Introduction

This book takes as its subject World War I memorials and commemorative practices. Its aim is to address memorial sculpture, in particular the approximately 400 figurative sculptures of American soldiers that constitute the majority of sculptural World War I memorials in the United States. To better understand these “doughboys,” the name given to both members of the American Expeditionary Forces (AEF) and the hundreds of sculptures erected in their image, and their function in the commemorative landscape of interwar America, this study will also examine their sculptural alternatives: memorials to peace, depictions of motherhood, and nude male allegories. Remarkably, neither growing scholarly interest in memorials nor the swelling ranks of twenty-first-century war memorials has directed much attention to U.S. World War I memorial sculpture.

Yet these monuments, including hundreds of doughboys portrayed in attitudes ranging from triumphant to mournful, occupy public spaces in cities and towns across the country, where they come into contact with thousands of viewers every day (fig. I.1). Some local communities pay their respects during memorial services and holidays with speeches, wreaths, flowers, and Christmas lights. Others pay them little attention. Exposed to the elements and rarely cleaned or restored, these forgotten sculptures fall victim to vandalism, traffic accidents, and lightning storms. Once their origins are recovered, however, it becomes evident that the physical spaces they inhabit are only one dimension of the complex position they once occupied at the intersection of public art, material culture, and commemorative practice. The study of World War I memorial sculpture offers a window into the art worlds and cultural criticism of the interwar period at the same time that it sheds light on attitudes toward gender and war and the relationship between cultural memory and monument; topics of continued relevance in the twenty-first century. It also forces us to question the utility of many war memorials, sculptures dedicated to show gratitude and perpetuate the memory of those who died in our nation’s wars, but that also celebrate militaristic ideals, thereby privileging the valor and necessity of war over its tragedy.
Scholars have published book-length studies of British and French memorials to the First World War, monographs on British memorial sculptors, and essays on topics ranging from soldier memorials to sculptors of reconstructive masks for disfigured soldiers, but only a small percentage of this literature focuses on U.S. sculptors and monuments. This oversight derives in part from attitudes toward the U.S. role in the First World War, widely considered less significant than that of other nations and less worthy of attention than U.S. involvement in other major wars. Yet the implications of American participation as they pertained to twentieth-century foreign policy, military development, labor relations, race relations, women’s status, and government functions, continue to be debated and reappraised. As Steven Trout, scholar of World War I literature, writes in his study of interwar period remembrance, the Great War is experiencing a surge of interest across disciplines at the same time that it is paradoxically remembered as being invisible and neglected, as America’s “forgotten war.”

In the introduction to her study of U.S. soldiers during this “forgotten” conflict, Jennifer Keene asks readers to reconsider the tragedy of modern warfare, pointing to the Meuse–Argonne offensive in the fall of 1918 as a response to suggestions that “American effort in World War I lacked a key pivotal battle that defined the war’s purpose, strategy, and suffering.” She reminds us that the offensive lasted forty-seven days and involved nearly 1.2 million American soldiers, more than the entire Confederate Army during the Civil War. Casualty rates averaged 2,550 a day, with 6,000 Americans dying each week. With no distinct beginning and end to the fighting, as in previous great battles, the psychological and physical horror was analogous to the continuous struggles waged by platoons of men during the jungle campaigns of World War II and the Vietnam War.

Indeed, Trout writes that in the 1960s, “World War I made a comeback in terms of collective memory … [becoming] a metaphor for military futility, a forerunner, because it supposedly achieved nothing–of the quagmire in Southeast Asia.” The absence of a pat counterweight to the conflict’s human loss, he writes, contributes to the “unsettled” nature of World War I memory. Military historian Lisa M. Budreau concurs: “The task of commemorating the first modern, international war of the twentieth century was an exceptionally complicated one … ”

Writers like Niall Ferguson, Trout, and Keene urge us not to diminish the importance of the 116,000 American deaths in World War I and the impact that the largely unanticipated bloodshed would have on the nation. By comparison, “the number of Americans who died in the much-filmed Vietnam War was ‘only’ 57,939, and the number killed in Korea was 33,000.” Of course, the meanings that these numbers convey are unstable, depending on the contexts in which they are experienced. American casualties in the
First World War, after all, were only 1.2 percent of the total death toll and scholars have played down the impact of American losses. Keene and Ferguson offer these statistics by way of putting the First World War into new perspective and introducing other compelling reasons to reconsider American participation. Keene stresses the new authority of the citizen soldiers who served in the country’s first national army. For the first time in military history, draftees comprised a majority of the citizen soldier population. Their behaviors and attitudes challenged army authorities and precipitated changes in army policy. The political activism of World War I veterans, moreover, instigated major government reforms. Veterans were responsible for winning adjusted compensation for servicemen and later, the GI Bill, which had far reaching consequences for the economic and social landscape of the nation.

At the same time, hopes raised by U.S. involvement were dashed when the war ended. Women were driven out of the new jobs they had occupied only briefly and African-American veterans were subjected to the harsh discrimination and violence of Jim Crow.

Re-examination of the roles U.S. soldiers and veterans played abroad and on the home front during and after World War I, as well as reconsideration of the collective memory of the Great War in the interwar years, helps explain the widespread impulse to initiate fundraising campaigns to dedicate memorials to local heroes in the 1920s. Their dedication was largely a grassroots affair, spearheaded by women’s clubs, local chapters of veterans’ and patriotic organizations, and civic and ethnic groups. These organizations were increasingly involved in the business of memory in the early twentieth century. Writing regional and club histories, making pilgrimages to historic sites, erecting historic markers, and dedicating monuments were among the practices that helped ease the anxieties brought on by relentless modernization.

The American Legion in particular “was memory obsessed,” building on and finding inspiration in the intense “memory culture” of the AEF. Legion posts thus played a significant role in shaping the types of heroic monuments that would dominate the World War I commemorative landscape.

The revival of interest in the First World War has led historians to study American overseas cemeteries and the significance of American Legion and Gold Star Mothers’ pilgrimages to those sites. But just as literary scholars have traditionally privileged the critical visions of “lost generation” writers, like F. Scott Fitzgerald, Ernest Hemmingway, and John Dos Passos, over war stories published in popular magazines, art historians have long been more interested in modernist responses to war, like the anti-war Dada movement, than monumental tributes associated with war’s glorification. Likewise, the grand gestures of official U.S. monuments abroad have garnered more attention than the more spontaneously dedicated memorials in the United States. Pitted against canonical modern art stylistically and ideologically, traditional war memorials are unappealing topics for those who foreground
the formal innovation and radical politics of the avant-garde. Art critic Deborah Solomon, remarking on the new respect accorded patriotic art in the wake of the terrorist attacks on September 11, 2001, noted that “To proclaim an unironic interest in such art [bronze statues of soldiers on horses, for instance] was to invite sneers from sophisticates, to be written off as a visual illiterate.”

It is time to look again at these figurative sculptures as the interwar period becomes the subject of increasing art historical inquiry, and as recent conflicts invite reappraisal of nationalistic art and the commemoration of war. Ignoring them fosters the cultural amnesia that has contributed to an explosion of war memorial dedications in recent years, including new memorials to both world wars. It also misses an opportunity to study a rich era in U.S. history when immigrant and women artists strove to find a voice and a physical presence in the civic sphere, and when more established sculptors struggled to forge a viable public art that was simultaneously classic and modern, high-minded and accessible, and patriotic without being propagandistic. World War I memorials represent the last major wave of public figurative sculpture until nearly a half-century later, when the *Vietnam Veterans’ Memorial* (1982) sparked a resurgence of memorial making that continues today.

Though products of social and cultural forces unique to their time, World War I memorials, unlike the common soldier monuments of the Civil War or the unheroic black granite wall of the *Vietnam Veterans’ Memorial*, did not represent a major turning point in the history of U.S. commemorative art. Rather they signal a transitional period, during which locally dedicated monuments in many ways followed the patterns of Civil War commemoration. The Civil War had “ushered in a new era of the public monument.” The common soldier memorials of the Civil War, as art historian Kirk Savage has shown, dedicated mostly in the 1880s through the first decade of the twentieth century, marked a significant shift in commemorative practice because they did not depict the military or political leaders of earlier equestrian monuments (fig. I.2). The new sculptures, dedicated locally and representing the rank and file, “rehabilitated and modernized” the figure of the citizen soldier: “While the experience of the war had undermined the soldier’s very integrity as an individual, the standing-soldier monument restored the individual body to center stage.” At the same time, the “parade rest” pose of the men depicted in Civil War statues, a relaxed military pose that allowed the soldier to stand with his weight shifted onto one leg and body leaning into his rifle, projected a compromise between “regimentation and independence.” Civil War figurative sculptures embodied negotiation on many levels: between the regimented and the independent, the abstract and the concrete, and the national and the local. Generalized, native, white, American “types,” they rescued the individual from the mass of a modern army at the same time that their whiteness differentiated military regimentation from slavery’s subordination. Savage shows that “While the loss of agency for white men
translated itself into commemorative gain, the gain of agency for black men
translated itself into commemorative loss.”

This study will demonstrate how the fighting and vigilant poses of U.S.
soldiers in World War I memorials similarly conferred agency on their white
subjects, asserting their physically capable presence in interwar society while
failing to represent the manhood of black veterans. Fighting doughboy
sculptures reinforced the warrior ideal that both civilians and citizen soldiers
subscribed to during and after the war, despite the fact that only 40 percent of
U.S. forces in World War I were combat soldiers (as compared with 90 percent
during the Civil War). Yet even non-combatants were eager to frame their
service in terms that evoked the warrior ideal by emphasizing their bravery
and the hazardous nature of their service. Fighting soldier sculptures
contributed to the perpetuation of that ideal throughout the 1920s.

Chapter 1 demonstrates why soldier memorials came to occupy
such a significant presence in interwar commemoration. With national
commemorative efforts focused on battlefield cemeteries abroad, civic and
veterans’ groups across the country took memorial making into their own
hands. The committees who raised funds, deliberated, and took charge of
memorial making at the local level, despite efforts made by critics to encourage
more artful tributes, overwhelmingly chose the tangible body of the soldier
himself with which to commemorate their dead. That the American Legion,
the largest veterans’ organization in the country (with over 10,000 posts by
1941), persisted in framing its memory of the war in terms of the heroism
of individual experience, rather than dwelling on the uncertain causes or
outcomes of the war, cannot be underestimated in an examination of these
sculptures. A speaker at the dedication of Exeter, New Hampshire’s World
War I memorial in 1922 summed up popular sentiment when he said, “The
people admire a soldier. They applaud deeds of valor. They accept bravery
as a requisite of manhood. They recognize greatness of action as the chief of
distinctions. In short, the whole world loves a soldier.” Similar in concept to
the Civil War statues in that he represented the rank and file combat soldier,
the World War I doughboy was more often depicted in an active pose with
drawn bayonet or in a steadfast and vigilant pose with rifle held across
the body, promoting an aggressive and virile image of interwar American
manhood.

The name “doughboy” itself conjures up the youthful optimism that these
figures represented for the communities who commissioned them in the
1920s. Keene provides an overview of the competing accounts for why World
War I soldiers were nicknamed doughboys: “Some historians trace the name’s
origins to 1854, when infantrymen along the Texas border cleaned their pipes
with a ‘dough-like’ pipe clay and lived in adobe buildings. [Others claim] that
the name doughboy came from the large brass [pastry-like] buttons that the
infantry wore in the Civil War.” Over the course of the Great War,
the nickname came to be used for more than just members of the infantry but for all army combat branches, aviators, logistical support troops, and U.S. marines. A contributor to *Red Cross Magazine* explained:

The doughboy needs definition. He is not merely the American private soldier, though technically the term “doughboy” is used to describe the private; ... there is no difference in opinion in the officers’ mess, the noncom’s mess, and in the mess of the private soldier ... when the song rollicks:

“And it’s O boy,
It took the doughboy
To hang the wash on the Hindenburg line”

it means the whole outfit, including the telephone girls.22

Whatever its origins, the nickname’s appeal was linked to its evocation of youth and boyishness (despite claims that the term could just as easily be used for women telephone operators).23 The name also recalls another popular figure of turn-of-the-century American culture, the “cowboy,” called by historian E. Anthony Rotundo a hero who was “a man in his exploits but as heedless of civilized restraint as a boy.”24 The doughboy, too, could be described as heedless of restraint, both in terms of the challenges he posed to army authority and the problems that arose as the result of inadequate combat training (such as over-eagerness to advance or to engage the Germans during unspoken truces).25 Even the uniform of the doughboy accentuated his boyishness. One scholar has described World War I soldier sculptures as “kid-warriors-crusaders-(boys to men) dressed in a uniform that includes Oxford bags, baseball leggings, a kerchief, ranger hat, and an overall Baden-Powell Eagle Scout look.”26 The early twentieth-century Scout movement that Robert Baden-Powell (1857–1941) founded encouraged outdoor recreation, education, and survival skills for boys aged 11–18, not much younger than the draftees in the First World War. Initially men between the ages of 21 and 30 enlisted to serve, but by 1918, Congress extended the age limits to 18 and 45. The last surviving doughboy, Frank Buckles, who died in 2011 at the age of 110, lied about his age to join the army at 16, perpetuating even in death visions of heroism and boyish impulse that charging doughboy memorials put forth. The memorials, together with images of fighting doughboys in the popular culture of the war and interwar years, helped mythologize the U.S. soldiers as embodying a bravery bordering on recklessness.

Chapter 1 also examines how circumstances particular to the interwar period in the United States, such as the Red Scare, new immigrant quotas, and a burgeoning commercial culture, all shaped the efforts and visions of the local groups responsible for the vast majority of sculptural memorials. It shows, for example, how the culture of fear nurtured by the Red Scare in 1919 and other challenges that faced returning veterans influenced the
popularity of doughboy sculptures, and, in particular, fighting and vigilant ones. Of the approximately 800 sculptural World War I memorials dedicated from 1918 through the 1930s, 65 percent are freestanding sculptures of soldiers and allegories. Of these figurative sculptures, close to 80 percent are soldiers and more than 60 percent of the soldiers are fighting (depicted throwing grenades or charging forward with drawn bayonets). Five percent of the soldiers are mourning or wounded. Many of the memorials that are not freestanding figurative sculptures are simple plaques with honor rolls, some embellished with small sculptural reliefs depicting doughboys and allegories. Granite steles, obelisks with cast bronze eagles, and decorated flagpoles are also typical tributes. Less common are memorials that feature life-size relief sculptures, suggesting that communities that could afford major sculptural monuments preferred the presence of freestanding statues.

The majority of this data has been gleaned from the Smithsonian Institution Inventory of American Sculpture database. Compiled in collaboration with Save Outdoor Sculpture! (SOS!), an initiative of the non-profit Washington, D.C.-based organization Heritage Preservation, which conducted a nationwide survey of publicly accessible outdoor sculpture in the 1990s, the database does not include strictly utilitarian memorials or memorials that cannot be classified easily as “sculpture.” While utilitarian memorials do not present an area of focus for this study because their popularity did not offer a significant threat to traditional sculptural memorials until World War II, these statistics on memorial types are nonetheless estimates. It is difficult, for instance, in a study of this scope, to account for the total number of minor monuments like honor rolls. The Smithsonian database includes basic bronze honor rolls affixed to steles or boulders, but since SOS! survey parameters defined sculpture as three-dimensional and excluded tablets and cairns, many of these simple tributes were overlooked. Soon after the war’s end, before communities initiated efforts to commission more elaborate tributes, local groups dedicated unassuming bronze plaques and honor rolls with minimal sculptural decoration ordered directly from monument firms and foundries such as T.F. McGann & Sons Company of Boston, Massachusetts, or Gorham Company Founders of Providence, Rhode Island. Of these, the most basic unadorned tablets, listing the names of the men from a particular community who served and died, attached to a boulder or stele, constitute a much larger percentage of all World War I memorials than available data suggests. In many cases, these permanent markers replaced temporary wooden and plaster honor rolls that had been erected during the war. Nearly a century later, scores of them have been vandalized or removed from their original locations. The same is true of the plaques affixed to many of the memorial trees dedicated in New York City after the war. Those that remain offer quiet records of sacrifice. Whether the result of community practicality, frugality, or obedience to American Federation of Arts guidelines that encouraged
simplicity, these honor rolls trace the history of a neighborhood or town’s service with an economy of means.

The conflict at the heart of this study, however, focuses on the more prominent freestanding sculptures of the soldiers themselves, both the mass-produced products of monument firms, like the one by Ernest Moore Viquesney with which Chapter 2 begins, and the one-of-a-kind works designed by professional sculptors for particular sites. A majority of critics believed that only art, defined as something refined, not too literal, and custom made by professional artists, could properly embody the uplifting and spiritual essence of memorials. Thus the thriving presence of the monument industry was a major source of concern for American art critics after World War I. Steadily increasing numbers of common soldier memorials had invited a critical backlash not long after they first emerged in the United States in the late nineteenth century. By 1910, disdain for “statue mania” had intensified and spread. French critics diagnosed Paris as having succumbed to statue mania and American commentators like painter and National Commission of Fine Arts member, Frank Millet, drew comparisons between Paris and Washington, D.C., calling D.C. a “scrap heap for poor statues.” The system of production and dissemination of mass-produced soldier statues, having grown and developed to meet the popular demand for Civil War memorials at the turn of the twentieth century, was already in place by the signing of the Armistice, making it easy to continue rather than break from earlier memorial making practices.

Chapter 2 provides an overview of the campaign that U.S. cultural groups initiated in 1918 to stem the tide of industry-produced soldier sculptures like Viquesney’s. Inevitably, by addressing the shortcomings of such statues and the potential pitfalls of memorial art more generally, artists, architects, critics, museum directors, professors, urban planners and other cultural spokespeople engaged in a heated discourse about public taste and the function of commemorative art. Their apprehension about the quality of World War I memorials reflected genteel notions of culture that held art appreciation to be the purview of the educated elite. It also revealed efforts to guard sculptors’ relatively newly won professional influence and to protect a set of core “American” ideals and values, rooted in Western sculptural traditions. Their concerns were bound up with cultural power and professional legitimacy, both necessary to secure their livelihood and continued relevance in a fast changing and modernizing society. At the same time, progressive era faith in the ability of education to improve public taste signaled the emergence of more participatory models of culture. Critics hoped that memorial sculpture, made in a language of updated classicism by the nation’s best artists, would help create enlightened citizens. For their intents and purposes, the public included newly arrived immigrants, and working and middle-class Americans who were increasingly exposed to the unfiltered realism
of new forms of popular entertainment. The public also included veterans and politicians and the members of civic groups and patriotic organizations who commissioned commemorative sculpture at the local level. The key problem was that sculptors perceived the stakes as so high and that members of America's cultural elite did not trust the public's ability to select refined art worthy of such lofty didactic functions. Thus, even though commentators agreed art was the most proper memorial form, they urged committees to refrain from dedicating soldier sculptures and "symbolic groups," since they could not guarantee laypeople would select appropriate sculptural tributes.

Despite the overwhelming tide of professional opinion against doughboy memorials, a very small minority of writers on the topic praised soldier statues, and even copies of original designs, as effective solutions to the problem of public commemorative art because of their emotional and commercial accessibility. Many more (though still a minority) promoted utilitarian memorials, signaling a trend that would not come to full fruition until World War II. Thus World War I commemorative practices echoed patterns established by Civil War memorials, but also foreshadowed later twentieth-century trends.

World War I memorials as a whole ultimately reflect a surprising degree of individuality, given the conservative nature of public art and the anti-radical politics of the Red Scare. The sculptors discussed in Chapter 3, both well-known and lesser-known artists, introduced themes of suffering and loss by making memorials that featured mourning, wounded, and dying soldiers. Beginning in 1921, a less stridently anti-radical political climate permitted the dedication of sculptures that quietly questioned the triumphant and fighting types. These works still upheld nationalist narratives of heroic sacrifice and reflected the sentimental imagery of the period's popular culture, but they nonetheless gave form to their makers' desires to rise above patriotic propaganda. For women sculptors, the act of modeling the male body for public display in a war memorial was a significant achievement. This chapter thus considers Gertrude Vanderbilt Whitney's decision to model the vulnerable male body for her Washington Heights–Inwood Memorial in New York in the context of women sculptors' on-going challenges in the field of public commemorative military sculpture. The memorials discussed here all maintained a judicious balance between the real and ideal and between expressing romanticized and ambivalent attitudes toward war.

Also notable are the memorials that challenged popular expectations concerning heroism and war by forfeiting the body of the soldier altogether. Almost half of all sculptural memorials failed to include the doughboy, in many cases due to the great expense of erecting figurative statuary. Common alternatives consisted of steles or obelisks adorned with inexpensive sculptural elements like decorated tablets or bronze eagles. Yet some sculptors and communities sought more enlightened and artful substitutes
for representational soldiers. The sculptors covered in Chapter 4 opted for allegorical subjects. Daniel Chester French, for example, who had built his career on making allegorical architectural sculpture before World War I, took advantage of the freedom his reputation allowed by making two daring memorial designs that featured the dying male nude. The lesser-known Pietro Montana aspired to greater professional heights by sculpting artful allegories and making “highbrow” art historical references in his memorials. Allegory thus offered a self-consciously refined solution to the problem of memorial art, but also an iconography that was open-ended enough to challenge the prevailing commemorative language of militarism without offending conservative constituencies. Finally, motherhood, and allegories of maternal sacrifice provided another alternative to the fighting soldier. As has been noted in the context of pioneer mother monuments, “[m]otherhood was ... a potent symbol in the United States” that “could be put to a variety of uses.” Bashka Paefi used her powerful maternal allegory of Civilization as a pacifist critique of patriotic motherhood, while others used allegories of maternal sacrifice in support of that self-abnegating ideal.

As more and more memorials are dedicated in the twenty first-century, it behooves us to look at those dedicated in the last 100 years and to ask whether communities should dedicate new memorials without taking the time to learn the histories of and question the values perpetuated by those that already exist. Only when memorials teeter on the verge of ruin do community groups and preservationists drum up support to raise funds for conservation (and in one instance, to help prevent the endangered monument from being sold in the online classifieds). Obviously, monuments require regular care to prevent cycles of restoration and decay. It is also important to acknowledge the necessity of confronting their histories and to recognize how their meanings change over time, in many cases losing relevance and offending contemporary sensibilities. Memorials that have not kept pace with the attitudes and values embraced by their changing communities, however, should not be relegated to the scrap heap of e-Bay classifieds, but used to probe the complex machinations of public debate and compromise. This study aims not to recover and celebrate the militaristic ideals promoted by many war memorials, but to embrace them as carriers of historical knowledge that can encourage the rethinking of those ideals. New methods for highlighting and questioning the meaning of monuments exist today, ranging from virtual photograph exhibitions and digital projections to podcasts and programming with stories told by veterans of more recent wars. Embracing temporary projects and “interventions” like those proposed by Kirk Savage for the Mall in Washington, D.C., might not only resurrect the physical landscape of the past in communities across the nation but forge vital connections with war and remembrance today as the centennial of U.S. participation in World War I approaches.
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