasting through its National Park Service, Bureau of Land Management, and National Forest Service entities, supplemented by similar state-based operating units. Not to include this kind of designation as a class, regardless of how else they may or may not seem to fit our study criteria, could cause confusion.

While this might be perceived as a data-corrupting influence, we take some comfort that from the widest of angles, the numbers of memorials likely to fall into this category, compared to all memorials in America, is a comparatively small number. So even if we concede that this may be a contaminate, we do not agree that it will be enough to contaminate the base of data. The project takes the position that including this group as a whole will not corrupt the database and to exclude it, either totally or on a memorial-by-memorial basis, could lead to user confusion.

III. Our Map – Toward a Taxonomy

If the intent of this website and its associated data collection and analysis efforts is to describe America's monuments and memorials in a systematic way, as well as develop a taxonomy of classifying them, then it will require data.

To begin acquiring these data, we ask ourselves a series of questions. First, what stories do these memorials and monuments tell? Of self-sacrifice and battle, certainly, but also of individual, group, and family recognition; evolution, progress, and technology; loss and perseverance; sports and entertainment; community violence as well as community service; continental discovery along side efforts to preserve it.

A second question we ask ourselves is, who are the subjects of these stories? Men and women in war, presidents and generals, absolutely, but also the person next door, outstanding citizens; persons of academia, letters and science; race and ethnicity; the uniformed, non-military, such as police and fire; and, animals. The study will seek to determine if these subjects and objects are recognizable in the stories of our memorials.

A third question is, who designed and built -- and now maintains -- our monuments and memorials? We need to learn who caused any given monument or memorial to be established in the first place. The study will also document who currently maintains it. Toward this end, we will also examine where our monuments are situated – in Pittsburgh, Dallas, Washington, D.C., San Francisco, Denver, Boston; or, as part of a historical site, in a parking lot, out in cyberspace, by a quiet river.

As a function of our databased website, we want to answer these questions. The good news is that there are many opportunities to do so, as America is a big place and has many memorials and monuments. The bad news is, of course, that America is a big place and has many memorials and monuments.

The survey items listed below will describe each of the database parameters and their several response options. Each item contains a topic description and then selections from which to choose. The study describes each selection. A caution: our degree of assuredness about any given item cannot always be perfect, in spite of our construct, its definitions, controlled vocabulary, and so forth. Even though we deploy all of these techniques effectively, it is still possible that we may not be able to learn everything that we need to or would like to know about a monument. Where the situation can be understood, where it is obvious from its content or communications with knowledgeable parties, then the project can take some comfort in its responses and categorizations.

However, some things might never be known with certainty. Recognizing these cautions, we intend that the study's evaluative efforts proceed fairly and in the hope that, as stated in the Hippocratic oath, we do no harm.

As previously noted, the survey uses a data collection tool to help achieve its ends of identifying and describing a monument (see Appendix F). The database examines each memorial in light of the same set of criteria, or data items. The study also spells out as a function of these efforts how the several items are employed, and why. The purpose of what follows is to list the several data items in our collection tool, applied against each memorial observed, and define each. The items are clustered around four major categories, Content, Design, Setting, and Demography, as follows:

CONTENT:

1 The Story
2 Story Subjects/Objects
3 Portfolio
4 Subject Gender
5 Race/Ethnicity
6 Military Conflicts

DESIGN:

7   Design Type
8   Design Description
9   Material (Dominant)
10 Size of Form
11 Image Dimensions
     [Continuted]

12 Inscription
13 Text Availability
14 Visuals
15 Design Preservation
16 Separate Monument Identification
17 Designer(s)
18 Fabricator(s)/Manufacturer(s)

SETTING:

19 The Site
20 Panorama-enhancing Features
21 The Aesthetic
22 Site Development
23 Access to Monuments
24 Number of Monuments
25 Site Upkeep
26 Site Maintenance

DEMOGRAPHY:

27 Memorial Identification
28 Location
29 Nature of the Memorial
30 Lead Sponsor(s)
31 Period(s) Covered
32 Establishment/Review
33 Comments/Notes

Several technical considerations may be brought forward at this point,

before we get into the data items themselves. The survey creates its data by

comparing components of each memorial against the same set of descriptive

items. The process surfaces an important advantage to considering America's

monuments as a databased group. The process produces what the survey calls

a leveler effect, which may be explained best by the following example. The

survey approaches a stone-with-plaque memorial situated next to a western Colorado stream honoring a local environmentalist no differently than it approaches the Statue of Liberty in New York harbor or the Jefferson Memorial at the Tidal Basin in Washington, D.C. That is, the project surveys each memorial identically; each site provides the same contribution to the collected pool of information.

One material and challenging, if not a database, distinction: we likely know of the existence of the Lady Liberties and the Tidal Basins, but how do we find those Colorado streams with their stone memorials? This is an important part of our challenge, and to help, the study includes as Appendix B suggestions on how one might find the monuments and memorials of America.

When we do find the monuments, the first thing we must do is look at the content of the monument, especially its story, which we take up next.

ITEM #1: THE STORY

In order to show appreciation for the gifts of certain people, places, and things, society erects, as we have noted, monuments and memorials to recall and honor them. For any given memorial, there are many characteristics that the survey takes note of and gathers up as data. One of the chief characteristics is the story that a monument tells. This is an easy assertion that disguises a series of intricate processes that the survey will need to undertake. For instance, we need to know the clear story that a given memorial tells. In addition, we need to determine whether or not the memorial is telling just this one, obvious, discreet story, or rather is telling us several, intertwined tales. How would we possibly know which story does or should take precedence? The tale the memorial tells can be simple or complex, and the memorial itself can be equally simple or complex.

What if the story seems complex but the memorial simple, or vice versa: is this observation of any note? The story each memorial tells may be a unique tale, or it could be that some of the stories appear across different memorials. And finally, structurally, the stories of our monuments must fit into our database

construct; we need to keep track of them and compare them one to another. To anticipate and address these questions and points as well as others like them, the survey employs a controlled vocabulary to describe an array of stories. Each monument included in the project is evaluated in light of these story categories and descriptions; the study then classifies the story each memorial tells as one, and only one, of them. We believe this technique, based on initial fieldwork, sensibly aggregates at a high but useful level the virtually endless tales the memorials and monuments of America tell. Yet at the same time, our variety of categories seems adequate to distinguish the major story themes that our memorials have presented.

The challenge of this ordering methodology is to consistently classify with multi-dimensional stories those that might possibly fall under any of several categories. This is important because the requirement of the project is that we must choose only <u>one</u> story. To help with this choice, the project takes a "sense of the memorial" approach. That is to say, we choose from our list of possibilities the story that dominates the memorial as presented to the viewer, as well as that which is the most concrete and action-oriented relative to the memorial's time, place, and deed. The study summarizes below the kinds of stories it believes any given memorial might tell, and the defining characteristics of the stories.

Self-sacrifice: Entering into a situation or a calling, or allowing oneself to be entered into a situation or a calling, including conscription into the armed forces, knowing that loss of one's life could be a likely outcome.

Loss and perseverance: Something is over, yet we continue. We had something, or aspired to something important, fundamental, but we lost it, or it was taken from us. Yet we continue, though maybe in a re-created form. These might be the stories of slavery, holocaust, natural disaster, or societal violence.

Leadership: Most people who have a memorial erected in their honor could likely be called leaders. This descriptor would seem to have limited usefulness as it is not discriminating enough. Ironically, the authors believe that when we use the term in a limited way, its usefulness seems to become more effective: for our survey purposes, then, this selection, Leadership, represents a very focused, narrow, moment. Specifically, its focus is leadership style as opposed to leadership content.

This category applies to the monument where the story tells how the leader got others to follow, whether physically or by example in spirit. It is not whether or not someone displayed leadership qualities – everyone in this survey probably does. In summary, leadership content will likely take us to story opportunities related to **recognition**, **business**, **community service**, **and**

continental discovery, whereas, when the leadership question is about leadership <u>style</u>, then this is the story category the survey employs.

Battle (in victory or defeat): A circumscribed moment in time, though the dimensions and depth of this moment may vary substantially. While most likely a military situation (e.g., the battle of Yorktown), a Battle designation may also include a non-military situation, e.g., a memorial commemorating a "legislative battle."

Heroism: Like the **Leadership** category, above, many people who have a memorial erected in their honor could likely be called heroes. The project believes that this term needs to be defined. For our purposes, the definition of heroism is an act, or series of acts, which rises to meet the standard of the unexpected happening and, in its unfolding, furthers a value, or set of values that are believed to be important at the time or under the circumstances. And may still be so today. The unexpected happening does not have to have been overcome or defeated; the person or animal may have failed in the attempt to overcome. Importantly, the act carried out does not have to have been done; there is no obligation that it be done. An example is sited in Carmel, New York, the monument to Sybil Ludington, who "called out the volunteer militia, by riding through the night, alone, on horseback, at the age of 16, alerting the countryside to the burning of Danbury, Connecticut, by the British."

What is carried out is done on a voluntary basis and may have a strong flavor of the Good Samaritan. Further, what is done is not part of a job function. Employing a hypothetical, a fireman may be expected to rescue a person from a burning house; while brave, the act would not, for the purposes of our survey, rise to heroic, because it is expected that this is what a fireman should do, this is his or her job. Continuing with this example, what is not expected is that a random, civilian passer-by or on looker might rush into the burning house to rescue someone. Whether the civilian is successful in bringing the person out, if indeed there even were such a person inside the burning house -- this act the survey classifies as one of heroism.

Patriotism: For purposes of the survey, this category is limited to an act, an action which the project defines as a deed meant to further one's country while foregoing all other ends. Where a memorial wants to honor a concept vs. an act of patriotism, the survey classifies it under **Arts & Science/Political Thought & Philosophy**, below.

Ideals: Honoring an act or deed that symbolizes the quest for perfection, the moral high ground, or that which one perceives to be the standard-setter.

God/Religion/Religious Freedom: Includes both personal and organized religion. The telling of the American story is not just set against a wide backdrop

of religious conviction; religion is inextricably entertwined with the American story. The testing point for this survey item is to catch the story of the memorial as it links to religion. It is about religious practice as it relates and interrelates to the American story and is expressed in a memorial defined by the study as valid. It is not the task of the database to tell the story of religion in and of itself; the database is not about the practice of religion.

Individual/Group/Family Recognition: The category focuses on the recognition by <u>SPONSORS</u> of individuals, groups, and families. The intent of the category is to focus more on the person or persons and less on what they did; this said, what they did could be either a single act or event or a multidimensional effort. Technically, for our purposes, a group equals more than one; also, the study includes in this category a family of one person. Finally, the monument may be recognizing the works of one person or a group. If it is memorializing one person, then the surveyor must also complete the item called <u>PORTFOLIO</u>, below (ITEM #3).

Evolution/Progress/Technology: The story of change or betterment in the world around us; honoring the perception of progress toward the good; the impact of technology on our lives and the life of the country.

Arts & Science/Political Thought & Philosophy: The general sense of the monument pulls the viewer towards the academic. This category covers both the arts and the sciences. It may also include the topics of philosophy and political thought (political thought is not considered politics, which is covered below, under **Politics/Statesmanship**).

Business/Commerce: The project gravitates toward this category when the memorial demonstrates either a participation in or an excelling at the art of making, buying, and selling things commercially. America began as trading posts of European monarchs and their naval commanders and, as colonies formed from joint stock companies operating under royal charter. Given these beginnings as well as our continuing national bent towards commerce, the survey construes the terms business and commerce in their broadest sense.

Sports/Entertainment: The worlds of the athlete and the entertainer, narrowly but deeply applied. Those being recognized may have roots in either professional or non-professional ranks, the community, or on the national scene.

Community Service: Works performed in the community interest for a sustained period of time that also suggest a multidimensional scope. Alternatively, the survey assigns the recognition of a single yet complex act that covers a relatively short period of time, or a one-dimensional focus over an

extended period of time. These activities must also center on the community, however characterized or portrayed by the memorial.

If the memorial is not focused on community, see **Individual/Group Recognition**, above. The efforts of the recognized could be the labors of one person or a group of persons. If one person, the surveyor also completes the item called PORTFOLIO, below. Finally, while single acts or events involving a person will tend to categorize as **Individual/Group/Family Recognition**, the study classifies an act or event that is not person-centered as a community service.

Societal Violence (nonmilitary): Acts of violence, whether random or not, against American citizens, society and/or America's guests. Examples might include victims of a shooting, bombing, automobile accident, plane crash. The military is not involved.

Politics/Statesmanship: Stories devoted to the day-to-day political sphere, domestic and international. The study defines statesmanship as a thin-air form of politics, where the political strives toward and essentially achieves the status of a multifaceted art form.

Continental Discovery: The study assigns this classification when the memorial's story extends the frontiers of what was to become, or what is, or what

will be, the American way of life. America was uncovered, and continues to be uncovered, piece by piece. The survey categorizes here those stories that explore or extend our experience whether in the past or the future. In a way, this exploration, this discovery, never stops.

Natural Preserve: A place designated by appropriate authorities and honored and preserved in a natural (or undeveloped) state. Typically, development groups other than Native Americans have not enhanced a site.

Seafaring: Stories of the sea, defined broadly to include any body of water from an ocean to a river.

Other (list): The study lists here stories that do not seem to fit into one of the above categories. The survey posts an explanatory message under COMMENTS/NOTES. If the study finds that it is repeatedly categorizing a certain story into this category, it adds the story type to the designated areas above.

Under Consideration: Decision has yet to be made.

ITEM #2: STORY SUBJECTS/OBJECTS

If one of the most important aspects of a monument is the story it tells,

then it follows that a second, crucial aspect are the players who populate the

monument's story. The database depicts these players as <u>SUBJECTS</u> (people)

and <u>OBJECTS</u> (things). In order to determine and evaluate in an organized

fashion who the <u>SUBJECTS/OBJECTS</u> are, the survey asks of our monument

candidates the following: who are the leading players in these stories that our

monuments tell, who and what are the objects of our affection and admiration as

told in these stories? Broadly speaking, the authors hypothesize that the

following inspire most of America's memorials and monuments:

- War
- Individuals
- Organizations
- Groups
- Places and things
- Animals

The project refines these broad categories, all of which it considers of

similar stature, in order to differentiate storyteller intentions across many aspects

of human endeavor. These further refinements, their labels, and descriptions, the

survey summarizes below.

Men and Women in War: These subjects are members of the armed

services. These could be people who have participated generally in the military

or people who have served in a particular war. While this service must be in an

American war, and the memorial commemorating the service must itself be

situated in the United States or its territories, the person or persons being

memorialized might not be American. For instance, the person could be a

member of a foreign armed service engaged alongside American troops. Or the

person could be on temporary assignment to a US military unit. There may be

other such reasons or circumstances suggesting categorization here. Some wars

or battles were fought on American soil before the colonies organized

themselves into the US; memorials to men and women in war associated with

this period are included here. This category does not include non-armed services

persons involved in war who are remembered under **Outstanding** or **Common**

Citizen; **War Dead**; and, the **Uniformed-Nonmilitary**. These three types are

defined below.

War Dead: Those members of the armed services who have died as a

result of military conflict. While the conflict in which he or she expired must be an

American war, and the memorial so honoring them must be situated in the United

States or its territories, it is possible that the dead person or persons being

memorialized might not be American. The dead person could have been a

member of a foreign armed service engaged alongside US troops or a person on temporary assignment to the US military. In addition, some wars or battles were fought, as we know from above, on American soil before the colonies organized themselves into the US; memorials to men and women in war associated with these times are included here. Monuments to the war dead which also cite those who could be categorized as **Men and Women in War** are accounted for here.

Outstanding Citizen: The memorial honors a person. The person, this honoree, is identifiable and is perceived by those having sponsored the memorial to be in some way special. This is why the <u>SPONSORS</u> are thanking him or her. This category includes statesmen, defined here as persons perceived as leaders in national and perhaps international affairs; they seem to have risen above the personal to extend the national.

Outstanding Citizen Group: These are the persons the memorial honors. The honorees are identifiable and are perceived by those having sponsored the memorial to be in some way special. This is why the <u>SPONSORS</u> are thanking them.

Common Citizen: The memorial honors a person. The honoree may or may not be identifiable. The person is perceived neither by him- or herself, nor by

those taking the action, to be in anyway special, and is so honored because of or in spite of his or her status. This is why the SPONSORS are thanking him or her.

Group of Common Citizens: The persons the memorial honors. The honorees may or may not be identifiable. The persons are perceived neither by themselves nor by those taking the action to be in anyway special, and are so honored because or in spite of their status. This is why the SPONSORS are thanking them.

Person of Letters/Academia/Science: A man or woman whose background, training, or occupation is of the arts, literature, education, science, or in an endeavor apparently associated with these activities.

Uniformed, Non-military: Those who serve the public, usually in a highly regimented fashion. Prime examples would be policemen, firemen.

Place: A location in America or one of its territories. It may or may not have a name associated with it. From a geographic point of view, the monument may be associated with the placename either closest to it or most logically associated with it.

Private Organization: An entity organized in the private sector, such as a corporation, to pursue and/or achieve the goals for which the entity was established.

Government Entity: A unit of government – state, county, city, local, or federal. Could include all branches of the unit -- executive, congressional, judiciary.

Native Americans: Relates to the Indians and Indian tribes inhabiting America when European monarchs and/or their commercial companies visited, stayed, and ultimately morphed into the US. These people also include natives of Alaska, Pacific Islanders of Hawaii, and Indian groups associated with America's territories, such as the Taínos of Puerto Rico.

African-Americans: This grouping includes, among others, American-, African- and Caribbean-born blacks. A person, or a group of persons, that considers him or herself a member of this racial type.

Ethnic Not Elsewhere Classified: When ethnic groups other than Native Americans and African-Americans are the objects of the memorial, the survey employs this category. The name of the ethnic group will be identified under COMMENTS/NOTES.

American Presidents: A president of the United States. The memorial depicts the person as president; if the person is being memorialized because he may have been something else, say a soldier, then the data base approaches the memorial from this perspective and not that of president.

Foreign National/Non-American: A person, or a group of persons, who participated in the American experience in some way, only this person, or the group of persons, was not an American citizen during the time period under consideration. May or may not have become a citizen subsequent to the story the memorial tells.

Prehistoric Structure: An organized, inanimate, and likely complex entity related to a period of time prior to recorded history, e.g., the Lava Beds National Monument, Tulelake, CA. Could be either naturally occurring or man-influenced.

Thing: An inanimate object, usually; possibly a place that does not fit appropriately into the category of Place, above. Not a person, entity, event, or social process.

Animals: A living, non-person entity, e.g., a dog, horse, bird.

Under Consideration: Decision has yet to be made.

ITEM #3: PORTFOLIO

This item relates to that immediately above, <u>STORY SUBJECTS/</u> <u>OBJECTS</u>. Where the subject of the monument is an individual person, the project notes and categorizes certain background information about the individual who has been memorialized. Specifically, using a controlled vocabulary, the survey lists the person's office, post, position, or occupation. The current inventory of <u>PORTFOLIO</u> possibilities the project includes as Appendix C.

Assuming the memorial and its person fit into this item, the study employs one of the categories below to describe his or her portfolio. Where the subject of a memorial is not an individual person, then the survey checks the item "Not applicable," below; any exceptions to those listed below would be described under <u>COMMENTS/NOTES</u>. Possible categories for consideration are:

Not Applicable: The <u>SUBJECT/OBJECT</u> is not capable technically of a portfolio designation.

Portfolio: For list from which one must choose, see Appendix C.

Without Portfolio: The project ascribes this designation to someone who is capable of having a portfolio but does not. For instance, a monument that commemorates an act of heroism of a young girl, where the sole person involved in the act may not hold a position or post in the community.

Not Known: The study ascribes this category to someone who is capable of having a portfolio but does not. The reason the person does not is principally that we do not yet know the portfolio.

Under Consideration: Decision has yet to be made.

ITEM #4: SUBJECT GENDER

The monuments and memorials of America may honor men, women, both, or neither. The survey attempts to acquire data about and to describe how often our monuments tend to honor one sex or the other, or neither. Sometimes a memorial's **Herald** may allude to the sex of the honored; alternatively, its **Form** may display what is clearly a man or a woman.

When these two guideposts are not available or helpful, there is a third, more limited technique. When names are listed on the monument, the surveyor may look at first names, and if they all seem like male names, the survey checks male; if they all appear to be female names, then the survey chooses female. When neither of the above is at our disposal, the database provides a default category, below.

For those SUBJECTS/OBJECTS inventoried above, the database categorizes them by sex as follows.

Male: Those monuments which affirmatively demonstrate that the SUBJECTS/OBJECTS relate to the male sex. The **Herald** need not necessarily include the exact word "boy," "man," or "men." Suffice it to say, if there are

several names in a **Herald** and all appear to be male names, the memorial may be categorized as **Male**.

Female: Those memorials which affirmatively demonstrate that the SUBJECTS/OBJECTS relate to the female sex. The memorial need not necessarily use the exact word "girl," "woman," or "women." Suffice it to say, if there are several names in a **Herald** and all appear to be female names, the memorial may be categorized as **Female**.

Male and Female: Those memorials which affirmatively demonstrate that the SUBJECTS/OBJECTS relate to both the female and the male sex.

Neither Sex: The memorial is silent on sexual orientation. It is about people, but it alludes in an affirmative fashion to neither men nor women.

Cannot Determine: Default category: when a monument cannot, for whatever reason, be assigned to one of the above categories, the study assigns it here. This category includes transgender situations that do not fit into the four categories above.

Not Applicable: Not human. Includes animals or other non-human memorials, such as those whose subjects involve ideas, places, and things.

Under Consideration: Decision has yet to be made.

ITEM #5: RACE / ETHNICITY

This item relates to America, the melting pot, the multicultural. Based on race or ethnicity, it examines the SUBJECTS/OBJECTS of our monuments from the point of view of Americans -- whether Caucasians, African-Americans, Jews, Native Americans, Hispanics, Asians, or others.

As a society, the US seems to be facing a fundamental dichotomy. On one hand, society promotes its social DNA as containing politically open-minded and heterogeneous genes; we are all created with equal opportunity, members in good standing of a democracy with a one-person, one-vote gene pool. On the other hand, at this point in America's history, when we look around at the distribution of societal resources, leadership, perceived value, influence, visibility, things may not be as equal or as we might wish.

While the perception of ourselves seems important, there also appears to be outward divergence between what we say we believe and how we actually behave. So, the answer to the question, have we been growing old and growing true to our societal gene pool, is likely to be negative. Given this probable disparity, given how we perceive, relate to, and make decisions about racial and ethnic groups in America, the project's authors wonder what, if anything,

America's monuments might tell us about these groups and about race and ethnicity in our country. Maybe they cannot tell us anything. As artistic or social science entities, the monuments of America may not be appropriate or sensitive enough to capture the look, the feel, the multidimensionality of race and ethnicity in America. However, assuming the hypothesis that our subject might indeed be receptive enough, we set out to discover whether or not this is so. The project is sensitized to the likelihood that there will be difficulties not only with outcome but also with process.

In the approach to the question of race and ethnicity, we encounter several process barriers. The first is a definitional one. What from a practical point of view do we mean by race and ethnicity, and what kinds of groups tend to cling to which categories? It seems a certain mass and shape of our biological characteristics and/or our social, heritage, cultural, and religious attributes pull us toward an ethnic identity, self-imposed or otherwise. Related, it is challenging to know what names or titles to attach to groups.

Assuming, however, we have in hand these admittedly broad, vague racial and ethnic categories and names when we come to assess a memorial, can we say that a monument is Caucasian, Native American, Jewish, African-American, or Asian? Can the monument tell the difference? Can we tell the difference looking at the monument? If there is a difference and we can discern it, how does the survey label the observation? If there is a difference, but the survey cannot

effectively label the observation, of what practical use to the project might the observation be?

A second and related barrier to achieving the study's goals is what the study calls classification overlap. Because race and ethnicity are difficult to define, both logically and functionally, it would follow that the available language to help categorize the distinctions may not be as precise as it should be. An obvious example would be "Hispanic." How useful is this term in helping us compare and contrast the concept of race and ethnicity in monument making?

A final barrier relates to the power of perception. To be classified, below, as other than "Silent on Topic" or "All Inclusive," the monument's racial or ethnic category must be frank and obvious from either its **Form, Herald**, or both. The obvious avenues of approach to working with this category are either to observe the **Form** or to parse the **Herald**; some additional knowledge and insight may be gained when we combine the **Form** and the **Herald**. Compared to discovering if gender has a role to play in monument making, there seem to be many more variables in play, and they may be harder to firm up in a given monument.

The study acknowledges these barriers to race and ethnicity as they relate to America and its history, to America and its monuments. Given these barriers, the study sets out to discover if our item called RACE / ETHNICITY can generate data and information that is useful for better understanding race and ethnicity in America, past and future. Should a community's dominant race or ethnicity group change, or begin to change, what happens to the community's accumulation of

monuments? Does an incoming group value what has gone before, what has previously been memorialized? Does it tend to honor and maintain the old as well as perhaps begin to install the new and the different? Perhaps it will abandon what it perceives as not vital to its social needs.

To conclude this section, the project hypothesizes that from a memorial's STORY and SUBJECTS/OBJECTS, from its **Herald** and **Form**, it likely can develop and present useful findings in the area of race and ethnicity. The study classifies its observations into the following categories, or groups.

Not applicable: If the SUBJECT/OBJECT of a monument is not a person, but rather an animal, idea, or inanimate object, then the survey classifies the item as not applicable relative to race and ethnicity.

Racially silent: From **Herald** and/or **Form**, an observer cannot conclude that the monument under consideration is making any comment about race or ethnicity. It appears to be silent on the subject. This category is different from both **Euro-Asian White** and **Racially Inclusive**, below.

Euro-Asian White: What are popularly perceived as Caucasian. This could include groups such as English, French, Jews, Arabs, Dutch; those from Germany, Spain, Eastern Europe, the Mediterranean, the Middle East, North Africa; also Russia, Australia, and New Zealand. If the subject of race or ethnicity

is neither mentioned nor implied, while at the same time its **Form** appears to be of one of the above groups, then the classification is Euro-Asian White.

Racially Inclusive: To be included here, a monument must make a positive, affirmative statement through its **Form** and/or **Herald** that heterogeneous people or groups of heterogeneous people are being remembered. It is not sufficient for classification here if the **Herald** is silent on this topic, which on its face might suggest inclusion, should the **Form** give the appearance of Euro-Asian white.

Native American: The project uses this term to refer to any of the original inhabitants of the US. For example, these inhabitants include the many Indian cultures of North America; the Taínos Indians of Puerto Rico; Alaska Natives, such as the Eskimos, Aleuts, Inuits, and American Indians; Native Hawaiians, descendants of the indigenous Polynesian people of the islands; and Pacific Islander groups.

African-American: Members of an American ethnic group who have brown to black skin color and whose ancestors were Africans (including those by way of Caribbean islands or Europe).

Hispanic: Includes those from the Caribbean islands, Mexico, the South American countries, and the US. Does not include European Spain, which is classed under **Euro-Asian White**, above.

Asian-American: Applies to those peoples of East, Southeast, and South Asia, such as those from countries like China, Mongolia, Korea, Japan, the Philippines, India, Pakistan, and Indonesia.

Combination: Combines groups of two or more of the following: **Euro--Asian White, Native American, African-American, Hispanics, Asian-Americans**. The project lists the combining groups in the COMMENTS/NOTES section.

Other: The memorial can and should be categorized, but it does not fit in any of the types above. The survey provides a title for this other classification in its COMMENTS/NOTES section.

Not Determined: The memorial can and should be categorized, but this has not yet been carried out.

Under Consideration: Decision has yet to be made.

ITEM # 6: MILITARY CONFLICTS

The survey categorizes a monument whose <u>STORY</u> focuses on war, battle, and military service as a memorial to a military conflict. The study provides categories to include recognition of the major wars, if not necessarily all wars, in which the US and its predecessor governments or management/executive agencies have engaged. The categories include fighting on what would come to be called American soil, prior to the formation of the US in the late 18th century. Fighting in two of the war types listed below could happen simultaneously, e.g., during the Civil War and Native American conflicts. In a case like this, if the <u>STORY</u> of the monument centers on Indians, then **Native American** is the military conflict category the survey notes and tallies.

The observer will notice that the survey associates begin/end dates, in years, with each of the possible responses. Monuments routinely carry dates on their <u>IMAGE DIMENSIONS</u> (ITEM #11, below), so the project believes the study should define wars and their years in order to take up the data/information efficiently. As much as the study knows that this dating is helpful, it also

understands it might from time to time seem at odds with a reader's or viewer's understanding of when things happened. There are a number of reasons for this.

In part, the differences relate to the fact that historians write history, and they write it at different times, likely armed with varying research points of view and evolving data. Also, wars are not as tidy as researchers: a conflict might have ended in one part of a war zone yet it might rage on for some time in another.

Finally, a dating discordance may relate to how one may be measuring a war, for instance, end of hostilities vs. treaty signing vs. ratification by all parties. These events often take time, and they may occur in different years, which is our measuring stick. The survey's leaning is to try to assign the year in which a war's hostilities actually ended. The possible survey responses are as follows.

Not Applicable: The subject of the monument is not a war, battle, or other kind of military conflict.

Pre-Colonial Fighting: Conflicts occurring between 1492-1607 (Columbus – Jamestown).

Colonial Wars: Battles between the colonies and the several European countries and/or Indian groups during the period 1607 to 1775.

Revolutionary War: Fighting by Continental forces with French military assistance against both British and Indians, from 1775 (Lexington and Concord) to 1781 (Yorktown).

War of 1812: The conflict between the US and Britain, supported by Canadians and Indians, from 1812 to 1815 (Battle of New Orleans).

Mexican War: The fighting in the southwest US between the US and Mexico beginning in 1846 and ending in 1848.

Civil War: The war between the states of the North and the South, from 1861 to 1865.

Native American Wars: Fighting between and/or among Indians, Indian groups, and Europeans, their colonists, the US military, or others, during the 16th through the 19th centuries.

Spanish-American War: The conflict between Spain and US during 1898.

World War I: The United States and allies fight against Germany and its allies, from 1917 to 1918. (The war began in 1914 in Europe prior to American

involvement; monuments whose **Heralds** carry dates in the 1914-1918 range are also categorized as WW I.)

World War II: The United States and allies fight against Japan, Germany, and their allies, from 1941 to 1945.

Korean War: The President authorizes the use of US armed forces in Korea against the North Koreans, from 1950 to 1953.

Vietnam War: The period of hostilities from 1964 (Tonkin Gulf Resolution) to 1973, with the signing of the cease-fire agreement between the US and South Vietnam and the Viet Cong and North Vietnam. (One could plausibly argue that, for the US, its involvement in the Vietnam War began even earlier, in the 1950's, and ran to 1975 with the fall of Saigon; a surveyor may find these time periods reflected in a monument and as appropriate should include it here.)

Persian Gulf War / Desert Storm: American troops and allies respond to and attack Iraq and occupied Kuwait, from 1990 to 1991.

All Conflicts as a Group: War taken altogether, as an entity, regardless of who was fighting or when.

Other Conflicts: The monument does not fit into any of the above categories. The study categorizes the conflict here and provides a descriptive title under COMMENTS/NOTES.

Under Consideration: Decision has yet to be made.

ITEM #7: DESIGN TYPE

By "design" the project means the plan for the creation of the monument. Below, in ITEM #8: DESIGN DESCRIPTION, the study inventories a variety of plans for memorials and monuments. Suffice it to say here, no matter what a memorial looks like, whatever image it seeks to convey to a viewer, the project holds that the memorial's plan at the most elementary level does so spatially. It does this by either focusing on things together, bringing discrete design elements into a unit, or it defuses its focus, putting space between and among its chosen design elements. At the most basic level, trying to account for the designer's planned use of space and focus, the survey distinguishes between two memorial design types, the integrated design type and the parallel. We describe the attributes of these two types, below.

Integrated Design Type: In this model, the monument presents a unified and visually entwined **Herald** (its letters and words) and **Form** (its centerpiece). Words and centerpiece are presented to us equally, so to speak, and the project evaluates them as being of a piece; they are at one. Easy examples of this

design type are the traditional engraved marker or a stone or rock with a lettered

tablet attached.

Parallel Design Type: In this type monument, the designer presents

separately the **Herald** and **Form**. The **Form** in this type of memorial is the core,

the centerpiece. Indeed, in this type it <u>is</u> the memorial, and the survey evaluates

it as such. In contrast to the model above, the **Herald** here tends to play a

subordinate role, a complementary role, and the survey evaluates it narrowly, as

an identifier. Accordingly, the survey describes only its identifier design type,

preservation status, image dimensions, and size. An obvious example of this

might be a park (defined in the study as an earthwork) with a boulder nearby

containing a plaque with a **Herald** memorializing the park.

There are two impacts of this categorization on the project – the aesthetic

and the functional. Aesthetically, the study attempts to use these two general

design types as a means to try to measure a memorial's visual intricacy. How

complicated and involved might a memorial be visually? The integrating type of

design appears on its face to be comparatively more efficient, quicker to grasp,

easier to understand, as its **Herald** and **Form** are entwined, unified. Functionally,

the purpose of describing these two different types relates to the delineating

capabilities of our database software: distinguishing between these two types of

design permits a memorial's centerpiece to be described and then compared to

others along a variety of parameters. Without this distinction, the study cannot

know with necessary precision what it is describing; without this distinction, it

cannot describe the memorial with enough precision to allow the database to

maximize its capability to compare and contrast. For instance, in the **Parallel**

Design Type example from above, if the survey did not differentiate between the

earthwork (the **Form**) and the **Herald** (the marker on the stone), what specifically

is the survey reporting? What exactly is our study describing as the memorial -- a

comparatively small stone or a substantial piece of real estate?

ITEM #8: DESIGN DESCRIPTION

When we look at a monument or memorial, what are we looking at, and how do we describe its appearance? What exactly <u>is</u> the memorial? When considering a memorial for inclusion in the study, a surveyor must describe what to him or her constitutes the essence of the memorial. This discriminating process is necessary, as our database approach with its controlled vocabulary requires that we differentiate and dissect. Consider a hypothetical example, a gazebo with a flagpole to one side and a dedicatory plaque attached to a nearby rock. We must determine whether the memorial is the plaque, rock, flagpole, gazebo, or a combination of these. To do so, we must consider what feature or features compel us to conclude that the memorial we are viewing is one thing or another. In a sense, the monument is all of these features.

But suppose it cannot be all of these. When one is trying to include information about both <u>a</u> memorial and <u>many</u> memorials in one database, then counting and describing a plaque is one thing -- but counting and describing a gazebo, which does not look like a plaque, is another. To deploy effectively the database's controlled vocabulary, our intellectual tasks opposite a given site are

to observe, dissect, prioritize, conclude, and assign. The study approaches these tasks in two ways. First, it concludes whether a site is **Integrated** or **Parallel**, as above, ITEM #7: DESIGN TYPE. Second, the survey sets aside those features that it deems least essential to the memorial's STORY and SUBJECTS/OBJECTS.

For instance, in the example above, on dissection the site is **Parallel** in design, which by definition assigns both rock and plaque to a certain item in the survey. Next step, the surveyor will drop the fact that there is a flagpole in the memorial's design, as compared to the gazebo it appears less essential to the sense of the memorial (though the flagpole will be picked up by the wide-view **Visuals** of the monument). Therefore, in this example, the **Gazebo** is the description of the designer's intent.

To conclude, the designer's task in the present is to actualize and accomplish the desire to remember and be grateful about the past. And the survey's job is to describe and categorize the designer's intent using the vocabulary options that we inventory and illustrate below.

Animal with or without Pedestal: Animal situated on a base, raised or not.

Armament: Weapon of any kind, e.g., a cannon or machine gun, whether resting on a base or not.

Bell: Cup-shaped object, with a flared opening at one end, whether mounted atop a base or not. The project uses this category when the memorial **Form** is predominantly, if not solely, a bell. A memorial design might include a bell as a piece of its overall design; in this case, the survey characterizes the design in accordance with the memorial's overall design intent.

Bust of Person on Pedestal: Sculpture of a person's head situated on a pedestal.

Clock: A device signifying but also symbolizing the measuring and telling of time. May not be a watch.

Diorama or Model: Three-dimensional scene that tells the monument's story.

Earthworks: Thing made from or of the earth, e.g., a butte or a park.

Flag Pole with or without Pedestal: Pole of any thickness extending upward to any height to display a flag or flags. This category is employed when the memorial design consists solely of a flagpole, whether or not mounted atop a base. When a memorial design includes a flagpole as a piece of a larger, overall

design, more as an accessory, the survey does not use this category. Rather, the study categorizes the design in accordance with the memorial's overall design intent.

Fountain/Pool: Container designed to hold water. At the time of observation, it may or may not in fact be holding water, moving, or spraying the water as intended, or otherwise functioning.

Gazebo: Open-sided, freestanding, roofed structure for gatherings in and around it, constructed of any materials.

Geometric with or without Pedestal: Thing whose **Form**, or design appearance, is driven by geometry and geometric shapes. The geometric may or may not be cut, shaped, or polished. It is not a **Traditional Marker** or a **Wall**; also, it could be sculpted but would not be classified as a **Sculpture**.

Historic Structure: Special place of historical significance, however, not a landmark. This category may also be used as THE SITE, see ITEM #19, below.

Horse and Rider: Person with a horse -- astride it, beside it, or otherwise.

Medallion: A medal, or something resembling a medal, of oval or circular shape, however mounted or placed.

Sculpture with or without Pedestal: Work of art that is not a **Statue** of a person, below, or a **Geometric**, above. May or may not be elevated in some fashion.

Statue with or without Pedestal: Three-dimensional **Form** of a person. The category accepts any technique or material used to arrive at the design intent. The statue may or may not be resting on a base.

Stone/Rock with Tablet: Rock, stone, or boulder of no seeming, preconceived shape, though the design intent could be that it appear this way; there is a tablet embedded, mounted to, or situated in the stone/rock.

Tablet/Plaque: Flat surface of any material, though typically of metal, with letters/words and/or image/images raised or in any fashion engraved into its surface.

Traditional Marker: Looks like a gravestone; it may be cut, shaped, and polished, or not.

Wall/Wall-like: Upright, likely flat structure of whatever kind of material, stretching across a site and on which the **Herald** is recorded by any technique.

Website: Electronic-based, computerized technique for establishing a memorial. Also considered and known as a virtual site.

Monument Not Elsewhere Classified: When a monument cannot be classified in any of the other category options above, the survey includes it here. The study inserts a short, one- or two-word, identifier. In the process of collecting the data, if a classification appears more than 10 times, the survey assigns it its own category, as the purpose of this particular category is to capture scarce design types.

Under Consideration: Decision has yet to be made.

ITEM #9: MATERIAL (DOMINANT)

Monuments and memorials are made of many different materials. The survey seeks through standard, non-technical visualization behaviors to determine and document a memorial's dominant material. Given this self-imposed limitation -- that we will not be performing any physical analyses of a memorial's aggregates -- it will not be possible to know the exact materials in a memorial. In the survey, therefore, we seek to categorize the obvious, dominant material that comprises the monument. The study categorizes and defines the choices of dominant materials as follows.

Stone/Rock: Naturally formed, petrified materials; comparatively hard. Can be carved; shaped and polished; or, left rough, unshaped.

Metal: Any type or shape of metallic substance or alloy.

Stone/Rock and Metal: A combination of the two categories above --
stone or rock material carved, shaped, and polished, or rough and unshaped, in
conjunction with any type of metallic substance or alloy.

Landscaping: Parcel of land or elements of the parcel of land, including
trees.

Wood: Prepared wooden material and surface. Does not include trees.

Dirt/Rock: Soil, either naturally occurring or mechanically transported.

Glass: Item made of materials with variable optical and other properties,
transparent or translucent, in any form, e.g., a stained glass window.

Electronic: Memorial for viewing by means of an electronic device or
capability -- typically a website/computer.

Other: A material not mentioned above; the survey characterizes it under
COMMENTS/NOTES.

Under Consideration: Decision has yet to be made.

ITEM #10: SIZE OF FORM

Monuments may be any size. The project seeks to determine if certain STORIES or SUBJECTS/OBJECTS tend to be associated with the size of memorials -- small, medium, or large. An important challenge for the survey is to define what it considers small, medium, or large; to do so in a plain and practical way; then, using a controlled vocabulary, to apply that definition on a consistent basis over many memorials and much time.

Towards accomplishing these ends, we start by trying to characterize the normal, the average. Next, we employ non-technical, comparative-type and simple words, assume a sense of materiality, then work toward staking out a range between the comparatively large and the comparatively small. Specifically, we say that our reference point, the average, the normal, is the human size -- the human body (and indeed, by extension, perhaps the human experience). From this perception of size, then, we compare a given memorial or monument against the human size. Given these baselines, specific terms and categories our controlled vocabulary utilizes are as follows.

Very Small: Likely it could be held in the hand, like a plaque or small stone. Less in size than **Small**, below.

Small: Next smaller size compared to the **normal**, below.

Average/Normal: The normal size is something approximating -- actually slightly larger than -- the size, the mass of the human body.

Large: Next larger size compared to the **normal**.

Big: Greater in size than **Large**.

Very Big: Greater in size than **Big**. May be entered, e.g., the Lincoln Memorial, the Washington Monument.

Outsized/Megasized: The monument's impression fills to or stretches beyond what the eye can see in a single glance.

Under Consideration: Decision has yet to be made.

ITEM #11: IMAGE DIMENSIONS

A monument has anywhere from one to an unlimited number of angles, or sides. SPONSORS and DESIGNERS (see below, ITEM #17) use the sides of monuments, also called panels, to convey information about the memorial. A panel may contain letters, numbers, and/or visuals. The survey converts the number of different, developed sides of a monument into an assumption about the depth of the story-telling techniques imbued in the memorial by its creators: the more dimensions employed, the more complex their story-telling efforts.

This item also measures a story's range or scope, and seeks to determine how much resource it takes DESIGNER or SPONSOR to tell the monument's story efficiently, effectively, and fully. The survey also seeks to determine if there is a correlation between some STORIES and the SUBJECTS/OBJECTS of those stories, and the number of image dimensions the site employs. For instance, do memorials of **Men and Women in War** tend to take one side to tell their stories while memorials devoted to a **Group of Common Citizens** tend to take two, or more, sides? Or, might the finding be just the opposite?

Pursuing all of these interests implies we know how to count the number of panels on a given monument. By definition each memorial must contain a **Main** angle, below. Also by definition, an additional angle must contain new information (as opposed to a continuation of existing information). One does not find this new information on the **Main** or on any previous side. An example would be when the **Main** memorializes a person, and on a separate, additional side the memorial provides comment on the person's wisdom or insight.

A notable example to the contrary is as follows: on a given war memorial, the names of those honored may be so extensive as to carry to three sides of the memorial. However, the project counts the memorial as having only one image, no matter how many sides the names occupy. The reasoning is that they, the three sides of names, are all really the same image -- that of the names of those persons being thanked. Continuation of the listing of names is not an additional dimension, rather a continuation of known information. In this example, as sides two and three do not contain new information, the site contains two sides, a main side plus one other. Finally, there could be a situation that is **Not Applicable**; see below. Here, the survey places an explanation in the COMMENTS/NOTES section. The study characterizes the several categories of image dimensions as follows:

Main Side, or Angle: All memorials by definition must have at least one dimension; we style this the Main dimension. It carries an initial and, we assume,

strong impression of the information the memorial is trying to convey. Frequently, the Main dimension is the only dimension. If no Main side or angle can be identified, then it is likely that by definition the memorial under consideration does not qualify for inclusion in the database. There could be an exception. And if in fact there is no Main, yet the study includes the memorial, then it will provide an explanation as to why in the COMMENTS/NOTES section.

Main + One: A side contains new information, beyond that set forth in the Main.

Main + Two: Two sides contain new information, beyond that set forth in the **Main**.

Main + Three: Three sides contain new information, beyond that set forth in the **Main**.

Four+: Four sides contain new information, beyond that set forth in the **Main**.

None: See COMMENTS/NOTES for explanation.

Not Applicable: see COMMENTS/NOTES for explanation.

Not known: There is an image dimension which, at the present time, is not known, for whatever reason. The intent here is to acquire and categorize the content of the image.

Under Consideration: Decision has yet to be made.

ITEM #12: INSCRIPTION

The **Herald**, which by definition is required of a memorial, must be affixed to, inscribed upon, or in some other way made a part of the monument. The surveyor's choices for this item are not so tidy as one might want. However, based on preliminary field surveys, the choices below do seem both to work and to contribute to the project's goals. The choices under this category are as follows:

Inscribed/Lettered Directly: The **Herald** is engraved into the memorial.

Inscribed/Lettered on Tablet: Engraving or lettering on a tablet attached to the memorial. See also the next response, below.

Inscribed/Lettered Directly and on Tablet: An inscription that combines the first two categories, directly above.

Tablet, Bas-Relief: Same as **Inscribed/Lettered on Tablet**, above, except the lettering is raised above the surface.

Small Engraved Plaque: Engraved message on metal or wood typically not exceeding 5" by 5" in size. Usually employed by attaching it to a unit.

Not Applicable: The surveyor chooses this category when the monument falls under ITEM #16, below -- where the memorial is of the **Parallel** type.

Under Consideration: Decision has yet to be made.

ITEM #13: TEXT AVAILABILITY

In order to be included in the project, a memorial must have a **Herald.** The purpose of this item is to indicate whether the project has in its possession either the entire text or some of it. The survey gathers the text of the **Herald** and may make it available by any of several means: handwritten, dictated/transcribed, or by means of the monument's photograph. The specific choices the surveyor may consider are: **text available**, **partial** or **text available**, **all**.

It is worth noting that as the database stores a **Herald's** wording incidental to the study's general efforts, the words themselves may not be readily available. Only rarely does the survey gather or retain the names of individuals mentioned in lists of names on monuments.

ITEM #14: VISUALS

The project contains images, typically two to five shots of a given memorial. It attaches to these images a unique number, separate from any other database number. The number is that assigned by the developing studio.

One image frame is a close-up of the **Herald**, visualized so the words can be read. Sometimes this is not possible, given the design of a particular memorial, in which case the image may only suggest the larger whole. The study stores the words themselves, either in whole or in part, in the database file. A second visual is an intermediate-to-full shot that captures the memorial as an entity. It is likely the **Herald** will not be readable in this shot, but it does visualize the context of the memorial. If indicated, a third or more images flesh out the site and place the memorial in a larger context.

There may be visuals of a memorial on file, which are not the properties of the database. The database affirmatively notes when this is the case. These may not be made available without the owner's permission.

The selections for this item from which to choose are as follows:

Yes/Location: Checking this category means the pictures of the monument are in the database. The study signifies this by entering the image-specific file identifier. The owners of the project have acquired and own these images.

Others, Authorized: Pictures of the memorial are in the database. Others have taken these images; however, the project is authorized to use them. Here, the authors do not speak to the quality or intent of the images; rather, only to their existence in the database

Others, Non-Authorized: An image exits, but it belongs to others, and the project does not have permission to display or release it. It might be possible to use the image for research purposes only. Nonetheless, this category does denote that there is a picture, or pictures, extant of the monument. Finally, the survey's database does not speak to the quality or intent of the photo.

No: There are no visuals of the memorial available.

Under Consideration: A determination as to how best to respond to the data need has yet to be made.

ITEM #15: DESIGN PRESERVATION

Describe how well preserved the design of the monument appears to be. Aspects that the survey assesses of any deterioration of materials include the condition and look of the following: the dominant material; the **Herald**, as it lay across the IMAGE DIMENSION(S); and, the continuing faithfulness of the memorial's **Form**. Note that this design preservation item does not take into consideration the monument's SITE (ITEM #19) and its upkeep. For instance, while a memorial may be situated at an essentially abandoned site, its design still may be satisfactorily preserved.

Conversely, the design may be failing for reasons of climatic impact on the dominant material, yet its SITE has been kept up satisfactorily. The five-point scoring assessment below provides the project with an evaluation range both broad yet distinctive, measuring what the project considers material stages of deterioration. This item may be scored as follows:

Good: Looks very much as the design seems to have been intended. There has been little if any weathering effect, damage, or other deterioration.

Satisfactory: It is clear that the design's preservation is holding; however, it is also obvious that it cannot make the "good" category above, because there has been deterioration or damage to some portion in particular, or to the memorial overall.

Failing: A deteriorating phase has begun. The original design intent is still clear, but decay has clearly begun, or damage inflicted, and it is marked.

Marginal: The degeneration or damage is well advanced or extensive. It would seem obvious that the design intent began failing well before this current observation, though there may be some reason to say that it has not yet reached the **Poor** category, below.

Poor: The decay/damage has advanced to a state where one cannot be even relatively sure of what the design intent may have been.

Not Applicable: None of the above apply; the reason for checking this category will be noted in COMMENTS/NOTES, below.

Under Consideration: Decision has yet to be made.

ITEM #16: SEPARATE MONUMENT IDENTIFICATION
(includes 16A, 16B, 16C)

As noted above under ITEM #7: DESIGN TYPE, for memorials of the

Parallel type, the **Herald** will be physically separated from its **Form**. The purpose

of the current item is to properly describe and classify the heralding component

under this model. Importantly, it is not the monument itself this item is describing,

but rather the identifier that relates to it. This distinction becomes important in

terms of materials used, design description, preservation, upkeep, setting

description, size, and inscription. Also, were we not to observe this basic

distinction, a tendency might be to memorialize the identifier and not that which it

identifies. The example given previously was that of a park (defined in the study

as an earthwork) with a boulder nearby containing a plaque. Our task here is to

describe and classify the boulder and not the park. Accordingly, the survey

describes only its design type, preservation status, and size. The choices are:

No: Must check here if memorial is the **Integrated** type. In other words,

this section is not applicable to this type of monument. Skip rest of item.

Yes: Must check if memorial is the **Parallel** type. Here we need to

describe and classify the identifier's attributes. Continue to 16A, below.

ITEM #16A: IDENTIFIER DESIGN TYPE

When in ITEM #16, above, the monument type is of the **Parallel** type, the following must be evaluated and marked appropriately.

Traditional Marker: Looks like a gravestone; it may be cut, shaped, and polished, or not.

Stone/Rock with Tablet: Rock, stone, or boulder of no seemingly preconceived shape, though this could be the design intent; with a tablet embedded, mounted to, or situated in the stone/rock.

Geometric with/without Pedestal: Thing whose **Form**, or design appearance, is driven by geometry and geometric shapes. The Geometric may or may not be cut, shaped, or polished. It is not a **Traditional Marker** or a **Wall**; also, it could be sculpted but would not be classified as a **Sculpture**.

Tablet/plaque: Flat surface of any material, though typically of metal with raised letters/words and/or image/images off of or in any fashion engraved into its surface.

Not Applicable: Does not apply to this item.

Under Consideration: Decision has yet to be made.

ITEM #16B: IDENTIFIER DESIGN PRESERVATION

Describe how well preserved the design of the identifier is. Aspects of the design that the survey assesses to arrive at a characterization of any deterioration of materials include the condition and look of the dominant material and the **Herald** as it lay across the IMAGE DIMENSION(S). The five-point scoring assessment, below, provides the project with an evaluation range both broad and distinctive, measuring what the project considers material stages of deterioration. This item may be scored as follows:

Good: Looks very much as the design seems to have been intended. There has been little if any weathering effect, damage, or other deterioration.

Satisfactory: It is clear that the design's preservation is holding; however, it is also obvious that it cannot make the "good" category above, because there has been deterioration or damage to some portion in particular, or to the identifier overall.

Failing: A deteriorating phase has begun. The original design intent is still clear, but marked decay has clearly begun, or damage inflicted.

Marginal: The degeneration/damage is well advanced. It is obvious that the design intent began failing well before this current observation, though there may be some reason to say that it has not yet reached the **Poor** category.

Poor: The decay/damage has advanced to a state where one cannot be even relatively sure of what the design intent may have been.

Not Applicable: None of the above apply; the reason for checking this category will be noted in COMMENTS/NOTES, below.

Under Consideration: Decision has yet to be made.

ITEM #16C: SIZE OF HERALD

The specific categories the project utilizes are as follows.

Very Small: Likely it could be held in the hand, like a plaque or small stone. Less in size than **Small**, below.

Small: Next smaller size compared to the **normal**, below.

Average/Normal: The normal size is something approximating -- actually slightly larger than -- the size, the mass of the human body.

Large: Next larger size compared to the **normal**.

Big: Greater in size than **Large**.

Other: None of the above.

Under Consideration: Decision has yet to be made.

ITEM #17: DESIGNER(S)

This item addresses the artistic forces behind a monument, principally its designer, or designers. Indeed, for any given monument, the survey needs to determine not only if there was any such artistic influence but, actually, who was involved. For the study, a designer could include an architect, landscape architect, sculptor, or others. This category seeks to capture designer information to the extent that it is applicable, known, and available.

When a memorial has no obvious ascribed designer(s), the study employs an interim categorization. Perhaps too, there was no individual designer involved with the memorial -- it was prefabricated so to speak and selected by the SPONSOR(S) from, maybe, a catalogue containing multiple ready-made designs. The database is designed so that it may capture the full names of at least two designers. Where there is a third (or more) the survey notes the person in the COMMENTS/NOTES section. Our possible database fields are as follows:

Designer(s) Known: The survey is aware of the person, or persons, known to have created the design. If on the monument itself the **Designer** should

attach a title to his or her name, e.g., "Sc," this marking should be included with and after the last name, below.

Designer Not Yet Determined: This is an interim category, used when the surveyor believes that a designer seems likely to have been involved and that it is still possible to determine the identity of the designer.

Designer Unknown: When after due consideration the study is unable to determine the designer, it employs this category. Its use implies that the authors believe a designer was involved, but he or she is unknown.

Designer Name 1A: The first/only designer's first name or initial.

Designer Name 1B: The first/only designer's second name or initial; if no second name or initial, leave the field blank.

Designer Name 1C: The first/only designer's last name. When the designer uses only one name, the study places it in this field. If the **Designer** should attach a title to his or her name, e.g., "Sc," this marking should be included with and after the last name.

Designer Name 2A: A second designer's first name or initial.

Designer Name 2B: A second designer's second name or inital; if no second name or initial, leave the field blank.

Designer Name 2C: A second designer's last name. When the designer uses only one name, the study places it in this field. If the **Designer** should attach a title to his or her name, e.g., "Sc," this marking should be included with and after the last name.

Prefabricated: A memorial's **Form** may have been created using a basic mold from which many individual monuments and memorials have been extracted. A typical example of this might be a **Traditional Marker**; see ITEM 8: DESIGN DESCRIPTION. Where we know such a mold was pre-developed and also know the **Designer**, the study completes both categories.

Not Applicable: There may be memorials where a designer would not be indicated, for instance, the Lava Beds National Monument in Tulelake, California. Here, the DESIGNER is nature itself.

Under Consideration: Decision has yet to be made.

ITEM #18: FABRICATOR(S) / MANUFACTURER(S)

This is the category where the project notes and stores the name of the foundry or manufacturing entity and where the monument was fabricated, when determined and known. For many memorials, this information may be difficult to ascertain. For others, the study does not require it, as in the case of the item above labeled **Prefabricated**. In this case, while the item may obviously have been ordered for the particular memorial, it was not necessarily or specifically designed for it. Here, the category **Not Applicable** is checked. There may be another feature not often specifically identified: the builder of the monument. Assuming it involves people other than the designer(s) or the foundry, the company or people who actually constructed the monument, when identified, the survey lists it in the <u>COMMENTS/NOTES</u> section. The fields the survey completes related to the **Fabricator** or **Manufacturer** are as follows:

Known: The survey is aware of the firm known to have fabricated the monument. The surveyor completes the section on **Fabricator First** and **Second Names**, below.

Not Yet Determined: This is an interim category, used when the surveyor believes that a fabricator seems likely to have been involved and that it is still possible to determine its identity.

Unknown: When after due consideration the study is unable to determine the manufacturer, it employs this category. Its use implies that the authors believe a manufacturer was involved, but the name of the firm is unknown.

Not Identified: There are no identifying markings on the memorial, and where research has been carried out, it has not pointed to a specific foundry.

Fabricator First Name: The first or only name of the foundry.

Fabricator Second Name: A second name, or names, of the foundry.

City: The city in which the foundry was located when it produced the memorial. If the foundry has since re-located, the study lists its new city location, when known, under COMMENTS/NOTES.

State: The state in which the foundry was located when it produced the memorial. If the foundry has since re-located, the study lists its new state location, when known, under COMMENTS/NOTES.

Not Applicable: There are memorials where a fabricator's name and address are not indicated, for instance, when the category **Prefabricated**, under ITEM #17 DESIGNER(S), above is indicated.

ITEM #19 THE SITE

Memorials and monuments are situated in spaces and places – the site. The purpose of this item is to answer questions about the appearance of the memorial's situation, to categorize the settings into broad, dominant types, define and distinguish between them, and assign each qualifying monument in the project to one of these categories. We inventory these types below, and afterward provide additional instruction.

Park/Garden/Lawn: This is a landscaped setting characterized by grass, trees, flowers, or fields. The setting may or may not appear to be designed specifically to accommodate a memorial or monument.

Plaza: Hardened, apron-like arrangement around the monument, especially on the front side, to accommodate observers. The site should appear to be designed specifically to support the memorial, or memorials. A plaza could actually be situated within a **Park/Garden/Lawn** setting, as above; however, in this case the study will refer to it as a **Plaza**.

Cemetery/Burial Ground/Graveyard: By way of definition, while the words cemetery, burial ground, and graveyard carry different technical meanings, the study considers the terms interchangeable. The project does not include cemeteries as a class, though full of memorials, because they are put in place as part of our end-of-life mores for disposing of and remembering individual loved ones on a private basis. These then are private monuments, while the project focuses on public monuments. This said, the survey must consider the topic further, as it is a complex category that presents us with both special problems and noteworthy opportunities, developed below.

First, within cemeteries, memorials included in this study are those installed to dedicate not a buried individual, but rather, to remember those STORIES and SUBJECTS/OBJECTS upon which our survey typically focuses. For instance, within a local cemetery, a nearby town may have located its Civil War monument. This memorial is included in the project.

A second possibility is this: a lone grave, or several graves situated at the same site, may be classed as a monument. An example would be Sitting Bull's grave located in Mobridge, North Dakota. For this kind of exception to be included, the important justification is *Convention #7*, the above-mentioned distinctiveness inclusion – a site with one or few graves vs. a site with hundreds or thousands of them.

Finally, we entertain the possibility of a mirror-image of the previous opportunity: A memorial not situated in a cemetery that otherwise meets all of the survey's criteria for inclusion may also contain some or all of the deceased's remains. For instance, this would be the case at the Worth Monument, across from Madison Square Park in New York City, where the body of Major General William Jenkins Worth, a distinguished Mexican War officer, lies buried beneath the 51-foot-high memorial.

Gazebo: Structure that is covered, opened at the sides, and freestanding. A gazebo could also be a DESIGN DESCRIPTION (see above, ITEM #8).

Architectural space: Interior space not elsewhere classified in this item.

Historic Structure: Special place of historical significance, but not a landmark. This item could also be a DESIGN DESCRIPTION (see above, ITEM #8).

Historic Landmark: Place of historical significance with state or national landmark status.

Street: Memorial situated directly at street level or apparently oriented to the street itself.

Rural Location: Exterior space set away from a developed community.

Virtual Site: Website, in cyberspace, on the internet. The survey uses this category when the memorial exists solely as a website. This category is not used when the virtual site is complementary to a memorial with a physical presence; see below instead, ITEM 28: LOCATION/**Website**.

Inside Building – Public or Private: Interior space belonging or available to the public, for instance, a town hall or a public or private school or hospital. A criteria is that all visitors must have similar access, especially if the SITE is not free of charge, its hours of operation are limited, or access to it may in fact be guarded, as in the case of a public school or government building. Specifically, if the site is a private one, it must be consistent with Convention 3: Delimit Public (vs. Private) Monuments, above.

Other: Any setting not classified as one of the above. The particulars will be noted in the COMMENTS/NOTES section of the survey.

Under Consideration: Decision has yet to be made.

The analysis and execution of this item could cause confusion. The reason is that the survey having established these several settings, the observer will notice that the kinds of designations it proposes might overlap with one another, or even with two others. For example, if a memorial sits on a **Lawn** next to a **Street** in front of a **Historic Structure**, which category of SITE does one check off? In this case, the answer is **Historic Structure**.

The survey follows this rule in assigning a memorial to a SITE from amongst our inventory of choices: Within the survey's controlled vocabulary, the specific spot, the exact space that a memorial occupies, is secondary to the location of that specific spot. In other words, the database defaults to space or spot categorizations only when the location choice is not applicable.

ITEM #20: PANORAMA-ENHANCING FEATURES

Some settings almost seem to supercharge a monument. It is not that a monument cannot be engaging simply because it lacks such a supercharged setting. But, where it is possible that the SPONSORS and DESIGNERS can call upon these resources, they are capable, it seems, of moving the memorial to a different level of appreciation. These several settings and the study's characterization of them are as follows:

Land: either elevated or depressed

Open Space: free of obstructing things and greater than 1-2 acres

Water: ocean, river, lake, stream, pond

None: There is no panorama-enhancing feature.

Not Applicable: The situation does not apply in this case.

Under Consideration: Decision has yet to be made.

ITEM #21: THE AESTHETIC

One intention of a monument is to honor by remembering -- encouraging us not to forget. One way to reinforce this purpose is to carry out the memorialization in an appealing way. Another intention of a memorial, beyond reminding, is to satisfy. Yet trying to define and evaluate attractiveness, appeal, and beauty are challenges in and of themselves. Ideally, we want our monument makers to strive for intelligence and visual eloquence. We hope, at the least, they can draw us into the monument's story and subjects. For practical purposes, we assume that beauty is not so much a thing -- a point, an item, a feeling -- but rather, a range of things -- points, items, and feelings. Incorporating these assumptions, the project seeks to make and convey its evaluation of the aesthetic elements and effects of a monument by rating each memorial individually, using a simple rating scale applied across a series of variables, as described below. These variables are the memorial's appeal, its setting, associated traffic, visualization of the panorama, and the opportunity to view and to enjoy the item.

As it is unlikely that one can evaluate the aesthetics of a monument unless one is physically present, observing on-site, the surveyor's first step with respect to carrying out this item is to complete the following assessment status evaluation.

<u>ASSESSMENT STATUS</u>

Completed: See below.

In progress: See below.

Not performed: Not yet done. Skip remainder of section.

<u>SCORING SYSTEM: RATINGS</u>

Values Scale. The survey assigns an ordinal value to a given parameter. The study uses this value as a weighting tool. In the case of our "aesthetic" item, the study provides a range of seven values across each of five parameters. The seven values are as follows:

- Exceptional   7 points
- Very Good   6 points
- Good   5 points
- Acceptable   4 points
- Wanting   3 points
- Bad   2 points
- Unacceptable   1 point

The study defines these values as follows:

7 Excellent: Clearly exceptional in its presentation and effect.

6 Very Good: There are many points that elevate the memorial to this level.

5 Good: There is at least one, and likely two, points that elevate the monument to an above average, the **Acceptable**, rating.

4 Acceptable: The presumed average, or minimally acceptable, standard; the operative word is acceptable.

3 Wanting: There is some aspect to the item that pulls it down. It may be a general item spread superficially across the whole memorial or a particular deficiency that, while not wide, is deep.

2 Bad: The entire item is affected. Each material aesthetic element is off the mark to some noticeable extent.

1 Unacceptable: Each possible element is wide of the mark to an extreme.

SCORING SYSTEM: PARAMETERS

What follows are the five parameters the study measures with descriptions as to how best to interpret them.

Appeal of the Item: Is a memorial's appeal expected, typical, predictable? Is it appropriate to the intention, to the seeming task at hand? If yes to these questions, its score will likely be **Acceptable**, or 4. If not, then lower. If the appeal is more unique, intricate, venturesome, enveloping – yet on target within the boundary of appropriateness – then it should score comparatively higher.

Orderliness of the Setting: Is the setting in which the monument is situated an ordered one, and tidy? If yes, its score should be **Acceptable**, or 4. Further, is the monument and site punctuated in any way? For instance, if it is plain, unadorned, overlooked, misplaced, unsuitable, the study values these lower. Or, on the other hand, there might be a garden or other landscaping about the monument, which the study values more highly.

Traffic: For the study's purposes, traffic refers to automobiles, including motorcycles, trucks, and buses; but also, in some contexts, foot traffic, bicycle, train, plane, or some other kind of transport. Traffic should, by and large, be

close enough for access but far enough for appreciation. If the traffic is either too close or too far away the rating of its associated monument will be lowered.

Several situations need to be noted. First, the impact of parking lots and access roads in a highly urban setting needs to be measured differently from those of a large-acreage, more rural setting. Second, the exceptional scene is where the traffic is close enough for convenient access to the monument yet far enough away so that it does not distract from or undermine an observer's enjoyment of the site. Last, a monument within a range of from one to fifteen feet of a roadway in an urban or suburban setting typically is likely to receive a substandard score.

There are two additional detractors that the survey defines as "traffic" and measures similarly. These are noise and odor. With the former, an example would be where the memorial is situated out in the country, only right next to an interstate freeway – bucolic but deafening. With the latter situation, the monument might be situated in a park next to a former garbage dump – quiet but the smell is nauseating.

Visualization and the Panorama: Situating oneself on a memorial's site and having the opportunity to look around at spaces surrounding the memorial can generate a good feeling. This may be pleasing and heighten the experience of the monument. To evaluate this aspect of the aesthetic of a memorial, the surveyor visualizes the panorama. This places the memorial in a larger societal

or natural setting, and the surveyor evaluates and scores it along this line. Where the panorama is tight, limiting, cluttered, suffocating -- either because of nature, civilization, or both -- the resultant score tends to be lower. Where the panorama is generous and open, the score tends to be higher.

Viewing and Enjoyment Opportunities: The project assumes people would want to visit a monument and, in the best sense of the word, enjoy it. In its **Form** and **Herald**, a monument may be capable of calling out the contemplative in us. Does the memorial under consideration provide the opportunity for visiting, contemplating, enjoying? Typically, this means providing a bench or other opportunity to relax. Or as a function of its design, the memorial itself may provide for something like this, a resting place where an observer might pause to try to grasp and absorb the message, the remembrance, the impact the memorial is meant to convey. To the extent that the memorial does or does not provide these opportunities, it will receive a higher or lower score.

SCORING OUTCOME

The surveyor having observed, evaluated, and assigned a numerical value to the five variables immediately above, the scores for the variables are then summed and divided by five. The study notes the resultant numerical score, carried out to one decimal place, and checks the corresponding "aesthetic" item

along a range, from a high of Exceptional to a low of Unacceptable. This said, the task of trying to quantify beauty, to digitize appeal – no matter from whose perspective we view it – is a challenging one. The project hopes that its approach to the challenge, using this methodical, rational model, helps quantify that beauty, that meeting of purpose.

ITEM #22: SITE DEVELOPMENT

This item treats the dates and times that <u>SPONSORS</u> develop and commemorate a monument. The availability of this data may vary widely. The dedication date is sometimes a part of a memorial's **Herald**. Likewise, when a memorial is re-dedicated, perhaps after refurbishment and/or relocation, the new date may also be made a part of the **Herald**.

When the full, exact date is not a part of the **Herald**, there are three choices: The year of the dedication is in some other way affixed to the memorial; or the year of the dedication may be reasonably estimated; or, finally, research may be required to establish the dates surrounding a memorial. Certainly, in terms of a memorial's "start date," see below, this is almost never a part of the memorial itself. It invariably requires background research or other knowledge, information, or understanding. The data fields the project completes in order to satisfy this item are as follows:

Start Date: At some point, <u>SPONSORS</u> begin to anticipate, then to plan, a monument. This item recognizes the year in which the planning begins. The year

entered is that which is either specifically known or can reasonably be ascribed as the date. When the surveyor finds that the memorial cannot pass this reasonableness test, the survey leaves the field empty.

Dedication Date: The year, month, and day in which the memorial is formally dedicated.

Dedication Year (Actual): The year in which the memorial is formally dedicated. The surveyor takes the year from the item immediately above.

Dedication Year (Estimate): When an **Actual Dedication Year**, above, is not available, it might be possible from circumstances, research, or the memorial site itself to reasonably estimate the year when a memorial may have been dedicated. If reasonable estimates cannot be established, this element of the memorial is categorized as "date unknown," below.

Year Re-dedicated/Expanded 1 (Actual): Memorials may be re-dedicated, expanded, resited – this category addresses these kinds of activities.

Year Re-dedicated/Expanded 2 (Actual): As above, only a second time.

Date Unknown: When the dedication date is not known and cannot be reasonably estimated, the surveyor observes this under COMMENTS/NOTES.

Under Consideration: Decision has yet to be made, observed under COMMENTS/NOTES.

ITEM #23: ACCESS TO MONUMENTS

The parameter that the project calls "access" relates to the comparative ease of reaching the monument and its site. A key question is, access from where? The answer is, from that point associated with the audience for whom the memorial is intended. For instance, assume the monument is to honor the firemen of Scottsdale, Arizona, and it is situated in the middle of the town of Scottsdale. The memorial's access evaluation would likely be **Ready**, because it is convenient to those for whom it was likely erected, the citizens of Scottsdale. This answer would hold true for a site like the Vietnam War Memorial, with more of a national vs. a community orientation. It is readily available to those who are in Washington, D.C., no matter where they call home.

On the other hand, what the rating does not imply, staying with both of these examples, is that for a person in California the memorial would be "**Requires Travel**." Also, this access rating does not speak to the following question: Having arrived at the monument, is one given the opportunity to view it, to enjoy it? For sometimes, while a monument may be readily accessible, as defined above, there could be an obstruction to one's view and enjoyment of the

monument. The survey rates this particular aspect under ITEM #21: THE AESTHETIC of the memorial, above. The choices here are as follows.

Ready: Relatively accessible to the population from a variety of points. Possible that it is more accessible from one place than another, but is at least accessible from one.

Requires Travel: In virtually all cases, one must use transportation to reach the site. For instance, the monument under consideration may be situated near a battlefield outside of a town, and everyone must travel to get to the memorial.

Off Beaten Path -- Requires Travel: As above, and once having traveled, one must then proceed further either by vehicle, foot, or other conveyance. For instance, continuing to use the example cited just above, the monument might be situated on the battlefield itself and, once having gotten to a certain point on a paved road, one might have to take an unpaved, path-like trail to reach the destination. This category could include monuments which, due to their location, could put a pedestrian visitor in the way of on-coming traffic.

Challenging: Obstacles other than, and/or in addition to, distance are thrown in the visitor's way. These could make visiting the memorial difficult and certainly inconvenient.

Unreasonable: An element of possible danger is introduced. For instance, the monument is situated up a steep, unimproved incline; in some isolated spot which due to weather could pose a danger; or facing on-coming vehicular traffic.

Under Consideration: Decision has yet to be made.

ITEM #24: NUMBER OF MONUMENTS

The project makes and gathers observations about how many memorials are situated on a given site. It also cross-references when there is more than one monument on a site the **Identification Numbers** of the others. Further, for a site with four or more memorials, the project takes into consideration in particular the style in which the location is developed. To gather this kind of data, the study needs first to define the term "site," which for our purposes is a location or space that projects a unity to the eye. Architecturally, this sense of unity is usually achieved by means of boundaries such as roads, buildings, sidewalks, recreational areas like ballfields, or building blocks of landscaping such as lawns, bushes, and trees. Taken together, these can develop in the mind's eye a single place, a unified site.

The size of the site may vary; while the project sizes, if you will, the numbers of memorials themselves, see below, its survey instrument does not measure site size per se. Thus, a site could be a comparatively small one, with any number of variously-sized monuments situated about it, or the site could encompass hundreds of square miles or acres with only a single memorial

situated on it – or indeed one memoral consuming all of it. The options from which to select in cataloging the number of memorials on a site are as follows.

One: Single memorial is situated on a site.

Two: Two memorials are situated on a site.

Three: Three memorials are situated on a site.

Four-plus: Four or more memorials are situated on a site. The relationships of the memorials to each other appear serial, though they may be somewhat random. This layout, this category, is different from that of the **Mall Arrangement**, below.

Mall Arrangement: This designation speaks both to the numbers of memorials on a site and their arrangement. The number of memorials on a site must be at least **Four-plus** to be classified here. And also, stylistically, the memorials must relate to each other based upon what appears to be a pre-planned approach, like stores designed into a shopping mall. This **Mall Arrangement** pulls itself and the memorials together as a unit and gives the appearance of having been planned, if not installed, all at once.

Under Consideration: Decision has yet to be made.

As mentioned above, where a site contains more than one monument, the project relates each to the other, or others. It does this by associating the second with the first by means of its **Identification Number**.

ITEM #25: SITE UPKEEP

The community should not only remember but also maintain its memorials and monuments. How well maintained is a site? Does it seem cared for, tidy? Is the designer's intent, as best we can tell, intact? The surveyor's evaluation range is fairly wide, since the author questions whether any more precision on this item is either warranted or possible. The evaluation choices that reflect the caretaker's efforts are:

Satisfactory: The site is generally acceptable.

Unsatisfactory: The site is generally not acceptable.

Abandoned: It is clear from both the memorial in particular and its site in general that for those charged with site upkeep their hope as well as upkeep efforts have been suspended or dropped.

Not Applicable: None of the above, for whatever reason, apply. An explanation will be noted under <u>COMMENTS/NOTES</u>, below.

Under Consideration: Decision has yet to be made.

ITEM #26: SITE MAINTENANCE

This item seeks to answer the question of who maintains the monument and the site of which it is a part on an on-going basis. There are both governmental and nongovernmental response options. The response to our point above might be a single entity, such as the National Park Service, or it could be a combination of entities, for instance, a village civic group such as a Rotary Club, in cooperation with a town's parks department or beautification group.

The following background situation might also be considered. At one level, who or what provides the direct, hands-on service? This is regardless of the funding for care. For instance, if town government maintains the memorial as a function of funds received from county government, the survey considers the town as the provider and not the county. At a second level, perhaps even in counter-distinction to the above, where a government entity or community group contracts with a private entity to perform site maintenance services, the survey notes that the local entity is the provider of service and not the contracted service provider. The project derives its assessment of site-maintenance services from the following: where it is obvious from site observation, communications with

knowledgeable parties, or review of written documents. Our category choices are as follows:

Local Government: Direct services provided by what might variously be called a city, town, village, or the like, including branches of local government such as a division of roads or of parks and recreation. This category may also serve as a default group for anything that is obviously not a county, state, federal, or community group, below, if and when the project can assume with reasonable certainty that this is the case.

County Government: Services provided directly by government organized at the county level.

State Government: Services provided directly by government organized at the state level. This includes maintenance services provided by any state executive entities, such as parks and recreation or any state military units.

Federal Government/NPS: Services provided directly by the federal government's National Parks Service or any Parks Service-controlled entity.

Federal Government/BLM-NFS: Services provided directly by the federal government's Bureau of Land Management (BLM) or National Forest Service (NFS) units, or any BLM or Forest Service-controlled entity.

Federal Government/Other: Services provided directly by other units of the federal executive branch, including any provided by the United States military.

Community Group #1: A congregation of people, typically volunteers or a non-profit entity organized at the local level, that undertakes the continued maintenance of a monument. This local group could be a branch of an organization with a national orientation, such as the DAR. Its name, assuming it is known, will be noted under COMMENTS/NOTES, below.

Community Group #2: The same as immediately above, except it is a second such community group. Its name, assuming it is known, will be noted under COMMENTS/NOTES, below.

None of the Above: When the maintenance entity is known but fits into none of the categories above, the survey categorizes it here and lists it specifically in the COMMENTS/NOTES section of the database.

Not Yet Determined: The project is currently evaluating who is responsible for site maintenance.

ITEM #27: MEMORIAL IDENTIFICATION

The item collects and documents demographic information, on an on-going basis. This information includes for each monument a database number, title, key word, and file number.

Database Number. The study assigns each memorial included in the survey a distinct number for identification within the database. It does not number or otherwise track sites that fail to meet the project's criteria for inclusion.

Title. The survey calls each memorial by a name. This name, or Title, is how the study refers to the site inside the database, whether in writing or in conversation. Where a site has already been given an official title and this is known, e.g., the Lincoln Memorial, the study replicates this Title. The survey may use any of the following as a technique to assign a default title. A name may be a part of the memorial itself or alluded to in literature or writings related to the site. As a part of local custom, it may carry a colloquial identifier.

Finally, there may be no official or de facto name associated with a memorial or, if it exists, the authors cannot determine it. In this case, for ease of referral and simplicity of communication, the study assigns a name, or nickname if you will. The study typically tries to convey in the Title something of the memorial's story, subject, design, sponsor, or period – something about the essence of the memorial itself.

An important task of the project is to compare and contrast memorials. As the study uses a database storage tool, the project must exercise caution on how it refers to entities; otherwise, similarities when stored may inadvertently become differences and hence get lost to follow-up and recall. To recognize and manage these two important facts, the study includes as Appendix D, Naming and Styling Guidelines. This is information about the project's assigning **Titles** and spelling practices.

Key Words. The study assigns key words to each site for ease of subject reference. The purpose of the key word is at the highest level of categorization -- identifying monuments dedicated to the fundamental ideas, actions, and themes that are America – its stories, military actions, leaders, builders, people, and space. These key words and their references are:

History: Stories about America.

War: Military engagements against an enemy.

Leader: A person memorialized because others have followed.

Nurturer: A person, thing or idea that has nurtured lives or life.

Racial/Ethnic: The physical/cultural backgrounds of the America people.

Landscape: The spaces that are American spaces.

File Number. In the process of carrying out the study's work, each monument site will undoubtedly generate information -- literature, photos, data analysis, evaluations, maps, and so forth. The study saves this information, batching it in logical ways, and assigns each memorial to a File Number (not to be confused with the **Database Number**, above). The materials are usually stored in envelopes, and any given File Number and envelope contain information about anywhere from one to fifteen memorial sites.

Item #28: MEMORIAL LOCATION

A memorial is established at a SITE, and the survey describes its position

using the following locators: town, county, state, zip code, and, when possible,

nearby cross streets. The survey treats locations situated in US territories, e.g.,

Puerto Rico, similarly. The study also notes the address of website activity, if

any. The database self-fills a field indicating the country is the US, of course. In

the future, cartographic references could also be available and useful.

We expand on each of the above-mentioned locators in turn, below.

Town. The town is the local civic and geographic entity in which the

monument is located. It surrounds the memorial most immediately. The project

designates the term "*town*" to include a city or a village; contrariwise, the survey

does not consider a neighborhood, community, or housing subdivision to be a

town. When for whatever reason the survey cannot discern the memorial's town

name, the survey lists the name of the town that is associated with the

memorial's mailing address or its physical location.

County: The survey notes the county in which a memorial is situated. Territorially, the county is the aggregation of land organized immediately above the **Town** level; it may include property belonging to state and federal governments. Politically, the survey assumes the county to be an independent political division of government.

A county's boundaries could co-terminate with those of a **Town**; the entities could have either the same or different name designations covering the same territory. If the county in which the memorial is situated extends into or overlaps with another county, the survey uses the county associated with the memorial's mailing address, for initial identification purposes. If this solution is not available or appropriate, the survey cites that county associated with what is popularly perceived to be the main entrance or approach to the monument.

State: This is the name of the state or US territory – its two-letter, abbreviated form -- in which the memorial is situated. If the memorial extends into another state, the survey lists that state associated with the mailing address of the monument. However, if this is not available or appropriate, the survey cites that state associated with what is popularly perceived to be the main entrance or approach to the monument.

Zip Code: The 5-digit or 9-digit code associated with the monument's mailing address. If the memorial has no individual mailing address, the study

uses the zip code most closely associated with what is popularly perceived to be the main entrance or approach to the monument.

Cross Streets/Location. The study attempts to position, if not pinpoint, a memorial by listing nearby cross streets whenever possible and practical. In addition, the survey supplements this information, when it might prove useful, by noting adjacent public structures, for example, a city hall or a library. Finally, the survey notes when a memorial sits along a prominent US highway, for example, US 1, or an Interstate Highway, for example I-10.

Website: The survey completes this data element under two circumstances. First, a memorial maintains a website as an adjunct to a physically existing place. For example, for a memorial that is a part of the National Park Service, the survey notes the memorial's web address here and as well may list any related, additional information under the Survey Item.

Second, for a qualifying **Virtual** memorial, where the site exists only on the internet, the LOCATION elements (**town**, **county**, **state**, **zip**) are those of the SPONSOR'S, or SPONSORS', mailing address; for this, cross streets/location are not completed.

ITEM #29: NATURE OF THE MEMORIAL

In studying and attempting to classify a given memorial, the survey begins in each case by determining what kind of a memorial we are looking at. Specifically, whether it was formed through human or superhuman means, as in the case of a land parcel essentially untouched by civilization. Or whether the memorial is a website with no other physical form of existence, situated under water, or even extraterrestrial. Some may also be either former monuments or future monuments. Each memorial that the study includes must satisfy one of these aspects.

Man-made. A person, or a group of people, creates the memorial, and it is physically situated in an American location, as defined above. A man-made memorial may also have an internet site associated with it that extends the description or publicizes the physical site.

Extraterrestrial. The site is situated in outer space. It may or may not be man-made. An extraterrestrial memorial may also have an internet site associated with it that extends the description or publicizes the physical site.

Former Memorial. Some sites may be destroyed or their existence otherwise ended. Also, some memorials remain at the original sites but their nature is changed, and the societal intent is that they not be memorials any longer. The purpose of this classification is to account for that which was at some point included as a part of the study, only later ceased to be so.

Future/New/Evolving Memorials. By and large, people plan memorials and, as a function of this fact, the strategies and related decision making may take many months, years, or even decades. The purpose of this particular designation is to be able to identify and monitor the planning efforts. Following the establishment or development of the memorial, the survey moves the item into one of the other categories, above. While in this future status, an intended memorial may also have an internet site associated with it that extends the description or publicizes the physical site.

Terrestrial. The physical matter of the earth constitutes the memorial. The site has not been developed by society in a way that then creates a memorial. (Should this happen, the site becomes categorized as **Man-made**, above.) A

terrestrial memorial may also have an internet site associated with it that extends the description or publicizes the physical site.

Underwater. The memorial – man-made or terrestrial -- is situated beneath the sea. There must either be an associated land-based **Form** and/or **Herald** that announces the memorial or an internet site that serves a similar function.

Virtual. The site exists only on the internet. The survey subjects the site to its Conventions related to *American* as well as *Societal Confirmation Process*.

Under Consideration: Decision has yet to be made.

ITEM #30: LEAD SPONSOR(S)

The project seeks to identify those key people and/or organizations whose vision and action have motivated, or are currently motivating, the beginnings of a memorial. The survey refers to these individuals and groups as the LEAD SPONSOR(S). The sponsorship process includes nurturing a memorial's birth through the public agreement process – design, site selection, memorialization. Items entitled THE STORIES, as well as their SUBJECTS/OBJECTS, comprise the fabric of this sponsorship process.

These two topics underpin the course to reach collective agreement about who or what should be honored, how, and by what means. All who participate in the establishing of a memorial may not be cited by the study, which to the best of its ability identifies those who have assumed leadership positions. The sponsorship landscape for a given memorial could be comparatively straightforward. An American Legion post, for example, convinces local town government to place in its public space a memorialized stone honoring townspeople killed in the Korean War. Or, in an alternative approach, the landscape may be more complex and might require combining the resources of

several sponsoring bodies. For instance, a local government makes land available for a monument; a membership group forms to raise funds from the public through personal donations; and a historical society pitches in with its organizational capabilities to reach out to and communicate with the community.

To conclude this section, the sponsorship process seems like the act of tracing a glacier's move down a mountainside. The ice scrapes and pulls everything up into itself, then deposits its contents at the bottom of the incline. Along the way, the underlying surface has been scarred, sometimes very deeply. The process does not end just because the contents have arrived at the bottom, because the monument is in place, even dedicated. There are continuing tolls society must pay so that it might continue to remember: The memorial must be maintained, or not, and it may also end up having to be relocated, which likely necessitates additional public review and agreement.

Potential lead sponsors that the database considers are as follows.

Auxiliary Support Group: Assembly of people who are related to and gather in support of a line of work or function. For example, in the area of police work, a police benevolent society functions as an auxiliary support group.

Business/Businesses: Commercial entities, both for-profit and not-for-profit, sponsor monuments. Structurally, the business may be a corporation, partnership, or proprietary entity.

Citizens/Residents: A group that sponsors a monument. This collection of people may be called other names, such as natives, inhabitants, and so on. The database uses this category when the **Herald** specifically states that the monument is sponsored by citizens or residents.

Contrariwise, when a memorial indicates that a branch of government sponsored the memorial on behalf of its citizens or residents, the database credits the branch of government with sponsorship and not **Citizens/Residents**. If it is clear from the **Herald** and/or from of the memorial's **Form** that **Citizens/Residents** and a branch of government both co-sponsor the memorial, then the survey includes both of the categories.

Community Group: People or organized entities in a community may bring themselves together to sponsor a memorial. They could do so for this single effort, or they could be an on-going organization which has taken as a part of its functioning the sponsorships of memorials, monuments, and the like.

DAR/SAR Groups: Groups and the members who associate themselves with the Daughters (DAR) or Sons (SAR) of the American Revolution. These

organizations have national as well as local chapters, often cited in a memorial's **Herald**. Some chapters seem to have given themselves names that are variations of these two titles; regardless of name, such organizations are included here.

Educational Entity: Schools of a public nature at any educational level, from kindergarten through graduate school, may sponsor memorials. When they do, the study categorizes their sponsorship here. For a private school memorial to be included here, it must have also passed the test for <u>Societal Confirmation Process, Convention 5</u>, above.

Family/Friends/Colleagues: Associates surrounding a person, group, thing, or undertaking. Much less formal than **Membership Group/Public Contribution**, above. Often, this category self-styles itself in the memorial's **Herald**.

Fire Fighters/Organizations: Members of a fire department or the fire department itself, whether organized on a voluntary or for-pay basis. The category may or may not include civilian staff of fire-fighting organizations, depending on the memorial's **Herald** and **Form.** This category comprises fire-fighting at all levels of government, from federal to local. Where it is clear from a

memorial's **Herald** or from history that another entity is also in support, the survey includes that entity as a <u>SPONSOR</u>.

Government, County: Sponsorships by a government organized at the county level, including entities controlled or under the auspices of a county government. In some locales, a county may be referred to by some other name. See Appendix D, Naming and Styling Guidelines. For our purposes here, all will be referred to as "county," unless for some reason this might result in confusion; in this case, the database notes the exception under <u>COMMENTS/NOTES</u>.

Government, Federal -- BLM/NFS: Projects developed by these federal government divisions -- Bureau of Land Management, National Forest Service units, any BLM or Forest Service-controlled operating unit.

Government, Federal -- NPS: Projects initiated by the federal government's National Parks Service or any Parks Service-controlled operating unit.

Government, Federal -- Other: Projects developed by other units of the federal government, including any sponsored by branches of United States military forces.

Government, Local: Sponsorships advanced by what might variously be styled a city, town, village, borough, hamlet, center, or the like. The database also includes branches of local government, such as roads or parks and recreation.

Government, Other: The database uses this category as a default government group. It places in this group any memorial or monument that it cannot categorize as local, county, state, or federal, as defined above.

Government, State: The database assigns a memorial to this category for the following reasons – a **Herald** cites the state as the sponsor or, in the absence of such a direct citation, the memorial's location signifies that state government has very likely sponsored the memorial.

Under the term state government, the database includes any executive, legislative, or judicial functions carried out as a part of a state's governmental mission. Specifically, this definition includes sponsorships by state-controlled entities such as parks and recreation or any state-based military units. The project includes in this category the 50 states of the Union, Washington, DC, and the territories of Puerto Rico, the American Virgin Islands, American Samoa, and Guam.

Historical Society: Entities calling themselves historical societies, or variations on this designation, usually not-for-profit corporations recognized in the community as organizations whose tasks are generally to preserve and interpret that community's past for the education and enjoyment of its citizens and visitors.

Membership Group/Public Contribution: Voluntary, formalized, usually single-purpose groups which hold themselves out as drivers of the memorial; they reach out to the public asking for donations of money and/or other resources, which they then channel into their specific memorial. They may style themselves in a variety of ways, all of which are grouped under this heading.

Not Known: The survey does not know the sponsoring entity of a memorial, and it is not likely that it will become known. The presumption here is that the authors have investigated the situation, including consultation with historical sources and/or those most likely to know about memorial sponsorship, yet the study still cannot turn up the relevant background information.

Other: Sponsorship by a person, a group of people, or an organization that does not fit into any of the categories above. The project notes the entity name under COMMENTS/NOTES, below.

Other Nongovernment: When a sponsor does not appear to fit any of the above categories, the survey defaults its classification under this heading. When the database assigns this category, the project places a message in the COMMENTS/NOTES section, listing title or description as appropriate.

Policemen/Police Departments: Members of a police department or the police department itself, however organized. The category may or may not include civilian staff of police organizations, depending on the memorial's **Herald** and **Form**. This category comprises police work at all levels of government, from federal to local, with the exception of military police. Where it is clear from a memorial's **Herald** or from history that another entity is also in support, the study also includes that entity as a SPONSOR.

Religious Group: Sponsors in a memorial's **Herald** who associate themselves with, or are actually a part of a religious group. The sponsor may be religious; however, for the memorial to be included here it must have also passed the test for Societal Confirmation Process, Convention 4, above.

Veterans Groups: Men and women who have formed themselves into groups based on a shared military experience, such as the American Legion. Typically, these groups have organizational names and numbers, and where they are known the survey includes them in the database under

COMMENTS/NOTES. Veterans of the National Guard and of any state- or locally-based military-oriented units are also included in this category, as is the Merchant Marine no matter a monument's establishment date.

Unknown: At this time, the SPONSOR is unknown to the project, but there is some likelihood that it can become known. The database uses this item when it appears that after some degree of investigation, the authors may yet determine whom the sponsor or sponsors are. This might not yet include consultation with historical sources and/or people most likely to know. The database uses this category if it knows one of the sponsoring agencies and suspects there is possibly another about which it can likely know in the future.

<u>ITEM #31: PERIOD(S) COVERED</u>

The monuments that <u>SPONSORS</u> establish commemorate a period or periods of time – or all time – regardless of when they are actually dedicated: what is being remembered occurred at a certain time, in a certain period. The survey seeks to identify how often given periods of time are memorialized. In structuring the periods themselves, the project employs the general contours of the American social experience as framed by historians in their telling of the American story. The periods are laid out and characterized as follows.

Prehistoric: Prior to the earliest peoples; the focus here appears to be on the memorializing of the land itself.

Early Civilizations to 1492: This period covers the first persons or groups to live in what is now titled the US landscape. The limited historical record indicates these persons or groups were, as styled by others, Indian cultures.

First Americans/Colonists 1492-1775: From Columbus to the dawn of the American Revolution, the establishment of European rulers' trading posts and/or colonies along the east and the southeast Atlantic coasts, as well as Spanish settlements in the west.

American Revolution 1776-1788: The revolution's beginnings up to the election of the first president of the United States.

Washington to Lincoln: The period that begins with Washington's presidency (1789) and ends with the assassination of Lincoln (1865).

1866 – 1913: The period after Lincoln and the Civil War up to, but not including, the start of World War I.

1914 – 1945: The years that include, as well as those between, World War I and World War II.

1946 – 1973: From the end of World War II to the close of the Vietnam War.

1974 – 2000: The period beginning after the close of the Vietnam War to the close of the millennium.

2001 - Current: Start of the millennium to the present day.

For all time, no time: The period alluded to is timeless.

20th Century: The period alluded to spans the 20th Century as a whole.

The national existence: From that of first Americans to the current period.

Under Consideration: Decision has yet to be made.

ITEM #32: DATES AND SOURCES

The survey records the date when it establishes and subsequently reviews a monument. It also documents the source, or sources, of its information. The project maintains these data and sources on an on-going basis. At each review the study carries out any change to the database, indicates the review's date, and notes the review technique or techniques. This re-survey could be either a full review, which includes examining all survey items, or it could be a partial one, which examines specific items where new information may have become available. It could also include a comparing reconsideration; in this case, the survey examines particular selections across a number of memorials in similar, or even dissimilar, circumstances. Finally, it is possible that, following a review, the study makes no change; the study indicates this outcome in the COMMENTS/NOTES section.

The fields to be completed are as follows:

Date of Completion: The date of a memorial's original and subsequent reviews. The original the study carries as the #1 date, and the latest, as #2. All others are carried in brief form under COMMENTS/NOTES.

Compilation Technique: How was the review carried out? The choices are:

Site Survey: On-site, in-person visit, or visits, to the monument.

Book: Pages fastened along one edge and bounded by covers on front and back; its pages may be hand-written, printed, or blank.

Correspondence: Communication by letter-writing, whether it involves personal or commercial communication.

Government Materials: Information of whatever style that is printed and/or published and distributed by a federal, state, or local branch of government, or one of its divisions.

Journal: A periodical containing articles that focus on a particular subject. When the articles are of a general nature, the survey titles them magazines, and they are categorized under this subject.

Newspaper: General circulation publication, usually put out daily or weekly, that contains news articles, editorials, and feature stories (as well as, usually, advertising).

Promotional Materials: General information, often of a written, commercial nature, that promotes monuments or things and places that contain information about or references to monuments.

Travel Information: Sourcing materials related to and/or promoted by members of the travel industry.

Website: The World Wide Web or similarly networked information technology.

Other: The source is other than one of the above. The survey notes the sources under COMMENTS/NOTES.

Under Consideration: Decision has yet to be made.

ITEM #33: COMMENTS/NOTES

This is a free-form section of the database. The project enters data and information here for two reasons, one related to contingency and the other related to the unknown. First, as part of the descriptive and defining activities that run through the project, the study may indicate that it enters a notation into COMMENTS/NOTES if certain things do or do not happen, are or are not discovered. The study carries out this activity by entering the particular item number and making the appropriate entry. The second reason for using this item is if the study encounters something about a monument that it has not anticipated. This is where it records that unforeseen observation.

THE END

Appendix A

<u>DRAFT INTERNATIONAL CORE DATA STANDARD FOR</u>
<u>ARCHAEOLOGICAL SITES AND MONUMENTS</u>

<u>Cross-Walk</u>

<u>CORE DATA STANDARD TO NATIONAL REGISTRY-MONUMENTSANDMEMORIALS.COM</u>

Core #	Core Title	National Registry-MonumentsandMemorials.com	Item #
3.1.1	Reference number	Identification Number	27
3.1.2	Name of monument or site	Title	27
3.1.3.1	Date of compilation	Dates and Sources	32
3.1.3.2	Date of last update	Dates and Sources	32
3.1.4	Originator of reference	Dates and Sources	32
3.1.5	Cross references to related Records of monuments/sites	Number of Monuments	24
3.1.5.1	Reference number	Identification Number	27
3.1.5.2	Qualifier of relationship	Not yet available	NA
3.1.7.1	Documentation cross ref. no.	Dates and Sources	32
3.1.7.2	Type of documents	Dates and Sources	32
3.2.1.1	Country or nation	Location: Country	28
3.2.1.2	Geo-political unit	Location: State	28
3.2.1.3	Administrative sub-division	Location: County	28
3.2.2.1	Description of site location	Location: Cross Streets	28
3.2.3.1	Name for address purposes	Title	27
3.2.3.2	Number in the street/road	Not collected	NA
3.2.3.3	Name of street/road	Location: Cross Streets	28
3.2.3.4	Locality	Not collected	NA
3.2.3.5	Town/City	Location: Town	28
3.2.3.6	Postal or zip code	Location: Zip	28
3.3.1	Monument or site type	Design Description	8
3.3.2	Monument or site category	Design Type	7
3.4.1.1	Cultural period	Period(s) Covered	31
3.4.1.2	Century	Site Development	22
5.0	Glossary	Naming and Sytling Guidelines	App. D
6.0	Bibliography	Sources Consulted	App. E

Core items not included in Appendix: Preface, Introduction 1.0,
Theoretical famework 2.0, Implementing the core data standard 4.0

Appendix B

<u>FINDING MONUMENTS AND MEMORIALS</u>

There are a number of ways to explore for monuments and memorials in order to identify, study, and enter them into the project's database. These techniques extend from the simple, like driving around the streets of a community, to the more complex, such as exploring the internet for special databases. The approaches also include reading newspapers and visiting places where it is common knowledge that monuments are known to exist, such as Washington, D.C. or a state's capitol. Any one approach may be more right, more appropriate than another at a given time or place, and, in fact, the techniques the study appeals to often overlap. For instance, it is efficient and useful to study information about a place before visiting. We use the tool or tools which, ultimately, best help us locate, identify, and describe the nation's monuments. Clearly, the items mentioned below should be viewed not as exhaustive, but instead suggestive of further opportunity; this inventory is a beginning, not an end.

<u>PLACES AND VISITING PLACES</u>

- Visit a city or town: go to a place having studied some of the *<u>INFORMATION</u>* sources noted below.

- Drive around a neighborhood, looking for opportunity, including the roadways and the roadway areas themselves

- Outside and inside public spaces of towns and villages

    - City hall, inside and out

    - Fire, police, library, park, and school grounds

- Event-specific places, e.g., a battle, former industry, civic event

- Historical areas and sites – federal, state, regional, local

- Public and common spaces of larger cities (population 50,000+)

- State capital cities, like Boise, Austin, Springfield, Albany

- War or battlefield sites, like Vicksburg National Military Park

- Mega-historical areas: Boston, City of New York, Philadelphia, and Washington, DC,

INFORMATION

- Books: accounts about monuments, local as well as national, have been written and published

- Media: peruse newspapers and journals (general magazines and specific)

- Libraries: community and regional units contain local history collections

- Special information collections like "civil war monuments in Michigan"

- travel-oriented literature and guides: usually commercial in nature

- Maps: general purpose and topic-specific

- Government literature: federal, state, county, local

- Entities: consult entities such as historical societies and preservation groups, where focus may range from a specific community to a national perspective

- Internet:

    - Carry out searches of national, local, special and specific databases

    - Visit sites of monument-specific websites

Appendix C

<u>INVENTORY OF PORTFOLIO TITLES</u>

Arts
Author
Business/Commerce
Civil Servant
Clergy
Educator
Elected Official: US President
Elected Official: US Vice President
Elected Official: US Senator
Elected Official: US Representative
Elected Official: Governor
Elected Official: Regional Official
Elected Official: Local Official
Explorer
Fire Officer
Founding Father
Health / Medical Care
Leader: National / Foreign
Leader: Interest Group
Leader: General / Local
Military
Philanthropy
Police Officer
Scientist

Appendix D

<u>NAMING AND STYLING GUIDELINES</u>

The same or similar kinds of memorials might be titled one way or another, as a function of time, geography, poetic license, general circumstances, or other reason on the part of the <u>DESIGNERS</u> or <u>SPONSORS</u>. Regardless of the cause, this situation could present problems if not anticipated and accounted for, so to minimize identification problems, the study relies upon certain naming and styling conventions.

There are two reasons – one rather broad, the other technical and narrow -- for imposing such an artificial shell around the project's **Titles** (and sometimes other data fields). The first is clarity of communication. We need to know what we are saying to one other. Specifically, if we call the same kind of thing by different names, however grounded in fact and/or history, this could lead to confusion and, ultimately, misstatements and lost opportunities.

The second, technical, reason relates to the survey's using a controlled vocabulary. Here, it is critical in order not to undermine the database's capabilities that all of the same kinds of things, e.g., all World War II monuments, be gathered into and accounted for using the same World War II information bucket, if you will. The study follows this direction regardless of the name physically appended to or popularly associated with a given memorial. We may

not otherwise be able to identify and then compare and contrast sites within the database. Thus, even though a visitor may look at a memorial and see one name engraved on it, a surveyor may in fact be entering it into the database under a different **Title**.

What follows are several conventions the survey uses to try to maintain consistency and order across its titling, and hence, its recall efforts.

Christopher Columbus – The survey uses the full name spelled in this fashion of this Italian explorer sailing under the Spanish flag, regardless of how an individual memorial may spell the name or whether it uses his given, last, or both of these names.

County Alternative Names: Sometimes a county may be called by other names, such as freehold, borough, township, or district. By definition, the survey classifies any of these kinds of descriptions as **County**.

Duplicate Names, Same Place – From time to time, people in the same **Town** may designate more than one memorial to the same thing, e.g., the Revolutionary War. There may be a monument and a marker. The survey may, if appropriate, give each the same title. As a matter of course, it will not sub-number similar memorials, i.e., Revolutionary War 1, Revolutionary War 2.

Federal and State Monument Designated Titles -- When the study cites, incorporates, or alludes to an entity that is a part of one of these services -- for instance, at the federal level the National Park Service, Bureau of Land Management, or the National Forest Service -- it uses the name and/or initials that the controlling service provides.

Markers, Time Capsules, or Milestones – The **Title** for these kinds of monuments relate to the event and/or place. The first word of the **Title** relates to what the maker is and its second word denotes where the marker is, or in the case of Time Capsules when it is due to be opened. If the marker involves the category **Roadways and Highways**, below, see that citation for the standard. Typically, the study uses the word marker or milestone or the words time capsule in the title; exceptions would be noted under COMMENTS/NOTES.

Memorial or monument, use of the word: Where the sense and rhythm of the memorial's title can be conveyed without the specific use of the word memorial or monument, then the survey tries to do so.

Public Listing vs. Memorial Name: A site that is memorialized in the memory of a named person, or persons, might some times and for whatever reasons be referred to publicly as something else. In these cases, the survey

titles the memorial in the database by the named person and not by any public or

popular styling that might currently apply. It does this because the **Herald**

conveys the named memorialization, and the study therefore gives it precedent.

Roadways and Highways – The study uses these names in two ways.

First, when it notes where a memorial is situated under the survey item

LOCATION, it may use either or both named or numbered roadways. Second,

from time to time, federal or state entities, for example, the National Park

Service, may memorialize a roadway itself. Here, as spelled out in Convention

11: Include State and Federal Monuments and Memorials, above, the study by

definition includes all such memorials. To meet its needs here, the study uses

seven levels of road designation, two named and five numbered: named

monument roads include items such as the National Road, the Memorial

Parkway, or Boston Post Road. And local streets include an endless array of

names, such as Maple Avenue or Bradford Street. In addition, as noted above,

the study employs five levels of numbered roads. An interstate highway such as

Interstate 95 is classed as I-95. United States roadways, for instance US 22,

denote the nationwide designation system prior to the interstate network; state

road numbers are preceded and designated by the letters SR. The same goes

for county roads: they are preceded by the letters CR. Some roads on Indian

reservations may be preceded by an "I," such as IR 24. (The study also uses

several abbreviations associated with this topic, as follows. Directional shortcuts:

the words east, south, west, and north are abbreviated, respectively, as: S, W, N, and E. <u>Street</u>: road, street, avenue, way, circle, lane are abbreviated, respectively, as: Rd., St., Av., Wy., Cr., and Ln.)

Spelling of Non-US (Foreign) Names – The study with its first citation of such a name defaults to an Anglicized version and, then, continues with the same spelling. Further, unless it breeds confusion, the study uses only the last name of the honored, e.g., Kosciusko, for the noted Polish general Thaddeus Kosciusko, who supported the colonists, or Gandhi, as in Mahatma Gandhi.

US Presidents – Monuments to presidents of the United States are titled by the person's last name. For instance, the **Title** to monuments of George Washington is Washington; similarly, Abraham Lincoln is Lincoln. The study employs this single-name convention regardless of how an individual **Herald** may be worded or when during the life or career of the president the memorial may be referring.

United States or United States of America: Carried in the **Title** as US or USA.

Wars: As there are many memorials related to the military and war, there are many opportunities for inconsistency. Further, as fighting implies at least two

forces struggling with each other, and sometimes there are more, each of the participants might refer to the same encounter by a different name. To deal effectively with these issues, the survey employs several war-related conventions. Generally, it uses for all wars the controlled vocabulary contained in <u>ITEM #6, MILITARY CONFLICTS</u>, above, in an effort to minimize multiple-sided titling situations. More specifically, it employs the following guides:

<u>Revolutionary War</u> – Memorials dedicated to fighting associated with the formation of the US during the eighteenth century default to this **Title**.

<u>World War I, World War II: Full Spelling</u> – When the survey cites these wars individually, this is how it spells their names. The study does not use the treatments First World War and Second World War to **Title** memorials in the database.

<u>WWI, WWII: Abbreviated Spelling</u> - When in titling memorials the survey abbreviates these two wars, this is how it abbreviates them.

<u>The Great War or The World War</u> - Some memorials to the conflict fought in Europe between 1914 and 1919 (American military involvement, 1917-1919) were erected before the start of World War II. The <u>SPONSORS</u> of these World War I memorials did not know at the time that it was the first of two, so understandably they did not refer to it as the first. In these cases, the project titles the memorials as either <u>World War I</u> or <u>WWI</u>.

<u>Groups or Units</u> -- Monuments may memorialize groups, or fighting units, which served in a war, for example, the Dough Boys, the Fighting 59th, or other

such. The project's bent is, first, to **Title** the war or wars with which the group is associated, say World War II, and, second, to include the named unit under the item <u>COMMENTS/NOTES</u>.

Appendix E

<u>S</u>OURCES <u>C</u>ONSULTED

<u>General References</u>

Getty Conservation Institute. *Economics and Heritage Conservation*. Los
　　　Angeles: The Getty Conservation Institute, 1999.

＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿. *Values and Heritage Conservation Research
　　　Report*. Los Angeles: The Getty Conservation Institute, 2000.

International Council of Museums, International Committee for Documentation
　　　(CIDOC). *Draft International Core Data Standard for Archaeological Sites
　　　and Monuments*. World Wide Web: http://www.icom.org, 1995.

Morgan, Edmund S. *The Birth of the Republic, 1763-1789*. 3rd ed. Chicago: The
　　　University of Chicago Press, 1992.

Morison, Samuel Eliot. *The Oxford History of the American People. Vol. 1,
　　　Prehistory to 1789.* New York: Penguin Books, 1965.

Rothman, Hal. *America's National Monuments: The Politics of Preservation.*
　　　University Press of Kansas, 1989. First published as *Preserving Different
　　　Pasts: The American National Monuments*. Urbana: University of Illinois
　　　Press, c1989.

Savage, Kirk. *Standing Soldiers, Kneeling Slaves: Race, War, and Monument in
　　　Nineteenth-Century America*. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University
　　　Press, 1997.

Simmons, R. C. *The American Colonies: From Settlement to Independence*. New
　　　York: W. W. Norton & Company, 1976.

Urdang, Laurence, ed. *The Timetables of American History*. New York: Simon &
　　　Schuster, 1996.

Site References

Bogart, Michele H. *Public Sculpture and the Civic Ideal in New York City, 1890-1930.* Washington: Smithsonian Institution Press, 1997.

Capasso, Nick. "'Remember the Ladies': New Women's Memorial in Boston and Contemporary Commemorative Art." *Sculpture*, vol. 19, no. 5 (2000): 46-51.

Carlock, Marty. *A Guide to Public Art in Greater Boston from Newburyport to Plymouth.* Revised Edition. Boston: The Harvard Common Press, 1993.

Cooney, Patrick Louis. *Discovering the Mid-Atlantic: Historical Tours.* New Brunswick, New Jersey: Rutgers University Press, 1991.

Davis, Lenwood. *Travel Guide to Black Historical Sites and Larndmarks in North Carolina.* Winston-Salem, North Carolina: Bandit Books, 1991.

Di Ionno, Mark. *A Guide to New Jersey's Revolutionary War Trail.* New Brunswick, N.J.: Rutgers University Press, 2000.

Dunkak, Harry M. "*St. Paul's Church, Eastchester: A Colonial and Revolutionary Parish in New York."* Portions of this article previously published and reprinted by permission from *Anglican and Episcopal History,* Vol. LVII, No. 4, December, 1988. A pamphlet of St. Paul's Church National Historic Site, 1999.

Frazer, Robert W. *Forts of the West: Military Forts and Presidios and Posts Commonly Called Forts West of the Mississippi to 1898.* Norman, Oklahoma: University of Oklahoma Press, 1972.

Hedren, Paul L. *Traveler's Guide to the Great Sioux War.* Helena, Montana: Montana Historical Society Press, 1996.

May, George F., comp. *Michigan Civil War Monuments.* http://suvcw.org/mi/mcwm1.html: Michigan Civil War Centennial Observance Commission, 1965.

Reynolds, Donald Martin. *Monuments and Masterpieces.* New York: Thames and Hudson, 1988.

Tauranac, John. *Manhattan Block By Block: A Street Atlas.* New York: Tauranac, Ltd., 2000.

Version 2 02/03/2002   <u>DATA COLLECTION TOOL</u>
APPENDIX F

Orig. Version; with orig
copyright materials
File: 100/sheet6

CONTENT: 1 2 3 4 5   **CONTENT:**

THE STORIES   **THE STORIES**

	1	2	3	4	5	
Self-sacrifice						Self-sacrifice
Loss & perseverance						Loss & perseverance
Leadership						Leadership
Battle (victory or |defeat)						Battle (victory or |defeat)
Heroism						Heroism
Patriotism						Patriotism
Ideals						Ideals
God/religion/religious freedom						God/religion/religious freedom
Individual/group/family recognition						Individual/group/family recognition
Evolution/progress/technology						Evolution/progress/technology
Arts&science / polthought&phil						Arts&science / polthought&phil
Business/commerce						Business/commerce
Sports/entertainment						Sports/entertainment
Community service						Community service
Societal violence (nonmilitary)						Societal violence (nonmilitary)
Politics/statesmanship						Politics/statesmanship
Continental discovery						Continental discovery
Natural preserve						Natural preserve
Seafaring						Seafaring
Other (list)						Other (list)
Under consideration						Under consideration
Subtotal						Subtotal

STORY SUBJECTS/OBJECTS

Men and women in war
War dead
Outstanding citizen
Outstanding citizen group
Common citizen
Group of common citizens
Person of ltrs/acad/science
Uniformed, nonmilitary
Place
Private organization
Government entity
Native Americans
African-Americans
Ethnic not elsewhere classified
American presidents
Foreign national/nonamerican
Prehistoric structure
Thing
Animals
Under consideration

STORY SUBJECTS/OBJECTS

Men and women in war
War dead
Outstanding citizen
Outstanding citizen group
Common citizen
Group of common citizens
Person of ltrs/acad/science
Uniformed, nonmilitary
Place
Private organization
Government entity
Native Americans
African-Americans
Ethnic not elsewhere classified
American presidents
Foreign national/nonamerican
Prehistoric structure
Thing
Animals
Under consideration

IDENTIFICATION NUMBER	1	2	3	4	5

IDENTIFICATION NUMBER

PORTFOLIO		**PORTFOLIO**
Not Applicable		Not Applicable
Without portfolio		Without portfolio
Not known		Not known
Under consideration		Under consideration
List here		List here
Subtotal		Subtotal

SEX OF SUBJECTS/OBJECTS

SEX OF SUBJECTS/OBJECTS

Male		Male
Female		Female
Male and Female		Male and Female
Neither sex		Neither sex
Cannot determine		Cannot determine
Not applicable		Not applicable
Under consideration		Under consideration
Subtotal		Subtotal

RACE/ETHNICITY

RACE/ETHNICITY

Not applicable		Not applicable
Racially silent		Racially silent
Euro-asian white		Euro-asian white
Racially inclusive		Racially inclusive
Native American		Native American
African American		African American
Hispanic		Hispanic
Asian-American		Asian-American
Combination		Combination
Other		Other
Not determined		Not determined
Under consideration		Under consideration

Subtotal

MILITARY CONFLICT(S)

(May select up to six (6) choices)

Not applicable
Pre-colonial fighting
Colonial Wars
Revolutionary War
War of 1812
Mexican War
Civil War
Native American Wars
Spanish-American War
World War I
World War II
Korean War
Vietnam War
Persian Gulf War/Desert Storm
All conflicts as group
Other conflicts: Specify_____

Subtotal

MILITARY CONFLICT(S)

(May select up to six (6) choices)

Not applicable
Pre-colonial fighting
Colonial Wars
Revolutionary War
War of 1812
Mexican War
Civil War
Native American Wars

Spanish-American War

World War I
World War II
Korean War
Vietnam War
Persian Gulf War/Desert Storm

All conflicts as group
Other conflicts: Specify_____

1 2 3 4 5

PORTFOLIOS   **PORTFOLIOS**

	1	2	3	4	5	
Arts						Arts
Author						Author
Business/Commerce						Business/Commerce
Civil Servant						Civil Servant
Clergy						Clergy
Educator						Educator
Elected Official: US President						Elected Official: US President
Elected Official: US Vice President						Elected Official: US Vice President
Elected Official: US Senator						Elected Official: US Senator
Elected Official: US Representative						Elected Official: US Representative
Elected Official: Governor						Elected Official: Governor
Elected Official: Regional Official						Elected Official: Regional Official
Elected Official: Local Official						Elected Official: Local Official
Explorer						Explorer
Fire Officer						Fire Officer
Founding Father						Founding Father
Health / Medical Care						Health / Medical Care
Law / Legal / Justice						Law / Legal / Justice
Leader: National / Foreign						Leader: National / Foreign
Leader: Interest Group						Leader: Interest Group
Leader: General / Local						Leader: General / Local
Military						Military
Philanthropy						Philanthropy
Police Officer						Police Officer
Scientist						Scientist
Other						Other
Under consideration						Under consideration
Not Applicable						Not Applicable

1 2 3 4 5

DESIGN:	DESIGN:
DESIGN TYPE	**DESIGN TYPE**
Integrated	Integrated
Parallel	Parallel
Under consideration	Under consideration
DESIGN DESCRIPTION	**DESIGN DESCRIPTION**
Animal w/wo pedestal	Animal w/wo pedestal
Armament	Armament
Bell	Bell
Bust of person on pedestal	Bust of person on pedestal
Clock	Clock
Diorama/model/complex	Diorama/model/complex
Earthworks	Earthworks
Flagpole w/wo pedestal	Flagpole w/wo pedestal
Fountain/pool	Fountain/pool
Gazebo	Gazebo
Geometric w/wo pedestal	Geometric w/wo pedestal
Historic structure	Historic structure
Horse and rider	Horse and rider
Medallion	Medallion
Sculpture bas relief	Sculpture bas relief
Sculpture w/wo pedestal	Sculpture w/wo pedestal
Statue w/wo pedestal	Statue w/wo pedestal
Stone/rock w/tablet	Stone/rock w/tablet
Tablet/plaque	Tablet/plaque
Traditional marker	Traditional marker
Wall/wall-like	Wall/wall-like
Website	Website
Monument not elsewhere classified	Monument not elsewhere classified
Under consideration	Under consideration

MATERIAL (DOMINANT)
Stone/rock
Metal
Stone/rock and metal
Landscaping
Wood
Dirt/rock
Glass
Electronic
Other
Under consideration

SIZE OF FORM
Very small
Small
Average (human)
Large
Big
Very big
Outsized/megasized
Under consideration

MATERIAL (DOMINANT)
Stone/rock
Metal
Stone/rock and metal
Landscaping
Wood
Dirt/rock
Glass
Electronic
Other
Under consideration

SIZE OF FORM
Very small
Small
Average (human)
Large
Big
Very big
Outsized/megasized
Under consideration

IMAGE DIMENSIONS	1	2	3	4	5	**IMAGE DIMENSIONS**

IMAGE DIMENSIONS

Main
Main + One
Main + Two
Main + Three
Four +
None
Not applicable
Not known
Under consideration

IMAGE DIMENSIONS

Main
Main + One
Main + Two
Main + Three
Four +
None
Not applicable
Not known
Under consideration

INSCRIPTION

Inscribed/lettered directly
Inscribed/lettered on tablet
Inscribed/lettered directly + on tablet
Tablet, bas-relief
Small engraved plaque
Not applicable
Other
Under consideration

INSCRIPTION

Inscribed/lettered directly
Inscribed/lettered on tablet
Inscribed/lettered directly + on tablet
Tablet, bas-relief
Small engraved plaque
Not applicable
Other
Under consideration

TEXT AVAILABILITY

Text available, partial
Text available, all
Under consideration

TEXT AVAILABILITY

Text available, partial
Text available, all
Under consideration

VISUALS

Yes (specify Visual location)
Others, non-authorized
Others, authorized
No
Under consideration

VISUALS

Yes (specify Visual location)
Others, non-authorized
Others, authorized
No
Under consideration

DESIGN

DESIGN PRESERVATION

PRESERVATION

Good	Good
Satisfactory	Satisfactory
Failing	Failing
Marginal	Marginal
Poor	Poor
Not applicable	Not applicable
Under consideration	Under consideration

1 2   3   4   5

IDENTIFICATION SEPARATE FROM M|M	IDENTIFICATION SEPARATE FROM M|M
No	No
Yes	Yes

IF YES, IDENTIFIER DESIGN TYPE	**IF YES, IDENTIFIER DESIGN TYPE**
Traditional marker	Traditional marker
Stone/rock w/tablet	Stone/rock w/tablet
Geometric w/wo pedestal	Geometric w/wo pedestal
Tablet/plaque	Tablet/plaque
Under consideration	Under consideration

IF YES, DESIGN PRESERVATION	**IF YES, DESIGN PRESERVATION**
Good	Good
Satisfactory	Satisfactory
Failing	Failing
Marginal	Marginal
Poor	Poor
Under consideration	Under consideration

IF YES, SIZE OF HERALD	**IF YES, SIZE OF HERALD**
Very small	Very small
Small	Small
Average (human)	Average (human)
Large	Large
Big	Big
Other	Other
Under consideration	Under consideration

DESIGNER(S)	**DESIGNER(S)**
Known (fill-in below)	Known (fill-in below)
Not yet determined	Not yet determined
Unknown	Unknown
Ready Made	Ready Made
Not Applicable	Not Applicable

If one designer: **If one designer:**

designer first name
designer second name
designer last/only name

If two designers:
designer first name
designer second name
designer last/only name

FABRICATOR/MANUFACTURER
Not Identified
Known (fill-in below)
Not yet determined
Unknown
Not Applicable (typically if prefabricated)

Fabricator First Name
Fabricator Second Name
City
State

designer first name
designer second name
designer last/only name

If two designers:
designer first name
designer second name
designer last/only name

FABRICATOR/MANUFACTURER
Not Identified
Known (fill-in below)
Not yet determined
Unknown
Not Applicable (typically if prefabricated)

Fabricator First Name
Fabricator Second Name
City
State

SETTING: 1 2 3 4 5 **SETTING:**

THE SITE
Park/garden/lawn
Plaza arrangement
Cemetery/burial
ground
Gazebo
Architectural space
Historic structure
Historic landmark
Street
Rural location
Virtual site
Inside building --
public or private
Under consideration
Other: describe
_____

THE SITE
Park/garden/lawn
Plaza arrangement
Cemetery/burial ground

Gazebo
Architectural space
Historic structure
Historic landmark
Street
Rural location
Virtual site
Inside building -- public or
private
Under consideration
Other: describe
_____

PANORAMA-ENHANCING FEATURES

None
Not Applicable
Land
(elevation/depression
)
Open space
Water
Under consideration

PANORAMA-ENHANCING FEATURES

None
Not Applicable
Land (elevation/depression)

Open space
Water
Under consideration

THE AESTHETIC

Score these Items:
Appeal of the item
Setting pulled
together appropriately
Traffic close enough
for access,

THE AESTHETIC

Score these Items:
Appeal of the item
Setting pulled together
appropriately
Traffic close enough for access,

far enough for appreciation

Visualization and panorama

Opportunity to view, to enjoy the item

Score Marks:
7 = Exceptional
6 = Very Good
5 = Good
4 = Acceptable
3 = Wanting
2 = Bad
1 = Unacceptable

SITE DEVELOPMENT   1   2   3   4   5   **SITE DEVELOPMENT**

Start date   Start date
Dedication date   Dedication date
Dedication year (Actual)   Dedication year (Actual)

Dedication year (Estimated)   Dedication year (Estimated)

Year re-dedicated/expanded1 (Act) Year re-dedicated/expanded1 (Act)

Year re-dedicated/expanded2 (Act) Year re-dedicated/expanded2 (Act)

Date unknown   Date unknown
Under consideration   Under consideration

ACCESS TO MONUMENTS   **ACCESS TO MONUMENTS**

Ready   Ready
Requires travel   Requires travel
Off beaten path   Off beaten path
Challenging   Challenging
Unreasonable   Unreasonable
Under consideration   Under consideration

NUMBER OF MONUMENTS   **NUMBER OF MONUMENTS**

One   One
Two   Two
Three   Three
Four-plus   Four-plus
Mall arrangement   Mall arrangement
Under consideration   Under consideration

OTHER MONUMENTS ON SITE   **OTHER MONUMENTS ON SITE**

One   One
Two   Two
Three   Three
Four+ (Go to   Four+ (Go to

COMMENTS/NOTES
)

SITE UPKEEP
Satisfactory
Unsatisfactory
Abandoned
Not applicable
Under consideration

COMMENTS/NOTES)

SITE UPKEEP
Satisfactory
Unsatisfactory
Abandoned
Not applicable
Under consideration

SITE MAINTENANCE	1	2	3	4	5

SITE MAINTENANCE

Local government
County government
State government
Federal governmen/|nps
Federal government/blm-nfs
Federal government/other
Community group #1
Ccommunity group #2
None of the Above
Not Yet Determined

DEMOGRAPHY:

Key Word - Word 1
Key Word - Word 2
Key Word - Word 3

Keyword Choices:
History   H
War   W
Leader   L
Nurturer   N
Racial/Ethnic   R
Landscape   LA

FILE NUMBER

LOCATION
Town
County
State
Zip
CrossStreets | Location:
1
2

3
4

WEBSITE (when known, available)

NATURE OF THE MEMORIAL

Man-made
Extraterrestrial
Former m|m
Future m|m
Terrestrial
Underwater
Virtual
Under consideration

3
4

WEBSITE (when known, available)

NATURE OF THE MEMORIAL

Man-made
Extraterrestrial
Former m|m
Future m|m
Terrestrial
Underwater
Virtual
Under consideration

LEAD SPONSOR(S) 1 2 3 4 5 **LEAD SPONSOR(S)**

Auxillary support group	Auxillary support group
Business/businesses	Business/businesses
Citizens/residents	Citizens/residents
Community group	Community group
DAR/SAR groups	DAR/SAR groups
Educational entity	Educational entity
Family/friends/colleagues	Family/friends/colleagues
Fire fighters/organizations	Fire fighters/organizations
Government, county	Government, county
Government, federal -- BLM/NFS	Government, federal -- BLM/NFS
Government, federal -- NPS	Government, federal -- NPS
Government, federal -- Other	Government, federal -- Other
Government, local	Government, local
Government, other	Government, other
Government, state	Government, state
Historical society	Historical society
Membership group/public contribution	Membership group/public contribution
Other	Other
Other nongovernment	Other nongovernment
Policemen/police departments	Policemen/police departments
Religious group	Religious group
Veterans groups	Veterans groups
Unknown	Unknown
Under consideration	Under consideration

PERIOD(S) COVERED (up to 7)

Prehistoric	Prehistoric
Early civilizations to 1492	Early civilizations to 1492
First Americans/Colonists 1492-1775	First Americans/Colonists 1492-1775

American Revolution 1776-1788

Washington to Lincoln

1866 - 1913
1914 - 1945
1946 - 1973
1974 - 2000
2001 - Current
For all time, no time
20th Century
The national existence

Under consideration

DATES AND SOURCES

a) Date of Compilation

b) Compliaton Technique
   (Check those that apply)

Site survey
Book
Correspondence
Government materials

Journal
Newspaper
Promotional materials
Travel information
Website
Other
Under consideration

COMMENTS/NOTES