

VISUAL SILENCE: AFRICAN AMERICAN VOICES IN WASHINGTON, DC'S
COMMEMORATIVE FORMATIONS

by

MEGAN IRENE FITZMAURICE

(Under the Direction of Belinda A. Stillion Southard)

ABSTRACT

This thesis puts forward a rhetorical investigation of the visual and racial politics at play in Washington, DC's commemorative formations. Specifically, this thesis looks to the Capitol Rotunda, National Statuary Hall, and the Martin Luther King, Jr. Memorial in order to understand how three major forms of racism—institutional, symbolic, and postracial—shape and are shaped by these formations. A theory of *visual silence* helps to expose how and in what forms such racism works to simultaneously invoke and suppress the visual voice of African Americans in the nation's most honored spaces. Visual silence reveals that while African Americans have played an integral role in shaping civic life and national identity in the United States, because we cannot *visualize* their voices in the same tangible ways in which white Americans are portrayed in the country's commemorative spaces, their history, achievement, and significance are nearly silenced from the national narrative.

INDEX WORDS: Visual Rhetoric, Public Memory, Voice, Silence, Race

VISUAL SILENCE: AFRICAN AMERICAN VOICES IN WASHINGTON, DC'S
COMMEMORATIVE FORMATIONS

by

MEGAN IRENE FITZMAURICE

B.A., Cal Poly State University, San Luis Obispo, 2010

A Thesis Submitted to the Graduate Faculty of The University of Georgia in Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree

MASTER OF ARTS

ATHENS, GEORGIA

2013

© 2013

Megan Irene Fitzmaurice

All Rights Reserved

VISUAL SILENCE: AFRICAN AMERICAN VOICES IN WASHINGTON, DC'S
COMMEMORATIVE FORMATIONS

by

MEGAN IRENE FITZMAURICE

Major Professor: Belinda A. Stillion Southard

Committee: Barbara A. Biesecker
Kelly Happe

Electronic Version Approved:

Maureen Grasso
Dean of the Graduate School
The University of Georgia
May 2013

He has told you, O man, what is good;
and what does the Lord require of you
but to do justice, and to love kindness,
and to walk humbly with your God?
--Micah 6:8

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

First and foremost, this thesis is a tribute to the unending guidance and grace of my advisor, Belinda. Whether it was waiting two hours to send me her next set of revisions so I could watch the latest episode of *New Girl*, giving me her spare sofa, teaching me how to navigate a male-dominated academic field, or rechecking my endnotes (the ultimate labor of love), Belinda has supported my whole person. Thank you for always expecting far more from me than I ever thought (or still think) I could give. Really—I want to be you when I grow up.

This scholarly pursuit would also not have been possible without the wisdom, direction, and encouragement of several other faculty members. The rest of my committee—Barbara Biesecker and Kelly Happe—significantly shaped this project through their thought-provoking feedback on the prospectus. Barb’s seminar in rhetorical criticism confirmed my decision to pursue a doctoral degree in rhetoric, and her genuine interest in my work has pushed my writing, and my thinking, to entirely new levels. I am incredibly thankful for Kelly’s ability to not only ask hard questions, but her willingness to help think through answers. She helped me to process through some of this project’s most difficult stumbling blocks. I would also like to thank “the other Stillion Southard”—Bjørn, who helped give this project much of its historical depth, and often provided much-needed comedic relief.

Of course, the opportunity to even go to graduate school would not have been possible without the emotional, spiritual, mental, and financial support of my entire family—Dad, Mom, Stephanie, Veronica, Joe, Johnny, and sweet Julia Rose. You have all laughed, cried, prayed, and celebrated with me. I love you all sixteen times!

The Lord has been so good to always bless me with rich friendships to help sustain me through the everyday struggles and celebrations. Asia, Kelsey, Tara, and Alexandra—to be known is to be loved, and your deep care for me, felt all the way from California through your loving cards, calls, messages, and visits, affirmed that I am both loved and known. CJ—my research assistant, my best friend, and my brother—thank you for believing in me. Sheila—you are the most beautiful person, inside and out, that I’ve ever known. Thank you for your dedication to my walk with the Lord, and for being a constant source of spiritual and life wisdom. Emily W.—this thesis would not have been possible without our sacred writing dates. Thank you for being my chief wordsmith and dear friend. Sarah, Katie, Kaci, Cait and Hannah, my patient, generous, and hilarious roommates—thank you for loving me well through the hardest season of my life yet.

I am also hugely indebted to my Community Group—you are all the most vulnerable, genuine, eccentric, and truly loving people I have ever known. Thank you for letting me belong.

“Our lives begin to end the day we become silent about things that matter.”

--Martin Luther King, Jr.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	v
LIST OF FIGURES	x
CHAPTER	
1 VISUAL SILENCE IN WASHINGTON, DC: INVESTIGATING PUBLIC MEMORY, VISUAL RHETORIC, AND VOICE	1
Race, Citizenship, and the National Capital	4
Rhetoric and the Politics of Commemoration.....	9
Race, Citizenship, and Public Memory	10
Race, Citizenship, and Visual Rhetoric	15
Race, Citizenship, and Silence.....	18
Précis.....	25
2 VISUAL SILENCE IN THE CAPITOL ROTUNDA: COMMEMORATING INSTITUTIONAL RACISM.....	28
Race and Nation Building in Early America	30
The Capitol's Construction and its Democratic Design	35
A Commemoration of Ideal Citizenship	39
Conclusion	48

3	VISUAL SILENCE IN NATIONAL STATUARY HALL: PROTECTING	
	SYMBOLIC RACISM	50
	Racism and Citizenship in the United States	52
	Symbolic Racism and Rhetoric.....	54
	Symbolic Racism in Statuary Hall.....	57
	Disavowal	59
	Demotion	67
	Conclusion	72
4	VISUAL SILENCE IN THE MARTIN LUTHER KING, JR. MEMORIAL:	
	DISCERNING POSTRACIALISM	74
	The Postracial Age: Have We Arrived?	75
	The Postracial Age: King's Dream Fulfilled?	78
	The Postracial Age: Commemorating Colorblindness?.....	82
	The Postracial Age: Visual Silence as Deterring or Deploying Discrimination? ..	86
	Conclusion	89
5	VISUAL SILENCE: MOVING FORWARD, OR CHANGING FORM?.....	90
	Historical Implications.....	91
	Theoretical Implications	92
	Looking Forward	93

NOTES	95
REFERENCES	113
APPENDIX	
A Copies of Figures	120

LIST OF FIGURES

	Page
Figure 1: Statue of Freedom	120
Figure 2: Slave Labor Commemorative Marker.....	121
Figure 3: <i>The Apotheosis of Washington</i>	121
Figure 4: Bust of Martin Luther King, Jr.....	122
Figure 5: <i>The Woman Movement</i>	122
Figure 6: Statue of Rosa Parks in National Statuary Hall.....	123
Figure 7: National Statuary Hall.....	123
Figure 8: Capitol Visitor Center	124
Figure 9: Statue of Frederick Douglass	125
Figure 10: Stone of Hope.....	126
Figure 11: Mountain of Despair.....	126
Figure 12: Drum Major Inscription	127

CHAPTER 1

VISUAL SILENCE IN WASHINGTON, DC: INVESTIGATING PUBLIC MEMORY, VISUAL RHETORIC, AND VOICE

Standing atop the United States Capitol Building is a nineteen-and-a-half foot, 15,000 pound statue of a classical female figure. In one hand the figure clutches a sheathed sword hanging by her side, and in the other grasps a laurel wreath of victory and the shield of the United States. Easily one of the most visible landmarks in the entire District of Columbia, the “Statue of Freedom” is adorned with a headdress modeled after a traditional Roman helmet, embellished with an eagle’s head, feathers, and talons—“a reference to the costume of Native Americans” according to the Capitol Building’s web site.¹ The figure’s elaborate headpiece is perhaps its trademark feature, although sculptor Thomas Crawford originally intended for the figure to model a bronze rendering of the “liberty cap.” Freed slaves throughout the Roman Empire wore a simple, red pointed “liberty cap” to indicate their autonomy, and, shortly before the statue’s erection in 1855, European revolutionaries also used the cap as a symbol of liberation.² Such a headpiece would seem to be a fitting choice for a figure fashioned to represent the new government, which recently committed to ensuring “life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness” for all men, and to represent a young nation standing less than 100 years removed from its own revolutionary break. However, Thomas Davis, standing Secretary of the Treasury, deemed the liberty cap “unacceptable.”³ Though the reason for his position is unknown, it was no secret that the liberty cap had become a prominent symbol of the growing abolitionist movement in the United States.⁴ Forced to abandon the idea of the controversial cap, Crawford ultimately

yielded to Davis's desire to instead adorn the figure with the helmet of a Roman soldier, positioning the statue as the sentinel of one great empire who foreshadowed the rise of another.⁵

Altering the "Statue of Freedom" to disassociate it with abolition—a movement to "free" a group of citizens—is not the only ironic part about the statue's construction. To point, the "Statue of Freedom" was actually assembled by a slave. It was the first bronze statue cast in the United States, constructed under the direction of Philip Reid. An American slave owned by Clark Mills, Reid was the only known man at the time with the skill and knowledge to decipher the disassembly of the plaster model, prompting the federal government to pay Reid himself \$1.25 a day for his supervision of the statue's casting and construction, in addition to offering monetary compensation to Reid's owner for his skilled labor.⁶ Representing a national government which declared that "all men are created equal" upon its founding, the "Statue of Freedom" would never have made it out of its plaster molding were it not for the expertise of an enslaved foreman and the assistance of eleven slave laborers.⁷ Unable to participate in the freedom the statue symbolized but forced to help ensure its symbolic fortitude, these slaves were compulsorily silenced.

The role that slaves played in erecting the Statue of Freedom is illustrative of the visual and racial politics at play in Washington, DC's commemorative formations. From the federal district's founding in 1791 to its current standing as the alleged "Capital of the World," African Americans hold a central role in the city's historical, political, and rhetorical functions.⁸ Yet, these citizens lack the commemorative representation one would expect in what used to be "one of the most active slave depots in the nation" and is now America's "chocolate city," a tendentious nickname referencing DC's majority-black population.⁹ Such ironies, thus, prompt the following research questions: First, how can African Americans build, populate, and "speak

to” a nationalized space, yet also be rendered nearly voiceless in that space’s commemorative formations? Second, in light of the ways in which African Americans are commemorated, how does *visual silence* explain their rhetorical force, or in these cases, lack thereof? Last, how do these instances of visual silence shape racialized understandings of citizenship?

This investigation is especially timely as Washington, DC stands on the brink of what some have called “a true black renaissance.”¹⁰ For instance, in 2007, the Capitol Building’s newly renovated Capitol Visitor Center (CVC) installed a memorial to the slaves who built the Capitol. Also, in recent years, a bust of the likeness of Sojourner Truth joined the collection of artwork in the Capitol Rotunda, while a statue of Frederick Douglass currently awaits placement in the CVC. Furthermore, early this year, the Capitol Building’s collection of statues representing each of the fifty states added its first statue of an African American in the likeness of Rosa Parks. And last, the twenty-first century has also seen the highly contested construction and unveiling of the Martin Luther King, Jr. Memorial alongside the Tidal Basin, and still awaits the opening of the first Smithsonian museum dedicated to African American history and culture in 2015.

These controversial attempts to represent African Americans—slave laborers, Tubman and Douglass, and King—in the hallowed spaces of the nation’s capital city serve as the case studies through which this project investigates the racial and visual politics of commemoration.¹¹ These three studies function as prisms for the exploration of three key areas of rhetorical inquiry: public memory, visual rhetoric, and rhetorics of silence. To best understand how these three theoretical areas shed light on the racialized politics of commemoration in Washington, DC, it’s important to first elaborate on the historical and political context in which this project’s case studies are situated.

Race, Citizenship, and the National Capital

If the United States's establishment was the final "great experiment" for the promotion of human happiness as George Washington supposed, then the federal district named in his honor has arguably served as the nation's testing grounds for its principles of republican democracy.¹² Immediately following the Civil War, Washington, DC stood, as Senator Charles Sumner stated, as "an example for all the land," in which Congress had "abolished slavery, established schools for black children, banned discrimination on streetcars and railroads, enfranchised black men, and forbidden racial discrimination in office holding and jury service."¹³ Yet, in 1874, the legislative body decided that the president would instead appoint three commissioners to rule over the seventy square miles set aside for the nation's capital. Thus, the experiment came to an abrupt halt as black Washingtonians were re-disenfranchised, with national legislators aligning themselves with the few but loud voices of those like Congressman Thomas F. Bayard of Delaware, who argued "that negro suffrage in the District of Columbia has been the largest contributing cause to the present debt and the bad government of this community."¹⁴ It would be another one hundred years before local sovereignty was restored to the nation's capital.

To grasp the deep irony of such these discriminatory politics, one needs only to consider that the very US congress that enacted such politics would have no place to meet and no district over which to rule were it not for the contributions and labor of African Americans. Benjamin Banneker, the son of a former slave served on the team that surveyed the District of Columbia's original boundaries leading up to its founding in 1790.¹⁵ Located just below the Mason-Dixon line, there were as many as 3,185 slaves living in Washington, DC upon its establishment. Over 400 slaves (more than half the work force) helped construct the Capitol building, earning their

respective owners five dollars a month for their efforts.¹⁶ In stark contrast to what we now recognize as “America’s Front Yard,” The National Mall was formerly the country’s premiere slave depot due to its strategic location along the Potomac River. Englishman Joseph Surge called DC “the chief seat of the American slave trade” in his 1841 book, *A Visit to the United States*.¹⁷

Accounts of discrimination continued into the nineteenth and twentieth centuries as the 1875 Civil Rights Act was struck down by the Supreme Court in 1883. Justices argued that the bill, which outlawed “racial discrimination in juries, schools, transportation, and public accommodations,” was determined to infringe on private business practices.¹⁸ One of the most well-known accounts of the prejudice African Americans faced in the nation’s capital is Mary Church Terrell’s 1906 address to United Women’s Club, where she outlined “What it Means to be Colored in the Capital of the United States,” detailing stories of African American men and women excluded from restaurants, theatres, transportation, and employment. Highlighting one paradox of such discrimination, Terrell shares that as the wife of a Harvard law graduate, the daughter of a millionaire, and a woman with no shortage of wealth, she is still unable to find a bite to eat or a place to stay in the city because of the color of her skin.¹⁹ Black Washingtonians though, have consistently led the nation’s fight for social equality through adamant political activism, often guided by the students at Howard University, the district’s congressionally-funded college originally established for African American citizens. Leading a movement to host sit-ins at diners to demand equal service in 1960, students at Howard University appealed to the nearly forgotten public accommodation laws of the post-civil war Reconstruction years, forcing the US Supreme Court to acknowledge “that the laws were still in effect and that racial discrimination in the capital’s restaurants and other accommodations was already illegal.”²⁰

As the National Mall continued to expand and the city's tourist activity began to grow, the district recruited the engineering firm of Alexander and Repass to build the Tidal Basin bridge and seawall in 1949, an \$11 million dollar contract which was not only revolutionary because of its innovative structural design, but also because of the firm's biracial representation (Alexander was black, and Repass white).²¹ The monuments in Washington, DC, although overwhelmingly white in both the color of the structures and the men they honor, have consistently served as venues of political activism for many African Americans. First Lady Eleanor Roosevelt invited prominent vocalist Marian Anderson to give a concert from the steps of the Lincoln Memorial in 1939 after the singer was denied the use of Constitution Hall by the Daughters of the American Revolution due to her African American heritage. The event drew more than 75,000 attendees!²² Almost thirty years later, the same steps would host the largest protest in DC's history, with 250,000 people from across the country gathering for the March on Washington for Jobs and Freedom in 1963.²³ From the top of those steps Martin Luther King, Jr., delivered his famous "I Have a Dream" speech, an oration which all-too-well points out the incongruities between the promises of equality made to US citizens and the harsh reality of racial discrimination. One can see the irony of this speech's repeated call to "let freedom ring" when one recognizes that it was delivered from the top of a memorial honoring the man who authored the Emancipation Proclamation, a document which should have already guaranteed this freedom to every citizen one hundred years before King's speech.²⁴

Controversy over Washington, DC's political standing continues to pose questions about the extent to which the district's residents are given the same political representation and citizenship benefits as the rest of the country's population. Since the District of Columbia Home Rule Act passed in 1973, an elected mayor and thirteen-member council have held primary

governance over the District; however, Congress still holds ultimate authority over the city and may overturn local laws. Washington, DC holds one non-voting seat in the House of Representatives, but no senators—a point of frustration for local citizens made visible on their vehicle identification plates, which all officially bear the phrase “Taxation without Representation.”²⁵ The district’s high homicide rate, which has earned it the nickname of “The Murder Capital of the Country” and its notoriously dysfunctional public schools (a likely contributing factor to the reality that 1 in 3 residents are considered illiterate) further exacerbate local frustrations with their varied government structure.²⁶ While considered a national minority, African Americans actually make up the largest ethnic group in the district, composing over 50 percent of the population—a number actually down twenty percent from their demographic levels in 1970.²⁷ Local-national tensions are further intensified by this disparate racial dynamic—where the majority-white governing body of the US Congress still holds supreme authority over a majority-black population.

While Washington, DC’s local demographics make it appear otherwise, the national capital is in fact, a white public space. This is the case because, as Helán Page and R. Brooke Thomas explain, the district entails “patterns, configurations, tactics, or devices that routinely, discursively, and sometimes coercively privilege Euro-Americans over nonwhites.”²⁸ Emphasizing the realistic importance of intersectionality, white public space is specifically problematic in Washington, DC because it stands as a “site of ideological struggle where racism is reproduced by the professional class.”²⁹ On Capitol Hill, black workers earn on average 21 percent less income a year than their white counterparts because of their overrepresentation in lower-paying jobs.³⁰ Almost 500,000 people commute into the district each day, most of whom are white, and most of whom hold professional-class jobs, while the majority of African

Americans live within District boundaries, where sales taxes are higher than any state in the Union. Congress, which holds the power to overturn district legislation, is also overwhelmingly white. Currently, the House of Representatives boasts the highest number of African American members in its history at 44 out of 438, while there are *no* African American senators.

This whiteness is strikingly *visible* not only in the capital's most prominent personnel, but also in its extravagant structures. The majority of Washington, DC's most visited locations, including the White House, Capitol Building, Thomas Jefferson Memorial, Abraham Lincoln Memorial, Washington Monument, Supreme Court, Library of Congress, National Archives, all five Congressional office buildings, Natural History Museum, National Gallery of Art, National Portrait Gallery, and even the American Indian Museum and the Museum of African Art have been constructed with pale sandstone and white marble.³¹ These foremost white structures pay homage to the Greeks and Romans, who upon "stamping their Imperial mark on Washington," as William Walton notes, have made these civilizations' influence "by far the most pervasive in the city."³² Because the city's structures reflect a Greco-Roman influence, it can be supposed that these formations contribute to the implicit exclusion of Americans who do not lay claim to a European heritage.

As this study moves forward to discuss how both the district and the nation's racialized political history and current milieu has manifested and shaped the city's commemorative formations, we soon discover that Mary Church Terrell's admonishment of the national capital is no less germane today than it was over one hundred years ago:

And surely no where in the world do oppression and persecution based solely on the color of the skin appear more hateful and hideous than in the capital of the United States, because the chasm between the principles upon which this Government was founded, in

which it still professes to believe, and those which are daily practiced under the protection of the flag, yawns so wide and deep.³³

This “chasm” begs an exploration of race and public memory so that we might achieve an understanding of how this chasm, which has existed since the nation’s founding, is still not only present, but visible in its capital.

Rhetoric and the Politics of Commemoration

This study begins in rhetoric because of the discipline’s unique capacity to ascertain the role of social, political, and historical forces in shaping the discourse of a time, and in speaking to the ways the discourses of a time shape the social, political, and historical realities. Because public commemoration attempts to take something as complex and abstract as an event, an experience, or a life, and express it in tangible, concrete material, we must call upon the rhetorician to inquire as to how “the fears, the anxieties, the frustrations, [and] the aggressive impulses of a society” serve to channel a host of contextual forces, point to prevailing ideologies, and shape situated expressions of those beliefs.³⁴

Using rhetorical studies as the overarching framework, this project adapts the methods and aims of the public address tradition, for as Martin J. Medhurst aptly points out, “wherever there is symbolic inducement being practiced, the scholar of public address is not far behind.”³⁵ As previously mentioned, studies of public memory and citizenship necessitate an examination of both immediate and evolving contexts, making the historical and contextual methods of public address an ideal field for engaging a comprehensive analysis. A public address perspective allows the scholar to study discourse not as a self-contained product of a particular occurrence, but as the product of extensive societal forces.

Certainly, a further investigation of the visual representation of African Americans in the nation's capital is academically opportune, as such a study is able to build upon a well-established foundation of scholarship to which this introduction now turns. In order to gain a broad understanding of African American visual representation in Washington, DC, and how these commemorative formations (or lack thereof) influence widely-held beliefs about race and citizenship, I engage literatures of public memory, visual rhetoric, and rhetorics of silence.

Race, Citizenship, and Public Memory

Public memory scholarship looks at how commemorative formations both advance and inhibit particular narratives in national discourse, for as Paul Shackel notes, “current interpretations of the past can reinforce social inequalities in the present.”³⁶ Thus, I examine public memory's rhetorical origins, its divergence from other types of memory studies, its political implications, its significance to societal conceptions of race and national identity, as well as how monuments, memorials, and statues uniquely encapsulate prevailing modes of remembrance.

While the concept of public memory has developed a robust literature base in recent decades, the study of memory traces its rhetorical roots back to Plato's comparison of memory, “the mother of the Muses” to a wax tablet on which our souls keep record of “those sensations and perceptions which he wishes to remember.”³⁷ Aristotle too attempts to decipher the phenomenon of *memoria* in his treatise *On Memory and Recollection*, which, when joined with his explanation of *philia*, or “affiliation,” perhaps best gets to the heart of public memory: it is a concept that is both societal necessity and strategic *techne*, encompassing the innate need for people to establish a common bond among each other, and the means necessary to achieve it.³⁸

But it was in Cicero's *De Oratore* that a discussion about memory's significance to the rhetor first becomes clear, when he declares memory "the treasury and guardian of all things" and includes the concept as one of the foundational five canons of rhetoric.³⁹

Aristotle's idea of memory greatly informed French sociologist Maurice Halbwachs's conception of communal memory at the turn of the twentieth century. Halbwachs suggests that communal memories are formed in response to the needs and desires of specific communities, which, in turn, help to shape the group's collective identity. "Various groups that compose society are capable at every moment of reconstructing their past," a continuous loop of remembrance and identification which Halbwachs labels "the social frameworks of memory."⁴⁰ Halbwachs's assertion that "the past is not preserved but is reconstructed on the basis of the present" affirms memory's dynamic nature, and the central role communities play in determining their own histories.⁴¹

Public memory, then, emerges in the *koinos kosmos*, the shared space where memories are discussed, contested, and negotiated.⁴² Public memory, as Greg Dickinson, Carole Blair, and Brian L. Ott illustrate, "implicates a society's common interests, investments, or destinies, with profound political implications."⁴³ Thus, memory becomes public as people look beyond their own personal experiences and engage other interpretations of the past.

Although public memory takes hold as a collective phenomenon, not all members of the national imaginary have equal access to its production and circulation. Shackel notes that "memory becomes public when a group has the resources and power to promote a particular past."⁴⁴ To an extent then, disempowered groups must compete for public recognition. John Gillis contends that *all* commemorative activity is necessarily political, "for it involves the coordination of individual and group memories, whose results may appear consensual when they

are in fact the product of processes of intense contest, struggle, and in some instances, annihilation.”⁴⁵ Within the public realm, then, there is generally a dominant, “consensually-appearing” memory alongside any number of what Stephen Browne terms “counter memories”: cultural narratives that impose themselves over and against prevailing discourses of power and remembrance.⁴⁶ Thus, as certain memories prevail through widespread recognition and public acknowledgement, other group and class memories are inevitably masked.⁴⁷ Public memory, though, is more than just identity politics or class warfare; but also, “it is an argument about the interpretation of reality,” according to John Bodnar. He argues that memory is the argument over “fundamental issues about the entire existence of a society.”⁴⁸ Thus, societal power relations both shape and constitute public memory.

Recognizing the relationship between public memory and social inequality helps us understand the racialized politics of commemoration. Because, as Natalie Zemon Davis and Randolph Starn argue, “[i]dentity depends on memory,” the way that we perceive racial identity, both our own and that of others, is largely dependent on which historical narratives are most salient to our own self-conceptions.⁴⁹ Gillis asserts the unfortunate reality that “women and minorities often serve as symbols of a ‘lost’ past, nostalgically perceived and romantically constructed, but their actual lives are most readily forgotten.”⁵⁰ Browne offers an enlightening perspective on the conflict between African American racial and national identity as it plays out in the Crispus Attucks Memorial, a commemorative formation honoring the first “martyr” for the “American cause” during the Boston Massacre.⁵¹ Browne’s examination extends our understanding of public memory’s role in defining subjects through his argument that “people not only remember, but get remembered, and under conditions of historical inequality, getting remembered must take on a politics of its own.”⁵² Much scholarship regarding race and public

memory focuses on how leaders of the Civil Rights movement are frequently “getting remembered” for their work in the advancement of racial equality, while their contributions to economic, political, and/or social justice are rarely acknowledged through public commemoration.⁵³ Through an examination of the frequent comparisons between President Barack Obama and Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., Kristen Hoerl describes this discrepancy in remembrance as *selective amnesia*: “the rhetorical processes by which public discourse routinely omits events that defy seamless narratives of national progress and unity.”⁵⁴ Concepts like *selective amnesia* and the racialized politics of commemoration help demonstrate the strained representation of African American and other minority voices among mainstream national discourses.

Although John Quincy Adams boldly declared, “Democracy has no monuments. It strikes no medals. It bears the head of no man on a coin,” much scholarship has shown that commemorative formations have shaped meanings of US citizenship insofar as such formations shape and are shaped by what the nation chooses to memorialize.⁵⁵ Barbara A. Biesecker aptly suggests that “what we remember and how we remember it can tell us something significant about who we are as a people now, about the contemporary social and political issues that divide us, and about who we may become.”⁵⁶ Thus, what we believe it means to be “American” today is in large part shaped by how we remember the country’s inception, history, past leaders, and former citizens. Public memory and national identity are so intertwined that policy makers have traditionally gone to great lengths to maintain control of how the citizenry remembers its past as a means of maintaining a unified political body. Shackel suggests that memory is about “creating and reinforcing patriotism, and/or developing a sense of nostalgia to legitimize a particular heritage.”⁵⁷ It is no surprise, then, that governments also go to great lengths to control as Browne

suggests, “who gets remembered.”⁵⁸ Perhaps Bradford Vivian said it best: “Our symbolic relations with figures from the past engender the political and ethical practices through which we conceive of ourselves.”⁵⁹ Thus, national identity and national memory hold a reciprocal relationship of constitutive influence.

Scholarship has revealed intimations of public memory in such varied artifacts as cookbooks, textbooks, catechisms, movies, music, sports events, and photographs. Yet, national memorials, monuments, and statuary hold a distinctive role in their embodiment of public memory because of their “seemingly frozen face in the landscape,” wherein the processes and politics of construction are often overlooked by deceitfully static appearances.⁶⁰ In the United States, public commemoration has often been a source of political unrest, for as Kirk Savage notes, people have frequently “fought over the sponsorship and design of public monuments precisely because they knew what power the monuments had to define the will of the people.”⁶¹ Not only have politicians and the general public disputed the role of monuments, but scholars have expressed disagreement over how exactly these commemorative formations function. Daniel Abramson, and Carole Blair and Neil Michel have offered alternative readings of architect Maya Lin’s Civil Rights Memorial in Montgomery, Alabama. While Abramson reads the memorial to be “about the authority and legitimacy of the American Constitution and its legal and political instrument,” Blair and Michel alternatively view the memorial as an “ensemble of interrelated performances,” which “work toward a commentary on race issues of the present and open up possibilities for politics, rather than advancing a summary or unitary stance.”⁶² Indeed, commemorative formations are not as stationary in meaning as they are in appearance.

As this overview suggests, acts of national remembrance are a product of the nation’s greatest hopes and deepest anxieties, yet also a projection of its own citizenship ideals. The

ability of commemorative formations to give the appearance of a coherent national past, present, and future points to their inherent political ability to advance and inhibit particular national narratives. Understanding, then, the reflexive nature of public memory, this study aims to explore how prevailing interpretations of the past shape social inequalities in the present.

Race, Citizenship, and Visual Rhetoric

This project's examination of African American commemorative practices in Washington, DC requires an overview of visual rhetoric focused specifically on visibility and "rhetorics of display." Lester Olson argues that recovering the histories of "understudied populations and cultures" is possible through explorations of "the symbolic objects that members of such social groups had used and left behind."⁶³ The discussion that follows examines how place and space function rhetorically, and more specifically, how memorials and monuments enact national citizenship ideals. Then, I examine the intersection of racial identity and visibility, and in turn how citizenship is visualized.

The appearance, exhibition, or demonstration of an object is not the result of a singular decision, but rather the culmination of historical, political, and social processes, which determine the conditions of visibility for "rhetorics of display."⁶⁴ Lawrence J. Prelli notes that such selective processes "constrain the range of possible meanings available" to those who encounter these rhetorics of display.⁶⁵ To this end, Harriet F. Senie and Sally Webster argue that such rhetorics "must be viewed in the complex matrix in which [they are] conceived, commissioned, built, and finally received."⁶⁶ In short, rhetorics of display are inseparable from their contexts.

Visibility is itself a rhetorical construction, with rhetorics of display functioning to make certain people, attitudes, and ideas visible, and limiting the recognition of others. Unpacking how

racialized depictions of individuals and groups influence wider beliefs about racial identity, Victoria Gallagher and Kenneth S. Zagacki argue that “visual images can work both to articulate and to shape public knowledge,” emphasizing the close connection between popular artwork and popular opinion.⁶⁷ Moreover, they suggest that visual images are actually a language of their own, describing in thick detail “the qualities, the pleasures or pain, the duties, the kind of past, present, and/or future that is or that is desired” among the people they make visible.⁶⁸ Furthermore, scholars argue that visibility influences societal conceptions about race, not only through *who* is depicted in *which* way, but also through *who* is doing the visualizing, with “acts of looking” serving as both producers and products of race and identity.⁶⁹

Looking then to the monuments, memorials, murals, and statues that populate the national capital, it should be noted that these commemorative formations are in large part the products of federal or state government patronage, and therefore considered public art. Further, several scholars have noted the power and privilege embedded in public art displays.⁷⁰ Senie and Webster suggest that art in the public domain serves as a vessel for the political interests of its patrons, while more economically disadvantaged groups are reminded of their subclass position both through and from such aesthetic practices.⁷¹ Moreover, the US government’s sponsorship of artwork grew out of its desire to demonstrate the nation state’s “progress” and to solidify its standing in “the history of civilizations.”⁷² Reflecting on the significance of American “monumental art . . . whose content (usually historical or symbolic) expresses the ideals of government,” Senie and Webster call for more “sociopolitical studies of recent public art patronage and the role of the public in public art.”⁷³ Creating space for the rhetorical analysis of public art, they recognize that “the study of public art requires an interdisciplinary approach and a historical context.”⁷⁴ Rhetorical investigations of the Ulysses S. Grant Memorial, the US Statue

of Freedom, and the Washington Monument's iconic design have all seriously considered the institution's motivation for commissioning these national formations, agreeing with Senie and Webster, that "public art, in overt and covert ways, embodies the ideals and aspirations of its patron."⁷⁵

The spaces in which commemorative formations exist and interact influence national and cultural conceptions of citizenship. Several scholars have noted that sites are not merely locations where rhetoric occurs, but are indeed rhetorical in their own right.⁷⁶ For example, Carole Blair exposes the ability of sites to conscript and commission ideal citizens, often by showcasing individuals who have either "lived an extraordinary life or died a 'good death.'"⁷⁷ Memorials and monuments in particular serve as commemorative showcases for certain citizenship practices, while discouraging or masking others. Biesecker demonstrates how these "reconstructions of the past function rhetorically as civic lessons for a generation beset by fractious disagreements about the viability of US culture and identity."⁷⁸ Through an in-depth reading of the Women in Military Service for America Memorial, she shows how this commemorative formation "challenges conventional wisdom" and "makes visible" an often overlooked practice of women's citizenship.⁷⁹

While many scholars have noted the difficulty in delineating exactly what "citizenship" entails, especially as a construct inflected with legal, cultural, and social meanings, visual images appear to help make nationalistic expectations knowable. Perhaps because citizenship's conceptualization is so challenging, it often relies, as Robert Hariman and John L. Lucaities suggest, on "the visualizing power" of iconic images to make such abstract concepts concrete.⁸⁰ Cara Finnegan, for example, observes the two-way influence of visual culture and racial identity in the United States, noting how presidential portraits have allowed viewers "to elaborate an

Anglo-Saxon national ideal,” especially during times of increased anxiety about “the fate of the ‘American’ identity.”⁸¹ Case studies of visual rhetoric have also revealed the historically gendered disposition of US citizenship visible in the circulation of highly-masculine American icons and popular US images reinforcing traditional gender roles.⁸² Not surprisingly then, notions of class-based identity are also visible through examinations of US visual culture. James J. Kimble and Lester C. Olson’s investigation of US poster girl “Rosie the Riveter” show how this icon served to motivate working-class women to remain in the factories and suppress labor-organizing efforts in order to boost national production during World War II.⁸³ As such, nationally-circulated images often mark the racialized, gendered, and classed formations of US citizenship.

The significance of this literature points to visual rhetoric’s dynamic implications for how the US populous has come to perceive both race and citizenship. Consequently, further investigation of how *a lack of* visual representation has equally significant ramifications for American understandings of racial and national identity is necessary.

Race, Citizenship, and Silence

James Young astutely notes, “at least part of our veneration of ruins and artifacts stems from the nineteenth-century belief that such objects embody the spirit of the people who made and used them.”⁸⁴ This project’s earlier historical overview exposed the centrality of African American citizens to Washington, DC’s material and social makeup, yet the sparse and controversial representations of them in the nation’s capital leads me to ask about the extent to which these formations “embody the spirit of the[se] people.” To examine the way visual representations say more than the obvious, Barbie Zelizer suggests that we consider the “voice of

the visual,” alleging that “voice accounts for an image’s larger environment.”⁸⁵ Moreover, “visual voice,” as she calls it, facilitates a relationship between an image and the imagined, emotional, and contingent contexts that reach far beyond its immediate appearance, allowing for the same image to speak in different ways amidst different environments.⁸⁶ If, as Zelizer argues, the visual possesses *voice* and can indeed be considered a form of public address, then, as this project argues, the visual can also be silenced—or denied a visual voice.⁸⁷ This scholarly undertaking specifically aims to show how the visual voice of African Americans in US national spaces is coupled with a visual silence that works to exclude the recognition of “contexts, events people, [and] practices” that speak to this group’s identity as citizens.⁸⁸ To “mark” the place of these exclusions, this project uses the term *visual silence*. More than mere absence, visual silence recognizes that, through visual representation, voices of the oppressed are simultaneously invoked and suppressed. Indeed, when African Americans are memorialized in DC (if at all), the potential for their visual voices to fulfill their honorific function is routinely diminished and thus silenced. As the case studies in this project demonstrate, this silencing takes a number of forms, including obscurity, discipline, marginalization, disavowal, demotion, concealment, and obfuscation. These forms of visual silence are shaped by the racialized politics of commemoration and inflected by the forms of racism at play in the broader national context. Before turning to this project’s case studies, I first examine the rhetorical purposes of voice and silence, and how these two fundamental concepts influence power dynamics between dominant and marginalized social groups.

Philip Wander’s conception of a “Third Persona” informs the concept of visual silence, particularly through his discussion of recognition and imperception. According to Wander, the Third Persona is not only “what you and I are told to avoid becoming—but also a being negated

in history, a being whose presence, though relevant to what is said, is negated through silence.”⁸⁹ Thus, in examining how African American citizens helped to create and populate the national capital, yet remain unacknowledged and underrepresented in its commemorative spaces, we see how negation can be visually invoked, and how the Third Persona is expressed in tangible form. Wander expounds on the day-to-day effects of this negation, explaining that negated individuals and groups are often subject to prejudice, negatively affecting their “ability to produce texts, to engage in discourse, [and] to be heard in the public space.”⁹⁰

Arguably one of the most flexible and diversified concepts in rhetoric, voice often functions as a metaphor for the study of linguistic effects, storytelling, agency, and affect, among countless others.⁹¹ For some, “‘voice’ has become synonymous with the emancipation of the oppressed,” and others even suggesting that as rhetorical scholars we have an ethical obligation to help alienated persons “find their own voices.”⁹² Energizing voice in more relational terms, Eric King Watts conceptualizes it as “the enunciation and the acknowledgement of the obligations and anxieties of living in community with others.”⁹³ Lester Olson also acknowledges the “underlying sociological and political factors” which moderate the ways speech and silence are able to transform both the self and society.⁹⁴ Both Olson and Watts recognize the importance of proactively preserving the voices of marginalized groups, arguing that each person not only has an obligation to themselves, but also, as Watts states, “a civic duty to negotiate the constraints imposed on one’s speech.”⁹⁵ For many, voice seems to be a key factor for both individual and group empowerment.

While silence is often associated with a lack of voice or sound, it is certainly not lacking in significance. As Dennis Kurzon contends, “[s]ilence is meaningful . . . the central problem of silence in discourse is to discover that meaning.”⁹⁶ Bradford Vivian also discusses silence’s

rhetorical import, insisting that it is “a constitutive element of discourse.”⁹⁷ He maintains, “in order to evaluate its rhetorical function, then, one must analyze the characteristic form of a given silence, attending to the discursive means that engender, maintain, or transform it.”⁹⁸ Thus, tending to the historical, political, and ideological forces that have continued to allow for the silencing of marginalized groups is necessary. Attending to the sociopolitical milieu surrounding commemorative formations then allows us to unpack silence as a *rhetorical condition*, a possibility Vivian suggests due to silence’s ability to “discursively [produce] conditions for thinking, knowing, speaking, and rendering judgment about the relationship between historical and contemporary experiences.”⁹⁹

Silence, however, is not *always* a disempowering rhetorical condition, but can also be a strategic political option and even a resource to combat oppression. As Cheryl Glenn notes in her hallmark study of silence, “when silence is our choice, we can use it purposefully and effectively.”¹⁰⁰ Nonviolent protestors, for example, demonstrated the power of silence through their unignorable presence and abstention from brute force. When members of the National Woman’s Party held a silent protest outside the White House in order to demand suffrage, they illustrated the reality that actions often do speak louder than words.¹⁰¹ Thus, while silence can be a source of power for both empowered and disenfranchised peoples, this project reveals that the silence of African Americans’ visual voice in Washington, DC serves to limit rather than increase the political agency of these silenced citizens.

While there are few groups that have not, at some point in the country’s history, been denied their political voice and/or full citizenship rights, this study focuses specifically on how the minimal commemorative representation of African Americans in the nation’s capital demonstrates what Michelle Cliff calls “the alliance of speechlessness and powerlessness; that

the former maintains the latter; that the powerful are dedicated to the investiture of speechlessness on the powerless.”¹⁰² Another useful way to delineate this relationship between silence and power is the comparison of what James Scott calls “The Public Transcript”—a shorthand description of the open interaction between subordinates and those who dominate, and “The Hidden Transcript”—“discourse that takes place ‘offstage,’ beyond direct observation of powerholders.”¹⁰³ Looking for example at the Capitol Rotunda, it could be argued that the visible statues and artwork compose a “public transcript” of the nation’s history, marked almost entirely by depictions of white male citizens. The “hidden transcript,” then, details the skilled and slave labor that ensured the Capitol’s construction and the African American accomplishments that fueled the country’s progress, obstructed from direct observation.

The intersection of silence and race is not limited in its application to the muting of minorities, but Western society’s unwillingness to discuss the material and ideological effects of “whiteness” also points towards a certain voicelessness regarding race relations. Thomas K. Nakayama and Robert L. Krizek bring attention to the reality that “white” as a discursive space remains more or less invisible even though it continues to “influence the identity of those both within and without its domain.”¹⁰⁴ Rejecting the impression that whiteness has any essential meaning, they suggest it is more usefully viewed as a “rhetorical construction,” able to strategically appear either visible or invisible in its influence over our daily lives. Carrie Crenshaw discusses whiteness not as visible or invisible, but as a concept marked by rhetorical silence: “the public political rhetoric of whiteness relies upon a silent denial of white privilege to rationalize the judicial, legislative, and executive decisions that protect the material interests of white people at the expense of people of color.”¹⁰⁵

Not only are the politics of speaking and silence in the United States deeply racialized, but such demarcation consequently privileges some attributes of national identity while suppressing others. Watts shows how W.E.B. Du Bois's claim that "the ideals of democracy are corrupted by the negation of 'authentic' black voice," is predicated on the belief that "an African American voice articulates alternative norms, premises, and ideals."¹⁰⁶ Because Watts acquires this notion of a public black voice from Du Bois's challenge of established cultural norms for artwork, it seems clear that the "negation of black voice" often occurs on a visual level. Speaking almost directly to the significance of this project, Watts emphasizes, "the absence of an African American voice in American public discourse strengthens the notion that there is no black thought of public value."¹⁰⁷ Likewise, the absence of African American voice in public commemoration strengthens the notion that there are no black accomplishments of public value.

I now turn to the notion of *visual silence* and further develop how this rhetorical concept differs from established theorizations on either visibility or voice, and how it is able to make sense of a narrative that is visibly and historically effervescent, but not publically recognized. I suggest that visual silence might shed some light on Vivian's inquiry as to "How might one acknowledge the impossibility of silence qua silence while nevertheless recognizing the very real existence of silence in the lived experience of those muted by certain social, political, or historical injunctions?"¹⁰⁸ While Vivian offers a riposte through his notion of "silence as representation," a concept describing visual depictions of silent subjects, visual silence instead lends itself to visual depictions of subjects whom appear to possess a voice, charting the ways and the extent to which this voice has been silenced.¹⁰⁹

While African Americans have played an integral role in shaping civic life and national identity in the United States, because we cannot *visualize* their voices in the same tangible ways

in which white Americans are portrayed in the country's commemorative spaces, their history, achievement, and significance are nearly silenced from the national narrative. The deafening nature of the existing commemorative formations, which overwhelmingly honor white individuals, creates a claustrophobic discursive space in which African American voices are all but crowded out by the grandiose commemorations to white Americans. So deafening are most of the existing commemorative formations, that when there are visual representations of African Americans, their scant presence serves only to further mute their collective and individual voices. We see this through the half-body busts of Sojourner Truth and Martin Luther King, Jr. in the Capitol Rotunda, through the contested addition of the Frederick Douglass statue to the CVC, and through the negligence of the oversights marking the MLK Memorial. These omissions are certainly not unprecedented, as the United States has consistently held African Americans to their duties as citizens without making good on the rewards and rights to which they are entitled. This double standard manifested in the concept of visual silence depicts the reality that African Americans have made possible the preservation of dominant national narratives in commemorative form yet are denied not only the same visual recognition, but in the few instances of their commemoration, are denied *full* recognition—or, a full visual voice.

Attempting to do more than correct the lack of commemorative representation of African Americans, this project uses visual silence to show how the commemorative politics governing these structures generate major implications for race relations and national identity in the United States today. Bridging the gap between the historical and the contemporary, this project aims to show how silences, as Vivian argues, “constitute the discursive conditions that define how subjects in the present can imagine, know, and speak of subjects and social relations characteristic of a previous episteme.”¹¹⁰ Thus, by shedding light on the visual silence marking

commemorative practices in Washington, DC's commemorative spaces, we will be able to unearth the conditions that brought it into existence, and the social forces preserving its subsistence today.

Précis

Each of these case studies represents a chapter of this thesis. Each chapter is situated amidst the social, political, and historical milieu shaping the predominant African American experience of the time, including institutional, symbolic, and postracial forms of racism, respectively. Indeed, each chapter punctuates the particular form of visual silence at play in its respective era of racialized discrimination. In short, more than reinforcing the critical observation that the nation's commemorative formations were shaped and are shaped by racism, visual silence works to expose *how* and *in what forms* such racism works to simultaneously invoke and suppress the visual voice of African Americans in the nation's most honored spaces.

Chapter 2 turns to the aesthetic, commemorative, and ceremonial functions of the Capitol Rotunda—known as the “symbolic and physical heart” of this grandiose space.¹¹¹ Tall enough to house the Statue of Liberty inside, the Rotunda is marked most notably by the *History of America*, a 300 foot-tall frieze painted around the rotunda's inner dome that depicts significant people and events in the country's history.¹¹² A 4,664 square-foot fresco, *The Apotheosis of Washington*, covers nearly the entire rotunda's ceiling and features a nearly fifteen-foot tall depiction of the nation's first president.¹¹³ The rotunda also houses numerous commemorative sculptures, both directly beneath the dome, and in the newly renovated Capitol Visitor Center on the floor below. Because the rotunda is the most well-preserved space in the Capitol, an examination of what constitutes the typical visitor's experience in this space reflects the most

widely-held priorities of the country's early government, and the people they represented beyond. In brief, this chapter asks, how does the visual silence of African Americans in the Capitol's main space speak to their scarce representation in the nation's historical narrative? Looking at the visual depictions of the nation's historical narrative, this chapter argues that institutionalized racism shaped a form of visual silence that worked to obscure, discipline, and marginalize the visual voice of African Americans.

Chapter 3 looks at National Statuary Hall, a collection of statues housed in the US Capitol building composed of two statues from each of the fifty states, chosen by their respective legislatures "to honor persons notable in their history."¹¹⁴ Recently, the DC Arts and Humanities Commission and Congressional Delegate Eleanor Holmes Norton were denied permission to contribute a statue of Frederick Douglass to the collection.¹¹⁵ While Douglass would be the second African American honored in the collection as a representative of the federal district, current regulations only allow for statues from states (not districts), and so the figure of Douglass was instead given space in the Capitol Visitor Center.¹¹⁶ Additionally, the state legislature of Maryland recently refused to replace one of their current Statuary Hall representatives, both revolutionary war figures, with a statue of Harriet Tubman.¹¹⁷ An examination of which Americans have been deemed "notable" enough to be included in Statuary Hall unearths certain characteristics and commonalities of those the country sees as ideal citizens, and how citizenship functions as a racialized category. Thus, this chapter asks, how does the visual silence of African Americans in Statuary Hall protect a political philosophy subtly rooted in systemic prejudice, but explicitly resistant to acts of racism? Also, how does this manifestation of *symbolic racism* constitute a complex national space that visually, marks both acceptance of and resistance to

social progress? This chapter contends that visual silence works to disavow and demote the visual voice of African Americans.

Chapter 4 examines the National Martin Luther King, Jr. Memorial, which opened on October 16, 2011, and the controversy surrounding the sculpture's colossal budget, outsourced construction, and imprecise engraving. To many people's unease, the memorial committee appointed a Chinese sculptor over the \$180 million project, and chose to paraphrase one of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr.'s sermons for the memorial engraving rather than a direct quote.¹¹⁸ Moreover, this chapter examines how the memorial's construction and design promoted the nation's growing belief in the postracial ideal. Additionally, an understanding of how the memorial speaks to the country's current perceptions of King's complex advocacies necessitates an analysis of President Barack Obama's remarks at the memorial's opening ceremony. Thus, this chapter asks, how does the visual silence surrounding King's portrayal echo the unmet promises of the country's commitment to citizenship equality? Visual silence, in this case, works to conceal and obfuscate the visual voice of African Americans.

Finally, this project considers future studies of visual silence and how the nation's evolving understanding of both race and citizenship necessitate further rhetorical study of public discourse. Because, as this project shows, race-based prejudice in the United States has repeatedly changed form, continued understanding of how discrimination is taking root in the nation state will hopefully provide society with the tools to curb its deployment. Lastly, this brief conclusion offers several theoretical and historical implications of this project, as well as a brief glimpse into the nation's forthcoming commemorative endeavors.

CHAPTER 2

VISUAL SILENCE IN THE CAPITOL ROTUNDA: COMMEMORATING INSTITUTIONAL RACISM

“It’s important for Americans—and the world, frankly—to see that the Capitol will continue to reflect our history and our quest for a more perfect union,” Speaker of the House John Boehner affirmed at the ceremonial revealing of the building’s new Slave Labor Commemorative Marker.¹¹⁹ Prior to 2008, guests to the US Capitol Building entered the Rotunda directly through the ornate bronze doors flanking the building’s eastern front. Today, all guests must enter through the newly constructed Capitol Visitor Center (CVC), an interactive, museum-like space at the building’s entrance, which accounts for three-quarters of the Capitol’s total square footage.¹²⁰ After entering the CVC and passing through security, guests are faced with a built-to-size replica of the Statue of Freedom that stands atop the Capitol Dome. A plaque below the statue details the crucial involvement of Philip Reid and his fellow slave laborers in the statue’s construction, while bronze lettering above the figure labels this extensive foyer, “EMANCIPATION HALL.” To the left, a block of sandstone rests in a glass case alongside a plaque notifying observers that:

THIS SANDSTONE WAS ORIGINALLY PART OF THE UNITED STATES CAPITOL’S EAST FRONT, CONSTRUCTED IN 1824-1826. IT WAS QUARRIED BY LABORERS, INCLUDING ENSLAVED AFRICAN AMERICANS, AND COMMEMORATES THEIR IMPORTANT ROLE IN BUILDING THE CAPITOL.¹²¹

This “Slave Labor Commemorative Marker” was installed on February 28, 2012 upon recommendations from the Congressional Slave Labor Task Force, a committee assembled in 2005 “to study the contributions of enslaved African Americans in building the U.S. Capitol.”¹²²

While politicians composed the majority of the Task Force, one member, who also served on Arkansas's Black History Advisory Committee, thought it was important "to put a human face on the experience of slaves who helped build the capitol, and that visitors should be able to get a sense of who they were, and what they're daily experience was like."¹²³ Yet, he passed away during the committee's tenure, and those still serving went forward with the sandstone display. While this sandstone slab, the designation of the exhibit space as "Emancipation Hall," and Philip Reid's informative display are among the first artifacts Capitol tourists see upon their arrival, the prominent commemoration of African American citizens does not continue with the guests once they enter the older spaces of the building.

This analysis challenges Speaker Boehner's declarations as to how the Capitol "reflects [the United States's] history," and to how the space speaks to the national "quest for a more perfect union."¹²⁴ Although African Americans have made possible the symbolic preservation of dominant national narratives throughout the Capitol Building, and hold a central role in the historical formation of these narratives, they lack visual recognition in the building's main public space—the Rotunda—effecting a visual silence that negates their participation in the nation's historical narrative. This negation is not the result of mere exclusion, for even the most casual of rhetorical critics can observe the absence of African Americans in the paintings of the Rotunda. The negation effected through visual silence, rather, is one of a tension between presence and absence. I contend that the presences of African Americans invoked in the CVC instantiate a haunting of their absence in the Rotunda—a hallowed, privileged space "inside" the building, beyond the casual thoroughways of the CVC. In this particular case study of visual silence, we see how it works to obscure, discipline, and marginalize the visual voice of African Americans. In turn, an analysis of how visual silence functions in the Capitol's solely commemorative space,

the Rotunda, helps explain the ways in which African Americans are visually excluded from the narratives of US history, and how the space works to commemorate the nation's history of overt institutional racism.

To this end, this chapter first provides a narrative of the role African Americans played in the nation's establishment and growth through its first century. Second, this chapter offers an overview of the Capitol building's construction and design, revealing the implications of its architectural style and the slave labor that ensured its fortitude. Next, I investigate the pervasive visual silence of African Americans in the Capitol Rotunda through a rhetorical account of the commemorative formations within the building's symbolic and physical heart. This investigation attempts to explain how the similarities between the meager historical accounts of African Americans' nation-building efforts and their visually silenced commemorative representations in the country's governmental center reveals *how* overt institutional racism visually manifests itself within the Rotunda's representation of the nation's historical narrative.

Race and Nation Building in Early America

As Philip Wander suggests, examining acts of negation “insists on a historical perspective in relation to cultural artifacts and political issues.”¹²⁵ Shedding light on the historical contributions of African Americans to the nation's establishment and development during the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries is key to recognizing the conditions that allowed for the institutionalization of overt racism. From the creation of the United States until the Civil War, this brief chronology of US history during the country's first century details the rise and fall of slavery as a state-sanctioned institution, the central role of enslaved blacks during the Revolutionary War, and then the eventual emancipation of African Americans.

America's beginnings are marked by resistance to the tyranny of the British government, both in the Puritans' escape from religious persecution under monarchical rule and in the American colonists' rebellion against England's oppressive imperial rule. Yet, this new nation legitimized and protected a practice that was seen as so odious it "held no place in England," where the freedom of black citizens was ensured and protected by law.¹²⁶ In contrast, the North Atlantic slave trade represented the world's largest intercontinental migration through the capture and transportation of Africans to North America.¹²⁷ Initially, a number of whites were also subjected to indentured servitude, and toiled alongside both black slaves and other paid laborers in similar capacities.¹²⁸ It was not until the colonial government saw to the codification of slave laws, which guaranteed a racial basis to enslavement through their declaration: "that slave status followed the status of the mother."¹²⁹ Moreover, neither free nor enslaved blacks were permitted to own property, while white indentured servants were eventually able to settle their debts and become landowners, acquiring black slaves of their own and furthering the racialized premise of slavery in the colonies.¹³⁰

As American colonists grew increasingly dissatisfied with life under British authorities, it appears that they recognized the deep offense of slavery, yet worked to ensure that this dehumanizing system would be protected in the new government they sought to establish. Writing under the pseudonym "Humphrey Ploughjogger" in the *Boston Gazette*, John Adams voiced the colonists' dissatisfaction with Britain's increased taxation through an appeal to their shared ethnicity, asserting: "We won't be their Negroes. . . . I say we are as handsome as old English folks, and so should be as free."¹³¹ Early patriots went so far as to compare the pilgrims' six-week voyage to North America to the transportation of Africans to the New World, arguing that both passages carried free men into a life of bondage.¹³² Highlighting the contradictions of

these colonialists' grievances, English writer Samuel Johnson aptly questioned: "How is it that we hear the loudest yelps for liberty among the drivers of the Negroes?"¹³³ Historian Edmund Morgan fittingly labeled this commitment to freedom for white men and the concurrent degeneration of blacks by the early patriots as the "American Paradox."¹³⁴

Despite awareness of slavery's injustices, the colonists desired to establish a republican government in part to guarantee the permanence of this practice, providing legal protection for their own paradoxical advocacies. Republican principles of economic independence and civic virtue, along with the representative government's dedication to property-rights were used to justify the budding nation's classification of "all men" as white, male, property owners, thereby limiting the "unalienable Rights" listed in the Declaration of Independence to this exclusive group.¹³⁵ Black men and women on the other hand, could not *own* property—they *were* property, thereby excluding them from recognition by this government before its own recognition as a sovereign nation.

This new republic's military success was considerably aided by African Americans, who although largely unable to take part in the liberties they sought to protect, ensured the independence and growing prosperity of what came to be the United States of America. Recently a subject of much public deliberation and a symbol of African American protest and resistance, Crispus Attucks, a runaway slave, became "the first martyr for American freedom" during a confrontation with British troops in 1770.¹³⁶ Arguably, retaliation against a British governor who offered manumission to those American slaves who joined the Royal Army was a central cause of the Southern colonies' agreement to join the rebel forces, without whom the Revolutionary War would not have been possible, and certainly not successful.¹³⁷ Although the recruitment of black soldiers at the war's beginning was initially prohibited, several states began revising their

policies to allow for both enslaved and freed blacks to join the Continental Army with the understanding that all would be given freedom following their service.¹³⁸ Thus, as Franklin and Higginbotham perceived, “the Revolutionary War became for African Americans a struggle not simply between Great Britain and America, but also between master and slave.”¹³⁹ At least 5,000 black soldiers are estimated to have fought with the patriots during the Revolutionary War, yet an examination of public life during the nation’s early period reveals that the “freedom” they earned following the war still fell short of the liberty experienced by white citizens.¹⁴⁰

Subsequently, the drafting of the Constitution in 1787 only reinforced the “American Paradox” through its promotion of ascriptive inegalitarian citizenship under the guise of liberty and equality.¹⁴¹ Although the terms “slave” or “slavery” never appear in this founding document, the Constitution’s protection of property concurrently protected this practice. Instead, the drafters referred to “persons,” “service,” and “labour,” a linguistic strategy which legal scholar A. Leon Higginbotham, Jr., points to as evidence of the first congress’s reluctance to discuss the inherent immorality of such a practice.¹⁴² Although these early statesmen hesitated to discuss slavery’s ethical implications, they were quick to debate the political representation of slaves in the new state and federal governments. Slaves composed over a third of the population in most southern states, whose representatives argued for the inclusion of “those bound to service” in the apportionment of congressional representatives.¹⁴³ In contrast, delegates from the northern states opposed the inclusion of slaves in the allotment of congressional seats and electoral votes, leading to what came to be known as the “Three-Fifths Compromise.”¹⁴⁴ Also known as “The Great Compromise,” this conciliatory act counted “*those bound to Service for a Term of Years, and excluding Indians not taxed, three fifths of all other Persons.*”¹⁴⁵ At a time when there were few free blacks in the United States, such a system reinforced racial restrictions to US

citizenship, which, as Rogers Smith notes, shaped “a nation in which true Americans were native-born men with Anglo-Saxon ancestors.”¹⁴⁶

While the implications of African American citizenship had been disputed since the country’s inception, disagreement over the rights afforded to enslaved Americans climaxed during the Civil War. Although the official importation of slaves ended in 1808 and most northern states had gradually begun to outlaw slavery starting in the late eighteenth century (known as the “First Emancipation”), slavery only grew more entrenched in the South as plantation life expanded.¹⁴⁷ Upon the election of Abraham Lincoln in 1860, the new president asserted: “[The] question of Slavery was more important than any other; indeed, so much more important has it become that no other national question can even get a hearing just at present.”¹⁴⁸ The “question of Slavery” stood at the center of political tensions between northern and southern states, eventually leading eleven of the latter to secede from the Union, and ultimately to America’s Civil War. Battle began on April 12, 1861, with 186,000 mostly free African Americans fighting in the Union Army, while almost 90,000 African Americans, both slave and free, served in the Confederate army in different capacities.¹⁴⁹ African American women also played a significant role in the Civil War, working as nurses, hospital attendants, spies, scouts, and cooks.¹⁵⁰ While African Americans represented a significant proportion of both armies, those fighting for the Union faced serious hardships—they earned substantially less pay and encountered a 40 per cent higher mortality rate than their white counterparts, due to the inferior medical care black soldiers received.¹⁵¹

Just as slavery was the central focus of the Civil War, emancipation was the focal point of US reconstruction efforts after its conclusion in 1865.¹⁵² Revolutionizing “the chief seat of the American slave trade,” President Lincoln granted full emancipation to slaves in Washington DC

eight months prior to issuing his national “Emancipation Proclamation.”¹⁵³ Lincoln thought the 1862 District of Columbia Emancipation Act, which provided \$300 in compensation for slave owners and \$100 for slaves who chose to emigrate, would be a model for the rest of the nation and serve as a compromise between pro-slavery and anti-slavery parties.¹⁵⁴ Two years before the war’s end, Lincoln issued the Emancipation Proclamation which declared: “All persons held as slaves within any State or designated part of the State, the people whereof shall be in rebellion against the United States, shall be then, thenceforward, and forever free.”¹⁵⁵ Upon reunification of the Union and the Confederacy, Congress passed the Thirteenth Amendment, which instated a constitutional ban on all forms of involuntary servitude.¹⁵⁶ Later efforts to curb institutional racism came by way of the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Amendments, which respectively gave constitutional legitimacy to naturalized citizens and prevented the federal and state governments from denying their citizens’ voting rights “on account of race, color, or previous condition of servitude.”¹⁵⁷ While both statutes assisted in the decline of overt institutional racial discrimination, legal (and often mandated) segregation persisted in the United States until 1964 (and many would argue that it persists today; see Chapters 3 and 4). That it took almost 200 years to ban discrimination on the ground of race, color, or national origin through the 1964 Civil Rights Act suggests that civic inequality has been one of the most consistent characteristics of the new republic.¹⁵⁸

The Capitol’s Construction and its Democratic Design

With a new confidence in the permanence and prosperity of the United States following the Constitution’s ratification, the early national government took upon itself the task of establishing an equally enduring national capital. This next section offers a contextual overview

of the new government's residence in order to demonstrate how the early nation's understandings of race and citizenship were manifested in both the city and its structures.

In 1791, city surveyor Andrew Ellicott, assisted by mathematician and former slave Benjamin Banneker, set the boundaries for the one hundred square-mile federal district that would utilize territory contributed by Maryland and Virginia.¹⁵⁹ Because of Washington DC's location alongside the Potomac River and its position between these two states, the city became a central hub for the domestic slave trade, with dealers housing the men, women, and children in crowded pens and prisons.¹⁶⁰ Landowners from the North brought their "excess labour" to the premiere slave depots following the decline of the region's tobacco production, which concurrently attracted landowners from the South to acquire slaves for their growing cotton industry.¹⁶¹ Interstate slave trafficking in DC increased significantly following the 1808 ban on the African Slave Trade and the new establishment of US territories in the Southwest that permitted slavery.¹⁶² The slave coffles ("chain gangs" of enslaved blacks), which lined the edge of the National Mall, served as a convenient labor repository for the construction of the US Capitol Building that commenced in 1793.¹⁶³ Over 400 slaves (more than half the work force) helped construct the Capitol Building, earning their respective owners five dollars a month for their efforts.¹⁶⁴ Many slaves were injured and some even killed in the construction of this monumental structure, while numerous African Americans building the Capitol resisted oppression by poisoning their owners, working slower, and/or running away.¹⁶⁵ By 1800, there were over six thousand slaves residing in Washington DC—an enslaved population which had almost doubled since the district's creation a mere decade before.¹⁶⁶

An examination of the architecture and design of the Capitol Building reveals that the structure's strong neoclassical foundation parallels the Anglo-centric disposition of the nation's

foundational beliefs. Built to resemble the religious structures of the Greek and Roman Empires and Renaissance Europe, the Capitol Building portends to mark the success of George Washington's "Great Experiment," yet imitates—even venerates—the values of America's European predecessors.¹⁶⁷ From its grandiose dome to its ornate décor, the Capitol Building stands as a prime example of architecture's neoclassical tradition.¹⁶⁸ The Rotunda's large, domed ceiling was fashioned after The Pantheon, a Roman temple—a surprising architectural choice for the time, as this stylistic imitation had generally been reserved for churches and cathedrals.¹⁶⁹ Contributing to the sense that one is standing in one of Europe's majestic houses of worship, the structure is embellished with impressive Corinthian columns, florid plaster carvings, and exceedingly high ceilings. Art historian Philip Dodd notes, "[t]he classical tradition is a generalized and idealized interpretation of nature," a tradition that suggested the United States was less of a revolutionary counterpart than its European predecessors, and more of a continuation of the "idealized" principles of the Western world.¹⁷⁰ This elaborate simulation seems to conflict with the early Americans' desire to break away from European tradition, and instead highlights the nation's deep ties to its European heritage.

In 1812, Thomas Jefferson declared that: "The Capitol is the first temple dedicated to the sovereignty of the people, embellishing with Athenian taste the course of a nation looking far beyond the range of Athenian destinies."¹⁷¹ America was viewed in the early nineteenth century as a "second Athens," hence, the Capitol's designers adopted much of Athenian architectural tradition.¹⁷² Likewise, the Constitution's drafters embraced much of the Athenian way of government. An apparent forerunner to the "American Paradox," Athens earned the title of "the first democracy of the West," and legally mandated that all citizens participate in elections, yet refused to recognize women and slaves as citizens.¹⁷³ It seems more fitting then, to view the

Capitol as a temple dedicated to the sovereignty of *some* people, taking into account both the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution's commitment to securing the rights and liberties of Anglo-American men, while excluding the recognition of African American men and all women. Affirming the sacredness of the recently completed Capitol Building, Representative Rufus Choate (W-MA) spoke on behalf of his fellow congressmen: "We have built no national temples but the Capitol. We consult no common oracle but the Constitution."¹⁷⁴ The Capitol Building is repeatedly recognized as holy ground, both in its structural design and public perception. Likewise, the Constitution is viewed as a sacred text, framing disagreement with this system of government or its institutional practices as blasphemous, encouraging unquestioned patriotism with the intensity of religious devotion.¹⁷⁵

The Capitol's neoclassical style is generally perceived to be antithetical to modern architectural forms, an antithesis which I suggest correlates with the nation's austere veneration of the country's founding principles and its apprehension towards fundamental change or social progress.¹⁷⁶ Just as neoclassical architecture is prized for its sustenance across time and place, sociologist Joe Feagin observes, "The [Constitution's] framers reinforced and legitimated a system of racist oppression that they thought would ensure that whites, especially white men of means, would rule for centuries to come."¹⁷⁷ Over two hundred years later, the US Constitution, which protected slavery and sanctioned the racist order in the United States, still stands as the nation's legal, political, and at times, moral foundation.¹⁷⁸ The document has been amended, but no part has ever been removed or any section rewritten, and never has the United States held a second constitutional convention.¹⁷⁹ As the Capitol Building's strict neoclassical form recalls the ancient Greek tradition of limited democratic engagement, it simultaneously cements a similar unwillingness to reform governing principles to promote a more egalitarian political structure.

A Commemoration of Ideal Citizenship

While historical accounts reveal the interracial efforts exerted to shape the country's establishment and the Capitol's construction, such efforts are not nearly as obvious in the national narrative represented through the architecture in the Capitol Rotunda. Throughout this space, such reverent attention is given to the country's foremost white citizens that the contributions of its black citizens are concealed, and thereby, unknowable to bystanders. This visual silence of black nation-building efforts works to obscure the country's overtly racist past, and reconstruct a historical narrative that appears to center on egalitarian principles. This analysis proceeds spatially top-to-bottom through the Rotunda, looking first at its fresco-covered ceiling, next at the historical paintings lining the room's interior, and finally at the Rotunda statuary encircling its polished sandstone floor. I argue that an examination of how these displays construct a new historical narrative of the nation's inception demonstrates how visual silence works to both commemorate and conceal overt institutional racism—by obscuring, disciplining, and marginalizing the visual voices of African Americans.

The Apotheosis of Washington

Nearly every one of the 3-5 million guests who visit the Capitol each year are led through the CVC into the Rotunda, the building's exclusively ceremonial space and its most ornate.¹⁸⁰ Stretching 96 feet in diameter and 180 feet tall, the Capitol Rotunda is the building's most publically accessible space.¹⁸¹ *The Apotheosis of Washington*, a 4,664 square-foot fresco covers nearly the entire ceiling and features fifty-seven human and animal figures, with some standing up to fifteen feet tall.¹⁸² A deified George Washington hovers amidst clouds in the painting's center, while the goddess Liberty sits to his right wearing a Phrygian cap, the same style of

headpiece originally chosen for the “Statue of Freedom.”¹⁸³ In addition to Washington and the goddesses Liberty and Victory, thirteen maidens representing the first thirteen states complete the inner circle of figures, across which spans a banner reading “E PLURIBUS UNUM.”¹⁸⁴ Six clusters of figures surround this inner circle, with each cluster representing war, commerce, agriculture, science, maritime, and mechanics.¹⁸⁵ Icons of American achievements are portrayed within these clusters, including cotton bales, a steam engine, the Trans-Atlantic Cable, and an ironclad river steamboat, as well as notable early Americans such as Benjamin Franklin, Samuel F. B. Morse, and Robert Morris of Philadelphia, financier of the American Revolution.¹⁸⁶ The Greek term *apotheosis* means “to change into a God,” and while Washington stands at the center of this colossal artwork in both position and name, its impressive tribute to American enterprise makes this piece almost a collective deification of the country itself.¹⁸⁷

The *Apotheosis of Washington* could also be seen as an apotheosis of the ideal American citizen: white, male, wealthy, and land owning. The result is a form of visual silence that places on display the god-like men who embody this citizenship ideal—men, whose citizenship depended on the oppression of those rendered unseen in the apotheosis. Thus, here, visual silence functions to obscure the contributions of those early citizens who fall short of the citizenship ideal. More than merely omitting or ignoring these citizens, the visual silence of the apotheosis invokes and then elides them. Indeed, the apotheosis exhibits a selective narrative in which the nation’s founding is seen as a pinnacle moment made possible by one man’s efforts. This depiction of Washington as a god portrays the first president as a flawless being who has been bestowed with divine justification for his actions on earth. Before becoming either a war hero or the first president, Washington was one of the wealthiest men in the colonies, largely because he owned hundreds of male and female slaves.¹⁸⁸ Thus, his personal exploitation of hundreds of

African Americans, in addition to his active participation in legitimizing systemic racism through his central role in shaping the new republic, is not just ignored, but glorified. The visual silence produced by this fifteen-foot, deified depiction of Washington is overwhelming, thus, obscuring the presence of those he exploited in his past. At the time of his death, Washington was characterized as a man “raised up by Divine Providence to defend the liberties and vindicate the rights of his country,” and even, “the second Moses, leading the American Israelites out of the Briitsh [*sic*] ‘house of bondage’ into the ‘promised land’ of independence and republicanism.”¹⁸⁹ Yet, even a glimpse back at the nation’s founding documents, or a consideration of the treatment of blacks in the Revolutionary War make it clear that he was committed to defending only *some* liberties and only vindicating the rights of *some* citizens. The *Apotheosis*, then, implicitly commemorates the overt institutional racism of the country and its “founding father” by obscuring the oppressive policies and oppressed persons that were present at the nation’s founding.

Moreover, this fresco’s veneration of limited liberty and capitalistic enterprise sanctions the visual silence of those who toiled vehemently towards the new republic’s growth, yet were denied the basic rights they worked to preserve. Obscuring any portrayal of oppression or injustice, the new republic is painted as an imaginative Mt. Olympus for the country’s first president, showing Washington ascending into a palace of clouds strewn with symbols of the early United States. The fresco invokes the visualization of a fully emancipated, sovereign, and tyranny-free nation, depicting the goddesses Liberty and Freedom embracing Washington on either side, along with a fifteen-foot tall depiction of America crushing the head of tyranny. The visual silence ensuing from this victorious display encourages rotunda visitors to overlook the significant barriers to full citizenship encountered by the majority of the population from the

nation's very outset. Moreover, the heavenly display of cotton bales, a steam engine, the Trans-Atlantic Cable, and an ironclad river steamboat surrounding these glorious figures noticeably prize America's earliest innovations and financial achievements, yet visually silence the mostly-African American labor that ensured their creation. Although the centrality of enslaved African Americans to the growth of America's cotton industry is well known, African Americans, slave and free, also worked intensively on the construction, infrastructure, and operation of both the steamboat and the steam engine.¹⁹⁰ This glorification of a product and disregard for the process portrays a partial history in which technological advancement and individual economic success are valued over personal liberties and collective prosperity.

The Frieze of American History

While *The Apotheosis of Washington's* heavenly display is noticeably imaginative, the Rotunda's historical paintings appear to present an objective account of national progress. Notably, there are no African Americans represented in this artwork. This oversight, I argue, manifests visual silence by obscuring the presence of African Americans in the nation's shared history, eliding African Americans' influence throughout the country's growth from the public eye.

The *Frieze of American History*, an eight-foot tall, three-hundred-foot long relief painting depicts nineteen different scenes in US history, yet the visible absence of African Americans suggests the *Frieze of Anglo-American History* might be a more appropriate name. At the time of its commission in 1855, Capitol Engineering Captain M.C. Meigs explained to Secretary of War Jefferson Davis that the frieze would show, "[t]he gradual progress of a continent from the depths of barbarism to the height of civilization; the rude and barbarous civilization of some of

the Ante Columbian tribes; . . . the gradual advance of the white, and retreat of the red races; our own revolutionary and other struggles, with the illustration of the higher achievements of our present civilization.”¹⁹¹ In accordance with the Captain’s aims, the artists chose scenes of America’s early settlements and key battles, the arrival of Spanish explorers to the Americas, and the United States’s westward expansion. Allyn Cox completed the work in 1953 with a depiction of “The Birth of Aviation,” enabling the commemorative artwork to be displayed, as Meigs had hoped, “for future ages a monument of the present state of the arts in this country.”¹⁹² Below the *Frieze of American History* are eight, twelve-by-eighteen-foot paintings, four of which feature scenes from the American Revolution, and four of which depict events of European exploration.

The Rotunda paintings appear to commemorate Western imperialism more so than America’s history, a correlation that works to obscure memories that the country was not created solely through Anglo-American nation-building efforts. “Manifest Destiny” seems to be the frieze’s guiding theme, depicting “an Indian maiden” symbolizing “the untamed American continent,” followed by the colonists’ “taming” of the Native Americans, the early Americans’ “taming” of California and Mexico, and in the final scene, two US citizens’ “taming” of the skies.¹⁹³ The “Death of Tecumseh” scene is particularly violent, showing the Indian Chief being fatally shot amidst brutal hand-to-hand combat between the US soldiers and Indian warriors. Notably, five scenes in the frieze and four of the eight historical paintings emphasize European exploits on the American continent. This glorified portrayal of Western exploration provides a genealogy and a justification for what has been deemed the “American Paradox”—that the sovereignty of one people must come at the expense of another. Thus, the only visual depictions of non-white citizens in these paintings are those being “tamed”—effecting a silencing of their sovereignty.

While creating a comprehensive history of the nation in thirty-one scenes is understandably impossible, the choice of and manner in which US events are depicted in the Rotunda's historical artwork demonstrates a visual silence of the country's African American history. Whether the complete lack of African American representation in the thirty-one scenes composing this artistic depiction of US history was an act of benign neglect or purposeful omission, such an oversight averts observers from remembering the role African Americans played in these events, or their importance to historical events not depicted. Eric King Watts rather bluntly points to the disappointment of such an oversight, where once again, "The bright and shining semblance of 'American' again casts a long, ugly shadow over the accomplishments of African Americans."¹⁹⁴ Moreover, the frieze's presentation of US history as a linear, straightforward sequence of events serves to glorify the empowered, as Mark H. Leff observes, for the presentation of such a simplified narrative "only occurs when we leave others out of the picture."¹⁹⁵ Leaving African Americans "out of the picture" simultaneously creates space for optimistic nostalgia about America's past, and obscures memories about the enslavement and sub-par citizenship which characterized the African American experience. Watts insists that "the muting capacities that the transcendent realm generates for the material world are mediated by the disputatious activity of an African American public voice," enforcing the reality that the visual *absence* of African Americans in the heart of the nation's Capitol Building is indeed, a silencing of their historical voices.¹⁹⁶ Thus, this account of America's inception and success speaks over the grievances of those whose oppression supplied the very resources for those included in the depiction's social and political elevation.

Heroic Statuary

In contrast to the Rotunda's historical paintings, the room's statue collection features several representations of historically oppressed persons. Thus, this section of the analysis addresses how visual silence functions in light of the presence of such representations. Indeed, in addition to the obscuring function identified in the case of visual absences discussed above, visual silence functions here to discipline and marginalize representations of minorities in US history. Indeed, visual silence manifested itself in the visible discrepancy between the quality and quantity of representation in the statues of white men, and those of the historically oppressed. The following aims to demonstrate how the Rotunda's heroic depiction of ten white, male statesmen disciplines and marginalizes the representations of the three women and the single African American in the room.

Encircling the Rotunda's beige sandstone floor are ten full-bodied statues of George Washington, Abraham Lincoln, Dwight D. Eisenhower, James Garfield, Ulysses S. Grant, Andrew Jackson, Thomas Jefferson, Ronald Reagan, Gerald Ford, and Alexander Hamilton. Art historians generally classify human statuary into three categories based on height: life-size, heroic, and colossal.¹⁹⁷ Each of these ten statues is over seven feet tall, and thereby, each statesman depicted is categorized as "a heroic figure." The ten statesmen are joined by a bronze bust of Martin Luther King, Jr., the first statue of an African American to be installed in the Capitol Building. Depicting only his torso and head, the bust was initially placed in the Rotunda on a one-year probationary period in 1986, but has since remained in the Rotunda, next to the room's eastern entrance.¹⁹⁸ Busts of Elizabeth Cady Stanton, Susan B. Anthony, Lucretia Mott, and a block of unfinished marble representing the future of the Woman's Movement are part of a

sculpture known as *The Woman Movement*, a gift to the US Capitol by the National Woman's Party in 1921.¹⁹⁹

While the twentieth century additions of Martin Luther King, Jr. and the suffragists diversified the Rotunda's commemorative formations, their half-bust representations appear to have been disciplined into smaller spaces and shapes, forced to "fit into" the privileged spaces allotted for the larger-than-life depictions of their white male counterparts. Consequently, this discrepancy functions to commemoratively negate the significance of these historically-oppressed peoples' contributions to the nation's social progress. As noted, each of the white male statues featured in the rotunda has been created in "heroic" proportion, appropriate for their presence in the space Coretta Scott King called "the pantheon of national heroes" during the unveiling ceremony of her husband's sculpture.²⁰⁰ Senator Charles McC. Mathias (R-MD), Chairman of the congressional committee overseeing the sculpture's procurement echoed this designation, observed, "Martin Luther King takes his rightful place among the heroes of this nation."²⁰¹ Even though King was given his "rightful place" in this heroic room, he was given *less* space than the ten statesmen he joined, commemorated in bust rather than full statue form. Thus, King was not given the same heroic depiction as the ten statesmen he joined, a discrepancy that, through visual silence, disciplined his heroic achievements into a smaller space, signaling the smaller value of such achievements. While those with artistic expertise evaluate statuary with such various criteria as proportion, texture, technique and quality of material, artist Pierce Rice argues that with regards to public art, physical size and conspicuousness "might very well be thought of as the principal esthetic considerations," because such characteristics are most noticeable to the average observer.²⁰² Thus, even though these historically oppressed people are visualized, they are not *fully* visualized in the same way as the white statesmen, and therefore,

their voices are not *fully* recognized in comparison—rather, they are disciplined into a bit of a hush.

The lesser representation of Martin Luther King, Jr. and the suffragists is arguably a visual manifestation of racial minorities and women's lesser political representation throughout US history. Indeed, these partial representations imply an attempt to “give voice” to the nation's historically marginalized groups, but only do so in a disciplined and ultimately, marginalized manner. From the nation's inception African Americans have been denied full recognition as citizens—from the “Three-Fifths Compromise,” which literally classified them as little more than half-persons, to the 1964 Civil Rights act where black voters were still fighting racist barriers to voting, sub-par segregated public facilities, and racially-charged violence.²⁰³ Depicting Martin Luther King, Jr. from the abdomen up—about three-fifths his body size—seems unfortunately fitting in a space that purports to embody the nation's historical narrative. The upper bodies of the three suffragists emerging from a marble block epitomize their gradual, but not yet complete emergence as fully enfranchised citizens. Likewise, depicting male, white, land-owning citizens as seven-foot figures corresponds directly to their overrepresentation throughout the US political landscape.

Key in understanding how this space visually negates the significance of African American citizens in the national historical narrative is looking for the voices that have been actively prohibited from “speaking” in the building most “intimately linked with the lives of all the people of the United States.”²⁰⁴ Upon the relocation of *The Woman Movement* from its previous location in the Capitol crypt to its current location in the Rotunda, the National Political Congress of Black Women (CBW) lobbied aggressively against the move, stipulating that the likeness of Sojourner Truth be carved into the sculpture's portion of unfinished marble.²⁰⁵ CBW

Spokesperson C. Delores Tucker asserted, “We are tired of our contributions to this nation being ignored and passed over. If they insist on putting [the statue] in the Rotunda, it will be a monument of feminine racism.”²⁰⁶ While the appeal to add Truth to the monument was denied, a separate bronze bust of the African American suffragist and abolitionist was produced in 2009; however, the bust appears *not* in the Rotunda, but in the Capitol Visitor Center. Agreeing with Mandziuk’s contention that, “[w]here the commemoration is located indeed speaks as loudly as its visual appearance and the discourse that contextualizes it,” Truth’s installation in the Capitol’s public entryway, rather than its “sacred space” subordinates her role in the woman suffrage movement to those of the white women portrayed in the monument.²⁰⁷ In this case, visual silence seems to double on itself; through the disciplined representation of King and the suffragists in the space, very few members of these groups are granted “voice,” effecting a visual silencing of the unrepresented members of these minorities groups. Amplifying the marginalizing function of visual silence, Truth’s displacement resonates with visual silence’s disciplining function. Working in concert, the functions of obscuring, disciplining, and marginalizing demonstrate how visual silence is steadily at play in the hallowed spaces of the nation’s Capitol Building.

Conclusion

This examination of the visual silence of African Americans in the Rotunda reveals the Capitol’s capacity to obscure, discipline, and marginalize the nation-building efforts of the country’s oppressed citizens, perpetuating a civic myth that this nation has lived up to the egalitarian principles upon which it was founded. As Rogers Smith notes, “A *civic myth* is a myth used to explain why persons form a people, usually indicating how a political community originated, who is eligible for membership, who is not and why, and what the community’s values and aims are.”²⁰⁸ This civic myth, materialized in the Capitol’s structural design and

decoration, conceals, yet implicitly commemorates the historical integration of overt, institutional racism with American citizenship. Overt institutional racism “relies on the active and pervasive operation of anti-black attitudes and practices,” a paradigm which readily aligns itself with the early nation’s explicit belief in African Americans’ racial inferiority, and its implementation of policies which legitimized their subordination to white citizens.²⁰⁹ This clash between the Capitol’s civic myth and the nation’s historical narrative has pushed the accomplishments of African Americans, and the blatant prejudice they faced by white Americans and white institutions, into history books and historical archives, while the nation-building efforts of white men are met with overt, institutionalized, adoration in the nation’s most “sacred space.”

The visual silence of African Americans in the nation’s main public space parallels their unequal recognition as US citizens, a discrepancy which freezes the effects of this country’s overt institutional racism in time, preserving whiteness as a distinct characteristic of US citizenship. Crucial to understanding how systemic racism takes force in US society today, looking to the past is necessary, for “Historical events represent, reflect, and embed the tangible realities of everyday life,” Feagin notes, “both the means of concrete oppression and the means of symbolizing and thinking about that domination.”²¹⁰ Although the portrayal of America’s history throughout the Capitol’s neoclassical architecture and commemorative artwork attests to the persistence of such national values as freedom and democracy, the clear violation of these principles today demonstrates that the inequalities upon which this nation was founded still pose monumental consequences to African Americans. Thus, should Speaker Boehner’s desire that “the Capitol will continue to reflect our history” be granted, this national space will continue to evolve as a monument to racial injustice.²¹¹

CHAPTER 3

VISUAL SILENCE IN NATIONAL STATUARY HALL: PROTECTING SYMBOLIC RACISM

On February 27, 2013, merely weeks ago, the very first statue of an African American was unveiled at the United States Capitol Building.²¹² However, plans for this statue—of civil rights activist Rosa Parks—to be placed in National Statuary Hall have been underway since 2005. At that time, President George W. Bush signed a bill that promised the following: “To direct the Joint Committee on the Library to obtain a statue of Rosa Parks and to place the statue in the United States Capitol in National Statuary Hall, and for other purposes.”²¹³ Yet, it was not until eight years after the Congressional Act commissioned the project that the statue was officially unveiled. While the delay in placing the statue may suggest a lack of concern for Parks’s commemoration, the lag is a violation of the bill passed to commission the statue. The bill required that a statue be obtained “Not later than 2 years after the date of the enactment of this Act.”²¹⁴ Currently, there is no explanation for the delay in the placement of the statue honoring Parks. While the decision to memorialize Parks, a key figure in the fight to end public segregation, was certainly a laudable endeavor, Congress’s disinclination to enact her official commemoration in timely accordance with the legislation exemplifies what scholars have termed symbolic racism—a subtle form of systemic prejudice, still at play in the nation’s legislative practices.²¹⁵ Quick to promise but slow to enact Parks’s commemoration, Congress’s delay can be read as a tacit form of resistance to appreciating the role Parks played in securing civil rights for African Americans. If read this way, then the oversight in placing the statue in time must also

be read as a part in parcel to the federal government's ongoing, symbolic resistance to ensuring the full and speedy protection of African Americans' civil rights.

I suggest that, prior to the inclusion of the Parks statue, the exclusion of statues representing African Americans in Statuary Hall enacted a visual silence that allowed for the *visual* manifestation of symbolic racism, wherein the presences and absences of racial equality and inequality were simultaneously invoked through the Congress's governing practices concerning the collection. Through this case study, we see how visual silence works to disavow explicit acts of racism and demote the recognition of African Americans' contributions to national progress. In an effort to highlight the emergence and formation of symbolic racism in the last century, this chapter first looks to the political, social, and ideological contexts that shaped the dominant African American experience during this time. Next, this study moves forward to demonstrate how symbolic racism in the United States manifests itself materially in daily practices of citizenship, necessitating a rhetorical examination of how prejudice complicates the materiality of symbols. The analysis then turns to the specific ways that racialized understandings of citizenship are resisted and yet protected through conservative commemorative practices. To highlight these practices, the analysis offers a look at the visual silences created by Harriet Tubman's and Frederick Douglass's recent exclusion from representation in National Statuary Hall. I argue that these visual silences protect a political philosophy wherein acts of racism are explicitly deplored while anti-racist policies are viewed as unfair and unreasonable and thus, constitute a complex national space that visually, marks both acceptance of and resistance to social progress.

Racism and Citizenship in the United States

In order to demonstrate the changing forms of racial prejudice in the United States, this section addresses the quelling of overt institutional racism and the subsequent rise of symbolic racism. African Americans have been denied equal political representation throughout America's history, as many of the legal protections offered throughout the twentieth century served more or less only as token gestures of racial progress, maintaining for most African Americans a second-class form of citizenship at best. Yet, because segregation, disenfranchisement, and other forms of overt institutional racism were so engrained in the US legal system, any semblance of racial equality would ultimately be achieved through landmark actions in the form of judicial decisions, presidential executive orders, and congressional legislation.²¹⁶

In a key defeat of "Jim Crow" legislation, the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP) successfully petitioned the Supreme Court to strike down the "separate but equal" doctrine established by the court in 1896 that had legitimized racial segregation in public facilities.²¹⁷ In *Brown v. Board of Education*, the Supreme Court called for "all deliberate speed" in desegregating schools, ruling that separate was in fact *not* equal.²¹⁸ Yet, the Supreme Court refused to mandate a timeline for desegregation and instead allowed local governments to set the speed of integration, a laissez-fair strategy that allowed for the segregation struggle to continue even into the twenty-first century.²¹⁹

United States Presidents Harry Truman, John F. Kennedy, and Lyndon B. Johnson each used their presidential authority to enact new policies aimed at weakening the consequences of the country's still glaring systemic racism. In 1946, for example, Truman appointed a series of interracial committees to investigate the status of civil rights in the United States, and produced *To Secure These Rights*, a report that demanded "the elimination of segregation, based on race,

color, creed, or national origin, from American life” and sold more than a million copies.²²⁰

Truman furthered his civil rights agenda through the passage of Executive Order 9980, which instated “a policy of fair employment throughout the federal government, without discrimination because of race, color, religion, or national origin,” and Executive Order 9981, which prohibited segregation in the armed forces.²²¹ Kennedy also used his executive authority to promote non-discrimination, using the term “affirmative action” for the first time in US politics to describe the expectation that government contractors should proactively take steps to ensure that employees are treated fairly.²²² Executive Order 10925, signed by Kennedy in 1961 also established the President’s Committee on Equal Employment Opportunity, a board that conducted compliance interviews and imposed sanctions against employers when necessary.²²³ Johnson extended workplace discrimination protection efforts through the enactment of Executive Order 11246 in 1967, which prohibited considering race, religion or national origin during hiring processes.²²⁴

The passage of the Civil Rights Acts of 1957, 1964, and 1968 gave many hope for the amelioration of racism in the United States, as such legislation legally prohibited the overtly-racist “Jim Crow” laws that had been in practice since the post-Reconstruction era.²²⁵ Most importantly, the bill passed in 1964 not only prohibited discrimination and segregation in voting, education, and public facilities, but it also established the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission in order to enforce employers’ adherence to federal regulations.²²⁶ Additionally, the Voting Rights Act of 1965 outlawed poll taxes, literacy tests, and other bureaucratic restrictions that some state and local governments used to deny African American citizens the right to vote.²²⁷ Just three years later, the number of black voters rose by 250,000, and composed a black electorate three times greater than its size in 1964.²²⁸

Beyond the scope of government intervention, grassroots movements played a significant role in breaking down overt institutional racism. Notably, Rosa Parks's refusal to yield her seat on a public bus to a white man in 1955 led to a city-wide boycott of the Montgomery bus system in condemnation of their enforced segregation policies.²²⁹ Civil disobedience was a principle strategy in the Civil Rights Movement, demonstrated in part by "The Greensboro Four" and the "Student Sit-In Movement," where collegiate African Americans decidedly occupied "whites only" lunch counters at diners across the country.²³⁰ In perhaps the most remarkable demonstration of grass-roots activism, the March on Washington for Jobs and Freedom in 1963 brought between 200,000-300,000 civil and economic rights advocates to the National Mall, and is largely credited with the eventual passage of the 1964 Civil Rights Act and the 1965 Voting Rights Act.²³¹ In short, the Civil Rights Movement of the 1960s was a time, as Edward P. Morgan notes, where "an American populace finally awakened to the grotesque nature of Jim Crow," and through the joint efforts of litigation, legislation, and grass-roots activism, helped diminish the cruel, far-reaching effects of institutional racism.²³²

Symbolic Racism and Rhetoric

Although African Americans won many political victories in the 1960s, it would be an understatement to say they still faced substantial disadvantages even at the turn of the twenty-first century. Sociologists have termed *symbolic racism* the significant prejudice against African Americans still present among citizens and subtly embedded in government policies. "Symbolic Racism," as Melinda Jones defines it, is "an abstract, ideological resentment toward Blacks as a group, rather than toward particular individuals."²³³ Closely related to the term "modern racism," psychologists David O. Sears and P.J. Henry maintain that symbolic racism, "embodies four

specific themes: the beliefs that (a) Blacks no longer face much prejudice or discrimination, (b) Blacks' failure to progress results from their unwillingness to work hard enough, (c) Blacks are demanding too much too fast, and (d) Blacks have gotten more than they deserve."²³⁴ Moreover, this belief system not only assumes that black citizens receive preferential treatment in society, but that they do so at the expense of white citizens.²³⁵

While symbolic racism has primarily been theorized within the fields of psychology and sociology, this subtle, systemic prejudice calls for rhetorical examination in order to understand how this belief system both shapes and is shaped by the political, social, and material realities of a time. Sears and Henry explain: "The term *symbolic* highlights both symbolic racism's targeting Blacks as an abstract collectivity rather than specific Black individuals and its presumed roots in abstract moral values rather than concrete self-interest or personal experience."²³⁶ While Sears and Henry describe discrimination's root in "abstract values" and its target of an "abstract collectivity," it's also important to examine the rhetorical force of symbolically-racist discourse in the concrete ramifications of public expression. Thus, this analysis examines the rhetoric of symbolic racism in order to better explicate the reciprocal relationship of influence between symbolic attitude, and visible and material consequences. Such an examination allows for the recognition of discrimination's cyclical nature—that symbolically racist policies further the belief that African Americans are perpetual outsiders—a status ensured by the processes that force them into lower economic classes and exclude them from universities. As a result, African Americans' exclusion from mainstream society fortifies a belief among whites that African Americans are disinterested and incapable of participating in US public life, which in turn, reinforces anti-black policies and public discourse. Thus, rhetorical deployments of symbolic racism make concrete and visible the values and attitudes of symbolic racism.

Evidence of symbolic racism's material consequences is largely visible in both white citizens' resistance to racially targeted policy proposals, as well as government-enacted legislation, which often covertly, yet disproportionately, generates negative repercussions for the African American populous. One clear example of white opposition to political attempts at racial reconciliation is the persisting battle against affirmative action policies. Often described by whites as "reverse discrimination," most citizens who resist such policies do so under the belief that giving any degree of preference to African Americans for jobs, promotions, or college admission "gives blacks advantages they haven't earned."²³⁷ In 1996, California passed Proposition 209, which effectively prohibited the consideration of race in admissions for state colleges and universities, concurrently decreasing the enrollment of African Americans in higher education across the state.²³⁸ Washington and Texas followed suit, and now in 2013 the US Supreme Court is currently in the midst of deciding whether or not to implement a national prohibition on affirmative action.²³⁹ In another example of symbolic racism in the US education system, public support for busing to ensure integration in schools held the support of forty-two percent of whites in the 1960s, but dropped to only twenty-five percent in the 1970s.²⁴⁰ Resistance to proactive policies to ensure equal access to education has grown, as a recent study by the Harvard Civil Rights Project found that schools were more segregated in 2000 than in 1970, when busing for desegregation first began.²⁴¹ Thus, Jones's observation that "Many white Americans *endorse equal rights*, but do not necessarily endorse governmental policies aimed at providing *equal opportunity*" pinpoints the sizeable hurdle yet to be cleared by advocates for racial equality.²⁴²

National opposition to economic assistance legislation has severely impaired many lower and working class African Americans from escaping impoverished living conditions, subjecting

many African Americans to severe health problems and other discernible consequences of such abstract values as individualism and what is commonly thought of as a “Protestant work ethic.”²⁴³ Since 1965, for example, black unemployment has consistently been at least twice as high as white unemployment.²⁴⁴ In an effort to gain public support for his proposal to cut down federal unemployment aid, President Ronald Reagan frequently spoke about the “Welfare Queen,” a highly gendered and racialized depiction that described a South-Side Chicago mother who supposedly drove a Cadillac and lived a life of extravagance funded by America’s welfare system.²⁴⁵ This stands in stark contrast to the reality that Reagan’s campaign to “end government handouts,” cut funding for Medicaid, food stamps, student loans, unemployment compensation, child nutrition assistance, and Aid to Families with Dependent Children actually led to a massive increase in both the size and population of metropolitan ghettos between 1980 and 1990, with minorities representing seven out of eight residents in the nation’s most impoverished communities.²⁴⁶ Life in these disparate conditions, the exceedingly high black unemployment rate (disqualifying them from employer-based healthcare), and the denial of government-funded healthcare are significant factors shaping the reality that African Americans are at a considerably greater risk for almost every major disease in the United States.²⁴⁷ Thus, the lived consequences of symbolic racism are noticeably apparent throughout US society, despite claims to the end of race-based discrimination.

Symbolic Racism in Statuary Hall

In order to understand how tenets of symbolic racism manifest in commemorative formations, the following examines the politics of memorialization at play in National Statuary Hall. Key to this analysis is an understanding of how the hall came to be and its governing

policies of inclusion. Representative Justin S. Morrill (R-VT) proposed the idea of a national statue collection after the construction of the present House wing was completed in 1857, and what came to be known as the “Old House Chamber” was left vacant.²⁴⁸ In endorsement of Morrill’s proposal, Representative Charles Schirm (R-MD) called for states to “send the effigies of two of her chosen sons to be placed permanently in the National Statuary Hall.”²⁴⁹ Morrill’s proposal became law on July 2, 1864. It provided that:

the President is hereby authorized to invite each and all the States to provide and furnish statues, in marble or bronze, not exceeding two in number for each State, of deceased persons who have been citizens thereof, and illustrious for their historic renown or for distinguished civic or military services such as each State may deem to be worthy of this national commemoration.²⁵⁰

Thus, state governments began commissioning statues, starting with Rhode Island’s contribution of American Revolutionary War General Nathanael Greene in 1870.²⁵¹ While the collection was initially completed in 2005 with New Mexico’s contribution of their second statue, a bill passed in 2003 granted states the ability to petition Congress “to approve the replacement of a statue” if the Governor of the state and its legislature sanction the switch.²⁵² As of now, six states have replaced their original statues.²⁵³

Undertaking a rhetorical examination of the visual silence at play in Statuary Hall, I now turn to the discourses surrounding the exclusion of Harriet Tubman’s and Frederick Douglass’s statues. Helping us to better understand how symbolic racism is enmeshed with US citizenship ideals, I examine the legislative debates, the text of the commemorative legislation, and the public’s response to the proposed commemorations of Tubman and Douglass. Indeed, this analysis shows how the nation’s commemorative regulations protect a political philosophy

rooted in systemic prejudice and manifest a national space seemingly accepting of yet also resistant to social progress. Thus, this instantiation of visual silence is one of disavowal and demotion.

Disavowal

While advocates for the addition of Harriet Tubman and Frederick Douglass to Statuary Hall faced slightly different legislative roadblocks, both of their failed attempts were owed to a political philosophy rooted in the “abstract values” embedded in symbolic racism: the fear of growing black exceptionalism, and the glorification of individualism and the “Protestant work ethic.”²⁵⁴ These “abstract values” were safeguarded through claims that modifications to state and national commemorative policies were both unfair and unreasonable, allowing for the disavowal of overt discrimination. Thus, as a form of visual silence, the acceptance and rejection of Tubman’s and Douglass’s statues worked as both a consideration and rejection of non-Anglo American values.

To begin, the deliberations over and ultimate exclusion of Tubman’s statue invoked the tensions between the presence and absence of African Americans in the national imaginary, owed to the persistent fear that black citizens are now given preference over white citizens in US society.²⁵⁵ In 2011, Maryland state Delegate Susan Lee (D-Montgomery) and state Senator Catherine Pugh (D-Baltimore), chairwomen of the women’s and black caucuses, proposed a bill to replace a statue of American revolutionary John Hanson in the Statuary Hall with one of abolitionist Harriet Tubman.²⁵⁶ However, efforts to acquire a space in the collection largely failed not because Tubman was declared undeserving of such an honor, but because those opposing her installation saw it as an undeserved penalty against Hanson. Circuit Court Judge John Hanson Briscoe, a descendant of Hanson himself, fiercely opposed the measure, arguing, “Under no

circumstances would [the statue's removal] be appropriate . . . like John Hanson did something wrong and doesn't belong there."²⁵⁷ Further, he insisted that the bill's authors were "very dismissive" of Hanson and his historical significance.²⁵⁸ Senate President Thomas V. "Mike" Miller, Jr., (D-Calvert & Prince George's), also a descendent of Hanson, echoed the inappropriateness of the proposal, calling the addition of Tubman "at Hanson's expense" to be "unacceptable."²⁵⁹ Miller told the Senate body: "John Hanson was a great patriot and an important part of Maryland's history and of America's history. He needs to be honored, not removed."²⁶⁰ Proponents in favor of the statue swap argued that Hanson had been in Statuary Hall for over one hundred years, that Tubman is irrefutably more well-known than Hanson, and that Maryland's other statuary representative is also a white, male, revolutionary figure—and the largest slaveowner in US history.²⁶¹ Yet, rather than taking advantage of an opportunity to put forth the very first statue of an African American, the first enslaved person, and only the tenth woman in the collection, top leadership in the Maryland legislature depicted such an act as unjust punishment of another US politician. These discourses, working to deem an abolitionist woman worthy of commemoration, called Tubman into being, making present values of a history of social progress and strides toward racial equality. Simultaneously, the rejection of Tubman's statue created an absence of these values, marked by the ongoing presence of Hanson's statue and the hauntings of Tubman's statue. In this sense, visual silence worked to disturb the whiteness of the state's consistently-white statuary delegation, yet disavow the need to amend its appearance.

The legislators abstained from acknowledging the exclusionary nature of their commemorative regulations, disavowing responsibility for the discriminatory consequences of such legislation. This protective stance created space for both the actualization of symbolic

racism through governmental guidelines, and also the visualization of such discrimination through the state's commemorative formations. Falling short of support in both legislative houses, Maryland's delegates instead passed a new version of the bill with a significant amendment, making the federal, rather than the state government accountable for Tubman's commemoration. The amendment "respectfully request[ed] that an exception be made to allow the State of Maryland to place a third statue in the National Statuary Hall Collection," included admirable, biographical descriptions about the state's two current representatives, Charles Carroll and John Hanson, and reinforced the importance of "the statues honoring two men who risked their lives and fortunes to support and advocate for our nation's independence."²⁶² Additionally, the amendment informed readers, "The State of Maryland is a place of rich and diverse history," and indicated that the third statue would be of "Harriet Tubman, an African American woman" (that the two current statues were of white men was not mentioned).²⁶³ Thus, the senate's amendment allowed the state to endorse the importance of Tubman's commemoration without having to actually ensure its execution. In fact, it never *was* executed—the statue of Tubman was never added to the collection. Political Scientist John B. McConahay noted that with the conclusion of the Jim Crow Era came a growing belief among white Americans that "discrimination is a thing of the past, blacks are pushing too hard, they are getting too much attention and sympathy from the nation's elites and that blacks' gains and demands are no longer justified."²⁶⁴ Thus, by leaving the commemoration of Tubman in the hands of the federal government, the state legislators were able to abstain from giving into the black and women's caucus members "gains and demands," while still appearing to disavow the discrimination of the past. Maryland's legislative disavowal of Tubman functionally endorsed the visual silence pervading National Statuary Hall by refusing to consider modifications to the collection that would assist in repealing the negation of those voices that cannot be attributed to a white, male body. The

amendment to Senate bill 351 was less than a compromise—it effectively sent Harriet Tubman’s journey to Statuary Hall down a road to nowhere, hoping for a federal search-and-rescue mission that would never arrive.

The Tubman statue’s rejection from Statuary Hall not only points to the ways that the commemorative guidelines protected symbolically-racist values, but the statue’s rejection also functioned to protect the visual silence at play in Statuary Hall, apparent in the collection’s consistent display of historically-privileged persons, and disavowal of underprivileged citizens. Keen to provide an alternate solution to the replacement of John Hanson, Miller proposed that “a special category should be established in Statuary Hall for women and blacks who were not considered when states first were invited to contribute statues in 1864.”²⁶⁵ Miller’s suggestion that an additional category be created in Statuary Hall for “women and blacks” who were not eligible for commemoration upon the collection’s 1864 establishment is little more than a proposition of “separate but equal,” in that these citizens are denied the same citizenship as their white male counterparts, and instead offered a disconnected, hypothetical equivalent. Such an instance of visual silence affirmed the emblematic weight of visualizing “an African American woman,” yet recoiled from the opportunity to voice her symbolic magnitude. Calling Tubman and these “other” historically oppressed citizens to be commemorated presumes the recognition of gendered and raced struggle, while the suggested separation instantaneously resists the merging of such perspectives with the national narrative.

The forms of symbolic racism in this commemorative dilemma take root not in what the Maryland state legislature explicitly commissioned, but in its disavowal of accountability in the enactment of Tubman’s commemoration. Recognizing, then, that the probability of the federal government granting Maryland a third space in Statuary Hall was slim at best, Tubman’s

supporters successfully advocated for a bill that would allow the state to “request the United States Congress to place the statue in Emancipation Hall in the U.S. Capitol Building Visitor Center or another appropriate federal property located in Washington, D.C.”²⁶⁶ Thus, if the US Congress accepts the state’s proposal, “A gift of a Harriet Tubman statue from the citizens of Maryland to the people of the United States” would be presented, giving the federal legislators full discretion regarding the statue’s placement.²⁶⁷ Although the bill was passed by Maryland’s legislature and given on behalf of the state’s citizens, the proposal specifically declared that the state government would make no financial contribution to this project; the statue of Tubman would be entirely commissioned using “private funds” from donations by individuals and organizations.²⁶⁸ It appears that the legislators were not overtly opposed to having a statue of Tubman representing their state in the national Capitol, as long as her representation did not force a change in the status quo, or require them to take financial or logistical responsibility. Discrimination in this case takes form not through what the legislators *have* done, but through what they have left undone—an instance of symbolic racism in which there is a discrepancy between what is explicitly stated and what is materially manifested. This discrepancy produces an environment of visual silence through the tension between the citizens that *are* recognized through these commemorative formations, and those citizens who, although suitable for such commemoration, are hidden from view in bureaucratic disputes.

In a storyline that is both foreign and familiar, the rejection of Frederick Douglass’s statue from National Statuary Hall is yet another case of an African American citizen being considered and then disavowed representation in the nation’s most elite statue collection. Unlike Tubman, however, the consideration of Douglass’s statue was swiftly shut down by congressional vote. Douglass’s rejection from Statuary Hall was not just the simple disregard for

a statue, rather, it provoked fear among Congressional representatives that such a “symbolic victory” would lead to change in Washington, DC’s political representation.²⁶⁹ Thus, this prevention of a “symbolic victory,” provoked by the proposal to include a statue of a prominent African American activist, protected the symbolic racism embedded in the inequities of the nation’s electoral system, elucidating the ways in which visual silence simultaneously invokes and conceals notions of racial equality.

Affirming that commemoration is more than mere aesthetics, members of congress openly expressed fear that granting Washington, DC representation in National Statuary Hall would be used as justification for granting the district full representation in both the House of Representatives and the Senate—highlighting the political wrangling that works to effect visual silence. Leading the opposition, Representative Dan Lungren (R-CA), top Republican on the House Administration Committee, complained that DC’s statuary proposal “tries to show that there is an equality between the District of Columbia and the other states,” and that the proposal would thereby be setting a precedent for it to gain voting rights in the House, two senators, or even statehood.²⁷⁰ With a population of almost one hundred thousand more than Wyoming’s, the country’s least populated state, the District is home to residents and businesses that paid \$19.6 billion in federal taxes in 2011—more than those collected from nineteen states each, and the highest federal taxes per capita.²⁷¹ Yet, with only one, non-voting delegate in the House, the District is unable to actively engage the decision-making body that maintains ultimate legislative control over their city management. District residents, in this instance, are visually silenced—entertaining guests in a home where they cannot actually envisage themselves. In the same way that Washington, DC’s 600,000 citizens are disavowed a political voice in the nation’s most

influential legislative body, they are denied a visual voice in the nation's most influential statue collection.

I suggest that in disavowing Washington, DC's statutory delegate, the federal government was able to protect the racialized and classed hierarchy that so clearly defines District-Congressional relations without explicitly acknowledging that such a hierarchy exists, or making efforts to ameliorate the discriminatory consequences of this division. The District's top 5 percent of households, which are predominately white, make an average of \$473,000 a year, while the virtually all black, bottom 20 percent of households take in less than \$10,000 a year.²⁷² While joblessness for white district residents is nearly nonexistent, black unemployment rates have recently soared as high as thirty percent.²⁷³ Moreover, nearly 7,000 black children in the District are being housed in juvenile correctional facilities, while almost half of all black students in the district do not graduate from high school.²⁷⁴ As Courtland Milloy, a local DC writer, noted, "The two groups might as well be living in different worlds."²⁷⁵ Yet, the absence of Douglass's statue, or until recently, *any* African American in Statuary Hall provided for only one of these worlds to be visible. Douglass himself argued that poverty was—and remains—African Americans' "greatest enemy. . . the very condition which makes us a helpless, hopeless, dependent and dispirited people, the target for the contempt and scorn of all around us."²⁷⁶ Because Douglass stands as an emblem of the intense efforts required to break down the nation's racial divide and the lived consequences of society's discriminatory attitudes, commemorating his life inside the same space that governs this impoverished, predominately black community would only stand to visually heighten the hypocrisy of the liberty-granting institution. Thus, Congress's decision to disavow the Douglass statue from Statuary Hall protected the symbolic racism inherent in the racialized social conditions plaguing the District over which Congress

holds ultimate authority. The invisibility of Douglass, and thereby of ongoing racial struggle, from national remembrance allowed for the continued silencing of the present social injustices plaguing African Americans in the District community.

Already constructed at the time of its disavowal, the Douglass statue was conciliatorily placed on alternate District grounds in 2008, evincing a form of visual silence, wherein the figure's presence in one place derived from its absence in another.²⁷⁷ Congressional Delegate Eleanor Holmes Norton (D-DC) has spearheaded efforts for the statue's admittance to National Statuary Hall since 2002.²⁷⁸ Although three separate bills advocating for such an addition have been rejected, President Barack Obama signed a bill in September 2012 authorizing the Douglass statue's eventual display not in Statuary Hall, but in "a suitable location in the Capitol."²⁷⁹ Less than a mile from the Capitol Building, the seven-foot statue of Frederick Douglass currently awaits transportation to its "suitable" home in the Capitol Visitor Center (CVC).²⁸⁰ While the bill blocking Douglass's display provides him with a space in the federal building, it is not what Norton, the District, or the statue's other congressional advocates asked for, nor what they feel they deserve. After the bill's passage, local political writer Mark Plotkin remarked, "We have to take what we can get," while Norton commented, "we need to seize whatever rights we can, when we can, and pick up the rest when we can."²⁸¹ Forced to compromise, the District community was denied equal visibility in Statuary Hall, and thereby denied equal participation in the collection's legacy of citizens. Framing the exclusion of Douglass as a proper placement elsewhere elicits a visual silence of the community's perceived rights, demonstrating how discriminatory attitudes are able to exist, yet evade exposure—a rhetorical act of protection for the governing body of the collection. Although the bill did not explicitly relegate the district's Capitol representation to a less prestigious location, nor did it prohibit the commemoration of

African Americans in Statuary Hall, the resulting circumstances were the same as if the bill *had* been so explicit. Just as seemingly non-racial barriers to voting, such as poll taxes, literacy tests, and voter ID cards have disparately denied African Americans the right to vote, such seemingly non-racial barriers to allowing Frederick Douglass to join National Statuary Hall as voting rights or potential statehood kept African Americans from visually marking and speaking to the national narrative in Statuary Hall.

The visual silence at play in the exclusion of both the Tubman and Douglass statues has allowed both federal and state governments to disavow the nation's racist past and present. Excluding the Douglass and Tubman statues on the grounds that such additions violate traditional commemoration laws protected these governmental bodies from grappling with the more serious issues of race and gender at play in these controversies. Because both race and gender are two categories of citizenship that are typically thought of as visually marked, the government took great pains to prevent Tubman and Douglass's visualization, for once these citizens are visualized, their narratives are hard to ignore. Looking to the beliefs circulated by central government is key, for as Martin Luther King, Jr., aptly observed, "the habits, if not the hearts, of people are being altered every day by Federal action."²⁸²

Demotion

The debates over Frederick Douglass's and Harriet Tubman's statues have not only barred Douglass and Tubman from visual representation, but they have demoted conversations about race in the national Capitol. Yet, if we take seriously Roseann Mandziuk's observation that the "the commemoration of events or figures from the past mediates public values and contains markers of cultural clash over significant issues such as race and gender," it becomes apparent

that the legislative bodies' theoretical support for, but refusal to enact the improvement of the space Norton has called a "diversity embarrassment" stands as a refusal to recognize the discrimination materialized in the nation's commemorative formations.²⁸³ Thus, this section looks to how the Statuary Hall display and the demotion of Douglass and Tubman to the CVC contribute to the manifestation of both a racial and spatial hierarchy in the building. In the most recent chapter of both the Tubman and the Douglass commemoration sagas, these African American citizens have been demoted from the Capitol's most prestigious place to its entryway exhibits. Both statues were denied official acceptance in the Statuary Hall collection, and while Douglass has at least been granted space in the CVC, Maryland's proposal to donate a statue of Tubman for the CVC, "or another appropriate federal property," has yet to be reviewed by Congress.²⁸⁴

When comparing the function, history, and appearance of Statuary Hall and the CVC, it becomes readily apparent that all space in the national capitol is *not* created equal, suggesting that the statues' promised presence in the latter space is as unseemly as their absence in the former. While Statuary Hall serves as the connecting room between the Rotunda and the new House Chamber and is frequently used as a formal dining room for special State events, the CVC serves as a security checkpoint and information hub for tourists before they enter the main building.²⁸⁵ Statuary Hall has hosted this exclusive statue collection for over two hundred years, and as the Capitol's preliminary House Chamber, is the former workspace of eight representatives who later served as President.²⁸⁶ In contrast, the CVC was completed in 2008, boasting the most extensive expansion of the United States Capitol and the largest cafeteria in Washington, DC.²⁸⁷ Statuary Hall arguably also surpasses the CVC in visual grandeur, featuring twenty-six variegated marble pillars, a ceiling covered in three-dimensional gold leaf rosettes,

and a floor of black and white marble tiles. While the CVC is certainly impressive in its size, massive skylights, and sandstone structure, its primary purpose as a “holding tank” for Capitol visitors has also warranted the inclusion of two gift shops, two information desks, two coat checks, restrooms, and the celebrated cafeteria. The noted difference in environments fostered by these two spaces advances an examination of how the visual silence created by the government’s demotion of Douglass and Tubman’s presence to the CVC, and the figures’ concurrent absence from the Statuary Hall collection, manifests a space that secures notability as a predominately Anglo-American trait.

While it has been made apparent how racial hierarchy in the United States has been manifested in legislation, litigation, and lived experiences, the commemorative division between the CVC and Statuary Hall shows how this hierarchy has been manifested *visually*. Statuary Hall’s standing as a place of privilege is reinforced by the commemorative statues that fill the room, while the room’s grandeur simultaneously enhances the elite status of those persons portrayed. Although the Hall originally hosted the entire statue collection, it now contains just thirty-five statues, most of which have been in the room since its inception. Because this prized collection in Statuary Hall does not look drastically different than when the collection “of chosen sons” began in 1864, the room is largely a tribute to the nation’s earliest, white, male citizens.²⁸⁸ After the Old House Chamber reached maximum capacity in 1933, and newer states procured additional statues (including five Native Americans, one Hispanic American, and one Pacific Islander), the new figures were placed elsewhere in the Capitol, the newest of which are located in the CVC.²⁸⁹ It appears that Congress’s unwillingness to alter Statuary Hall for either Douglass or Tubman is consistent with their demonstrated attempts to conserve this collection’s original composition. Through such conservation efforts, Congress inadvertently maintains a visualized

racial hierarchy in the Capitol. On the building's upper floor, an almost entirely white delegation of citizens is commemorated adjacent to an equally white body of national legislators, while most of the notable non-white citizens commemorated are literally underground, keeping tourists company while they wait to enter the official Capitol building. Moreover, prior to the addition of Parks just this year, the only two African Americans seeking membership in the collection have had to petition for permission just to share the same space as the Capitol's cafeteria and coat check.

Rosalyn Deutsche aptly notes, "space is . . . political, inseparable from the conflictual and uneven social relations that structure specific societies at specific historical moments."²⁹⁰ Looking then to the political consequences of this stratified statue collection, the governing body's fear of social progress becomes readily apparent in their demotion of the Tubman and Douglass figures, with the statues thereby serving as strongholds of the symbolic racism still actively present at the turn of the twenty-first century. The complete absence, before just this year, of African Americans from the collection, and the concentration of white Americans in Old House Chamber appear to be visual manifestations of "the belief by whites that blacks violate traditional U.S. values and thus do not deserve any special help,"—what Hughes points to as a chief tenet of symbolic racism.²⁹¹ The majority of men commemorated in the Statue collection are political and elite military generals, two vocations that, for much of American history, have been inaccessible to African Americans. Yet, now that groups of citizens are making efforts to incorporate African Americans into the United States's visual history, the government is reluctant to modify the collection, or to "help" African Americans of "historic renown" be recognized.

The visual silence that persists through Tubman's and Douglass's demotion from the Statuary Hall collection to the CVC manifests a homogenous understanding of US citizenship, but more importantly, it hinders both politicians and the public from recognizing the significance of these individuals' efforts to advance the country's social progress. Without the portrayal of Tubman or Douglass in Statuary Hall, the collection makes no reference to the enslaved population of the United States, thereby silencing the momentous role this shameful practice held in shaping the nation, or the courage of the individuals who fought to end slavery and secure a form of citizenship rooted in "the blessings of liberty" promised in the Constitution.²⁹² Although born a slave, Douglass escaped and became a newspaper editor, statesman, and eventually, the country's first black vice presidential candidate. The bronze, bearded and broad-shouldered statue of Douglass shows the orator clutching his renowned speech, "What to the Slave is the Fourth of July?", an oration during which he answers his titled question: "Bombast, fraud, deception, impiety[;] . . . a thin veil to cover up crimes which would disgrace a nation of savages."²⁹³ Douglass's statue represents a willingness to resist social norms and challenge malevolent authority, and although such values have been a part of the American story since the Revolutionary War, their rejection, along with Douglass, from Statuary Hall, pushes them out of a place of honor and away from public acknowledgement. Harriet Tubman was also born a slave, yet after she escaped to Pennsylvania, she returned to the South over nineteen times to help more than three hundred other slaves achieve freedom.²⁹⁴ Tubman's dedication to ensuring the prosperity of not only herself, but of her fellow enslaved Americans spoke to social interdependence and communal welfare. Rather than presenting a public, enduring, tangible representation of Tubman's contribution to ensuring the "Life, Liberty, and the pursuit of Happiness" of her fellow citizens, the US Senate wrote a Resolution, "Honoring the life,

heroism, and service of Harriet Tubman.”²⁹⁵ Although commendable, the commemoration provided by the words of the Resolution is a considerable demotion of Tubman’s legacy compared to the public recognition manifested in the statue collection. For while the nine cosponsors of this legislation may have viewed the statement as an honor, it is unlikely that any significant portion of the population, or even the rest of the Senate body, has read the full resolution, thereby unable to participate in her commemoration.²⁹⁶ The millions of tourists who pass through the Capitol each year, and the 535 members of Congress and their staff who walk through Statuary Hall on a daily basis are unlikely to look for what is missing; rather, they are likely to make a judgment about what they *can* see—a host of white, male citizens applauded for their nation building efforts.²⁹⁷ Because these narratives of government resistance run counter to the epideictic function of a congressionally-controlled commemorative collection, the visual silence marking Statuary Hall assists in preserving homogenous, conservative, and submissive notions of citizenship. Consequentially, the absence of African American statues in the collection is a public silencing of the African American experience, of African American achievements, and of the way African Americans have consistently shaped the evolving state of the nation. Further, the presence of Parks, and the anticipated presence of Douglass, work to amplify the voice of these silences; as the delay, disavowal and demotion of their placement worked to squelch the honor, prestige, and recognition of their contributions to the nation-state.

Conclusion

On February 23rd, 2013, the new Rosa Parks statue was unveiled in Statuary Hall, reminding Capitol visitors and resident politicians that although Congress has been resistant to change in the past, such transformations are not impossible. A national symbol of civic

disobedience, her statue in Statuary Hall contributes the possibility that the presence of symbolic racism in Statuary Hall, might not always be “set in stone.” This investigation has lent itself to understanding how the delay, disavowal and demotion of African American commemoration functioned to protect the visual silence at work in the statue collection, revealing that since the nation’s inception, racism does not appear to have decreased, but rather changed form.

Understanding, then, racism’s shape-shifting form, we must also be cautious moving into the future, recognizing, as Victoria Gallagher has, that “No single monument can fill in the gaps of the memory and history of African Americans and racial relations in the United States.”²⁹⁸ Thus, while the presence of Parks helps to fill what is undeniably a colossal gap in the Capitol’s commemoration of African Americans, it simultaneously invokes an absence, owed to the structural barriers that allowed for the visual silence of these citizens in the first place are still, as this chapter has demonstrated, largely at work in the governmental guardians of the collection.

CHAPTER 4

VISUAL SILENCE IN THE MARTIN LUTHER KING, JR. MEMORIAL: DISCERNING POSTRACIALISM

The Memorial Foundation was established in 2011 with the vision of creating a national memorial for Martin Luther King, Jr. that “would be more than simply a monument, but rather a living memorial and space where people from all walks of life can visit and be inspired to live a life based on the principles of Democracy, Justice, Love, and Hope.”²⁹⁹ The Martin Luther King, Jr. (MLK) Memorial’s opening a year later would assure the Foundation that their efforts were not in vain—the four-acre commemorative space—made up almost entirely of white granite—on the Tidal Basin is, as this chapter contends, certainly more than a monument.³⁰⁰ Many commented that the mere construction of this memorial was more evidence of the nation’s racial progress than they ever thought they would see in their lifetime.³⁰¹ People came from all over the world to marvel at the three-story tall statue of the only African American man commemorated on the National Mall.³⁰² A host of civil rights activists spoke at the memorial’s opening, followed by a twenty minute address by President Barack Obama, in which he both praised the long-awaited commemoration of King, but also spoke poignantly about what he thought the civil rights leader would think about the current state of the nation. Quickly after the memorial’s erection, however, criticism surfaced, most notably from Maya Angelou, regarding the statue’s colossal budget, construction, and design.

This chapter investigates how the MLK Memorial instantiates a concrete visualization of the state of race relations at present in the United States, suggesting that this depiction of King

performs a visual silence of the active role racial difference still plays in characterizing citizenship, and entrenches the belief in what has been labeled a postracial American society. Because the country is currently in the midst of what has been termed a “postracial age,” and the MLK Memorial is still undergoing significant changes, a conclusive analysis at this moment would be challenging and perhaps problematic. Thus, this chapter does not function as an analysis in the ways the previous two chapters have, but rather, explores the relationship between visual silence and the MLK Memorial as a way to inquire into the ongoing issues regarding race in America, looking particularly at this idea of postracialism. As a way of organizing this current and ongoing conversation, I pose the following questions about postracialism generally and the MLK memorial specifically: *What is postracialism and how does it relate to the institutional and symbolic forms of racism previously discussed? How does postracialism shape the nation’s memory of King? How does the visual silence at play in the MLK Memorial commemorate the postracial ideal? What can the visual silence of the MLK Memorial tell us about postracialism’s particular instantiation of racism?*

The Postracial Age: Have We Arrived?

While the belief that racism is no longer a significant social problem in the United States has grown since the passage of the 1964 Civil Rights Act, the election of President Barack Obama in 2008 has expedited the growth of this ideological trend.³⁰³ Postracialism, then, assumes that significant racial progress has segued the country into an age where race is no longer a salient issue.³⁰⁴ A term often conflated with “postracism,” postracialism also refers to the shared understanding that racial identification in the twenty-first century has become obsolete.³⁰⁵ Sumi Cho observes that this “retreat from race” generally takes three forms: (1)

“Material, as the retreat from state-imposed remedies;” (2) “sociocultural, as the retreat from white liberal/progressive deference to Black normativity on the meaning of racial equality and justice;” and, (3) “political, as the retreat from collective political entities organized along racial lines and agendas as a legitimate protest or reform vehicle.”³⁰⁶ Michael Eric Dyson uses the term “racial amnesia” to describe this belief shared by dominant society that racial struggle has come to an end, and that acknowledging race as a factor in either an individual or a collective’s achievement has become obsolete.³⁰⁷ Postracialism, then, values some semblance of “racial equality” above racial justice.³⁰⁸

The “postracial ideal” is rooted in the belief that a society free of racial discrimination would be one that does not acknowledge any racial distinctions, an idea often conflated with the attainment of a “colorblind society.”³⁰⁹ While the “postracial ideal” of racial colorblindness originated in discourse produced during post-World War II civil rights movements, Howard Winant notes that such racial conceptions are capable of becoming “detached from the political contexts and practices that created them, and linked to quite different and sometimes opposing organizations and structures.”³¹⁰ Thus, anti-affirmative action groups and neoconservatives have at times broadcasted aspirations of a colorblind society, often while blocking civil rights legislation or policies aimed at racial reconciliation.³¹¹

Throughout mainstream discourse, Martin Luther King, Jr. has become almost synonymous with the postracial ideal. His “dream” of a nation where his children “aren’t judged by the color of their skin” is frequently appropriated to mean the disregard of race-based categorization, and the effects of such widespread classification on social relations.³¹² Dyson observes that King has become “the patron-saint of colorblind policies,” prompting citizens to embrace the leader’s desire for racial harmony with such fervor that his equal desire for black

solidarity and advancement is more or less forgotten.³¹³ Kristen Hoerl calls this substitution of King for the entirety of the civil rights movement the “King-as-synecdoche” phenomenon, observing that references to King’s 1963 speech are often used to support the idea that “race should no longer be considered to evaluate the justice of America’s primary institutions.”³¹⁴

Many Americans voiced the belief that the country had finally broken free from its history of racial struggle on November 4, 2008, when the nation elected its first African American president. President Barack Obama’s election was depicted by numerous news sources as the realization of Martin Luther King, Jr.’s dream, and proof that racism was no longer a barrier to the personal success of American citizens.³¹⁵ Rap artist Wyclef Jean succinctly described Obama’s election as the ultimate achievement of the postracial ideal when he spoke on behalf of this generation, telling *CNN* reporters on inauguration day, “We don’t believe in racism. You know, we don’t believe in color.”³¹⁶ Weeks after the election, Multi-media International published a special edition magazine titled *Obama: The Dream Fulfilled*, and distributed the one-hundred-page booklet in Wal-Marts, grocery stores, CVS pharmacies, and Barnes and Noble bookstores across the country.³¹⁷ The magazine’s opening statement proclaimed:

With the election of the United States’ first black president in Barack Obama, it’s clear that the Dream of Dr. King has come a long way. While bigotry and ignorance may still exist, America has now, more than ever before, perhaps faster than anyone thought, fulfilled its promise as the land of opportunity.³¹⁸

Likewise, Lecia Brooks, Director of Outreach for the Southern Poverty Law Center, called the election of Obama “the single most significant accomplishment America has made toward [King’s] Dream.”³¹⁹ Thus, the frequent use of King’s message to thwart the enforcement of any

race-based policies, along with the profuse comparisons of Obama to King, seem to suggest that the United States is increasingly convinced that recognizing race has become obsolete, and that the nation has officially outgrown its racist past.

The Postracial Age: King's Dream Fulfilled?

As Hoerl noted, public memory surrounding King almost entirely focuses on his efforts to help America overcome its “racist past.”³²⁰ This minimization of King’s advocacy is visibly manifest in the MLK Memorial’s design, through both its paraphrased display of King’s words, and its financially effusive budget. Such decisions to extravagantly memorialize King’s efforts towards racial harmony thwart viewers from also remembering his dedication to Christian humility and his fight against poverty—instigating a visual silence of King’s complex legacy. This visual silence, as it interacts with postracialism, works to heighten the *visual* representation of King and his advocacy, and omit the linguistic—taking away King’s language, silencing aspects of his legacy—affirming the decreased conversation regarding race in a postracial society.

The memorial itself contains four parts: an inscription wall, the “Mountain of Despair,” the “Stone of Hope,” and a giftshop.³²¹ The inscription wall is covered with twelve quotes from King, and “stress the four primary messages of Dr. King: justice, democracy, hope, and love.”³²² At the center of the memorial space are two large, white granite helms representing the Mountain of Despair, and between the two masses is the Stone of Hope, a three-story tall granite formation with King partially engraved at the forefront. The depiction of King, with his arms crossed and his expression stern, is modeled after a photograph taken of him standing in his office alongside a photograph of Mohandas K. Gandhi, leader of the Indian independence movement, and a

significant influence on Dr. King's commitment to non-violent tactics for social change.³²³

The greatest source of disagreement regarding the Memorial centered on the "Drum Major" inscription on the side of the Stone of Hope. The discourse of the disagreement reveals an instance of visual silence, for while the inscription visibly references one of King's last sermons, the absence of context, or even a full quotation from the sermon, silences the recognition of those ideals held by King that have not yet come to fruition. Currently, the inscription reads: "I was a drum major for justice, peace and righteousness," a paraphrase—not a quote—of a sermon given by King just months before his death in 1968.³²⁴ "Yes, if you want to say that I was a drum major," King told his congregation, "say that I was a drum major for justice. Say that I was a drum major for peace. I was a drum major for righteousness. And all the other shallow things will not matter."³²⁵ Supposedly, the Council of Historians that chose the memorial's inscriptions selected "a more representative chunk of the whole quote," yet it was later paraphrased "to accommodate a design change planners made while the statue was being carved in China."³²⁶ Unconcerned about *why* the quote was cut down, Maya Angelou, a member of the Council of Historians, said the inscription made King "look like an arrogant twit," and that, "He would never have said that of himself."³²⁷ The *Washington Post*'s Rachel Manteuffel noted that the paraphrase sounded "awfully self-aggrandizing for a man who so often symbolized the strength in humility."³²⁸

The past-tense inscription's declarative affirmation of justice, peace, and righteousness, also functions as a visual silence of the structural conditions that King challenged—the very conditions that still prevent the full manifestation of such values in US society. The inscription, taken out of context and void of the quote's key "if you want to say" qualifier, paints the picture that King's life work towards bringing justice, peace, and righteousness was ultimately

conclusive and successful. The paraphrase also gives viewers a sense of closure, that King, who stands at the forefront of the Stone of Hope, had successfully guided the nation's advancement away from the despair that marked racial relations throughout most of the country's history.

Dyson notes that: "King's obsession with wiping out racial oppression, poverty, militarism, and violence and his love for young people and the poor of every race who were trapped in ghettos or shotgun shacks are often clouded by a haze of recalling King's wish to overcome bigotry and his dream of racial harmony."³²⁹ The paraphrase visually embodies this discrepancy, broadcasting the positive forces that King strove for during his life, and silencing the challenges that he sought to diminish—challenges that still plague society today.

In response to the widespread criticism, Secretary of the Interior Ken Salazar, in consultation with the King Family, the memorial's sculptor, and the National Park Service, decided not to change the inscription, but to have it completely removed, "to ensure the structural integrity" of the memorial.³³⁰ The impending blank slab of granite signifies an impending instance of visual silence; the display of a new, unmarked space on the memorial's side promotes a flawless, seamless, remembrance, while silencing the integrity of King's memory in lieu of protecting the integrity of the structure. Generally speaking, this erasure enacts society's attempt to gravitate toward easy policy solutions to difficult social problems. In contrast, the core of King's "drum major" sermon points listeners towards the folly of "the desire in the human spirit to be great without doing any great, difficult things," and the folly of the Disciples of Jesus Christ as examples of this "drum major" mentality.³³¹ Moreover, the decision to erase the inscription parallels the attractiveness of the postracial mindset: Now that straightforward steps towards racial justice have been accomplished through legislative efforts, we are left to grapple with the more complex social problems ingrained in the nation's

capitalistic and political principles. Yet, rather than working through the disparate social conditions still at play, we have decided to ignore them and in effect *erase* the existence of segregation and racism that still permeate American society today. Postracialism does not only present the idea that we don't *need* to discuss racial relations, it attempts to take away the language that *allows* for dialogue on the current state of race in the nation.

Chiseling away the drum major inscription will cost about \$200,000, which coupled with the memorial's \$120 million original cost, leads us to question how this formation meshes with King's complex advocacies, and how the memorial visually silences the ways that race and class are intricately connected in US society.³³² Turning to the "drum major" sermon, King tells his congregation in the very next line: "And all of the other shallow things will not matter. I won't have any money to leave behind. I won't have the fine and luxurious things in life to leave behind. But I just want to leave a committed life behind."³³³ Because King did not desire to leave behind any type of wealth, commemorating him with a \$180 million dollar imported granite monument and affiliate giftshop forces us to ask what *is* being honored through this memorial. Such effusive spending to commemorate the man who launched the "Poor People's Campaign" in 1967, when he declared poverty to be the second phase of the civil rights movement, is ironic.³³⁴ The irony is heightened when one realizes that at the time King launched the "Poor People's Campaign" about thirteen percent of the population was living in poverty.³³⁵ Today, the nation's impoverished population now represents fifteen percent of the entire population, with blacks and latinos making up a disproportionately significant amount of those in poverty.³³⁶ Likewise, the only structure tied to the MLK Memorial is not a visitor center, or a museum, but rather, a giftshop. The commodification of King's image seems problematic, and as Charles Jones argues, such profit-gaining practices "cheapen(s) what he stood for."³³⁷ Commodifying,

more so than commemorating King's work encourages society to care more about the man and less about the movement, which appears to be the opposite of what King stood for, and exactly what this quote warned against.

The Postracial Age: Commemorating Colorblindness?

Although King is the first African American to be memorialized on the National Mall, the memorial's obfuscation of his race and portrayal of his heroic demeanor project colorblindness as a superhuman quality, promoting a unified, optimistic display of US race relations. In short, the statue of King on the memorial effects a visual silence that assures visitors that we have achieved "racial harmony."³³⁸ More specifically, through the visual invocation of King in the three-story high statue of his likeness, his racial identity and the integral role it plays in his legacy are silenced in a postracial context.

One way in which this visual silence manifested was through the seemingly international efforts to construct the memorial. More specifically, that the memorial was constructed primarily by Chinese artists and laborers evidenced, to some, King's "dream" of equal opportunity for all; however, the presence of King's vision coupled with the realities of the sculptors' communist allegiances points to the ways in which King's vision is absent—or in this case, unfulfilled. The MLK Memorial was commissioned to be built in China, which prompted much criticism, but was also promoted by those involved in the project as further evidence that King's "dream" had come true. Master Lei Yixin viewed his selection as the chief sculptor for the MLK Memorial as living proof of King's legacy, proclaiming: "He has always dreamed that people from all over the world will not be judged by the color of their skin—that we would all be brothers and sisters and enjoy equal opportunity. Now I have the luck to get this opportunity."³³⁹ Likewise, Nicholas

Benson, Chief Engraver for the MLK memorial commented, “All of what [Dr. King] stood for is sort of embodied in this workforce.”³⁴⁰ Not everyone took such an optimistic stance regarding the diversity of the memorial’s workforce; members of the US stonecarving community felt slighted upon the discovery that ten Chinese stonemasons accompanied Yixin to Washington, DC in order to assist with the project.³⁴¹ Stoneworker Clint Button adamantly told news sources, “There’s no reason that an American story can’t be told by Americans,” that “Even if we did a statue that looked horrendous, it would be done with integrity and with the intention of American tone and an American story, and a proper interpretation of history.”³⁴² Perhaps because several of Yixin’s previous projects have involved different representations of Mao Zedong, many have remarked that King and the Communist founder of the People’s Republic of China look strikingly similar.³⁴³

The postracial outlook embedded in this project’s international ties to a country notorious for their human rights violations enacts a visual silence of King’s commitment to global justice. The decision to export the structure’s labor and material, and the Foundation’s defense of such a decision, for example, promotes a certain postracial logic that deems an activity “nonracial” as long as people of more than one race are included.³⁴⁴ The promotion of this project’s visibly diverse personnel gives visual voice to King’s desire for the easement of racial tensions, yet, this celebration of workforce unity concurrently discounts the interrelated political tensions oppressing citizens both in the United States, and abroad. King warned that humankind was approaching an “international emergency” concerning the growing political and economic problems plaguing “the poor, the dispossessed, and the exploited of the whole world.”³⁴⁵ Yet, the outsourcing of the structure’s labor and resources was advertised as tangible evidence that the nation had not only moved beyond race, but beyond nationality.

The King commemorated on the National Mall embodies the idea of colorblindness, encouraging viewers take on a colorblind perspective as well, effecting a visual silence of his legacy that was centered on black solidarity and empowerment.³⁴⁶ To point, the memorial honors a black man, whose likeness is carved into white granite. Further, to many, the statue resembles a Chinese communist leader. Thus, just as the memorial promises to give visual voice to King's likeness, it simultaneously silences him through the obfuscation of his identity as a *black* visionary and through the unsuccessful depiction of King *as* King. To many, King's memorial performs what is thought to be his dream—the ultimate embracement of racial unity through the defiance of racial difference. King's racial obfuscation serves as a model for the aspiring racial obfuscation in the United States, visually silencing the cultural markers in which society still constructs racial difference, and thereby, hoping to eliminate the negative effects of difference. Underscoring the de-racialization of King, Harry S. Johnson, President of the MLK Memorial Foundation told news sources, “Don’t see this as an African-American project. Don't see Dr. King as an African-American hero. See him as an American hero.”³⁴⁷ Thus, visitors are confronted with an exalted, thirty-foot figure that isn't quite black, isn't quite white, and to some, appears Chinese—a visual display of the American melting pot, and compelling evidence to many willing to embrace a postracial era, that King himself, was colorblind.

Visual silence, in the postracial era, takes root in the notion of colorblindness, as the choice to not discuss race is simultaneously a recognition of its existence. The MLK Memorial's larger-than-life depiction of King and its location among the nation's foremost presidential monuments ascribes a heroic persona to the civil rights leader. Further, the memorial's promotion of “colorblindness” is depicted as a heroic trait through the colossal visualization of this racially-ambiguous leader, silencing the recognition of King's racial identity, and

encouraging visitors to disavow their own racial identities. King's heroic size and serious demeanor craft his perceived advocacy—one of colorblindness—as the highest aspiration. Thus, visitors literally “look up” to King and the postracial ideal he represents. “A post-racial outlook,” Dyson notes, “seeks to delete crucial strands of our identity,”³⁴⁸ a mindset which is visualized in this memorial's implicit suggestion that viewers, like King himself, should attempt to obfuscate their own sense of racial identity. Moreover, the memorial is a visual depiction of what Derrick Alridge has noted as the tendency for public discourse to focus on the early years of King's activism, presenting a “heroic, one-dimensional, and neatly packaged master [narrative]. . . that den[ies]. . . a complex, realistic, and rich understanding” of King's life and his work.³⁴⁹

The visual silence of the MLK Memorial's material similarity to the surrounding monuments visibly likens the significance of his national contributions to those of the former Heads of State, and silences the ways he actively sought to differentiate himself from their leadership. The King memorial stands on the National Mall alongside equally white monuments to some of the nation's foremost presidents (all of whom are white), a commemorative space which arguably, allows King, embodied in white granite, to “pass” as white. The MLK Memorial's location between the Lincoln and the Jefferson Memorials, and next to the Franklin Delano Roosevelt Memorial masks any notions of racial differentiation between the presidents and the civil rights leader. Moreover, the presence of King among this already-established assembly of political executives visually invokes King as a an equal to the men also memorialized in white materials, yet in doing so, silences the reality that King rose to prominence by challenging the ideological, social, and legal constraints set upon African Americans by the very men honored in the same space.

The Postracial Age: Visual Silence as Deterring or Deploying Discrimination?

The complexity of the MLK Memorial again points us towards visual silence, revealing the commemorative formation's ability to make present a vision of a colorblind society, while also negating national dialogue about the authentic ways that race still structures and informs *every* citizen's lived experience. Through the memorial's layout and its heavily-mediated opening ceremony, we see how race-based prejudice is both subtly strengthened, and publically denounced, challenging the notion that the United States has reached an age of postracialism.

The relationship between the memorial's centerpiece—the Stone of Hope, and the subsequent Mountain of Despair is one of both process and conclusiveness, sending a mixed message to viewers that we have both broken away from our racist past, and that we have not yet reached a postracial era. Inspired by a line in King's "I Have a Dream" speech: "With this faith we will be able to hew out of the mountain of despair a stone of hope," in the memorial King *is* the Stone of Hope, and he emerges from two granite helms representing the Mountain of Despair. According to the official National Park Service brochure distributed on location, the massive Stone of Hope "serves as a testament to Dr. King's leadership," while the Mountain of Despair is "representative of the struggle faced in the pursuit of social equality and peace."³⁵⁰ King's bodice though, is not fully formed—only the profile of his head and torso are fully discernible, giving the appearance that he is in the process of being chiseled *out* of the granite.

As the Stone of Hope stands fully detached from the Mountain of Despair, the gap between these two structures is filled with a visual silence that speaks to the complete fulfillment of King's dream, and concurrently, negates the structural racism of today that arguably keeps us fastened to the Mountain of Despair. It appears that King is in motion, that he has left the Mountain of Despair entirely, reminding viewers that racism was a problem of the past, and that

it is no longer a socially acceptable mindset. This portrayal of King in motion portrays a view that we have made substantial progress since the time of King's life, and encourages us to continue on this trajectory. This visual applause of national progress silences the reality that economic disparities between racial groups are at an all-time high, that gains in equal access to education are being retracted, and that other minority groups have become the primary targets of the same overt institutional prejudice that targeted African Americans.³⁵¹ The memorial's layout implies that racism is a thing of the past, dissuading viewers from the need to reevaluate the nation's current commitment to King's hope.

In contrast, King's half-formed bodice on the Stone of Hope arguably reminds viewers that King's dream for the nation has not yet been fulfilled, and thereby constitutes viewers as agents of change toward the realization of a postracial society. Dyson observes that King held a strong sense of patriotism, "rooted in the hope that the country could and would correct itself."³⁵² The patriotic nature of this depiction of King recognizes that it is not yet time for us to "put the chisels away," that the nation is capable of, but must continue its racial reconciliation efforts. Visually disavowing the nation's racism, yet affirming that it will one day be broken away, the memorial in some sense points us towards the eventual realization of Dyson's conceptualization of a "postracist outlook": one that "deletes oppression that rests on hate and fear; and that exploits cultural and political vulnerability."³⁵³

Although the design and structure of the MLK Memorial appears to silence much of King's legacy, the discourse of Obama's opening speech works to help bring voice to it again, making present the racial realities absent both in the memorial, and in the postracial age. As an African American holding the nation's most powerful position, Obama himself embodies visual silence. For example, although he is biracial, he is identified as, and identifies himself as

African American. Thus, many take his success as evidence of “how far” African Americans have come in this nation. Since he exemplifies the success of racial reconciliation, his public prestige risks validating a postracial outlook, silencing his ability to represent the population of disempowered blacks still living on the margins of society. As Dina Gavrilos succinctly notes, “highlighting one person’s achievement as ‘proof’ that an entire race of people is no longer plagued by racial prejudice, discrimination, and racism is problematic. Such conclusions fail to recognize the power that comes with systems of institutional and societal power.”³⁵⁴

Perhaps aware of his paradoxical persona, and his popular designation as a symbol of King’s “dream fulfilled,” Obama made opening remarks that refuted the notion that he, or the nation, could claim to have lived up to the legacy King left for US society. Obama reminds attendees that while they “see an America that is more fair and more free and more just” than the nation that King knew, “Dr. King’s work, is not yet complete.”³⁵⁵ As though reading into the visual politics at play in a postracial America—the very politics that construct him as “the first African American president”—Obama calls his audiences out for only “*see[ing]* an America” where King’s work is complete, and rather, urges his audiences to see an America where much work is yet to be done. Referencing the ensuing economic crisis and the nation’s “troubled neighborhoods” marked by “inadequate health care, constant violence,” Obama then calls for the nation to “take heed of King’s teachings,” that “aligning our reality with our ideals often requires the speaking of uncomfortable truths and the creative tension of non-violent protest.”³⁵⁶ Thus, it seems that very visual politics at play in a postracialized America that celebrated and allowed Obama the honor to speak at the first memorial for an African American on the National Mall, were the same visual politics that compelled Obama to expose the ways that racism is still at work. Indeed, Obama worked to confront his audience’s visual and racialized politics as he

grounded King's now-mythologized vision of America, arguing that racism today is intricately linked to the nation's current socio-economic woes, echoing King's call to "not be satisfied until justice rolls down like water and righteousness like a mighty stream."³⁵⁷ Demonstrating the ways in which the force of visual silence can be disrupted, Obama's remarks worked to diminish the force of the memorial's visual silence, and rather, to complicate its visual voice.

Conclusion

This chapter sought to investigate some of the nation's current wranglings regarding the present and ongoing politics of race and citizenship through an examination of the visual silence at play in the MLK Memorial. Considering the process of understanding race and racism as unending, this chapter punctuated its discussion through a series of questions, foreseeing no end to racism in the near future, just the evolution of its form. Looking to the MLK Memorial, then, to help unpack national understandings of race in their latest form, asking questions seems more appropriate than making conclusions. Thus, in exploring how postracialism has taken root generally in the United States, and visibly in the nation's most recent addition to the National Mall, it seems apparent that the visual silencing of race, and hence, racism, seems to have conflated efforts to heal racial tension, with a commitment to conceal or obfuscate racial differentiation. Moreover, through a look at Obama's remarks at the Memorial's dedication, we see how the forces of visual silence can be disrupted and rather, become a more forceful visual voice.

CHAPTER 5

VISUAL SILENCE: MOVING FORWARD, OR CHANGING FORM?

The Capitol Building, constructed in 1812, lacked any commemorations of African Americans until 1986, when a bust of Martin Luther King, Jr. was unveiled.³⁵⁸ National Statuary Hall, established in 1864, passed legislation in 2005 to allow for the first full-bodied statue of an African American, Rosa Parks, to join its ranks.³⁵⁹ Then, in 2011, the National Mall welcomed its first memorial to honor an African American, none other than iconic civil rights leader, King.³⁶⁰ At present, the nation awaits the construction of the National Museum of African American History and Culture to join Washington, DC's Smithsonian Institute in 2015.³⁶¹ Alongside nineteen Smithsonian buildings on the National Mall, this Smithsonian stands to make the largest and most significant contribution to honoring the history of African Americans in the United States. Perhaps these increased efforts at inclusion are evidence of the nation's racial progress, but the shape-shifting history of racial prejudice exposed in this project's look at the racialized politics of commemoration in the US Capital suggests otherwise. More than reinforcing the critical observation that race-based discrimination remains at play in our nation's most hallowed spaces, this project helped expose *how* these politics have evolved and how they currently operate. Attending to the tenuous relationship between the visual absences and presences of African American leaders and legacies in the US Capital, *visual silence* helped tease out these racialized dynamics through roughly three stages of racism in the United States: institutional, symbolic, and postracial. Further, charting these tensions helped expose how race-based discrimination functions at the intersection of public memory, visual rhetoric, and voice.

Moreover, this examination has revealed that when this nation *does* commemorate African Americans, the nation's focus on fitting these citizens into the commemorative structures and patterns already set for the nation—adding one bust to the Capitol, placing one statue in Statuary Hall, placing one memorial on the National Mall—takes precedence over engaging the political policies and philosophies at play that have deterred these citizens' commemoration in the first place. Thus, this project also demonstrated how the lack of commemorative formations, and the concurrent attempts to correct this gap, deployed the evolving nature of racial prejudice at different moments in US history. These three case studies have revealed that, although African Americans have played a central role in both the national narrative and the historical, political, and social functions of the national capital, their contributions are silenced by both the grandiose commemorations of white citizens and the token representations of national minorities.

Historical Implications

This thesis has demonstrated that America's racist present is not so far removed from its racist past. Frederick Douglass's observation that "[the black American] has ceased to be the *slave of an individual*, but has in some sense become the *slave of society*," aptly summarizes the transitory nature of the nation's systemic prejudice, which, as this project has demonstrated, is both manifested in and advanced by the nation's commemorative formations.³⁶²

Yet, rather than merely acknowledging that this discrimination still exists, this thesis exposed a negative correlation between the visibility of race-based prejudice, and the commemorative acknowledgements of African Americans. For instance, the institutional racism of America's beginnings was overtly visible in the enforced practices of slavery and segregation. After the wave of civil rights movements in the late twentieth century, the emergence of

symbolic racism was only subtly visible in the nation's legislative practices and social norms, but still highly discernible in the growth and concentration of "black ghettos," and the massive discrepancies in quality of health, education, and environment between black and white Americans. Amidst the turn of the twenty-first century, dialogue about race has become almost invisible, as politicians in the "postracial age" are prized for "not pulling the race card," challenging society's ability to visualize the economic destitution still so intricately tied to racial prejudice.³⁶³ In sum, as African Americans have become more visible in the public sphere and in positions of power, the discrimination that still significantly affects the African American populous, is becoming less and less visible. Thus, as the United States continues forward in its efforts towards racial reconciliation, we are challenged to examine if such efforts to dismantle the racial hierarchy are at work, or if this discrimination is merely being redirected. President Barack Obama's presence at the MLK Memorial's opening can be seen as a product of such efforts, yet, both the president's remarks and this project have demonstrated the abilities of discrimination to reemerge often stronger, yet more subtle, than ever.

Theoretical Implications

This dynamic, decreasingly-visible form of discrimination underscores the need for continued rhetorical examination of public discourse. For, as discrimination becomes less visible, it becomes more challenging to dismantle. As rhetoricians, we are called to go *beneath* the surface of texts, to investigate how they shape and are shaped by predominant societal beliefs. Thus, this project directed critical attention to both the overt and covert ways dominant discourses mask the voices of underprivileged communities, with the hope that Kristen Hoerl

was correct in her assessment that such rhetoric “may help to enrich our resources for envisioning social change and the means of attaining social justice.”³⁶⁴

Hence, this project’s theorization of visual silence helped to expose the complex ways certain groups are routinely silenced in public spaces. Visual silence suggests that the voices of the oppressed are not always silenced through what they can and cannot say, but often through what others can and cannot *see*. The three case studies presented in this project have demonstrated that commemoration routinely results in negation—for as one person or group is honored, another, as a result is pushed to the foreground. Any examination of visual silence, then, demands a deep investigation of the social, political, and historical forces shaping rhetorics of display in order to assess the voices that are actively at work in the production and function of such displays, but are negated through the ways in which their representations work to obscure, discipline, marginalize, disavow, demote, conceal and obfuscate their relevance. Visual silence pushes scholars not only to question how oppressed peoples are neglected from visual representation in the public sphere, but to assess how their representations perform a silencing function even when they are present.

Looking Forward

Uncertain of what exactly the current “postracial era” entails, and even more unsure about how citizenship will be racialized in the future, this project pushes rhetorical scholars to continue examining the nation’s commemorative formations, with the hopes that such scholarly endeavors will be able to reveal the unsuspecting ways racist discourse takes root visually. As the National Museum of African American History and Culture is scheduled to open on the National Mall in 2015, I am hopeful that the latest Smithsonian institution will serve as a call-to-

action for other institutional spaces in Washington DC to recognize this integral, yet too often overlooked aspect of American history and culture. However, this project recognizes that the museum, or any attempt to fill a missing gap without recognizing the structural problems that caused that gap in the first place risks a continuation of silenced representation by becoming a token depository for this group's national contributions. As opposed to advocating for a commemorative quota in the nation's capital, this project stands in agreement with Barbara A. Biesecker's insistence that that we focus instead on the contexts that allowed such exclusion to occur, in the hopes of preventing, rather than reinforcing a different set of criteria invoking the silence of yet another set of marginalized voices.³⁶⁵

NOTES

¹ “Statue of Freedom,” *Architect of the Capitol*, accessed November 12, 2012, <http://www.aoc.gov/cc/art/freedom.cfm>.

² The “liberty cap” was formerly known as a “Phrygian cap” during the Greco-Roman era. See Christopher Knight, “‘The Statue of Freedom’ Gets its Liberty Cap,” *Los Angeles Times*, January 19, 2009, sec. Culture Monster, <http://latimesblogs.latimes.com/culturemonster/2009/01/obama-sculpture.html>; “National Symbols in France: The Phrygian Cap or Liberty Cap,” n.d. http://www.languedoc-france.info/06141204_libertycap.htm.

³ “Statue of Freedom,” *Architect of the Capitol*; Knight, “The Statue of Freedom,” 2009.

⁴ Knight, “The Statue of Freedom,” 2009.

⁵ Ibid.

⁶ Architect of the Capitol, “Philip Reid,” n.d. <http://www.aoc.gov/cc/capitol/Philip-Reid.cfm>.

⁷ Ibid.

⁸ John Parker, “What’s the Capital of the World?,” *Intelligent Life*, September/October 2011, accessed April 2, 2013, <http://moreintelligentlife.com/content/ideas/john-parker/what-capital-world?page=0%2C1>.

⁹ Jesse J. Holland, *Black Men Built the Capitol: Discovering African-American History In and Around Washington* (Guilford, CT: Globe Pequot, 2007), vii.

¹⁰ Ibid., 175.

¹¹ This project adopts Beverly H. Wright’s understanding that the choice name for racial identification by Black Americans has been influenced by changes in the nation’s social and political environment, locus of control, and ideology during each era of progress or social movement. Thus, I use both the terms “African American” and “black” in accordance with the varying social, political, and ideological environments in which each of my case studies is situated. My terminology is carefully chosen within the context established by my examination of primary and secondary material from the relevant era in US history. See Beverly H. Wright, “Ideological Change and Black Identity during Civil Rights Movements,” *Western Journal of Black Studies* 5 (1981): 186-195.

¹² John Rhodehamel, *The Great Experiment: George Washington and the American Republic* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1998).

¹³ Kate Masur, *An Example for All the Land: Emancipation and the Struggle Over Equality in Washington* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2010), 2.

¹⁴ Ibid., 2-3.

¹⁵ Benjamin Banneker is also recognized as the first African American scientist, and the first African American to write and publish an almanac. Several sources also point to Banneker as Pierre L’Enfant’s replacement upon his dismissal as city planner, however, his name is absent official congressional records. Holland, *Black Men Built the Capitol*, 45.

¹⁶ Ibid., 3-10.

¹⁷ Ibid., 26.

¹⁸ Office of the Clerk of the U.S. House of Representatives, "The Civil Rights Act of 1875," *Art & History - Historical Highlights*, n.d., <http://artandhistory.house.gov/highlights.aspx?action=view&intID=294>.

¹⁹ One particularly jarring story describes three African American sisters attempting to gain entrance to the movie theatre, and while the two who were fairer skinned were admitted immediately, the third was blocked from entering. Sensing the "emergency," the girls' older companion told the ticket taker that the girl was of Filipino descent, to which the theatre employee immediately responded in apology, affirming to the companion that "of course she can go in." See Richard W. Leeman and Bernard K. Duffy, *The Will of a People: A Critical Anthology of Great African American Speeches* (Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 2012), 201-202.

²⁰ Masur, *An Example for All the Land*, 261.

²¹ Holland, *Black Men Built the Capitol*, 42-44.

²² *Ibid.*, 32-35.

²³ *Ibid.*, 35-36.

²⁴ *Ibid.*

²⁵ Ronald W. Walters and Toni-Michelle Travis, *Democratic Destiny and the District of Columbia: Federal Politics and Public Policy* (Lanham, MD: Lexington Books, 2010), 5-6.

²⁶ Ian Urbina, "Washington Officials Try to Ease Crime Fear," *The New York Times*, July 13, 2006, http://www.nytimes.com/2006/07/13/us/13deecce.html?_r=1; Keith L. Alexander, "Illiteracy Aid Found To Lag In District," *Washington Post*, March 19, 2007, <http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2007/03/18/AR2007031801347.html>.

²⁷ "District of Columbia QuickFacts from the US Census Bureau," 2010-2011, <http://quickfacts.census.gov/qfd/states/11000.html>.

²⁸ Helán Page and R. Brooke Thomas, "White Public Space and the Construction of White Privilege in U.S. Healthcare: Fresh Concepts and a New Model of Analysis," *Medical Anthropological Quarterly* 8 (1994): 111.

²⁹ Tanya Y. Price, "White Public Spaces In Black Places: The Social Reconstruction Of Whiteness In Washington, DC," *Urban Anthropology and Studies of Cultural Systems and World Economic Development* 27 (1998): 304.

³⁰ *Ibid.*, 316.

³¹ "Explore Capitol Hill," *Architect of the Capitol*, n.d. <http://www.aoc.gov/capitol-hill/architecture-materials/sandstone>.

³² William Walton and Evelyn Hofer, *The Evidence of Washington* (New York: Harper & Row, 1966), 37-38.

³³ Mary Terrell, as quoted in Leeman and Duffy, *A Critical Anthology*, 195.

³⁴ Kathleen J. Turner, "Rhetorical History as Social Construction: The Challenge and the Promise." In *Doing Rhetorical History: Concepts and Cases* (Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama Press, 1998), 6.

³⁵ Martin J. Medhurst, "The History of Public Address as an Academic Study," in *The Handbook of Rhetoric and Public Address*, eds. Shawn J. Parry-Giles and J. Michael Hogan (Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing, 2010), 55.

³⁶ Paul A. Shackel, "Public Memory and the Search for Power in American Historical Archaeology," *American Anthropologist* 103, no. 3 (September 2001): 655-670.

-
- ³⁷ Plato, *Theaetetus*, tr. by Benjamin Jowett (Project Gutenberg, 2008), <http://www.gutenberg.org/files/1726/1726-h/1726-h.htm>.
- ³⁸ Aristotle, *Aristotle on Memory and Recollection: Text, Translation, Interpretation, and Reception in Western Scholasticism*, Translated by David Bloch (Danvers, MD: Brill, 2007); Aristotle, *Aristotle's Nicomachean Ethics*. Translated by R.C. Bartlett and S.D. Collins (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2012).
- ³⁹ Cicero, *De Oratore*. Translated by E.N.P. Moor (London: Methuen and Company, 1904).
- ⁴⁰ Maurice Halbwachs, *On Collective Memory*, Tr. by Lewis A. Coser. (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1992), 182.
- ⁴¹ Ibid., 40.
- ⁴² Ibid., 25.
- ⁴³ Greg Dickinson, Carole Blair, and Brian Ott, "Introduction" in *Places of Public Memory: The Rhetoric of Museums and Memorials* (Tuscaloosa: University Of Alabama Press, 2010), 6.
- ⁴⁴ Shackel, "Public Memory and the Search for Power," 655.
- ⁴⁵ John R. Gillis, *Commemorations: The Politics of National Identity* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1996), 5.
- ⁴⁶ Stephen H. Browne, "Remembering Crispus Attucks: Race, Rhetoric, and the Politics of Commemoration," *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 85, no. 2 (May 1999): 173.
- ⁴⁷ Ibid.
- ⁴⁸ John Bodnar, *Remaking America: Public Memory, Commemoration, and Patriotism in the Twentieth Century* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1993), 14.
- ⁴⁹ Natalie Zemon Davis and Randolph Starn, "Introduction: Special Issue on Memory and Countermemory," *Representations* 26 (April 1989): 4.
- ⁵⁰ Gillis, *Commemorations: The Politics of National Identity*, 10.
- ⁵¹ Browne, "Remembering Crispus Attucks," 170.
- ⁵² Ibid.
- ⁵³ For a sample of these comparative studies, see: Kristen Hoerl, "Selective Amnesia and Racial Transcendence in News Coverage of President Obama's Inauguration," *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 98, no. 2 (May 2012): 178-202; Victoria J. Gallagher, "Memory and Reconciliation in the Birmingham Civil Rights Institute," *Rhetoric & Public Affairs* 2 (1999): 303-320; Denise M. Bostdorff and Steven R. Goldzwig, "History, Collective Memory, and the Appropriation of Martin Luther King, Jr.: Reagan's Rhetorical Legacy," *Presidential Studies Quarterly* 35 (2005): 661-690.
- ⁵⁴ Hoerl, "Selective Amnesia and Racial Transcendence," 180.
- ⁵⁵ As quoted in Edward Everett, *Orations and Speeches on Various Occasions* (New York: Arno Press, [1836]1972), 38.
- ⁵⁶ Barbara Biesecker, "Remembering World War II: The Rhetoric and Politics of National Commemoration at the Turn of the 21st Century," *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 88 (2002): 406.
- ⁵⁷ Shackel, 657.
- ⁵⁸ Browne, "Remembering Crispus Attucks," 169.
- ⁵⁹ Bradford Vivian, *Being Made Strange: Rhetoric Beyond Representation* (Albany: SUNY Press, 2004), 157.
- ⁶⁰ James E. Young, *Holocaust Memorials and Meaning* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1993), xii.

-
- ⁶¹ Kirk Savage, *Standing Soldiers, Kneeling Slaves: Race, War, and Monument in Nineteenth-Century America* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1997).
- ⁶² Carole Blair and Neil Michel, "Reproducing Civil Rights Tactics: The Rhetorical Performances of the Civil Rights Memorial," *Rhetoric Society Quarterly*, 30 (Spring, 2000): 32; Daniel Abramson, "Maya Lin and the 1960s: Monuments, Time Lines, and Minimalism," *Critical Inquiry* 22 (Summer, 1996): 701.
- ⁶³ Lester C. Olson, "Intellectual and Conceptual Resources for Visual Rhetoric: A Re-examination of Scholarship since 1950," *Rhetoric Review* 7 (2007): 2.
- ⁶⁴ Lawrence J. Prelli, "Introduction," in *Rhetorics of Display* (Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 2006), 2-3.
- ⁶⁵ Ibid.
- ⁶⁶ Harriet F. Senie and Webster, Sally, eds., *Critical Issues in Public Art: Content, Context, and Controversy* (New York: HarperCollins Publishers, Inc, 1994), xi.
- ⁶⁷ Victoria Gallagher and Kenneth S. Zagacki, "Visibility and Rhetoric: The Power of Visual Images in Norman Rockwell's Depictions of Civil Rights," *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 91, No. 2 (May 2005): 178.
- ⁶⁸ Ibid., 195.
- ⁶⁹ Michelle Smith, *Photography on the Color Line: W. E. B. DuBois, Race, and Visual Culture* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2004), 22; Caroline Knowles, "Seeing Race Through the Lens," *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 29 (May 2006): 512-529; Cassandra Jackson, *Violence, Visual Culture, and the Black Male Body* (New York: Routledge, 2011).
- ⁷⁰ For a sample of studies examining the political nature of public art, see: Senie and Webster, *Critical Issues in Public Art*; Rosalyn Deutsche, *Evictions: Art and Social Politics* (Cambridge: The MIT Press, 1996); Victoria D. Alexander and Marilyn Rueschemeyer, *Art and the State* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2005).
- ⁷¹ Senie and Webster, *Critical Issues in Public Art*, xiv.
- ⁷² Ibid., "Editors' Statement: Critical Issues in Public Art," *Art Journal* 48 (1989): 287-290.
- ⁷³ Ibid., 287
- ⁷⁴ Ibid.
- ⁷⁵ See: Dennis R. Montagna, "The Ulysses S. Grant Memorial in Washington, DC: A War Memorial for the New Century," (115-127); Vivian Green Fryd, "Political Compromise in Public Art: Thomas Crawford's *Statue of Freedom*," (105-114); and; Kirk Savage, "The Self-made Monument: George Washington and the Fight to Erect a National Memorial," (5-32); Harriet F. Senie and Sally Webster, "Patronage" (101) in *Critical Issues in Public Art: Content, Context, and Controversy*, eds. Harriet F. Senie and Sally Webster (New York: HarperCollins Publishers, Inc, 1994).
- ⁷⁶ Carole Blair, "Civil Rights/Civil Sites: 'Until Justice Rolls Down Like Waters,'" *The Carroll C. Arnold Distinguished Lecture* (National Communication Association, November 2006), 5; Danielle Endres, and Samantha Senda-Cook, "Location Matters: The Rhetoric of Place in Protest," *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 97, no. 3 (August 2011): 259-260.
- ⁷⁷ Blair, "Civil Rights/Civil States," 9.
- ⁷⁸ Biesecker, "Remembering World War II," 394.
- ⁷⁹ Ibid., 402.
- ⁸⁰ Robert Hariman and John Louis Lucaites, "Performing Civic Identity: The Iconic Photograph of the Flag Raising at Iwo Jima," *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 88 (2002): 365.

⁸¹ Cara A. Finnegan, "Recognizing Lincoln: Image Vernaculars in Nineteenth-Century Visual Culture," in *Visual Rhetoric: A Reader in Communication and American Culture*, ed. by Cara A. Finnegan, Lester C. Olson, and Diane S. Hope (Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications, 2008), 61–78.

⁸² Catherine H. Palczewski, "The Male Madonna and the Feminine Uncle Sam: Visual Arguments, Icons, and Ideographs in 1909 Anti-Woman Suffrage Postcards," *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 91(2005): 365–394.

⁸³ This analysis also provides an in-depth explanation of how the poster reified traditional US gender norms through Rosie the Riveter's highly-feminized characterization. See James J. Kimble and Lester C. Olson, "Visual Rhetoric Representing Rosie The Riveter: Myth And Misconception In J. Howard Miller's 'We Can Do It!' Poster," *Rhetoric & Public Affairs* 9 (2006): 533–569.

⁸⁴ James E. Young, *The Texture of Memory: Holocaust Memorials and Meaning* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1993), 127.

⁸⁵ Barbie Zelizer, *About to Die: How News Images Move the Public* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2010), 13.

⁸⁶ Ibid.

⁸⁷ Bonnie Dow and Cara Finnegan also make strong claims for considering visual form as public address. See, Bonnie Dow, "Feminism and Public Address Research: Television News and the Constitution of Women's Liberation," in *The Handbook of Rhetoric and Public Address*, 345–372; Cara A. Finnegan, "Studying Visual Modes of Public Address: Lewis Hine's Progressive Era Child-Labor Rhetoric," in *The Handbook of Rhetoric and Public Address*, 250–270.

⁸⁸ Zelizer points to "contexts, events people, [and] practices" as the components of an image's "larger environment." See Zelizer, *About to Die*, 13.

⁸⁹ Philip Wander, "The Third Persona: An Ideological Turn in Rhetorical Theory," in *Contemporary Rhetorical Theory: A Reader*, eds. John L. Lucaities, Celeste M. Condit, and Sally Caudill (New York: The Guilford Press, 1999): 370.

⁹⁰ Ibid.

⁹¹ For an extensive comparison of many of these studies, see: Eric King Watts, "'Voice' and 'Voicelessness' in Rhetorical Studies," *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 87, no. 2 (May 2001): 179–196.

⁹² David Appelbaum, *Voice* (Albany: SUNY Press, 1990); Karlyn K. Campbell, "Hearing Women's Voices," *Communication Education* 40 (1991): 37.

⁹³ Watts, "'Voice and 'Voicelessness,'" 180.

⁹⁴ Lester C. Olson, "On the Margins of Rhetoric: Audre Lorde Transforming Silence into Language and Action," *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 83 (1997): 50.

⁹⁵ Watts, "'Voice and 'Voicelessness,'" 187.

⁹⁶ Dennis Kurzon, *Discourse of Silence* (John Benjamins Publishing, 1998), 5.

⁹⁷ Vivian, *Being Made Strange*, 159.

⁹⁸ Ibid.

⁹⁹ Ibid., 170.

¹⁰⁰ Cheryl Glenn, *Unspoken: A Rhetoric of Silence* (Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 2004), 13.

¹⁰¹ For an in-depth analysis of how these “silent sentinels” fought for suffrage, see: Belinda A. Stillion Southard, “Militancy, Power, and Identity: The Silent Sentinels as Women Fighting for Political Voice,” *Rhetoric & Public Affairs* 10, no. 3 (2008): 399–417.

¹⁰² Michelle Cliff, “Notes on Speechlessness,” *Sinister Wisdom* 5 (1978): 5, as quoted in Glenn, *Unspoken*, 11.

¹⁰³ James C. Scott, *Domination and the Arts of Resistance: Hidden Transcripts* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1992), 167.

¹⁰⁴ Thomas K. Nakayama and Robert L. Krizek, “Whiteness: A Strategic Rhetoric,” *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 81, no. 3 (August 1995): 291.

¹⁰⁵ Carrie Crenshaw, “Resisting Whiteness’ Rhetorical Silence,” *Western Journal of Communication* 61, no. 3 (1997): 256.

¹⁰⁶ Eric King Watts, “Cultivating a Black Public Voice: W.E.B. Du Bois and the ‘Criteria of Negro Art,’” *Rhetoric & Public Affairs* 4, no. 2 (2001): 183, 198.

¹⁰⁷ *Ibid.*, 191.

¹⁰⁸ Vivian, *Being Made Strange*, 159.

¹⁰⁹ *Ibid.*

¹¹⁰ *Ibid.*, 170.

¹¹¹ Architect of the Capitol, <http://www.aoc.gov/cc/capitol/rotunda.cfm>.

¹¹² John B. Ellis, *The Sights and Secrets of the National Capital: A Work Descriptive of Washington City in All Its Various Phases* (Princeton, NJ: Jones, Junkin & Co., 1869), 69.

¹¹³ Architect of the Capitol, “Apotheosis of Washington,” *Explore Capitol Hill*, accessed April 2, 2013, <http://www.aoc.gov/capitol-hill/murals/apotheosis-washington>.

¹¹⁴ “The National Statuary Hall Collection,” n.d. <http://www.aoc.gov/cc/art/nsh/index.cfm>.

¹¹⁵ Courtland Milloy, “After years of wrangling, D.C. finally gets Frederick Douglass statue in U.S. Capitol,” *The Washington Post*, September 18, 2012, accessed March 22, 2013, http://articles.washingtonpost.com/2012-09-18/local/35494585_1_black-children-black-households-frederick-douglass.

¹¹⁶ Julia Edwards, “No Home on the Hill for Frederick Douglass Statue,” *National Journal Daily*, June 5, 2012, <http://www.nationaljournal.com/daily/no-home-on-the-hill-for-frederick-douglass-statue-20120605>.

¹¹⁷ J. Freedom du Lac, “Harriet Tubman vs. John Hanson: Statuary Hall Smackdown,” *The Washington Post*, March 16, 2011, <http://www.washingtonpost.com/wpdyn/content/article/2011/03/05/AR2011030503774.html>.

¹¹⁸ Carol Morello, “Martin Luther King Jr. Quotation to Be Replaced on Memorial,” *The Washington Post*, February 11, 2012, <http://www.washingtonpost.com/lifestyle/specialreports/MLKmemorial>.

¹¹⁹ House Speaker John Boehner, “Remarks at the Unveiling of Marker Commemorating Slave Laborers of U.S. Capitol” (speech), February 28, 2012, transcript, Speaker Boehner Press Office, <http://www.speaker.gov/speech/speaker-boehners-remarks-unveiling-marker-commemorating-slave-laborers-us-capitol>.

¹²⁰ Descriptions of the Capitol Visitor Center come from both personal observation and the photographs and diagrams provided by the Architect of the Capitol: “The U.S. Capitol Visitor Center,” accessed February 3, 2013, <http://www.visitthecapitol.gov/>.

¹²¹ “Slave Labor Commemorative Marker,” *Architect of the Capitol*, accessed February 3, 2013, <http://www.aoc.gov/capitol-hill/other/slave-labor-commemorative-marker>.

¹²² Directing the Architect of the Capitol to Place a Marker in Emancipation Hall in the Capitol Visitor Center which Acknowledges the Role that Slave Labor Played in the Construction of the United States Capitol, and for Other Purposes, H. Res. 135, 111th Congress (1996).

¹²³ *House Committee Administration*, "Slave Labor and U.S. Capitol Construction," (video), C-SPAN, November 7, 2007, accessed April 3, 2013, <http://www.c-spanvideo.org/program/202163-1>.

¹²⁴ Boehner, "Remarks at the Unveiling of Marker Commemorating Slave Laborers of U.S. Capitol."

¹²⁵ Philip Wander, "The Third Persona: An Ideological Turn in Rhetorical Theory," *Central States Speech Journal* 35 (1984): 210.

¹²⁶ Rogers Smith, *Civic Ideals: Conflicting Visions of Citizenship in U.S. History* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1997), 64.

¹²⁷ John H. Franklin and Evelyn B. Higginbotham, *From Slavery to Freedom: A History of African Americans* (New York: McGraw-Hill, 2011), 48. However, it should be noted that while slavery was not practiced on British soil, Great Britain was one of the leading financiers of the North Atlantic Slave Trade, transporting over three million people between 1662 and 1807. See: Kenneth Morgan, *Slavery and the British Empire: From Africa to America* (New York: Oxford University Press, USA, 2007), 12.

¹²⁸ Franklin and Higginbotham, *From Slavery to Freedom*, 48.

¹²⁹ *Ibid.*, 54

¹³⁰ *Ibid.*, 86.

¹³¹ T.H. Breen, "Ideology and Nationalism on the Eve of the American Revolution: Revisions Once More in Need of Revising," *The Journal of American History* 84 (1997): 29.

¹³² *Ibid.*, 32.

¹³³ William Palmer, "How Ideology Works: Historians and the Case of British Abolitionism," *The Historical Journal* 52 (2009): 1046.

¹³⁴ *Ibid.*

¹³⁵ Celeste M. Condit and John L. Lucaites, *Crafting Equality: America's Anglo-African Word* (University of Chicago Press, 1993), 26; "Declaration of Independence - Text Transcript," *The National Archives*, accessed January 26, 2013, http://www.archives.gov/exhibits/charters/declaration_transcript.html.

¹³⁶ Stephen H. Browne provides an extensive analysis of Crispus Attucks's place in public memory: Stephen H. Browne, "Remembering Crispus Attucks: Race, Rhetoric, and the Politics of Commemoration," *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 85 (May 1999): 169–187; Franklin and Higginbotham, *From Slavery to Freedom*, 88.

¹³⁷ The Continental Army forbade the service of black soldiers until Lord Dunmore, the Royal Governor of Virginia began recruiting slaves and free blacks to fight with the British Army by promising emancipation after their service. Thus, slave owners who previously were uninterested in joining the rebels offered their support in order to prevent their slaves from fleeing. See: Franklin and Higginbotham, *From Slavery to Freedom*, 90-92.

¹³⁸ Slave owners were given land or monetary bounties in exchange for sending their slaves to fight. *Ibid.*, 92.

¹³⁹ Franklin and Higginbotham, *From Slavery to Freedom*, 92.

¹⁴⁰ "The American Revolution: Lighting Freedom's Flame," *The National Park Service*, December 4, 2008, http://www.nps.gov/revwar/about_the_revolution/african_americans.html.

¹⁴¹ For an in-depth overview of the ways the term “equality” was used throughout the Revolutionary Era and in the US Constitution, see: Condit and Lucaites, *Crafting Equality*, 21-71.

¹⁴² John Rutledge, representative from South Carolina tellingly asserted that “*Religion and humanity had nothing to do with this question*” (of whether or not Congress should regulate the sale trade). A. Leon Higginbotham, *Shades of Freedom: Racial Politics and Presumptions of the American Legal Process* (New York: Oxford University Press, USA, 1998), 68-71.

¹⁴³ Adam Rothman, *Slave Country: American Expansion and the Origins of the Deep South* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2007), 3.

¹⁴⁴ Howard A. Ohline, “Republicanism and Slavery: Origins of the Three-Fifths Clause in the United States Constitution,” *The William and Mary Quarterly* 28 (1971): 563-584.

¹⁴⁵ Ibid., 566; The Three-Fifths Compromise is found in Article 1, Section 2, Paragraph 3 of the United States Constitution: “Constitution of the United States,” *National Archives*, accessed January 26, 2013, <http://www.archives.gov/exhibits/charters/constitution.html>.

¹⁴⁶ Smith, *Civic Ideals*, 3.

¹⁴⁷ Ibid., 104.

¹⁴⁸ Joseph R. Fornieri, ed., *The Language of Liberty: The Political Speeches and Writings of Abraham Lincoln* (Washington, DC: Regnery Pub., 2009), 774.

¹⁴⁹ Kenneth G. Goode, *From Africa to the United States and Then...: A Concise Afro-American History*, 2d ed (Glenview, IL: Scott, Foresman and Company, 1969).

¹⁵⁰ Ibid., 72.

¹⁵¹ Ibid., 71.

¹⁵² The Civil War’s end is generally recognized to have occurred when Confederate General Robert E. Lee surrendered to Union forces on April 9, 1865. See: Thomas L. Connelly, *The Marble Man: Robert E. Lee and His Image in American Society* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1978), 3.

¹⁵³ Englishman Joseph Surge called DC “the chief seat of the American slave trade” in his 1841 book *A Visit to the United States*. See Holland, *Black Men Built the Capitol*, 26.

¹⁵⁴ “The District of Columbia Emancipation Act,” *National Archives & Records Administration*, accessed January 21, 2013, http://www.archives.gov/exhibits/featured_documents/dc_emancipation_act/.

¹⁵⁵ Abraham Lincoln, “The Emancipation Proclamation,” transcription provided by: *National Archives & Records Administration*, accessed January 21, 2013, http://www.archives.gov/exhibits/featured_documents/emancipation_proclamation/transcript.html.

¹⁵⁶ Smith, *Civic Ideals*, 252.

¹⁵⁷ Ibid., 308-315.

¹⁵⁸ Franklin and Higginbotham, *From Slavery to Freedom*, 543.

¹⁵⁹ Andro Linklater, *The Fabric of America: How Our Borders and Boundaries Shaped the Country and Forged Our National Identity* (New York: Walker & Co., 2007), 94.

¹⁶⁰ Holland, *Black Men Built the Capitol*, 26; Damani Davis, “Slavery and Emancipation in the Nation’s Capital: Using Federal Records to Explore the Lives of African American Ancestors,” *Prologue Magazine: A Publication of the National Archives*, Spring 2010, accessed April 3, 2013, <http://www.archives.gov/publications/prologue/2010/spring/dcslavery.html>.

¹⁶¹ Holland, *Black Men Built the Capitol*, 26.

¹⁶² Smith, *Civic Ideals*, 104.

¹⁶³ Holland, *Black Men Built the Capitol*, 26.

¹⁶⁴ *Ibid.*, 3-10.

¹⁶⁵ "From Freedom's Shadow: African Americans and the U.S. Capitol," *U.S. Capitol Historical Society*, accessed January 20, 2013, <http://www.uschs.org/exhibit/exhibit-freedoms-shadow/index.htm>.

¹⁶⁶ Upon the establishment of Washington DC in 1790, records indicate an enslaved population of approximately 3,185. See: Holland, *Black Men Built the Capitol*; Davis, "Slavery and Emancipation in the Nation's Capital," Spring 2010.

¹⁶⁷ Henry H. Reed, *The United States Capitol: Its Architecture and Decoration* (New York: Norton, 2005), ix; John Rhodehamel, *The Great Experiment: George Washington and the American Republic* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1998).

¹⁶⁸ Reed, *The United States Capitol*, ix.

¹⁶⁹ *Ibid.*, ix, 41.

¹⁷⁰ Philip Dodd, *The Art of Classical Details: Theory, Design & Craftsmanship* (Victoria, AUS: Images Publishing Group, 2013), 55.

¹⁷¹ As quoted in: Reed, *The United States Capitol*, ix.

¹⁷² Gary Wills, "Oratory of the Greek Revival," in *Lincoln at Gettysburg: The Words that Remade America* (New York: Simon & Schuster, 2012), 42.

¹⁷³ *Ibid.*, 44; Edward Cohen, *The Athenian Nation* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2002), 30.

¹⁷⁴ Rufus Choate, *Addresses and Orations of Rufus Choate* (New York: Little, Brown, and Company, 1891), 38.

¹⁷⁵ T.C. Grey, "The Constitution as Scripture," *Stanford Law Review* 37 (1984): 1-25.

¹⁷⁶ For a discussion of classical vs. modern architectural styles, see: Karl Galinsky, *Classical and Modern Interactions: Postmodern Architecture, Multiculturalism, Decline, and Other Issues* (Austin, TX: University of Texas Press, 1992), 1-3; Peter Collins, *Changing Ideals in Modern Architecture: 1750-1950* (London, UK: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1998), 61-66.

¹⁷⁷ Joe R. Feagin, *Racist America: Roots, Current Realities, and Future Reparations* (New York: Taylor & Francis, 2012), 14.

¹⁷⁸ *Ibid.*, 16.

¹⁷⁹ *Ibid.*, 14.

¹⁸⁰ Architect of the Capitol, "About the Capitol," *Exploring Capitol Hill*, accessed March 17, 2013, <http://www.aoc.gov/capitol-buildings/about-us-capitol>.

¹⁸¹ Architect of the Capitol, "Capitol Rotunda," *Exploring Capitol Hill*, accessed April 2, 2013, <http://www.aoc.gov/capitol-buildings/capitol-rotunda>.

¹⁸² Architect of the Capitol, "Apotheosis of Washington," *Exploring Capitol Hill*, accessed April 2, 2013, <http://www.aoc.gov/capitol-hill/murals/apotheosis-washington>.

¹⁸³ While I did undertake a thorough tour of the Capitol Rotunda in March, 2013 in order to gain first hand observations, I rely heavily on architect Henry Reed's extensive compilation of large, full-page, color photographs of the Rotunda artwork in order to engage my analysis. See Reed, *The United States Capitol*.

¹⁸⁴ *Ibid.*

¹⁸⁵ *Ibid.*

¹⁸⁶ *Ibid.*

- ¹⁸⁷ Jean-Louis De Biasi, *Secrets & Practices of the Freemasons: Sacred Mysteries, Rituals and Symbols Revealed* (Woodbury, MN: Llewellyn Publications, 2010), 99.
- ¹⁸⁸ Feagin, *Racist America*, 9.
- ¹⁸⁹ John D. Blair, *A Sermon on the Death of Lieutenant General George Washington* (Richmond, VA: Meriwether Jones, 1800), 8; Robert P. Hay, "George Washington: American Moses," *American Quarterly* 21 (1969): 780-791, quoted in John F. Berens, "'Like a Prophetic Spirit': Samuel Davies, American Eulogists, and the Deification of George Washington," *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 63 (October 1977): 292.
- ¹⁹⁰ Thomas C. Buchanan, *Black Life on the Mississippi: Slaves, Free Blacks, and the Western Steamboat World* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2004); Eric Arnesen, *Brotherhoods of Color: Black Railroad Workers and the Struggle for Equality* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2001), 1-41.
- ¹⁹¹ "Reports of Captain M.C. Meigs, Corps of Engineers in Charge of Capitol Extension, Reconstruction of Dome, and Post Office Extension," in *Message from the President of the United States to the Two Houses of Congress* 32 (1855): 117-118.
- ¹⁹² *Ibid.*, 118.
- ¹⁹³ The notion of "Manifest Destiny" encompasses the motives and philosophies guiding US expansion, and can be summarized in three guiding themes: The special virtues of the American people and their institutions; America's mission to redeem and remake the world in the image of America; and, a divine destiny under God's direction to accomplish this task. See: Robert J. Miller, *Native America, Discovered And Conquered: Thomas Jefferson, Lewis & Clark, and Manifest Destiny* (Westport, CT: Praeger Publishers, 2006), 120.
- ¹⁹⁴ Eric King Watts, "Cultivating a Black Public Voice: W.E.B. Du Bois and the 'Criteria of Negro Art'," *Rhetoric & Public Affairs* 4 (2001): 196.
- ¹⁹⁵ Mark H. Leff, "Revisioning United States Political History," *American Historical Review* 100 (1995): 833.
- ¹⁹⁶ Watts, "Cultivating a Black Public Voice," 197.
- ¹⁹⁷ Jack C. Rich, *The Materials and Methods of Sculpture* (Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press, 1947), 20.
- ¹⁹⁸ Associated Press, "King Bust Unveiled in Capitol Rotunda," printed in *Times-News* (Hendersonville, NC, January 17, 1986), 2.
- ¹⁹⁹ "Portrait Monument to Lucretia Mott, Elizabeth Cady Stanton and Susan B. Anthony," *Architect of the Capitol*, accessed January 31, 2013, <http://www.aoc.gov/capitol-hill/other-statues/portrait-monument>.
- ²⁰⁰ Associated Press, "King Bust Unveiled in Capitol Rotunda," 2.
- ²⁰¹ "Bust of Martin Luther King, Jr.," *Architect of the Capitol*, accessed February 1, 2013, <http://www.aoc.gov/capitol-hill/busts/bust-martin-luther-king-jr>.
- ²⁰² Wladyslaw Tatarkiewicz, *A History of Aesthetics*, ed. by Joan Harrell (London, UK: Continuum International Publishing, 2006), 144-145; Rice, 128.
- ²⁰³ Franklin and Higginbotham, *From Slavery to Freedom*, 543.
- ²⁰⁴ U.S. Capitol Historical Society, *We the People: The Story of the U.S. Capitol*, 8-9.
- ²⁰⁵ Courtney Workman, "The Woman Movement: Memorial to Women's Rights Leaders and the Perceived Images of the Women's Movement," in *Myth, Memory, and the Making of the American Landscape*, ed. Paul A. Shackel (Gainesville: University Press of Florida, 2001), 55-56.

-
- ²⁰⁶ Ibid., 56.
- ²⁰⁷ Mandziuk, "Commemorating Sojourner Truth," 287.
- ²⁰⁸ Smith, *Civic Ideals*, 33.
- ²⁰⁹ Kwame Ture and Charles Hamilton, *Black Power* (New York: Vintage Publishing, 1992), 5.
- ²¹⁰ Feagin, *Racist America*, 14.
- ²¹¹ Boehner, "Remarks at the Unveiling of Marker Commemorating Slave Laborers of U.S. Capitol."
- ²¹² Ashley Southall, "Rosa Parks Statue is Unveiled at the Capitol," *The New York Times*, February 27, 2013, accessed March 23, 2013, <http://www.nytimes.com/2013/02/28/us/politics/statue-of-rosa-parks-is-unveiled-at-the-capitol.html>.
- ²¹³ To Direct the Joint Committee on the Library to Obtain a Statue of Rosa Parks and to Place the Statue in the United States Capitol in National Statuary Hall, and for Other Purposes, H.R. 4145, 109th Cong. (2005).
- ²¹⁴ Ibid.
- ²¹⁵ David O. Sears, Colette Van Laar, Mary Carrillo and Rick Kosterman, "Is it Really Racism?: The Origins of White Americans' Opposition to Race-Targeted Policies," *The Public Opinion Quarterly* 61 (1997): 16-53.
- ²¹⁶ John H. Franklin and Evelyn B. Higginbotham, *From Slavery to Freedom: A History of African Americans* (New York: McGraw-Hill, 2011), 536.
- ²¹⁷ Ibid., 508.
- ²¹⁸ Ibid.
- ²¹⁹ "Brown v. Board: Timeline of School Integration in the U.S.," *Teaching Tolerance* 25 (2004), accessed March 23, 2013, <http://www.tolerance.org/magazine/number-25-spring-2004/feature/brown-v-board-timeline-school-integration-us>.
- ²²⁰ Franklin and Higginbotham, *From Slavery to Freedom*, 500.
- ²²¹ William T. Bowers, William M. Hammond, and George L. MacGarrigle, *Black Soldier, White Army: The 24th Infantry Regiment in Korea* (Washington, DC: Center of Military History, 1997), 37; Jon E. Taylor, *Freedom to Serve: Truman, Civil Rights, and Executive Order 9981* (New York: Rutledge, 2012), 96.
- ²²² Bruce P. Lapenson, *Affirmative Action and the Meanings of Merit* (Lanham, MD: University Press of America, 2009), 2.
- ²²³ Ibid., 2-3.
- ²²⁴ Paul M. Ong, *The Impact of Affirmative Action: Policies and Consequences in California* (Walnut Creek, CA: AltaMira Press, 1999), 46.
- ²²⁵ Franklin and Higginbotham, *From Slavery to Freedom*, 500-519.
- ²²⁶ Ibid., 545; "Overview," *U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission*, accessed February 21, 2013. <http://www.eeoc.gov/eeoc/index.cfm>.
- ²²⁷ Franklin and Higginbotham, *From Slavery to Freedom*, 535-536.
- ²²⁸ Ibid.
- ²²⁹ Ibid., 519
- ²³⁰ Ibid.
- ²³¹ Lucy G. Barber, *Marching on Washington: The Forging of an American Political Tradition* (Berkley: University of California Press, 2004), 141; Laurie C. Hillstrom, *The Voting Rights Act of 1965* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2009).

- ²³² Edward P. Morgan, "Rights, Power, and Equality: The Modern Civil Rights Movement," in *Upon These Shores: Themes in the African-American Experience, 1600 to the Present*, eds. William R. Scott and William G. Shade (New York: Routledge, 2000), 221.
- ²³³ Melinda Jones, *Social Psychology of Prejudice* (Berkeley: Prentice Hall, 2002), 54.
- ²³⁴ David O. Sears and P. J. Henry, "The Origins of Symbolic Racism," *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 85 (2003): 260.
- ²³⁵ Jones, *Social Psychology of Prejudice*, 53.
- ²³⁶ Sears and Henry, "The Origins of Symbolic Racism," 260.
- ²³⁷ Michael Hughes, "Symbolic Racism, Old-Fashioned Racism, and Whites' Opposition to Affirmative Action" in *Racial Attitudes in the 1990s: Continuity and Change*, eds. Steven A. Tuch and Jack K. Martin (Westport, CT: Praeger Publishers, 1997), 55.
- ²³⁸ Franklin and Higginbotham, *From Slavery to Freedom*, 597.
- ²³⁹ Ibid.; Beth Reinhard, "Here Come the Culture Wars: Court Hears Cases on Affirmative Action and Gay Marriage," *National Journal*, March 7, 2013, accessed March 23, 2013, <http://www.nationaljournal.com/politics/here-come-the-culture-wars-court-hears-cases-on-affirmative-action-and-gay-marriage-20130307>.
- ²⁴⁰ Jones, *Social Psychology of Prejudice*, 51.
- ²⁴¹ "Brown v. Board: Timeline of School Integration in the U.S.," 2004.
- ²⁴² Jones, *Social Psychology of Prejudice*, 51.
- ²⁴³ Sears and Henry, "The Origins of Symbolic Racism," 260.
- ²⁴⁴ The Council of Economic Advisors for the President's Initiative on Race, *Changing America: Indicators of Social and Economic Well-Being by Race and Hispanic Origin* (1998), 23.
- ²⁴⁵ Sharon Hays, *Flat Broke with Children: Women in the Age of Welfare Reform* (Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press, 2003), 23.
- ²⁴⁶ Susan Faludi, *Backlash: The Undeclared War Against American Women* (New York: Three Rivers Press, 2006), 5; Paul A. Jargowsky, "Ghetto Poverty Among Blacks in the 1980s," *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management* 13 (1994): 289.
- ²⁴⁷ Linda Brannon and Jess Feist, *Health Psychology: An Introduction to Behavior and Health* (Belmont, CA: Wadsworth, Cengage Learning, 2009), 259.
- ²⁴⁸ "Statuary Hall (1857 to Present)," *U.S. House of Representatives: History, Art & Archives*, accessed March 7, 2013, <http://history.house.gov/Exhibitions-and-Publications/Statuary-Hall/Hall/History/>.
- ²⁴⁹ "Address of Mr. Schirm, of Maryland," in *Proceedings in the Senate and the House of Representatives Upon the Reception and Acceptance from the State of Maryland of the Statues of Charles Carroll of Carrollton and of John Hanson, Erected in Statuary Hall of the Capitol* (Washington, DC: Government Printing Office, 1903), 105.
- ²⁵⁰ Architect of the Capitol, "About the National Statuary Hall Collection," *Explore Capitol Hill*, accessed March 24, 2013, <http://www.aoc.gov/capitol-hill/national-statuary-hall-collection/about-national-statuary-hall-collection>.
- ²⁵¹ Victor J. Danilov, *Hall of Fame Museums: A Reference Guide* (Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 1997), 183.
- ²⁵² "Procedure and Guidelines for Replacement of Statues in the National Statuary Hall Collection," *Architect of the Capitol: Office of the Curator* (April 2011): 3.
- ²⁵³ Kansas, California, Alabama, Michigan, Iowa, and Ohio have each decided to replace one of their original statues.

-
- ²⁵⁴ Donald R. Kinder and David O. Sears, "Prejudice and Politics: Symbolic Racism Versus Racial Threats to the Good Life," *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 40 (1981): 416.
- ²⁵⁵ Jones, "Social Psychology of Prejudice," 53.
- ²⁵⁶ J. Freedom du Lac, "Harriet Tubman vs. John Hanson: Statuary Hall Smackdown," *The Washington Post*, March 16, 2011, accessed March 22, 2013, <http://www.washingtonpost.com/wpdyn/content/article/2011/03/05/AR2011030503774.html>.
- ²⁵⁷ Jeff Newman, "Maryland Lawmakers Fight Proposed Swap of Statues in U.S. Capitol," *The Washington Post*, February 24, 2011, accessed March 22, 2013, <http://www.washingtonpost.com/wpdyn/content/article/2011/02/22/AR2011022206709.html>.
- ²⁵⁸ Ibid.
- ²⁵⁹ Freedom du Lac, "Harriet Tubman vs. John Hanson."
- ²⁶⁰ Ibid.
- ²⁶¹ Ibid; "Tubman Deserves a Place in Statuary Hall," editorial in *The Baltimore Sun*, February 23, 2011, accessed March 22, 2013, http://articles.baltimoresun.com/2011-02-23/news/bs-ed-hanson-statue-20110223_1_harriet-tubman-marylanders-john-hanson.
- ²⁶² Request to Place a Statue of Harriet Tubman in the National Statuary Hall Collection, Maryland SB351, vol. 374838 (2011).
- ²⁶³ Ibid.
- ²⁶⁴ John B. McConahay, "Self-Interest Versus Racial Attitudes as Correlates of Anti-Busing Attitudes in Louisville: Is it the Buses or the Blacks?," *The Journal of Politics* 44 (1982): 707.
- ²⁶⁵ Newman, "Maryland Lawmakers Fight Proposed Swap of Statues in U.S. Capitol."
- ²⁶⁶ State Government Statue of Harriet Tubman, Maryland HB1429, vol. 3396 (2012).
- ²⁶⁷ Ibid.
- ²⁶⁸ Ibid.
- ²⁶⁹ Courtland Milloy, "After Years of Wrangling, D.C. Finally Gets Frederick Douglass Statue in U.S. Capitol," *The Washington Post*, September 18, 2012, accessed March 22, 2013, http://articles.washingtonpost.com/2012-09-18/local/35494585_1_black-children-black-households-frederick-douglass.
- ²⁷⁰ Ben Pershing, "D.C. Statues Bill Caught up in Voting Rights, Gun Law Controversies," *The Washington Post*, September 15, 2010, accessed March 22, 2013, http://voices.washingtonpost.com/dc/2010/09/dc_statues_bill_caught_up_in_v.html.
- ²⁷¹ According to official 2012 records, the District of Columbia's population is 632,323, and the state of Wyoming's population is 576,412: United States Census Bureau, "District of Columbia QuickFacts," *U.S. Department of Commerce*, accessed March 7, 2013, <http://quickfacts.census.gov/qfd/states/11000.html>; Libby Spencer, "President Obama Takes a Stand for D.C.," *The Impolitic*, January 19, 2013, accessed March 22, 2013, <http://theimpolitic.blogspot.com/2013/01/president-obama-takes-stand-for-dc.html>.
- ²⁷² Milloy, "After Years of Wrangling, D.C. Finally Gets Frederick Douglass Statue."
- ²⁷³ Ibid.
- ²⁷⁴ Ibid.
- ²⁷⁵ Ibid.
- ²⁷⁶ Ibid; Frederick Douglass, "Address to the Tennessee Agricultural and Mechanical Association," reprinted in *African-American Social and Political Thought: 1850-1920*, ed. by Howard Brotz (New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishers, 2009), 297.

²⁷⁷ Currently, the statue of Frederick Douglass is being housed in Washington, DC's Judiciary Square: Michael E. Ruane, "Unveiling a Tall Tribute to a Towering Abolitionist," *The Washington Post*, October 5, 2008, accessed March 17, 2013, http://articles.washingtonpost.com/2008-10-05/news/36863704_1_statues-tall-tribute-steven-weitzman.

²⁷⁸ Dan Merica, "District of Columbia to Get Statue in Capitol, But Not in Statuary Hall," *CNN Political Ticker*, September 14th, 2012, accessed March 17, 2013, <http://politicalticker.blogs.cnn.com/2012/09/14/district-of-columbia-to-get-statue-in-capitol-not-in-statuary-hall/>.

²⁷⁹ Ibid.

²⁸⁰ Ruane, "Unveiling a Tall Tribute to a Towering Abolitionist."

²⁸¹ Ibid; Pershing, "D.C. Statues Bill Caught up in Voting Rights, Gun Law Controversies."

²⁸² Martin Luther King, Jr., "The Case Against 'Tokenism,'" reprinted in *A Testament of Hope: The Essential Writings and Speeches of Martin Luther King, Jr.*, ed. by James M. Washington (New York: HarperCollins, 1990), 101.

²⁸³ Roseann M. Mandziuk, "Commemorating Sojourner Truth: Negotiating the Politics of Race and Gender in the Spaces of Public Memory," *Western Journal of Communication* 67 (September 2003): 272; Freedom du Lac, "Harriet Tubman vs. John Hanson."

²⁸⁴ An Act Concerning State Statue- Harriet Tubman, Maryland HB 1429, Ch. 723 (2012).

²⁸⁵ Descriptions of both National Statuary Hall and the Capitol Visitor Center are largely based off of the author's personal observations, aided by spatial diagrams provided on the Architect of the Capitol's website: <http://www.aoc.gov/capitol-hill>.

²⁸⁶ "Art & History: National Statuary Hall Collection," *Office of the Clerk of the U.S. House of Representatives*, accessed March 6, 2013, http://artandhistory.house.gov/art_artifacts/virtual_tours/statuary_hall/desk.aspx.

²⁸⁷ Tracy Samantha Schmidt, "A Costly Welcome for Capitol Visitors," *Time*, May 25, 2007, accessed March 17, 2013, <http://www.time.com/time/nation/article/0,8599,1625694,00.html>.

²⁸⁸ "Address of Mr. Schirm, of Maryland."

²⁸⁹ Architect of the Capitol, "About the National Statuary Hall Collection."

²⁹⁰ Rosalyn Deutsche, *Evictions: Art and Spatial Politics* (New York: Graham Foundation for Advanced Studies in the Fine Arts, 1996), 89.

²⁹¹ Hughes, "Symbolic Racism," 45.

²⁹² "Constitution of the United States," *National Archives*, accessed January 26, 2013, <http://www.archives.gov/exhibits/charters/constitution.html>.

²⁹³ Ruane, "Unveiling a Tall Tribute."

²⁹⁴ Request to Place a Statue of Harriet Tubman in the National Statuary Hall Collection, Maryland SB351, vol. 1450 (2011).

²⁹⁵ "Declaration of Independence," *National Archives*, accessed March 17, 2013, http://www.archives.gov/exhibits/charters/declaration_transcript.html; A Resolution Honoring the Life, Heroism, and Service of Harriet Tubman, SR455, 111th Cong. (2010).

²⁹⁶ A Resolution Honoring the Life, SR455.

²⁹⁷ It is estimated that between three and five million people visit the Capitol Building each year. Architect of the Capitol, "About the Capitol," *Exploring Capitol Hill*, accessed March 17, 2013, <http://www.aoc.gov/capitol-buildings/about-us-capitol>.

- ²⁹⁸ Donna Graves, "Representing the Race: Detroit's Monument to Joe Louis," in *Critical Issues in Public Art: Content, Context, and Controversy*, edited by Harriet F. Senie and Sally Webster (New York: Harper Collins Books, 1992), 16.
- ²⁹⁹ "Mission and Vision Statement of The Memorial Foundation," *The Memorial Foundation: Builders of the Martin Luther King, Jr. Memorial*, accessed March 22, 2013, <http://www.thememorialfoundation.org/node/58>.
- ³⁰⁰ Melanie Eversley, "Dispute Between King Family, Memorial Foundation Denied," *USA Today*, March 27, 2013, accessed March 29, 2013, <http://www.usatoday.com/story/news/nation/2013/03/27/king-foundation-family/2026545/>.
- ³⁰¹ Scott Horsley, "Obama Helps Dedicate Martin Luther King Memorial," *NPR News*, October 17, 2011, accessed March 29, 2013, <http://www.npr.org/2011/10/17/141411359/obama-helps-dedicate-memorial-to-martin-luther-king-jr>.
- ³⁰² Corey Dade, "Behind King Memorial, One Fraternity's Long Battle," *NPR News*, August 23, 2011, accessed March 29, 2013, <http://www.npr.org/2011/08/23/139853480/behind-king-memorial-one-fraternitys-long-battle>.
- ³⁰³ I agree with Sumi Cho's understanding that post-racialism is more than a political trend or social fact, but a twenty-first century ideology, evidenced by its material, sociocultural, and political effects. See, Sumi Cho, "Post-Racialism," *Iowa Law Review* 94 (2009): 1589-1649.
- ³⁰⁴ Ibid.
- ³⁰⁵ Martell Teasley and David Ikard, "Barack Obama and the Politics of Race: The Myth of Postracism in America," *Journal of Black Studies* 40 (2009): 411-425.
- ³⁰⁶ Cho, "Post-Racialism," 1594.
- ³⁰⁷ Michael Eric Dyson, *I May Not Get There With You: The True Martin Luther King, Jr.* (New York: The Free Press, 2000), 3.
- ³⁰⁸ Ibid.
- ³⁰⁹ Ibid.
- ³¹⁰ Howard Winant, *The New Politics of Race: Globalism, Difference, Justice* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press), xix.
- ³¹¹ For an example of how such "colorblind" arguments can be used both in support of and opposition to policies aimed at racial reconciliation, see: Nikole Hannah-Jones, "Race Didn't Cost Abigail Fisher Her Spot at the University of Texas," *The Atlantic Wire*, March 18, 2013, accessed March 29, 2013, <http://www.theatlanticwire.com/national/2013/03/abigail-fisher-university-texas/63247/>.
- ³¹² Dyson, *I May Not Get There With You*, 1-7.
- ³¹³ Ibid., 3.
- ³¹⁴ Kristen Hoerl, "Selective Amnesia and Racial Transcendence in News Coverage of President Obama's Inauguration," *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 98 (2012): 187.
- ³¹⁵ Former presidential candidate Mike Huckabee remarked upon Obama's election, "Forty years after this great leader has passed from us, [King's] dream is, in fact, coming true." See, FOX, "America Prepares for the Transfer of Presidential Power," *On the Record with Greta Van Susteren*, January 19, 2009. John McWhorter commented that Obama stands as "a ringing symbol that racism no longer rules our land." See, John Hartigan, *What Can You Say? America's National Conversation on Race* (Palo Alto, CA: Stanford University Press, 2010), 137.

-
- ³¹⁶ “Final Preps At Inaugural Site; Secret Service Countersnipers; ‘A Dream Come True’; Changing Views of Obama,” *CNN News*, aired January 19, 2009, accessed March 29, 2013, <http://edition.cnn.com/TRANSCRIPTS/090119/sitroom.02.html>.
- ³¹⁷ Multi-Media International, *Obama: The Dream Fulfilled, A Historical Retrospective* (Tinton Falls, NJ: Multi-Media International, 2009).
- ³¹⁸ *Ibid.*, 3.
- ³¹⁹ James Eng, “Race Relations and MLK’s Dream: Welcome to the Generation Gap,” *NBC News*, January 17, 2011, accessed March 26, 2013, http://usnews.nbcnews.com/_news/2012/01/12/10142060-race-relations-and-mlks-dream-welcome-to-the-generation-gap.
- ³²⁰ Hoerl, “Selective Amnesia and Racial Transcendence,” 187.
- ³²¹ Descriptions of the MLK Memorial are taken both from my own experience visiting the site on March 2, 2013, as well as images and descriptions found on the official memorial brochures distributed by the National Park Service.
- ³²² National Park Service, “Martin Luther King, Jr. Memorial,” n.d.
- ³²³ *Ibid.*
- ³²⁴ Roy Peter Clark, “We Owe it to King to Revise Inscription on His Monument,” *CNN News*, October 10, 2011, accessed March 27, 2013, <http://www.cnn.com/2011/10/11/opinion/clark-king-monument-inscription/>.
- ³²⁵ *Ibid.*
- ³²⁶ Rachel Manteuffel, “Martin Luther King a Drum Major? If You Say So,” *The Washington Post*, August 25, 2011, accessed March 29, 2013, http://www.washingtonpost.com/opinions/martin-luther-king-a-drum-major-if-you-say-so/2011/08/25/gIQAmUkeJ_story.html.
- ³²⁷ Gene Weingarten and Michael E. Ruane, “Maya Angelou Says King Memorial Inscription Makes Him Look ‘Arrogant,’” *The Washington Post*, August 30, 2011, accessed March 29, 2013, http://articles.washingtonpost.com/2011-08-30/local/35272106_1_peace-and-righteousness-inscription-lei-yixin.
- ³²⁸ Manteuffel, “Martin Luther King a Drum Major?”
- ³²⁹ Dyson, *I May Not Get There With You*, 290.
- ³³⁰ Krishnadev Calamur, “Inscription on Martin Luther King, Jr. Memorial to be Removed,” *NPR News*, December 11, 2012, accessed March 29, 2013, <http://www.npr.org/blogs/thetwo-way/2012/12/11/166993431/inscription-on-martin-luther-king-jr-memorial-to-be-removed>.
- ³³¹ Manteuffel, “Martin Luther King a Drum Major?”
- ³³² Patrik Jonsson, “Martin Luther King, Jr.: Who misquoted King so monumentally?,” *Christian Science Monitor*, January 14, 2012, accessed March 29, 2013, <http://www.csmonitor.com/USA/2012/0114/Martin-Luther-King-Jr.-Who-misquoted-King-so-monumentally>.
- ³³³ Dyson, *I May Not Get There With You*, 276.
- ³³⁴ Eng, “Race Relations and MLK’s Dream.”
- ³³⁵ *Ibid.*
- ³³⁶ *Ibid.*
- ³³⁷ Dyson, *I May Not Get There With You*, 273.
- ³³⁸ King is seen as the “moral guardian of racial harmony.” *Ibid.*, 6.

-
- ³³⁹ “Memories of MLK,” *The Washington Post*, accessed March 23, 2013, <http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-srv/special/lifestyle/mlk2011/memories/>.
- ³⁴⁰ Ibid.
- ³⁴¹ Malcolm Moore, “Martin Luther King Memorial Made in China,” August 22, 2011, accessed March 29, 2013, <http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/worldnews/asia/china/8715823/Martin-Luther-King-memorial-made-in-China.html>.
- ³⁴² Jonsson, “Who misquoted King so monumentally?”
- ³⁴³ Paul Needham, “Martin Luther King Memorial: A ‘Made in China’ Design Comes to DC,” *The Huffington Post*, August 12, 2011, accessed March 29, 2013, http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2011/08/12/martin-luther-king-memorial_n_925341.html.
- ³⁴⁴ Hartigan, *What Can You Say?*, 2.
- ³⁴⁵ Martin Luther King, Jr., “The Trumpet of Conscience,” in *A Testament of Hope: The Essential Writings and Speeches of Martin Luther King, Jr.*, ed. James M. Washington (New York: HarperCollins, 1990), 652.
- ³⁴⁶ Dyson, *I May Not Get There With You*, ix.
- ³⁴⁷ Corey Dade, “Behind King Memorial, One Fraternity’s Long Battle,” *NPR News*, August 23, 2011, accessed March 29, 2013, <http://www.npr.org/2011/08/23/139853480/behind-king-memorial-one-fraternities-long-battle>.
- ³⁴⁸ Michael Eric Dyson, *Can You Hear Me Now?: The Inspiration, Wisdom, and Insight of Michael Eric Dyson* (New York: Basic Civitas Books, 2011), 4.
- ³⁴⁹ Derrick P. Alridge, “The Limits of Master Narratives in History Text Books: An Analysis of Representations of Martin Luther King, Jr.,” *Teacher’s College Record* 108 (2006): 662-686
- ³⁵⁰ National Park Service,
- ³⁵¹ Eng, “Race Relations and MLK’s Dream;” Hannah-Jones, “Race Didn’t Cost Abigail Fisher Her Spot;” Michael McGough, “Gay marriage: What’s most offensive about DOMA,” *Los Angeles Times*, March 29, 2013, accessed March 31, 2013, <http://www.latimes.com/news/opinion/opinion-la/la-ol-gay-marriage-whats-most-offensive-about-doma-20130329,0,4079579.story>.
- ³⁵² Dyson, *I May Not Get There With You*, 244.
- ³⁵³ Dyson, *Can You Hear Me Now*, 4.
- ³⁵⁴ Dina Gavrilos, “White Males Lose Presidency for First Time: Exposing the Power of Whiteness Through Obama’s Victory,” *The Obama Effect: Multidisciplinary Renderings of the 2008 Campaign* (2010): 8.
- ³⁵⁵ President Barack Obama, “Speech at the Opening of the Martin Luther King, Jr. Memorial,” *The Washington Post* (October 16, 2011), http://www.washingtonpost.com/lifestyle/style/full-text-president-obamas-speech-at-mlk-memorial/2011/10/16/gIQAkbl3oL_story.html.
- ³⁵⁶ Ibid.
- ³⁵⁷ Martin Luther King, Jr., “I Have a Dream,” reprinted in *Contemporary American Public Discourse*, ed. Halford Ryan Ross (Prospect Height, IL: Waveland Press, 1992), 216.
- ³⁵⁸ Associated Press, “King Bust Unveiled in Capitol Rotunda,” *Times-News* (Hendersonville, NC, January 17, 1986), 2.
- ³⁵⁹ House, *To Direct the Joint Committee on the Library to Obtain a Statue of Rosa Parks and to Place the Statue in the United States Capitol in National Statuary Hall, and for Other Purposes*, 109th Cong., H.R. 4145, 2005.

³⁶⁰ Scott Horsley, "Obama Helps Dedicate Martin Luther King Memorial," *NPR News*, October 17, 2011, accessed March 29, 2013, <http://www.npr.org/2011/10/17/141411359/obama-helps-dedicate-memorial-to-martin-luther-king-jr>.

³⁶¹ Lonnie G. Bunch, "National Museum of African American History and Culture," *Smithsonian Institution*, accessed March 29, 2013, <http://www.si.edu/ofg/Units/sorsnmaahc.htm>.

³⁶² August Meier and Elliot M. Rudwick, *Along the Color Line: Explorations in the Black Experience* (Urbana-Champaign: University of Illinois Press, 2003), 18.

³⁶³ President Obama was often praised during his campaign for "not pulling the race card." See John Hartigan, *What Can You Say? America's National Conversation on Race* (Palo Alto, CA: Stanford University Press, 2010), 6.

³⁶⁴ Kristen Hoerl, "Selective Amnesia and Racial Transcendence in News Coverage of President Obama's Inauguration," *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 98 (2012): 197

³⁶⁵ Barbara Biesecker, "Coming to Terms with Recent Attempts to Write Women into the History of Rhetoric," *Philosophy and Rhetoric* 25 (1992): 143-144. See Vivian, *Being Made Strange*, 168-169 for a helpful summary of Biesecker's argument about the academic undertaking to recover marginalized voices.

REFERENCES

- Aristotle. *Aristotle on Memory and Recollection: Text, Translation, Interpretation, and Reception in Western Scholasticism*. Translated by David Bloch. Philosophia Antiqua. Brill, 2007.
- . *Nicomachean Ethics*. Translated by R.C. Bartlett and S.D. Collins. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 2012.
- Arnesen, Eric. *Brotherhoods of Color: Black Railroad Workers and the Struggle for Equality*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2001.
- Barber, Lucy.G. *Marching on Washington: The Forging of an American Political Tradition*. University of California Press, 2004.
- Berens, John F. “‘Like a Prophetic Spirit’: Samuel Davies, American Eulogists, and the Deification of George Washington.” *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 63, no. 3 (October 1977): 290–297.
- De Biasi, Jean-Louis. *Secrets & Practices of the Freemasons: Sacred Mysteries, Rituals and Symbols Revealed*. 1st ed. Woodbury, Minn: Llewellyn Publications, 2010.
- Biesecker, Barbara A. “Remembering World War II: The Rhetoric and Politics of National Commemoration at the Turn of the 21st Century.” *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 88, no. 4 (November 2002): 393–409.
- Blair, Carole, Marsha S. Jeppeson, and Enrico Pucci. “Public Memorializing in Postmodernity: The Vietnam Veterans Memorial as Prototype.” *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 77, no. 3 (August 1991): 263–288.
- Blair, Carole, and Neil Michel. “Reproducing Civil Rights Tactics: The Rhetorical Performances of the Civil Rights Memorial.” *Rhetoric Society Quarterly* 30, no. 2 (March 2000): 31–55.
- Bodnar, John. *Remaking America: Public Memory, Commemoration, and Patriotism in the Twentieth Century*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1993.
- Bowers, William T., William M. Hammond, and George L. MacGarrigle. *Black Soldier, White Army: The 24th Infantry Regiment in Korea*. Washington, D.C.: Center of Military History, 1997.

Brannon, Linda, and Jess Feist. *Health Psychology: An Introduction to Behavior and Health*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth, Cengage Learning, 2009.

Breen, T.H. "Ideology and Nationalism on the Eve of the American Revolution: Revisions Once More in Need of Revising." *The Journal of American History* 84, no. 1 (1997): 13–39.

Browne, Stephen H. "Remembering Crispus Attucks: Race, Rhetoric, and the Politics of Commemoration." *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 85, no. 2 (May 1999): 169–187.

Brummett, Barry. "Towards a Theory of Silence as a Political Strategy." *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 66, no. 3 (October 1980): 289–303.

Burke, R. *Benjamin Banneker*. American Lives. Heinemann Library, 2003.

Cicero. *De Oratore*. Translated by E.N.P. Moor. Methuen and Company, 1904.

Cohen, Edward. *The Athenian Nation*. Princeton University Press, 2002.

Collings Eves, Rosalyn. "A Recipe for Remembrance: Memory and Identity in African-American Women's Cookbooks." *Rhetoric Review* 24, no. 3 (July 2005): 280–297.

Collins, Peter. *Changing Ideals in Modern Architecture: 1750-1950*. London: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1998.

Condit, C.M., and J.L. Lucaites. *Crafting Equality: America's Anglo-African Word*. New Practices of Inquiry. University of Chicago Press, 1993.

Connelly, Thomas L. *The Marble Man: Robert E. Lee and His Image in American Society*. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1978.

Crenshaw, Carrie. "Resisting Whiteness' Rhetorical Silence." *Western Journal of Communication* 61, no. 3 (September 1997): 253–278.

Danilov, Victor J. *Hall of Fame Museums: A Reference Guide*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 1997.

Davis, Natalie Zemon, and Randolph Starn. "Introduction: Special Issue on Memory and Countermemory." *Representations* no. 26 (April 1989): 1–6.

Deutsche, Rosalyn. *Evictions: Art and Spatial Politics*. Graham Foundation/MIT Press Series in Contemporary Architect. New York: Graham Foundation for Advanced Studies in the Fine Arts, 1996.

Dickinson, Greg, Carole Blair, and Brian Ott. *Places of Public Memory: The Rhetoric of Museums and Memorials*. Tuscaloosa, AL: University Of Alabama Press, 2010.

Dodd, Philip. *The Art of Classical Details: Theory, Design & Craftsmanship*. Victoria, AUS: Images Publishing Group, 2013.

Dyson, Michael Eric. *Can You Hear Me Now?: The Inspiration, Wisdom, and Insight of Michael Eric Dyson*. New York: Basic Civitas Books, 2011.

———. *I May Not Get There With You: The True Martin Luther King, Jr.* New York: The Free Press, 2000.

Ellis, John B. *The Sights and Secrets of the National Capital: A Work Descriptive of Washington City in All Its Various Phases*. Jones, Junkin & co., 1869.

Feagin, Joe R. *Racist America: Roots, Current Realities, and Future Reparations*. Taylor & Francis, 2012.

Finnegan, Cara A. "Recognizing Lincoln: Image Vernaculars in Nineteenth-Century Visual Culture." In *Visual Rhetoric: A Reader in Communication and American Culture*, edited by Cara A. Finnegan, Lester C. Olson, and Diane S. Hope, 61–78. SAGE Publications, 2008.

Ford, R.T. *The Race Card: How Bluffing About Bias Makes Race Relations Worse*. Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 2009.

Fornieri, Joseph R., ed. *The Language of Liberty: The Political Speeches and Writings of Abraham Lincoln*. Washington, D.C.: Regnery Pub., 2009.

Franklin, John H., and Evelyn B. Higginbotham. *From Slavery to Freedom: A History of African Americans*. From Slavery Freedom. McGraw-Hill, 2011.

Galinsky, Karl. *Classical and Modern Interactions: Postmodern Architecture, Multiculturalism, Decline, and Other Issues*. University of Texas Press, 1992.

Gillis, John R. *Commemorations: The Politics of National Identity*. Princeton Paperbacks. Princeton University Press, 1996.

Glenn, Cheryl. *Unspoken: A Rhetoric of Silence*. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 2004.

Goode, Kenneth G. *From Africa to the United States and Then...: A Concise Afro-American History*. 2d ed. Glenview, IL: Scott, Foresman and Company, 1969.

Grey, T.C. "The Constitution as Scripture." *Stanford Law Review* (1984): 1–25.

Hartigan, John. *What Can You Say?: America's National Conversation on Race*. Palo Alto, CA: Stanford University Press, 2010. <http://books.google.com/books?id=3myrUtDtBCQC>.

Higginbotham, A. Leon. *Shades of Freedom: Racial Politics and Presumptions of the American Legal Process*. Oxford University Press, USA, 1998.

Hillstrom, Laurie C. *The Voting Rights Act of 1965*. Defining Moments. Omnigraphics, 2009.

Hoerl, Kristen. "Selective Amnesia and Racial Transcendence in News Coverage of President Obama's Inauguration." *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 98, no. 2 (May 2012): 178–202.

Holland, Jesse J. *Black Men Built the Capitol: Discovering African-American History In and Around Washington*. Globe Pequot, 2007.

Jackson, C. *Violence, Visual Culture, and the Black Male Body*. Routledge Research in Cultural and Media Studies. New York: Routledge, 2011.

Jargowsky, Paul A. "Ghetto Poverty Among Blacks in the 1980s." *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management* 13, no. 2 (April 1, 1994): 288–310.

Jones, Melinda. *Social Psychology of Prejudice*. Berkeley: Prentice Hall, 2002.

Kinder, Donald R., and David O. Sears. "Prejudice and Politics: Symbolic Racism Versus Racial Threats to the Good Life." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 40, no. 3 (March 1981): 414–431.

King, Jr., Martin Luther. "The Case Against 'Tokenism'." In *A Testament of Hope: The Essential Writings and Speeches of Martin Luther King, Jr.*, edited by James M. Washington. New York: HarperCollins, 1990.

———. "The Trumpet of Conscience." In *A Testament of Hope: The Essential Writings and Speeches of Martin Luther King, Jr.*, edited by James M. Washington. New York: HarperCollins, 1990.

Knowles, Caroline. "Seeing Race Through the Lens." *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 29, no. 3 (May 2006): 512–529.

Kurzon, Dennis. *Discourse of Silence*. John Benjamins Publishing, 1998.

Lapenson, Bruce P. *Affirmative Action and the Meanings of Merit*. Lanham, MD: University Press of America, 2009.

LaVeist, T.A., and L.A. Isaac. *Race, Ethnicity, and Health: A Public Health Reader*. Public Health/Vulnerable Populations. Wiley, 2012.

Leeman, Richard W., and Bernard K. Duffy. *The Will of a People: A Critical Anthology of Great African American Speeches*. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 2012.

Linklater, Andro. *The Fabric of America: How Our Borders and Boundaries Shaped the Country and Forged Our National Identity*. New York: Walker & Co., 2007.

Mandziuk, Roseann M. "Commemorating Sojourner Truth: Negotiating the Politics of Race and Gender in the Spaces of Public Memory." *Western Journal of Communication* 67, no. 3 (September 2003): 271–291.

Masur, Kate. *An Example for All the Land: Emancipation and the Struggle Over Equality in Washington*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2010.

McConahay, John B. "Self-Interest Versus Racial Attitudes as Correlates of Anti-Busing Attitudes in Louisville: Is It The Buses or the Blacks?" *The Journal of Politics* 44, no. 3 (August 1, 1982): 692–720.

Meier, August, and Elliot M. Rudwick. *Along the Color Line: Explorations in the Black Experience*. Blacks in the New World Series. University of Illinois Press, 2003.

Miller, R.J. *Native America, Discovered And Conquered: Thomas Jefferson, Lewis & Clark, and Manifest Destiny*. Praeger Publishers, n.d.

Morgan, Edward P. "Rights, Power, and Equality: The Modern Civil Rights Movement." In *Upon These Shores: Themes in the African-American Experience, 1600 to the Present*, edited by William R. Scott and William G. Shade. Routledge, 2000.

Morgan, Kenneth. *Slavery and the British Empire: From Africa to America*. New York: Oxford University Press, USA, 2007.

Nakayama, Thomas K., and Robert L. Krizek. "Whiteness: A Strategic Rhetoric." *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 81, no. 3 (August 1995): 291–309.

Omi, M., and H. Winant. *Racial Formation in the United States: From the 1960s to the 1990s*. Critical Social Thought. Routledge, 1994.

Ong, Paul M. *The Impact of Affirmative Action: Policies and Consequences in California*. Walnut Creek, CA: AltaMira Press, 1999.

Palmer, William. "How Ideology Works: Historians And the Case of British Abolitionism." *The Historical Journal* 52, no. 04 (November 6, 2009): 1039.

Prelli, Lawrence J., ed. "Introduction." In *Rhetorics of Display*. Columbia, SC: University of South Carolina Press, 2006.

Reed, Henry H. *The United States Capitol: Its Architecture and Decoration*. New York: Norton, 2005.

- Rhodehamel, John. *The Great Experiment: George Washington and the American Republic*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1998.
- Rich, Jack C. *The Materials and Methods of Sculpture*. Oxford University Press, 1947.
- Rothman, Adam. *Slave Country: American Expansion and the Origins of the Deep South*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2007.
- Savage, Kirk. *Monument Wars: Washington, D.C., the National Mall, and the Transformation of the Memorial Landscape*. University of California Press, 2009.
- Scott, James C. *Domination and the Arts of Resistance: Hidden Transcripts*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1992.
- Senie, Harriet. *Critical Issues in Public Art: Critical Issues in Public Art*. Smithsonian, 1998.
- Shackel, Paul A. "Public Memory and the Search for Power in American Historical Archaeology." *American Anthropologist* 103, no. 3 (September 2001): 655–670.
- Sieminski, Greg. "The Puritan Captivity Narrative and the Politics of the American Revolution." *American Quarterly* 42, no. 1 (March 1, 1990): 35–56.
- Smith, Rogers M. *Civic Ideals: Conflicting Visions of Citizenship in U.S. History*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1997.
- Stillion Southard, Belinda A. "Militancy, Power, and Identity: The Silent Sentinels as Women Fighting for Political Voice." *Rhetoric & Public Affairs* 10, no. 3 (2008): 399–417.
- Tatarkiewicz, Wladyslaw. *A History of Aesthetics*. Continuum Classic Texts. Bloomsbury, 2006.
- Taylor, Jon E. *Freedom to Serve: Truman, Civil Rights, and Executive Order 9981*. New York: Rutledge, 2012.
- Vivian, Bradford. *Being Made Strange: Rhetoric Beyond Representation*. Albany: SUNY Press, 2004.
- Walters, Ronald W., and Toni-Michelle Travis. *Democratic Destiny and the District of Columbia: Federal Politics and Public Policy*. Lanham, MD: Lexington Books, 2010.
- Walton, William, and Evelyn Hofer. *The Evidence of Washington*. New York: Harper & Row, 1966.
- Watts, Eric King. "Cultivating a Black Public Voice: W.E.B. Du Bois and the 'Criteria of Negro Art'." *Rhetoric & Public Affairs* 4, no. 2 (2001): 181–201.
- . "'Voice' and 'Voicelessness' in Rhetorical Studies." *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 87, no. 2 (May 2001): 179–196.

Wilson, K.H. *The Reconstruction Desegregation Debate: The Politics of Equality and the Rhetoric of Place, 1870-1875*. Rhetoric and Public Affairs Series. Michigan State University Press, 2002.

Workman, Courtney. "The Woman Movement: Memorial to Women's Rights Leaders and the Percieved Images of the Women's Movement." In *Myth, Memory, and the Making of the American Landscape*, edited by Paul A. Shackel. University Press of Florida, 2001.

Yates, Frances A. *The Art Of Memory*. Random House, 2011.

Zelizer, Barbie. *About to Die: How News Images Move the Public: How News Images Move the Public*. New York: Oxford University Press, USA, 2010.

APPENDIX

Copies of Figures

Figure 1: Statue of Freedom



Figure 2: Slave Labor Commemorative Marker



Figure 3: *The Apotheosis of Washington*



Figure 4: Bust of Martin Luther King, Jr.



Figure 5: *The Woman Movement*



Figure 6: Statue of Rosa Parks in National Statuary Hall



Figure 7: National Statuary Hall



Figure 8: Capitol Visitor Center



Figure 9: Statue of Frederick Douglass



Figure 10: Stone of Hope



Figure 11: Mountain of Despair



Figure 12: Drum Major Inscription