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Introduction

Monument and memorial building is one of the more dramatic forms of public art. The creation of an art work involves a complicated organization of social norms or conventions. These conventions are not solely aesthetic, but have built into them a number of other social rules related to administrative bureaucracies and political institutions. This involvement of various conventions is associated with the creation of any type of private or public art work.

This paper analyzes the proposed building of such a public art work constructed to memorialize students killed and wounded on May 4, 1970 at Kent State University. We begin with a discussion of Barry Schwartz's theory of collective memory. Then a social process theory is developed. The social process theory is discussed in terms of evidence from the experience gained in construction of an earlier memorial, the Vietnam Veteran's memorial (VVM) in Washington, D.C. With explication of the theory completed, experience associated with the proposed construction of a memorial to events of May 4, 1970 at Kent State University will be analyzed through use of the social process model of collective memory.

Collective Memory

In 1985 a Kent State University committee recommended a memorial be built on the campus expressing the themes of inquiry, learning, and reflection concerning the events of May 4, 1970, and its impact on American society. Early in 1986 a national competition for a memorial design was
conducted. This attempt to create a collective memory is an ongoing social process.

The social process of establishing artifacts symbolizing an aspect of collective memory has been discussed by a number of authors (Halbwachs 1925, Mead 1938, B. Schwartz 1982, 1983, 1985a, 1985b, 1986), who generally take a stance that past events are formulated to give significance and relevance to the present. Schwartz (1982 p. 376), in his discussion of Halbwach's (1925) work on the social context of remembering and forgetting, notes that the earlier author "promotes the idea that our conception of the past is entirely at the mercy of current conditions, that there is no objectivity in events, nothing in history which transcends the peculiarities of the present." Halbwach's radical approach to the establishment of collective memory is therefore modified by Schwartz, who takes the middle road between absolutist approaches attaching an objective and unchanging meaning to historical events, and the relativist approach where meaning is imposed exclusively by contemporary observers.

According to Schwartz (1982 p. 396), "the past cannot be literally constructed; it can only be selectively exploited. . ." and "the exploitation cannot be arbitrary. . ." for "The events selected for commemoration must have some factual significance . . ." In another of his works, Schwartz et al (1986) makes use of his theory of historical selectivity in collective memory to demonstrate how an aspect of Jewish history, the Roman siege of Masada in 73 A.D., was selectively used by modern Jews to provide a collective account for their contemporary experience in Palestine. Schwartz terms this process "recovered history", and his point is, for the most part, clearly made. However, in his conclusion to this article there are some critically important theoretical ambiguities which the present paper will seek to clarify.
Schwartz (1986 p. 160) quotes George Herbert Mead's interpreters (Maines, Sugrue, and Katovich, 1983 p. 163-165), such that Mead conceived of the past as serving the present in accordance with two functions. The first function is in "redefining the meaning of past events in such a way that they have meaning in and utility for the present . . ." and "[T]he functional character of reconstruction is contained in its contribution to present meanings." The second function is to provide "practical value in solving situational problems." Schwartz discounts the second function of "the use value of the past" in favor of the notion that perceptions of the past are considered to be "valid not for their utility but because of their objective fit with reality (Schwartz, 1986:160)." Schwartz terms this "objective fit with reality" the "congruence principle" and the pragmatist (Meadian) version the "pleasure principle". Though there appears at first to be a fine line separating these versions of how history is used to formulate meaning, a deeper consideration shows the delineation of two profoundly different ways of conceptualizing. This difference is illustrated in one of the most important and complex elements of human cognition: the application of metaphorical or analogous thought. For example, use of analogy is a primary element in Common Law jurisprudence where the principle of stare decisis or precedent provides a linkage with past decisions. The artist or poet grasps this analogous or metaphorical linkage with past works when she sculpts a shape or turns a phrase thereby reintroducing commonly known forms in extraordinarily different terms. T. S. Eliot (1932 p. 247) addresses this artistic coupling in his statement:

When a poet's mind is perfectly equipped for his work, it is constantly amalgamating disparate experiences; the ordinary man's experience is chaotic, irregular, fragmentary. The latter falls in love, or reads
Spinoza, and these two experiences have nothing to do with each other, or with the noise of the typewriter or the smell of cooking; in the mind of the poet these experiences are always forming new wholes.

Schwartz (1986 p. 161) argues that "we may trace the content of collective memory to a congruence principle rather than a pragmatist version of the pleasure principle." For Schwartz, the coupling of an event from the past to the present does not involve a self-serving selection of arbitrary bits and pieces whittled and fashioned to fit conveniently into a slot in the present. Rather, the past fits and is analogous with the present because it has been appropriately selected by the historian, sociologist, or poet.

Schwartz' inference is that the past as an analogy fits appropriately because in some way the past is structurally the same as the present because past events set forth the template for all future events. Schwartz (1982) touches upon this notion in an earlier work where he quotes the works of Levi-Strauss (1963), Eliade (1963), Shils (1975), and discusses the importance of origins as providing patterns for the present. Schwartz does strive to steer a middle course between the extremes of the absolutist and relativist approaches, but it is not clear how he can then make use of the terms appropriateness and selection, for to select or appropriate the past to fit with the present is a radically creative act, for the present is truly different. The work of applying an analogy is involved with a creative selection of aspects which appropriately fit with entirely new circumstances. History repeats itself only in the sense that the historian can strive to creatively demonstrate a similarity. The imposition of an analogy is a creative act. The analogy is objective only in the sense that its constituent historical facts are generally agreed upon; and the analogy is relative only
in the sense that historical facts are selectively superimposed on presently existing circumstances to fulfill cogent mnemonic needs of the community.

Use of the past to form an interpretation of the present is therefore involved both with the congruence principle and the pleasure principle. The present is similar to the future in that its meaning is essentially unknown. To provide the present with meaning it is critical that reference be made to the past. This process is similar to the linguistic coding of a new experience or discovery involved in communicating or teaching any innovative principle or discovery. For example, a metaphor or analogy is used because the teacher has no other means to express his new meaning. The philosopher in trying to describe to his student how mind differs from brain must link what is known to what is new and unknown. "The mind," says the philosopher, comprises much more than the simple physiological and anatomical configuration of neurons in the brain", but this statement provides little meaning to the student. However, when the philosopher uses an analogy comparing the mental process to a TV set he can produce more fruitful communicative results. "We may know all about the circuitry of a TV set, but this does not mean we understand all its various programs." Once the teacher's meaning is known, the student can eventually forget the analogous bridge and treat his new knowledge as literal without need to refer to the analogy. It is evident from a rapid perusal of etymologies in the Oxford English Dictionary that all linguistic coding is derived in this manner, the original cipher used analogously becomes literal and the metaphor is said to be dead. This is a radically creative process that is dependent upon the past only as a useful repertoire of known possibilities potentially applicable to the present. The analogy is a vehicle used to achieve new meaning and should not be confused as being literally identical to the new meaning.
This theoretical point is grounded in Parson's (1967 pp. 297-382, 1969 pp. 352-429) discussion of the relations of symbols with referents. According to Parson's economic analogy, such economic media as monetary metals symbolically reference goods-in-kind; and in turn, paper currency and eventually checks and credit cards come to represent monetary metal. The essential reason for movement from the concrete economic medium to the symbolic is to promote use-value or utility in social-economic exchange. As the medium ascends to symbolic stature, value is generalized for a greater portion of the community and ipso facto value consensus is achieved. However, the symbol is reified when confused with its referent. As Parsons notes, we cannot eat the currency nor can we use it to plow our fields. The life of the analogy or symbol is thus ephemeral.

A Social Process Theory of Memorial Building

Howard S. Becker (1974, 1976, 1982) has stressed that art is a form of collective activity. This is most evident with forms of art that are public, such as art which memorializes community personalities or events. Public memorials are intricately enmeshed in a network of social conventions, forgotten beneath the weight of stone, iron or bronze in the artifact rising from the desert at Giza, striding the Champs Elysees in Paris or welcoming the ships in New York harbor.

We will divide our social process theory of collective memory into five parts: socialization of the community to the building of the memorial, making a case for building the memorial, significant personalities and groups, community institutions (bureaucracies associated with the art world), and power. The theory will be explicated using the example
of the VVM and then be applied to the building of a memorial at Kent State University which commemorates the events of May 4, 1970.

Socialization of the Community to the Building of the Memorial

Socialization of the community involves the stock of knowledge available within the community which informs persons as to the relevance of a particular event and/or personality. Initially, events occur of national and international moment, but their importance or meaning is not immediately evident. Later, an account of the extraordinary event is created to situate it within the stock of historical knowledge available to the community. The event in this way is coupled by analogy with the known history of the community.

Aileen Saarinen (Carter 1978 p. 52) has commented that conceptions of events and personalities must reach a maturity before memorialization can even be considered. Time must pass to heal wounds and fade conflicts generated by events, but time also nurtures reflection, and provides maturity for memory invoking a perspective that situates experience within an appropriate historical context.

The historical perspective is necessary to determine the significance of the event as it applies to subsequent experience. When the community senses a need to recollect the past in the form of a material statement such as a memorial, specialists are called upon to create the appropriate statement. In the specialists' work, all the bits and pieces of memory are aesthetically amalgamated into an enormous inference structured by the current art world's aesthetic genre. The meaning of the memorial is created both through the social process whereby it is conceived and in the activities it generates after construction.
The artifact used to memorialize is of course a part of this social process. Though the Statue of Liberty is now a hallowed memorial to many notions currently interred in the American consciousness, and has established itself as an institution, it is inconceivable that a similar monument of its scale and aesthetic bearing be repeated, as has been proposed, in San Francisco harbor or anywhere else! The type of monument exemplified by the Statue of Liberty is a product of the nineteenth century. Not only is it a symbol of liberty and a remnant of a certain way of memorializing, but something much more as well. Modern abstract monuments as Eero Saarinen's Gateway Arch (1962-66) in St. Louis, Missouri and so called "living memorials" like memorial bridges or highways show a different conception and set of conventions for memorialization, but they have taken on a multitudinous set of new conceptions. The present meaning of these artifacts has come to be very different from conceptions of memorial originators. Community socialization makes use of an analogy with past experience which instigates building the original artifact, but these analogy-artifacts are eventually cast aside onto the conceptual midden of past generations. The current meaning comes to appear as the sovereign truth and reality.

Saarinen's requirement of maturity for memorialization of collective memory has been achieved by the VVM on a somewhat accelerated basis. The instigation for memorializing the fallen soldiers of the Vietnam war was originally based upon a similar need as with all wars - to stimulate memory of the past conflict - but each war is unique and the unique meaning eventually comes to be imposed upon the memorial during the building and after its construction, making this memorialization completely independent of past conceptions. Socialization of the community as to the events of Vietnam is still marked by that era's "Hawk-Dove" (pro and anti war) schism. The VVM
manifests the continuation of wartime ideational differences. Part
of the memorial commemorates the soldiers who died (the black granite walls),
and part represents a more traditional and heroic depiction of events (the
three bronze soldiers) similar to the Iwo Jima Second World War memorial.

Making a Case for Building a Memorial

With a stock of knowledge available within the community concerning an
event from the past, and its establishment as a significant marker in the
community's history, a case must be made for commemoration of the event.
After a memorial is built, accounts of its relevance seem obvious as do
reasons for its original erection. This post hoc corpus of knowledge is not
nearly so obvious before construction, because it was constituted as a result
of the monument itself. The original fact that the monument was built
signifies an initial importance to the event in the context of history, but
the event itself incarnate as with all experiences remembered and forgotten
has no intrinsically imbedded meaning. The meaning must be established.

Bartholdi's Statue of Liberty which now possesses an admirable community
consensus in its esteemed reputation was much less venerated in 1886 at its
unveiling. A case had to be made for the appropriateness of the statue which
involved a social process were parts were earlier displayed in the U.S. - the
torch - and a polemic was maintained defining the virtues of the statue for
years before it was built. After having been shipped to the U.S. from France
it was stored in warehouses until the American community was sufficiently
prepared for its erection. Even after erection much community comment
continued to further explain its appropriateness, as exemplified in Emma
Lazarus' poem which gave undeniable meaning not so neatly evident prior to the
fact of actual fabrication. We are now convinced of its significance as the
gala festivities during the summer of 1986 displayed.
A good argument can be made that Bertholdi's statue was motivated as a memorial to himself, but in order to realize construction a more generalized public account was necessary. Whatever the original stimulus for construction, the public monument is ultimately the subject of an ongoing community negotiation where advocates argue their case and thereby eventually establish community consensus.

An ongoing process of making a case and establishment of community consensus is evident in connection with the VVM both before erection and at the present time. The Vietnam Veteran's Memorial Fund (VVMF) began the task of amalgamating public consensus support for the memorial. This small movement gained attention and support from a wealthy benefactor, leading eventually to the design competition and construction. However, the meaning of the memorial site is still very much involved in the process of consensus building as seen in the interesting pattern of creative social uses the memorial has come to generate. The U. S. Department of the interior maintains an archive of the various memorabilia, such as teddy bears, worn flak jackets and combat boots, left by persons near a name; and the act of pencil-tracing the name of a friend or family member from the wall onto the VVM brochure has become an institution. Veterans wear their old uniforms to the site. One of the authors has observed a copy of the Uniform Code of Military Conduct in laminated plastic left at the feet of the bronze portion of the VVM, evidence of hardness in an old schism. It is obvious that the two portions of the VVM, the walls on the one hand, and the bronze statue on the other, have come together to symbolize in an agonizing time in American collective memory.

The Role of Significant Personalities and Groups in Memorial Building

Characteristics of the significant personalities and groups can be
derived from Garfinkel's (1956) reference to "the denouncer" in his explication of status degradation ceremonies, though we portray the characteristics in a more positive light. The significant personality may occupy a public office, though this is not a requirement, but the significant personality must be, or at least must become, a public person. The case for a memorial must be presented as if the event has public significance, and though the significant personality has a vested interest, this interest is generated from public sources, and is therefore not strictly personal. The relevance of the event is not supported by personal interests alone, and the personality has authority to speak on behalf of the community only because he or she now represents those community interests. The significant personality acts as sponsor for the ultimate values of the community, and must, as Garfinkel (1956) notes, make the dignity of the supra-individual values of the community regarding the memorial salient and accessible to view.

Part of the work of the significant personality is in obtaining the support of others through the creation of a voluntary association of persons who share similar interests. This association can capitalize on its power by gaining financial support from private and public sources and by pressuring formal and informal political groups such as lobbies and politicians. Obviously the job of the significant personality is furthered if the first portions of the process model have been fulfilled, in the sense that the community is well-informed of the event and the case has been made.

The role of Jan Scruggs (Scruggs and Swerdlow 1985), an enlisted combat veteran of Vietnam, in the building of the VVM was critical and shows how a person with relatively simple means can "capitalize" an initially small asset into a very large enterprise (Hess 1983, Howett 1985). Scruggs began with his life's
savings of approximately $2,000 from the selling of his small farm and used it to create an organization of veterans, VVMF. Later this organization played a role in gaining support in Congress to set aside a plot of land for the project. Scruggs fulfills Garfinkel's requirements as a significant individual who personifies the role of a proper advocate for the VVM. Scruggs has personal interests which are amplified off of his veteran comrades and survivors of the fallen. His marshaling of support from others such as the Texas computer magnate H. Ross Perot to finance the memorial design competition fulfilled the practical requirement of creating the means for erecting the memorial.

The Role of Community Institutions in Building the Memorial

Though the significant personality plays a major role in generating community support for the creation of the memorial, existing community institutions have a role in regulating initial decisions to build the memorial as well as in the actual construction. Part of the work of the significant personality is to engender support from powerful political groups, but it is then the role of administrative bureaucracies to filter, translate, and negotiate decisions to meet a formally instituted community norm. The legitimate authority and role of community institutions is critical and can direct a case in a multitude of unpredictable directions. Similarly, a bureaucracy whose authority includes evaluation of a memorial plan can change the direction of the original decision in a variety of ways.

Though community institutions or bureaucracies are usually thought to present impediments to creative attempts by the community, this is in no way always the case, for on some occasions these institutions can actually facilitate and protect community efforts from excessive incursion of special interests. The essential point in this connection is that these bureaucratic
entities can act to place a conservative community filter on the entire process of memorial building, and, as is the case with a judge in a court of law, act as arbiter when contending community groups are at odds. Community institutions then act as arbiters in building the memorial and often have authority to provide final permission to proceed. If this arbitral element of the social process model is missing, a serious impediment may occur in the process thus preventing the memorial's construction.

Institutions played a significant role in the building of the VVM. Because the memorial was to be built in Washington, D.C., permission to build the design had to be filtered through a formidable system of bureaucracies. First, after Congress mandates the land, all considerations for the memorial – design, landscape, planning, aesthetics – have to be approved by the National Capital Planning Commission, the Commission of Fine Arts and the Department of the Interior. Conventional wisdom conceives of bureaucratic institutions as impediments to the creative process, but particularly in the case of the VVM, these institutions acted as protective mediating devices. The architect, Paul Spreiregen, selected to administer the VVM design competition, has commented (Spreiregen 1986) that the VVM would not have been built without the "bureaucratic structure" provided by these institutions, for after the winner of the design competition was named some Vietnam veterans groups did not support it. However, the design was already in the bureaucratic works making it extremely difficult to simply ignore, no matter how powerful the arguments and political power of opponents. Eventually a compromise was reached by the two sides through mediation within the bureaucratic structure.

Existing community institutions play an important creative role in interpretation and support of memorial building, and it cannot be said that these institutions work is essentially disruptive. Because of the time it
takes to filter design ideas through large administrations, this greater amount of exposure leads to a negotiated statement having a much larger constituency than would be the case otherwise; therefore, the controversy has time to play itself out in the community milieu, thus softening particularistic influences from powerful elites and engendering wider community legitimacy.

The Role of Power in Building the Memorial

The marshaling of support from powerful groups and persons is critical to the success of memorial building. Obviously, politically powerful and wealthy persons play major roles, however, in memorial building specialized interest groups in the art world exert significant power due to the social deference and responsibility given them by the community. When memorial advocates decide to create an appropriate aesthetic metaphor, they defer to art world professionals, which, in the case of memorial building, means architects, sculptors, and landscape designers. This is a group of powerful elites, which have specific interests and authority. The interests and authority prevail in the selection of an aesthetic. If the aesthetic is to be imposed in a personal residence, or a corporate building, there may be criticism from the community, but critical vehemence is curbed because territory is private. A public monument presents a heightened level of emotion in the ensuing polemic because territory is not private. In the case of memorials, the aesthetic becomes an aspect of controversy with contending sides often consisting of community power against the interests of an art world elite.

In the case of the VVM, Jan Scruggs was able to incorporate the VVMF to erect a national monument honoring those who had died in the war. In 1979, legislation was introduced in Congress to allocate land for the planned
memorial and the project was eventually signed into law by President Carter in 1980. Though the VVMF was able to gain significant power from veterans and some of their associations, a key element in the initial impetus was from H. Ross Perot. Perot provided the seed money for a competition to select the memorial design.

In the VVM construction, significant controversy tended to be associated over the question as to the type of physical manifestation to be erected. A compromise was reached between VVMC supporters of the Maya Lin's granite walls and Perot backed supporters of a more representational bronze design by Frederick Hart. In both cases marshaling support from powerful groups provided the art world "support personnel" for building the memorials, as well as assuaging demands from contending elements of the community and eventually reaching compromises. When a public territory, whether real estate or symbolic memory, is being considered for some form of manipulation by the community, a single elite entity cannot legitimately impose itself without an outcry from other sectors.

The May 4, 1970 Memorial at Kent State University - A Social Process Analysis of Collective Memory

Method

The authors come to this research from unique perspectives. The first author has been a member of the Kent State sociology faculty since 1972. He is a sculptor whose works have appeared in the Cleveland Museum of Art and elsewhere. He submitted an entry into the Kent State University May 4, 1970 design competition. The second author has been a member of the Kent State University sociology faculty since 1966. He has written on the Kent State shootings and was a member of the first Memorial Committee. In addition to these background experiences, the authors used University documents, public
presentations, and personal interviews as sources of data for this study.

**Brief History of the Events and Issues**

The application of the social process model to the building of a May 4, 1970 memorial at Kent State University begins with a brief history of the events. Kent State University and the campus shootings on May 4, 1970, were symbols of the tragedy of America's involvement in Vietnam. What surprises many is that May 4 controversies continue to generate regional and, often, national attention addressing legal, social, and artistic issues. The wound inflicted on that day has taken long to heal.

Shortly after noon May 4, 1970, on a grassy knoll near a dormitory parking lot, a contingent of Ohio National Guardsmen opened fire for a period of thirteen seconds, striking thirteen Kent State University students, some of whom were nearby, others of whom were distant. Four students were killed, one was permanently paralyzed, and the others were wounded in varying degrees of severity.³

As is true of many issues in American society, controversy moves quickly to the courtroom. The legal struggle that followed May 4 spanned the decade of the seventies. Local, state, and federal courts became involved in extensive criminal and civil proceedings. No criminal convictions were ever obtained in regard to the deaths, however, in 1979 an out-of-court settlement was reached. The parents, students, and their attorneys received $675,000 paid by the State of Ohio.

While calls for a memorialization of the event began almost immediately after the shootings the only noteworthy event of this nature which occurred before the serious work on a university sponsored memorial in 1985 was the Segal controversy in 1978. The Putnam Foundation, on its own initiative, commissioned the well known sculptor, George Segal, to do a memorial sculpture
for Kent State University. Segal's piece was based on previous work using biblical theme of Abraham and Isaac. It showed a middle aged man, knife in hand, preparing to kill a bare chested youth kneeling in front of him. The university rejected the sculpture saying it was inappropriate and too violent. The Segal sculpture was eventually donated to Princeton University where it resides today.

In 1985 a Kent State committee recommended that a memorial should be built that expressed the themes of inquiry, learning, and reflection about May 4 and its impact on American Society, and early in 1986 a national competition for a memorial design was conducted. This event, unlike others in the history of May 4, seemed free of controversy until it was discovered that the winner of the design competition was not an American citizen, a violation of the competition rules. After several months of negotiation, the second place winner was chosen as the memorial design to be built on a site near the shootings.

In the summer of 1986 after selection of the design competition winner, another controversy developed over a resolution unanimously adopted by the American Legion's resolution committee opposing plans to build a memorial to May 4. The resolution entitled, "Kent State Memorial to Terrorists" generated considerable comment in the media. Most people objected to the Legion's use of the word "terrorist" to describe in blanket terms, all the students involved in demonstrations on May 4. Particular noteworthy was the case of Sandy Schuur, one of the slain students, who was on her way to class at the time of her death.

We now turn to application of the social process model to events of May 4, 1970. We look at issues of socialization, making a case for the memorial,
significant personalities and groups, community institutions, and the role of power.

Socialization of the Community to the Building of the May 4, 1970 Memorial

The social process model guides our analysis first to analyzing elements of socialization as they pertain to the May 4th memorial. In order for an event to have memorial consequence, a corpus of historical experience from normal times must be juxtaposed with historical information about the event. Knowledge of normal times is contrasted with the significant event, leading to a stock of knowledge informing the community concerning that event.

We can divide this stock of knowledge into three categories: people, locations, and issues. As to people, there are two core groups, the thirteen slain and wounded students on one side and the Ohio National Guard on the other. In any discussion about May 4, 1970 these two entities are always in the spotlight. Surrounding these two core groups are others including the families of the students; the National Guard commanders; the president of Kent State in 1970; the Governor of the State of Ohio.

The second category of location involves the site of the original confrontation. The Commons is a large grassy field in the center of the Kent State Campus. It was the location of many political demonstrations in the 1960's and 1970's, and it also served then, as it does today, for class meetings, sports field, and gathering spot for students. The Commons was an important part of Kent's cultural life.

Lastly, the issues category is part of the stock of knowledge and can be expressed in the form of several questions: Who burned the ROTC building? Did students have the right to assemble on the Commons? Should the Ohio National Guard have been brought onto the Kent State University Campus? Were the National Guardsmen justified in firing their weapons? This stock of knowledge
about people, location, and the issues is communicated in a variety of ways. First, there are informal channels with information moving in ways that resemble common patterns described by collective behavior scholars. Next, the media was involved in codifying the stock of knowledge for the community, which resulted in setting the agenda as to what is important in discourse about May 4. Regional papers such as the Akron Beacon Journal and the Cleveland Plain Dealer were the important sources for setting this agenda.

Finally, scholarship becomes part of the socialization process. Books and articles continue the socialization process begun by informal networks and mass media. In the Kent State case, the number of books and articles are extensive with the annotated bibliography running to over thirty book pages (Bills 1983). Lastly, the memorial effort itself becomes part of the socialization process particularly in light of the controversies which have to be explained. Memorialization of May 4, 1970 began with community support for a memorial design competition. Though the facts are evident, they had to be placed together in a form that supplied an initial analogy appropriate to that time, or a way of setting forth a symbolic consensus about the events. It is of course naive to believe that the physical entity incarnate is sufficient to symbolize events, for a social process has to play itself out in order to reflexively give meaning to the memorial.

Making a Case for the May 4, 1970 Memorial

The accounts of events on May 4 are of course not absolute or intrinsically relevant but must be negotiated. For example, the notion that the Cambodian incursion led to May 4, is obviously to simplistic. An appropriate account of events is not so straight forward. Attempts at promoting the appropriateness of a memorial can be seen in the discussions leading up to decisions to build. Advocates for the memorial feel that
portions of the community are unconvinced and must be "set straight" as to the appropriateness of the memorial. Recent statements by the president of Kent State capture these ideas in a succinct way. President Michael Schwartz (1986 E-3) of Kent State comments on the validity of May 4 as a significant event with an historical import that must be remembered:

May 4 is not just Kent State's burden. It is a burden carried by the entire society. It was an unprecedented event, and it must not be repeated. The standard (official) account of the event is argued by President Schwartz:

And then, during an awful period of American History when there was some question in the minds of many of us as to whether the American university, or indeed even the republic could survive, this university suffered its greatest tragedy. The university became a victim and, just as has so often been the case, the victim was blamed for its own victimization. Last year we continued a major effort to come to terms with that. The time was right for healing, for peace and thought, for learning and reflection. The time of playing childish games of praise and blame were over. The time had come to remember and move forward.

The argument supporting the appropriateness of the memorial is aimed at linking Kent State to greater national issues. For example, the analogous comparison of Kent State with the Boston Massacre was mentioned by one.

Also, President Schwartz's comments become directed not as much toward the absolute significance of the event as to overcoming the social opposition from that part of the community which is in disagreement with the more appropriate account. President Schwartz continues: Thinking that all was resolved, last summer we faced the Ohio Department of the American Legion's resolution critical of our efforts to make peace, to heal, to bring
perspective. We must understand that the attempt to control ideas is not just something that happens in totalitarian countries. Book-burning occurs whenever anyone, anywhere attempts to shape the quest for knowledge in his own image. We are victorious over small minds and the perpetuators of discord. We are victorious in remembrance of senseless events that nonetheless have meaning. And we must go home. Home to the real purpose of a university, which is to learn from human events.

Making a case for the memorial is an advocacy exercise in which participants must overcome arguments running counter to the "appropriate analogy" of memorial builders. Some of the advocates have more of a stake in the issue and this leads to the third element of the social process model, the role of significant personalities and groups.

The Role of Significant Personalities and Groups in Building the May 4, 1970 Memorial

In the Kent State case, it is easier to identify significant groups than individuals. Indeed, one group dominated activities seeking to create a memorial. This was a student organization called the May 4 Task Force. This group was formed in the mid-1970's to educate the Kent State community about May 4 and its aftermath. In 1982 the leadership of the Task Force went to Brage Golding, then President of the university, with the idea of establishing a memorial to the four slain students and the nine wounded. The President refused saying that such a memorial was not desired by the majority of the Kent State University community. After this rebuff, the May 4 Task Force stepped up its campaign with a public campaign including letter writing, speeches, petitions, and endorsements from various faculty and student groups. In 1983 the new president of Kent State, Michael Schwartz, received a petition from students and agreed to take the issue to the university's Board of
Trustees. The Board of Trustees in 1984 instructed the president to set up a committee to study the memorial issue. In 1985, the May 4 Memorial Committee which included faculty, administration, students, alumni, and Kent community members responded to the President with a report. The report by the Committee called for a memorial stressing the themes of inquiry, learning, and reflection. Such a conclusion was not forgone. Indeed, as late as October, 1984, the committee was sharply divided on the issue of whether or not to have a memorial. With the decision made by the University Board of Trustees to build a memorial the next step was seemingly simplistic and pragmatic, but turns out to be one of the more troublesome aspects of the process. Several existing social institutions were called into play: first, the institutionalized means of choosing a design was structured through an established design competition process; and second, with the winning design chosen, social mechanisms were activated to do the actual building. The May 4th Task Force had acted to link events at Kent State into the context of American collective consciousness, and the design competition was the next step toward formal legitimation.

The Role of Institutions in Building the May 4, 1970 Memorial

The institution that was most dominant in the effort to create a memorial was Kent State University particularly its President. There are many reasons for Schwartz's championing of a memorial. First, as a sociologist he noted the continuing debate over a memorial as highly divisive and needing of resolution. In addition, he saw the university in a unique position to congeal educational efforts on May 4. The memorial would greatly facilitate those efforts. It is not without irony, as long time faculty at Kent State, that we write positively about university leadership over the memorial affair.
In many ways university leadership was clearly lacking particularly on May 4, 1970.

How then did the university's central administration and its supportive bureaucracy involve itself in the memorial effort? Three major activities attract our attention. First, the university created the May 4 Memorial Committee already discussed. Second, the university ran the memorial design competition. Two important sets of activities should be noted. First, it undertook the initial fund raising to obtain matching funds to administer the competition and provide prize money for the winning designs. These efforts resulted in a matching grant of $85,000 from the National Endowment for the Arts. University funds were the source of the matching money. Second, Kent State provided administrative services for running the competition. Because of the size of the competition, this involved an enormous amount of staff time.

The planning of the competition took place in the summer of 1985. The competition was announced in the Fall of 1985. Approximately 1800 designers requested to compete. By the deadline of March 1986, 698 designs were submitted including 388 from individuals and 210 from teams. This number of submissions is second only to the Vietnam Veteran's Memorial submissions in the history of American National memorial competitions.

Lastly, the university and its bureaucracy is participating in efforts to build the memorial at this writing. The university has committed itself to raising $750,000 to build the memorial, and funds will be sought from only the private sector.

The Role of Power in Building the May 4, 1970 Memorial

Initially, the May 4 memorial design selection process manifested no significant power groups struggling for their particular memorial preferences.
Rather, there was a powerful individual committed to building the memorial, this was the president of Kent State University. As we have noted, the main group lobbying for the memorial was the student May 4 Task Force. By any standard, membership, money, or constituency, this was not a powerful group. Yet, through hard work and patience the Task Force was able to convince the university and its Board of Trustees that a memorial should be considered for Kent State.

A much more powerful group did emerge, however, as a result of the decision to conduct a design competition. The design competition made use of a powerful elite group in American society, the art world, which has something of a monopoly over aesthetic and symbolic taste. The current aesthetic of contemporary art is abstract as opposed to representational, and this aesthetic is pressed upon the uninitiated like ideologies as Mannheim (1936) describes them are imposed by economic or political elites.

After the president in consultation with others in the administration and faculty had decided on having the national competition to select an appropriate memorial, a direction was therefore taken to democratize the selection process and thereby ostensibly decrease any charge that particularistic groups had exerted undue influence. The notion of a national competition gives the appearance of an objective selection process; however, this does not take into consideration the powerful effect of the various elites associated with the professional areas of art, architecture, and landscape design, who are called upon to administer the competition. Paul Spreiregen, the architect in charge of the VVM was called in to administer the May 4 memorial competition. He selected the jury, and it consisted of artists, landscape architects, and was chaired by an environmental author.

One of the difficulties in building the May 4 memorial in contrast with
the VVM was the problem of conflict resolution. This was particularly acute when the winning submission was challenged because the designer was a Canadian citizen. This was a clear violation of the competition rules which stated that, "Competitors must be U.S. citizens at the time of registration" (Kent State University, 1986, p. 11, rule 1). After several months of fruitless negotiation between the University and the Canadian designer, the second place winner in the competition was chosen as the memorial design. In February, 1987, the designer of the original submission sued Kent State University for breach of contract and violation of civil rights (Garmon 1987 p. 1). A need for arbitration was clear. However, at Kent State there was or is no such arbiter, for the university administration which could act in this capacity was actually an advocate. For this reason there was no available party to negotiate any dispute.

When conflict occurred with the VVM, there were several organizations including the National Capital planning Commission, the Commission on Fine Art, and the formidable Department of the Interior (under James Watt) that acted as arbiters in the VVM memorial building process. These institutions appropriately negotiated the design selected by the panel.

One of the most prominent criticisms of the winning design in the VVM competition centered on the charge of elitism. Sprieregen mentions in his book on memorial competitions (Sprieregen 1979) that one of the chief criticisms of competitions is that the winning design may be selected, but the memorial is never actually built. Public memorials have an inherent egalitarian feature which is not often recognized by artistic elites. Tom Wolfe's (1982) highly critical (and in the opinion of some, inappropriate) comments on elitism associated with selection of the VVM design, exemplify the populist tendencies which come out as a result of memorial building.
Sprieregen (1986) mentioned in a speech at Kent State University that he did not feel it was appropriate to include a veteran on the VVM jury panel because of the potential for controversy.

The controversy over the VVM involved political, social, and even sexual elements. The VVM according to some did not depict the fighting soldier representationally enough, and it was an obviously non-masculine design according to others. After long negotiations, the more representational Frederick Hart bronze sculpture with inclusion of the American flag had been selected to accompany the Maya Lin design. The next question to be worked out centered on where the Hart sculpture and flag should be placed in association with the Lin design. One of the original suggestions made by a committee supporting the Hart design was to place the bronze sculpture below on the surface of the Lin design in the vertex of the V with the flag on the surface. As one female author (Hess 1983 p. 125) notes "the committee wanted the statue in the center of Lin's walls - in effect penetrating her V."

The governmental institutions which reviewed memorial building set the context as mediators in the controversy which ensued over the VVM, and a compromise was reached. In the KSU case this set of institutions was not available to act as a mediator. The rules for the competition included the statement, "The memorial should be harmonious with its site. It should be an artistic 'incident' alongside a pedestrian pathway" (Kent State University, Design Program, 1986). Also included in the rules of the competition, the comment, "The form of acknowledgement of the four students who died and the nine who were wounded will be a matter for the competitors to decide, as will other elements of the design of this reflective site. However, in keeping with the wishes of the families of the four deceased students, the form of their acknowledgement is to be of the most modest nature" (Kent State University,
Design Program 1986).

It was quite obvious from the rules of the competition that some form of recognition of the four students killed and nine wounded should be made, but that this recognition should not directly represent particular students. The desire on the part of the university administration for a non-representational and a-political memorial design was to a great extent portrayed in the furor over the rather representational Segal sculpture mentioned above. The Segal controversy was specifically left out of the pamphlets which advertised and discussed the memorial competition. It is, however, quite apparent now that a representational type design was not to be selected by the jurors. This is evident both from perusal of modern memorials as well as the specific history of the Segal controversy at Kent State University.

According to James Dalton, Director of the Kent State University School of Architecture and Environmental Design, the four runners-up in the competition were selected in accordance with their compliance with the first, second, and third place winner's essential abstract aesthetic code. Confirmation of this can be enforced by reference to the figures accompanying this article. Also, an informal conversation (Gregory 1986) with Sprieregen after the results of the competition were announced revealed that the jurors decided prior to their reviewing the submissions that they should look for designs which "symbolically" depicted the students killed and wounded.

The latent rule structure used by the jurors then was founded on their professional milieux training and experience and the specific requirements for the May 4 memorial, together generating the informal a priori agreement concerning an appropriate design: the memorial should be an abstract statement
symbolically representing the students killed and wounded. The admixture of abstract symbols with numbers restricted the physical product to a memorial exhibiting numerical configurations of the numbers four (students killed), or nine (students wounded), or thirteen (students killed and wounded). Referring to the figures accompanying this article, the first and second place winners certainly conform to this rule; and, in addition, the runners-up conform to this latent ordering. The Dalton evidence, above, infers that runners-up were selected in accordance with the latent rule, and personal inspection of the submissions by the authors of this article is further confirmation.

In contrast to the latent ordering used by jurors, the rules of the competition would have permitted a more general national symbolic statement about the war and its relation to May 4, such as inferences to American issues of the time i.e. "the Hawks and the Doves" including names, or something of the sort, of the students killed and wounded.

The latent ordering used by the jurors tended to filter out competitors who are not participants in the current genre of the art world. Though the competition rules and publicity went to great lengths in observing competitor anonymity and strived for large numbers of competition participants, this democratic, fair and egalitarian set of ethics were not observed by the juror's filter. Therefore, the final product of the competition was essentially an elitist selection. For example, Sprieregen (1986) in his speech at Kent State noted that in the VVM competition, one juror spent only three hours in reviewing the over 1,400 designs (he noted as well that it takes over forty-five minutes just to walk by and observe, not to mention read the site plans for this many entrants) and selected two, one of which was the
eventual winner (Maya Lin). Though Sprieregen made this statement as evidence of the winning design's absolute virtue and the jury's fine selective abilities, it is more accurately evidence of the swift crisp effectiveness of the elite filter. The virtue in this process is the ease in filtering out the ridiculous entrants and producing further innovative enhancement of a current aesthetic; however, an aspect that is not so virtuous is the filter's tendency to accent rather than diminish the inevitable populist criticism which may prevent actual building of the memorial. As mentioned above, populist criticism from Tom Wolfe and veterans groups for a less elitist memorial were assuaged by various mediating institutions, whereas in the Kent State situation this was not possible due to the university's role.

Summary and Conclusions

This essay has proposed a general model for understanding the creation of public memorials. Drawing on the work of Barry Schwartz we have merged collective memory theory with the process of memorial building. The May 4, 1970 memorial was initiated through a linkage with the past, as with the VVM. The VVM's collective memory and amalgamates important symbols of American experience associated with the Vietnam era. A similar division is apparent with Kent State's memorial, but the social institutions allowing that divisiveness to play itself out as a process is not formally in place; however, this is illustrative of the uniqueness in Kent State's situation. The ensuing process of building the memorial and its use after construction create new situational accounts establishing its meaning in collective memory.

Schwartz takes issue with Mead's (Maines, et al 1983 p. 164) "use value of pasts" because this notion does not semiotically formulate meaning
(Schwartz 1986 p. 160) and imposes undue instrumental and practical effects upon collective memory. The point advanced in this paper emphasizes the social process of creating an appropriate analogy with the past which has a general utility in creating meaning consensus about an event in the present. This is a semiotic act, but its outcome is also notably practical in establishing community solidarity over the event. Schwartz (1986 p. 160) states "collective memory becomes a significant force in a dialectic of social change." We argue that the symbols of the VVM and the social process unfolding at Kent State involve a dialectic of symbolic interaction producing collective memory that has the very practical effect of establishing community consensus and solidarity.
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ABSTRACT

Monument and memorial building is one of the more dramatic forms of
public art. The creation of this type of symbolic work involves a complicated
organization of social norms or conventions. These conventions are not solely
aesthetic, but have built into them a number of other social rules related to
administrative bureaucracies and political institutions. This involvement of
diverse conventions is associated with the creation of any type of private or
public art work.

This paper analyzes the proposed building of such a public art work
constructed to memorialize students killed and wounded on May 4, 1970 at Kent
State University. We begin with a discussion of Barry Schwartz's theory of
collective memory. Then a social process theory is developed. The social
process theory is discussed in terms of community socialization, making a case
for building the memorial, the role of significant personalities and groups,
the role of institutions, and the role of power. Evidence from experience
gained in construction of an earlier memorial, the Vietnam Veteran's Memorial
in Washington, D.C. is used to substantiate the social process model. With
explication of the theory completed, the recent history of the proposed
construction of a memorial to events of May 4, 1970 at Kent State University
is analyzed through use of the social process model of collective memory.
The Theory of Collective Memory

In 1985 a Kent State University committee recommended a memorial be built on the campus expressing the themes of inquiry, learning, and reflection concerning events of May 4, 1970, and its impact on American society. Early in 1986 a national competition for a memorial design was conducted. This attempt to create a collective memory is an ongoing social process.

The social process of establishing artifacts symbolizing an aspect of collective memory has been discussed by a number of authors (Halbwachs 1925, Mead 1938, B. Schwartz 1982, 1983, 1985, et al. 1986), who generally take a stance that past events are formulated to give significance and relevance to the present. Schwartz (1982 p. 376), in his discussion of Halbwachs' (1925) work on the social context of remembering and forgetting, notes that the earlier author "promotes the idea that our conception of the past is entirely at the mercy of current conditions, that there is no objectivity in events, nothing in history which transcends the peculiarities of the present."

Halbwach's radically relativist approach to the establishment of collective memory is therefore modified by Schwartz, who takes the middle road between absolutist approaches attaching an objective and unchanging meaning to historical events, and the relativist approach where meaning is based exclusively upon the vagaries of contemporary observers.

According to Schwartz (1982 p. 396), "the past cannot be literally constructed; it can only be selectively exploited..." and "the exploitation cannot be arbitrary..." for "The events selected for commemoration must have some factual significance..." In another of his works, Schwartz et al (1986) makes use of his theory of historical selectivity in collective memory to demonstrate how an aspect of Jewish history, the Roman siege of Masada in
73 A.D., was selectively used by modern Jews to provide a collective account for their contemporary experience in Palestine. Schwartz terms this process "recovered history", and his point is, for the most part, clearly made. However, in his conclusion to this article there are some critically important theoretical ambiguities which the present paper will seek to clarify.

Schwartz et al (1986 p. 160) quotes George Herbert Mead's interpreters (Maines, Sugrue, and Katovich, 1983 p. 163-165), such that Mead conceived of the past as serving the present in accordance with two functions. The first function is in "redefining the meaning of past events in such a way that they have meaning in and utility for the present . . ." and "[T]he functional character of reconstruction is contained in its contribution to present meanings." The second function is to provide "practical value in solving situational problems." Schwartz discounts the second function of "the use value of the past" in favor of the notion that perceptions of the past are considered to be "valid not for their utility but because of their objective fit with reality (Schwartz, 1986:160)." Schwartz terms this "objective fit with reality" the "congruence principle" and characterizes the pragmatist (Meadian) version as the "pleasure principle". Though there appears at first to be a fine line separating these versions of how history is used to formulate meaning, a deeper consideration shows a delineation of two profoundly different ways of conceptualizing. This difference is illustrated in one of the most important and complex elements of human cognition: the application of metaphorical or analogous thought. Schwartz touches on this point, but de-emphasizes the use-value or pragmatic importance of analogical conceptualization. For example, use of analogy is a primary element in Common Law jurisprudence where the principle of stare decisis or precedent provides linkage with well established past decisions. The artist or poet grasps this
analogous or metaphorical linkage with past works when she sculpts a shape or turns a phrase thereby reintroducing commonly known forms in extraordinarily different terms. T. S. Eliot (1932 p. 247) explains this artistic coupling in his statement:

When a poet's mind is perfectly equipped for his work, it is constantly amalgamating disparate experiences; the ordinary man's experience is chaotic, irregular, fragmentary. The latter falls in love, or reads Spinoza, and these two experiences have nothing to do with each other, or with the noise of the typewriter or the smell of cooking; in the mind of the poet these experiences are always forming new wholes.

Schwartz (1986 p. 161) argues that "we may trace the content of collective memory to a congruence principle rather than a pragmatist version of the pleasure principle." For Schwartz, coupling of an event from the past to the present does not involve a self-serving selection of arbitrary bits and pieces whittled and fashioned to fit conveniently into a slot in the present. Rather, the past fits and is analogous with the present because it has been appropriately selected by the historian, sociologist, or poet.

Schwartz' inference is that the past as an analogy fits appropriately because in some way the past is structurally the same as the present because past events set forth the template for all future events. Schwartz (1982) touches upon this notion in an earlier work quoting works of Levi-Strauss (1963), Eliade (1963), Shils (1975), and discusses the importance of origins as providing patterns for the present. He does strive to steer a middle course between the extremes of absolutist and relativist approaches. But, it is not clear how he can then make use of the terms appropriateness and selection. To select or appropriate the past to fit with the present is a radically creative act, for the present is truly unique and does not fit
easily into an old prefabricated box from past construction. The work of applying an analogy is involved with creative selection of aspects which appropriately fit with entirely new circumstances. History repeats itself only in the sense that the historian can strive to creatively demonstrate similarity. Imposition of an analogy is a creative act. The analogy is objective only in the sense that its constituent historical facts are generally agreed upon; and the analogy is relative only in the sense that historical facts are selectively superimposed on presently existing circumstances to fulfill cogent mnemonic needs of the community.

Use of the past to form an interpretation of the present is therefore involved both with the congruence principle and the pleasure principle. The present is similar to the future in that its meaning is essentially unknown, and to provide the present with meaning, it is critical that reference be made to the past. This process is similar to the linguistic coding of a new experience or discovery involved in communicating or teaching any innovative principle or discovery. For example, a metaphor or analogy is used by the philosopher because he has no other conveyance to express new meaning. This philosopher in trying to describe to his student how mind differs from brain must link what is known to what is new and unknown. "The mind," says he "comprises much more than the simple physiological and anatomical configuration of neurons in the brain." But this statement provides little meaning to his student. However, when the philosopher uses an analogy comparing the mental process to a TV set he can produce more fruitful communicative results. "We may know all about the circuitry of a TV set, but this does not mean we understand all its various programs." Once the teacher's meaning is known, the student can eventually forget the analogous bridge and treat his new knowledge as literal without need to refer to the
analogy. The original cipher used analogously is obliterated by literalness, and the metaphor is said to be dead. This is a radically creative process dependent upon the past only as a useful repertoire of known possibilities potentially applicable to the present. The analogy is a vehicle used to achieve the new meaning and should not be confused as being literally or functionally identical to it.

This theoretical point is grounded in Parson's (1967 pp. 297-382, 1969 pp. 352-429) discussion of the relations of symbols with referents. According to Parson's economic analogy, such economic media as monetary metals symbolically reference goods-in-kind; and in turn, paper currency and eventually checks and credit cards come to represent monetary metal. The essential reason for movement from the concrete economic medium to the symbolic is to promote use-value or utility in social-economic exchange. As the medium ascends to symbolic stature, value is generalized for a greater portion of the community and ipso facto value consensus is achieved. However, the symbol is reified when confused with its referent. As Parsons notes, we cannot eat the currency nor can we use it to plow our fields. The life of the analogy or symbol is thus ephemeral.

A Social Process Theory of Memorial Building

Howard S. Becker (1974, 1982) has stressed that art is a form of collective activity. This is most evident with forms of art that are public, such as art which memorializes community personalities or events. Public memorials are intricately enmeshed in a network of social conventions, forgotten beneath the weight of stone, iron or bronze in the artifact rising from the desert at Giza, striding the Champs Elysees in Paris or welcoming the ships in New York harbor.
We will divide our social process theory of collective memory into five parts: socialization of the community to the building of the memorial, making a case for building the memorial, significant personalities and groups, community institutions (bureaucracies associated with the art world), and power. The theory will be explicated using the example of the Vietnam Veteran's Memorial (VVM) and then applied to the proposed memorial at Kent State University commemorating the events of May 4, 1970.

**Socialization of the Community to the Building of the Memorial**

Socialization of the community involves the stock of knowledge available within the community informing persons as to the relevance of a particular event and/or personality. Initially, events occur of national and international moment, but their importance or meaning is not immediately evident. Later, an account of the extraordinary event is created to situate it within the stock of historical knowledge available to the community. The event in this way is coupled by analogy with the known history of the community.

Aileen Saarinen (Carter 1978 p. 52) has commented that conceptions of events and personalities must reach a maturity before memorialization can even be considered. Time must pass to heal wounds and fade conflicts generated by events, but time also nurtures reflection, and provides maturity for memory invoking a perspective that situates experience within an appropriate historical context.

The historical perspective is necessary to determine the significance of the event as it applies to subsequent experience. When the community senses a need to recollect the past in the form of a material statement such as a memorial, specialists are called upon to create the appropriate statement. In the specialists' work, all the bits and pieces of memory are aesthetically
amalgamated into an enormous inference structured by the current art world's aesthetic genre. The meaning of the memorial is created both through the social process whereby it is conceived and in the activities it generates after construction.

The artifact used to memorialize is of course a part of this social process. Though the Statue of Liberty is now a hallowed memorial to many notions currently interred in the American consciousness, and has established itself as an institution, it is inconceivable that a similar monument of its scale and aesthetic bearing be repeated, as has been proposed, in San Francisco harbor or anywhere else! The type of monument exemplified by the Statue of Liberty is a product of the nineteenth century. Not only is it a symbol of liberty and a remnant of a certain way of memorializing, but something much more as well. Modern abstract monuments as Eero Saarinen's Gateway Arch (1962-66) in St. Louis, Missouri and so called "living memorials" like memorial bridges or highways show a different conception and set of conventions for memorialization, but they have taken on a multitudinous set of new conceptions. The present meaning of these artifacts has come to be very different from conceptions of memorial originators. Community socialization makes use of an analogy with past experience which instigates building the original artifact, but these analogy-artifacts are eventually cast aside onto the conceptual midden of past generations. The current meaning comes to appear as sovereign truth and reality.

Saarinen's requirement of maturity for memorialization of collective memory has been achieved by the VVM on a somewhat accelerated basis. The instigation for memorializing the fallen soldiers of the Vietnam war was originally based upon a similar need as with all wars - to stimulate memory of the past conflict - but each war is unique and the unique meaning eventually
comes to be imposed upon the memorial during the building and after its construction, making this memorialization completely independent of past conceptions. Socialization of the community as to the events of Vietnam is still marked by that era's "Hawk-Dove" (pro and anti war) schism. The VVM manifests the continuation of wartime ideational differences on the war: part of the memorial commemorates the soldiers who died (the black granite walls), and part (the three bronze soldiers) represents a more traditional and heroic, though subdued, depiction of events, similar to the Iwo Jima Second World War memorial.

Making a Case for Building a Memorial

With a stock of knowledge available within the community concerning an event from the past, and its establishment as a significant marker in the community's history, a case must be made for commemoration of the event. After a memorial is built, accounts of its relevance seem obvious as do reasons for its original erection. This post hoc corpus of knowledge is not nearly so obvious before construction, because it developed as a result of the monument itself. The original fact that the monument was built signifies an initial importance to the event in the context of history, but the event itself incarnate as with all experiences remembered and forgotten has no intrinsically imbedded meaning. The meaning must be established.

Bartholdi's Statue of Liberty which now possesses an admirable community consensus in its esteemed reputation was much less venerated in 1886 at its unveiling. A case had to be made for the appropriateness of the statue which involved a social process were parts were earlier displayed in the U.S. - the torch - and a polemic was maintained defining the virtues of the statue for years before it was built. After having been shipped to the U.S. from France it was stored in warehouses until the American community was sufficiently
prepared for its erection. Even after erection much community comment continued to further explain its appropriateness, as exemplified in Emma Lazarus' poem which gave undeniable meaning not so neatly evident prior to the fact of actual fabrication. Most Americans are now convinced of its significance as the gala festivities during the summer of 1986 displayed.

A good argument can be made that Bertholdi's statue was motivated as a memorial to himself, but in order to realize construction a more generalized public account was necessary. Whatever the original stimulus for construction, the public monument is ultimately the subject of an ongoing community negotiation where advocates argue their case and thereby eventually establish community consensus.

An ongoing process of making a case and establishment of community consensus is evident in connection with the VVM both before erection and at the present time. The Vietnam Veteran's Memorial Fund (VVMF) began the task of amalgamating public consensus support for the memorial. This small movement gained attention and support from a wealthy benefactor, leading eventually to the design competition and construction. However, the memorial is still very much involved in a process of building consensus about its meaning. This can be seen in the pattern of creative social uses the memorial is generating. The U. S. Department of the interior maintains an archive of the various memorabilia, such as teddy bears, worn flak jackets and combat boots, left by persons near a name on the granite walls; and the act of pencil-tracing the name of a friend or family member from the wall onto the VVM brochure has become an institution. Veterans wear old uniforms to the site. A television beer ad uses only the heroic bronze portion of the VVM in appealing to its clientele; and one of the authors observed a copy of the Uniform Code of Military Conduct in laminated plastic left at the feet of the
three bronze figures, evidence of hardiness in an old schism. It is obvious that the two portions of the VVM, the walls on the one hand, and the bronze statue on the other, have come together to symbolize an agonizing time in American collective memory.

The Role of Significant Personalities and Groups in Memorial Building

Characteristics of significant personalities and groups can be derived from Garfinkel's (1956) reference to "the denouncer" in his explication of status degradation ceremonies, though we portray the characteristics in a more positive light. The significant personality may occupy a public office, though this is not a requirement, but he must be, or at least must become, a public person. The case for a memorial must be presented as if the event has public significance, and though the significant personality has a vested interest, this interest is generated from public sources. Therefore it is made to appear as a community effort and not strictly personal. Relevance of the event is not supported by personal interests alone, and the personality has authority to speak on behalf of the community only because he or she now represents those community interests. The significant personality acts as sponsor for the ultimate values of the community, and must, as Garfinkel (1956) notes, make the dignity of the supra-individual values of the community regarding the memorial salient and accessible to view.

Part of the work of the significant personality is in obtaining the support of others through the creation of a voluntary association of persons who share similar interests. This association can capitalize on its power by gaining financial support from private and public sources and by pressuring formal and informal political groups such as lobbies and politicians. Obviously the job of the significant personality is furthered if the first
portions of the process model have been fulfilled, in the sense that the community is well-informed of the event and the case has been made.

The role of Jan Scruggs (Scruggs and Swerdlow 1985), an enlisted combat veteran of Vietnam, in the building of the VVM was critical and shows how a person with relatively simple means can "capitalize" an initially small asset into a very large enterprise (Hess 1983, Howett 1985). Scruggs began with his life's savings of approximately $2,000 from the selling of his small farm and used it to create an organization of veterans, VVMF. Later this organization played a role in gaining support in Congress to set aside a plot of land for the project. Scruggs fulfills Garfinkel's requirements as a significant individual who personifies the role of a proper advocate for the VVM. Scruggs has personal interests which are amplified off of his veteran comrades and survivors of the fallen. His marshaling of support from others such as the Texas computer magnate H. Ross Perot to finance the memorial design competition fulfilled the practical requirement of creating the means for erecting the memorial. The fine-tuning of the analogy with the past is thus performed by the significant personality or group.

The Role of Community Institutions in Building the Memorial

Though the significant personality plays a major role in generating community support for the creation of the memorial, existing community institutions have a role in regulating initial decisions to build the memorial as well as in actual construction. Part of the work of the significant personality is to engender support from powerful political groups, but it is then the role of administrative bureaucracies to filter, translate, and negotiate decisions to meet formally instituted community norms. The legitimate authority and role of community institutions is critical and can direct a case in a multitude of unpredictable directions. A bureaucracy
whose authority includes evaluation of a memorial plan can change the
direction of the original decision in a variety of ways.

Though community institutions or bureaucracies are usually thought to
present impediments to creative attempts by the community, this is in no way
always the case, for on some occasions these institutions can actually
facilitate and protect community efforts from excessive incursion of special
interests. The essential point in this connection is that these bureaucratic
entities can act to place a conservative community filter on the entire
process of memorial building, and, as is the case with a judge in a court of
law, act as arbiter when contending community groups are at odds. Community
institutions then act as arbiters in building the memorial and often have
authority to provide final permission to proceed. If this arbitral element of
the social process model is missing, a serious impediment may occur in the
process thus preventing construction.

Institutions played a significant role in building the VVM. Because the
memorial was to be built in Washington, D.C., plans to build the design had to
be filtered through a formidable system of bureaucracies. First, after
Congress mandates the land, all considerations for the memorial — design,
landscape, planning, aesthetics — have to be approved by the National Capital
Planning Commission, the Commission of Fine Arts and the Department of the
Interior. The architect, Paul Spreiregen, selected to administer the VVM
design competition, has commented (Spreiregen 1986) that the VVM would not
have been built without the "bureaucratic structure" provided by these
institutions, for after the winner of the design competition was named some
Vietnam veterans groups did not support it. However, the design was already
in the bureaucratic works making it extremely difficult to simply ignore, no
matter how powerful the arguments and political power of opponents.
Eventually a compromise was reached by the two sides through mediation within the bureaucratic structure.

Existing community institutions play an important creative role in interpretation and support of memorial building, and it cannot be said that these institutions work is essentially disruptive. Because of the time it takes to filter design ideas through large administrations, this greater amount of exposure leads to a negotiated statement having a much larger constituency than would be the case otherwise; therefore, the controversy has time to play itself out in the community milieu, thus softening particularistic influences from powerful elites and engendering wider community legitimacy.

The Role of Power in Building the Memorial

The marshalling of support from powerful groups and persons is critical to the success of memorial building. Obviously, politically powerful and wealthy persons play major roles, however, in memorial building specialized interest groups in the art world exert significant power due to the social deference and responsibility given them by the community. When memorial advocates decide to create an appropriate aesthetic metaphor, they defer to art world professionals, which, in the case of memorial building, means architects, sculptors, and landscape designers. This is a group of powerful elites, which have specific interests and authority. The interests and authority prevail in the selection of an aesthetic. If the aesthetic is to be imposed in a personal residence, or a corporate building, there may be criticism from the community, but critical vehemence is curbed because territory is private. A public monument presents a heightened level of emotion in the ensuing polemic because territory is not private. In the case of memorials, the aesthetic becomes an aspect of controversy with contending
sides often consisting of community power against the interests of an art world elite.

In the case of the VVM, Jan Scruggs was able to incorporate the VVMF to erect a national monument honoring those who had died in the war. In 1979, legislation was introduced in Congress to allocate land for the planned memorial and the project was eventually signed into law by President Carter in 1980. Though the VVMF was able to gain significant power from veterans and some of their associations, a key element in the initial impetus was from H. Ross Perot. Perot provided the seed money for a competition to select the memorial design.

In the VVM construction, significant controversy tended to be associated with the question as to the type of physical manifestation to be erected. A compromise was reached between VVMC supporters of the Maya Lin's granite walls and Perot backed supporters of a more representational bronze design by Frederick Hart. Marshalling support from powerful groups provided the art world "support personnel" for building the memorial. When a public possession, whether physical or symbolic, is being considered for some form of manipulation by the community, a single elite entity cannot legitimately impose itself without an outcry from other sectors. The drawing of an analogy is therefore a community embedded creation.

The May 4, 1970 Memorial at Kent State University – A Social Process Analysis of Collective Memory

Method

The authors come to this research from unique perspectives. Both authors are veterans. The first author has been a member of the Kent State sociology faculty since 1972. He is a sculptor whose works have appeared in the Cleveland Museum of Art and elsewhere. He submitted an entry into the Kent
State University May 4, 1970 design competition. The second author has been a member of the Kent State University sociology faculty since 1966. He has written on the Kent State shootings and was a member of the first Memorial Committee. In addition to these background experiences, the authors used University documents, public presentations, and personal interviews as sources of data for this study.

**Brief History of the Events and Issues**

Kent State University and the campus shootings on May 4, 1970, were symbols of the tragedy of America's involvement in Vietnam. What surprises many is that May 4 controversies continue to generate regional and, often, national attention addressing legal, social, and artistic issues. The wound inflicted on that day has taken long to heal.

Shortly after noon May 4, 1970, on a grassy knoll near a dormitory parking lot, a contingent of Ohio National Guardsmen opened fire for a period of thirteen seconds, striking thirteen Kent State University students, some of whom were nearby, others of whom were distant. Four students were killed, one was permanently paralyzed, and the others were wounded in varying degrees of severity.

As is true of many issues in American society, controversy moves quickly to the courtroom. The legal struggle that followed May 4 spanned the decade of the seventies. Local, state, and federal courts became involved in extensive criminal and civil proceedings. No criminal convictions were ever obtained in regard to the deaths, however, in 1979 an out-of-court settlement was reached. The parents, students, and their attorneys received $675,000 paid by the State of Ohio.

While calls for a memorialization of the event began almost immediately after the shootings the only noteworthy event of this nature, which occurred
before the serious work on a university sponsored memorial in 1985, was the Segal controversy in 1978. A private foundation, on its own initiative, commissioned the well known sculptor, George Segal, to do a memorial sculpture for Kent State University. Segal's piece was based on his previous sculpture using biblical themes of Abraham and Isaac. It showed a middle aged man, knife in hand, preparing to kill a bare chested youth kneeling in front of him. The university rejected the sculpture saying it was inappropriate and too violent. The Segal sculpture was eventually donated to Princeton University where it resides today.

In 1985 a Kent State committee recommended that a memorial should be built that expressed the themes of inquiry, learning, and reflection about May 4 and its impact on American Society, and early in 1986 a national competition for a memorial design was conducted. This event, unlike others in the history of May 4, seemed free from controversy until it was discovered that the winner of the design competition was not an American citizen, a violation of the competition rules. After several months of negotiation, the submission that took second place in the competition was chosen as the memorial design to be built on a site near the shootings.

In the summer of 1986 after selection of the design competition winner, another controversy developed over a resolution unanimously adopted by the American Legion's resolution committee opposing plans to build a memorial to May 4. The resolution entitled, "Kent State Memorial to Terrorists" generated considerable comment in the media. Most people objected to the Legion's use of the word "terrorist" to describe in blanket terms, all the students involved in demonstrations on May 4. Particular noteworthy was the case of Sandy Scheur, one of the slain students, who was on her way to class at the time of her death.
We now turn to application of the social process model to events of May 4, 1970. We look at issues of socialization, making a case for the memorial, significant personalities and groups, community institutions, and the role of power.

Socialization of the Community to the Building of the May 4, 1970 Memorial

The social process model guides our analysis first to analyzing elements of socialization as they pertain to the May 4 memorial. In order for an event to have memorial consequence, a corpus of historical experience from normal times must be juxtaposed with historical information about the event. Knowledge of normal times is contrasted with the significant event, leading to a stock of knowledge informing the community concerning that event.

We can divide this stock of knowledge into three categories: people, locations, and issues. As to people, there are two core groups, the thirteen slain and wounded students on one side and the Ohio National Guard on the other. In any discussion about May 4, 1970 these two entities are always in the spotlight. Surrounding these two core groups are others including the families of the students; the National Guard commanders; the president of Kent State in 1970; the Governor of the State of Ohio.

The second category of location involves the site of the original confrontation. The Commons is a large grassy field in the center of the Kent State Campus. It was the location of many political demonstrations in the 1960's and 1970's, and it also served then, as it does today, for class meetings, sports field, and gathering spot for students. The Commons was an important part of Kent's cultural life.

Lastly, the issues category is part of the stock of knowledge and can be expressed in the form of several questions: Did students have the right to assemble on the Commons? Should the Ohio National Guard have been brought
onto the Kent State University Campus? Were the National Guardsmen justified in firing their weapons? This stock of knowledge about people, location, and the issues is communicated in a variety of ways. First, there are informal channels with information moving in ways that resemble common patterns described by collective behavior scholars. Next, the media was involved in codifying the stock of knowledge for the community, which resulted in setting the agenda as to what is important in discourse about May 4. Regional papers such as the Akron Beacon Journal and the Cleveland Plain Dealer were the important sources for setting this agenda.

Finally, scholarship becomes part of the socialization process. Books and articles continue the socialization process begun by informal networks and mass media. In the Kent State case, the number of books and articles are extensive with the annotated bibliography running to over thirty book pages (Bills 1983). Lastly, the memorial effort itself becomes part of the socialization process particularly in light of the controversies which have to be explained. Memorialization of May 4, 1970 began with community support for a memorial design competition. Though the facts are evident, they had to be placed together in a form that supplied an initial analogy appropriate to that time, or a way of setting forth a symbolic consensus about the events. It is naive to believe that the historical facts incarnate are sufficient to symbolize events, for a social process has to play itself out in order to reflexively give meaning by analogy to the past. The events at Kent State must be tied into past events, such as Vietnam, in order to have wide community consensus.

Making a Case for the May 4, 1970 Memorial

Accounts of events on May 4 are of course not absolute or intrinsically relevant but must be negotiated. For example, the notion that the Cambodian
incursion in 1970 led to May 4, is obviously to simplistic. An appropriate account of events is not so straight forward. Attempts at promoting the appropriateness of a memorial can be seen in the discussions leading up to decisions to build. Advocates for the memorial feel that portions of the community are unconvinced and must be "set straight" as to the appropriateness of the memorial. Statements by the President of Kent State capture these ideas in a succinct way. President Michael Schwartz (1986 E-3) commented on the validity of May 4 as a significant event with an historical import that must be remembered:

May 4 is not just Kent State's burden. It is a burden carried by the entire society. It was an unprecedented event, and it must not be repeated. The official account of the event is stated by President Schwartz:

And then, during an awful period of American History when there was some question in the minds of many of us as to whether the American university, or indeed even the republic could survive, this university suffered its greatest tragedy. The university became a victim and, just as has so often been the case, the victim was blamed for its own victimization. Last year we continued a major effort to come to terms with that. The time was right for healing, for peace and thought, for learning and reflection. The time of playing childish games of praise and blame were over. The time had come to remember and move forward.

The argument supporting the appropriateness of the memorial is aimed at linking Kent State to greater national issues. For example, the analogous comparison of Kent State with the Boston Massacre of 1770 was often mentioned. Also, President Schwartz's comments became directed not so much toward the absolute significance of the event as to overcoming opposition from that part of the community which was in disagreement with the official account.
President Schwartz continues:

Thinking that all was resolved, last summer we faced the Ohio Department of the American Legion's resolution critical of our efforts to make peace, to heal, to bring perspective. We must understand that the attempt to control ideas is not just something that happens in totalitarian countries. Book-burning occurs whenever anyone, anywhere attempts to shape the quest for knowledge in his own image. We are victorious over small minds and the perpetrators of discord. We are victorious in remembrance of senseless events that nonetheless have meaning. And we must go home. Home to the real purpose of a university, which is to learn from human events.

Making a case for the memorial is an advocacy exercise in which participants must overcome arguments running counter to the "appropriate analogy" of memorial builders. Some of the advocates have more of a stake in the issue and this leads to the third element of the social process model.

The Role of Significant Personalities and Groups in Building the May 4, 1970 Memorial

In the Kent State case, it is easier to identify significant groups than individuals. Indeed, one group dominated activities seeking to create a memorial. This was a student organization called the May 4th Task Force. This group was formed in the mid-1970's to educate the Kent State community about May 4 and its aftermath. In 1982 the leadership of the Task Force appealed to Brage Golding, then President of the university, with the idea of establishing a memorial to the four slain and nine wounded students. Golding refused, saying that such a memorial was not desired by the majority of the Kent State University community. After this rebuff, the May 4th Task Force stepped up its campaign with a public campaign including letter writing, speeches, petitions, and endorsements from various faculty and student groups.
In 1983 the new president of Kent State, Michael Schwartz, received a petition from students and agreed to take the issue to the university's Board of Trustees. The Board of Trustees in 1984 instructed the president to set up a committee to study the memorial issue. In 1985, the May 4 Memorial Committee which included faculty, administration, students, alumni, and Kent community members responded to the President with a report. The report by the Committee called for a memorial stressing the themes of inquiry, learning, and reflection. Such a conclusion was not forgone. Indeed, as late as October, 1984, the committee was sharply divided on the issue of whether or not to have a memorial. With the decision made by the University Board of Trustees to build a memorial the next step was seemingly simplistic and pragmatic, but turns out to be one of the more troublesome aspects of the process. Several existing social institutions were called into play: first, the institutionalized means of choosing a design was structured through an established design competition process; and second, with the winning design chosen, social mechanisms were activated to raise funds to do the actual building. The May 4th Task Force had acted to link events at Kent State into the context of American collective consciousness, and the design competition was the next step toward formal legitimation. President Schwartz characterized the Kent State affair as "a burden carried by the entire society." Both he and the May 4th Task Force had acted to initiate a link between events at Kent State with other historical occurrences. An analogy was drawn giving the "burden" significance in American collective memory.

The Role of Institutions in Building the May 4, 1970 Memorial

The institution that was most dominant in the effort to create a memorial at Kent State University was its President. There are many reasons for Schwartz's championing of a memorial. First, as a sociologist he noted the
continuing debate over a memorial as highly divisive and needing of resolution. In addition, he saw the university in a unique position to congeal educational efforts on May 4. The memorial would greatly facilitate those efforts. It is not without irony, as long time faculty at Kent State, that we write positively about university leadership over the memorial affair. In many ways university leadership was clearly lacking particularly on May 4, 1970.

How then did the university's central administration and its supportive bureaucracy involve itself in the memorial effort? Three major activities attract our attention. First, the university created the May 4 Memorial Committee already discussed. Second, the university ran the memorial design competition. Two important sets of activities should be noted. It undertook the initial fund raising to obtain matching funds to administer the competition and provide prize money for the winning designs. These efforts resulted in a matching grant of $85,000 from the National Endowment for the Arts. University funds were the source of the matching money. Also, Kent State provided administrative services for running the competition. Because of the size of the competition, this involved an enormous amount of staff time. The planning of the competition took place in the summer of 1985, and the competition was announced in the Fall of 1985. Approximately 1800 designers requested to compete. By the deadline of March 1986, 698 designs were submitted including 388 from individuals and 210 from teams. This number of submissions is second only to the VVM's submissions in the history of American National memorial competitions.

Lastly, the university and its bureaucracy is participating in efforts to build the memorial at this writing. The university has committed itself to raising $750,000 to build the memorial, and funds will be sought from only the
private sector. Advocacy for the memorial lies primarily with the University administration. Through analogy the University linked May 4, 1970 to greater national issues. But concurrently, in order to reduce controversy, the University stated that the memorial should be "neither ... an expression of accusation or praise.... The design is not to be a political expression (Kent State University, Design Program, 1986b p. 16)." This narrows the analogy to a focus upon a more insular issue concerning only the deaths and wounding of the students. By narrowing the analogy, the University decreases its potential for generalized consensus on the event not to mention its pool of financial contributors.

The Role of Power in Building the May 4, 1970 Memorial

Initially, the May 4 memorial design selection process manifested no significant power groups struggling for their particular memorial preferences. Rather, there was a powerful individual committed to building the memorial, this was the president of Kent State University. As we have noted, the main group lobbying for the memorial was the student May 4 Task Force. By any standard, membership, money, or constituency, this was not a powerful group. Yet, through hard work and patience the Task Force was able to convince the university and its Board of Trustees that a memorial should be considered for Kent State.

A much more powerful group did emerge, however, as a result of the decision to conduct a design competition. The design competition made use of a powerful elite group in American society, the art world, which has something of a monopoly over aesthetic and symbolic taste. The current aesthetic of contemporary art is abstract as opposed to representational, and this aesthetic is pressed upon the uninitiated like ideologies, as Mannheim (1936) describes them, are imposed by economic or political elites.
After the president in consultation with others in the administration and faculty had decided on having the national competition to select an appropriate memorial, a direction was therefore taken to democratize the selection process and thereby ostensibly decrease any charge that particularistic groups had exerted undue influence. The notion of a national competition gives the appearance of an objective selection process; however, this does not take into consideration the powerful effect of the various elites associated with the professional areas of art, architecture, and landscape design, who are called upon to administer the competition. Paul Spreiregen, the architect in charge of the VVM was called in to administer the May 4 memorial competition. He selected the jury, and it consisted of artists, landscape architects, and was chaired by an environmental author.

One of the difficulties in building the May 4 memorial in contrast with the VVM was the problem of conflict resolution. This was particularly acute when the winning submission was challenged because the designer was a Canadian citizen. This was a clear violation of the competition rules which stated that, "Competitors must be U. S. citizens at the time of registration" (Kent State University, 1986a, p. 11, eligibility rule 1.1). After several months of fruitless negotiation between the University and the Canadian designer, the second place winner in the competition was chosen as the memorial design. In February, 1987, the designer of the original submission sued Kent State University for breach of contract and violation of civil rights (Garmon 1987 p. 1). A need for arbitration was clear. However, at Kent State there was or is no such arbiter, for the university administration which could act in this capacity was actually an advocate. For this reason there was no available party to negotiate any dispute.
When conflict occurred with the VVM, there were several organizations including the National Capital planning Commission, the Commission on Fine Art, and the formidable Department of the Interior (under James Watt) that acted as arbiters in the VVM memorial building process. These institutions appropriately negotiated the design selected by the panel.

One of the most prominent criticisms of the winning design in the VVM competition centered on the charge of elitism. Sprieregen mentions in his book on memorial competitions (Sprieregen 1979) that one of the chief criticisms of competitions is that the winning design may be selected, but the memorial is never actually built. Public memorials have an inherent egalitarian feature which is not often recognized by artistic elites. Tom Wolfe's (1982) highly critical (and in the opinion of some, inappropriate) comments on elitism associated with selection of the VVM design, exemplify the populist tendencies which come out as a result of memorial building. Sprieregen (1986) mentioned in a speech at Kent State University that he did not feel it was appropriate to include a veteran on the VVM jury panel because of the potential for controversy.

The controversy over the VVM involved political, social, and even sexual elements. The winning design in the VVM competition, according to some, did not depict the fighting soldier representationally, and it was an obviously non-masculine design according to others. After long negotiations, the more representational Frederick Hart bronze sculpture (one of the contenders in the original competition), with inclusion of the American flag, was selected to accompany the Maya Lin design. Another question to be worked out centered on where the Hart sculpture and flag should be placed in association with the Lin design. One of the original suggestions made by a committee supporting the Hart design was to place the bronze sculpture below on the surface of the Lin
design in the vertex of the V with the flag on the higher surface. As one female author (Hess 1983 p. 125) notes "the committee wanted the statue in the center of Lin's walls – in effect penetrating her V."

The governmental institutions which reviewed memorial building set the context as mediators in the controversy which ensued over the VVM, and a compromise was reached. In the KSU case this set of institutions was not available to act as mediator. The rules for the competition included the statement, "The memorial should be harmonious with its site. It should be an artistic 'incident' alongside a pedestrian pathway" (Kent State University, Design Program, 1986b p. 16). Also included in the rules of the competition, the comment, "The form of acknowledgement of the four students who died and the nine who were wounded will be a matter for the competitors to decide, as will other elements of the design of this reflective site. However, in keeping with the wishes of the families of the four deceased students, the form of their acknowledgement is to be of the most modest nature" (Kent State University, 1986a p. 10).

It was quite obvious from the rules of the competition that some form of recognition of the four students killed and nine wounded should be made, but that this recognition should not directly represent particular students. The Design Program rules state, "The Memorial design is to include a physical expression regarding the four students who died (Kent State University, Design Program, 1986b p. 16, requirement 11)." The desire on the part of the university administration for a non-representational and a-political memorial design was to a great extent portrayed earlier in the furor over the representational Segal sculpture. The Segal controversy was specifically left out of pamphlets which advertised and discussed the memorial competition. It is quite apparent now that a representational type design was not to be
selected by the jurors. This is evident both from perusal of modern memorials as well as the specific history of the Segal controversy at Kent State University.

According to James Dalton, Director of the Kent State University School of Architecture and Environmental Design, the four runners-up in the competition were selected in accordance with their compliance with the first, second, and third place winner's essential abstract aesthetic code. Confirmation of this can be enforced by reference to the figures accompanying this article.  [Figures to be placed about here] Also, an informal conversation (Gregory 1986) with Sprieregen after the results of the competition were announced revealed that jurors decided prior to their reviewing submissions that they should look for designs which "symbolically" depicted students killed and wounded.

The latent rule structure used by the jurors then was founded on their professional milieux training and experience and the specific requirements for the May 4 memorial, together generating the informal a priori agreement concerning a design: the memorial should be an abstract statement symbolically representing only the students killed and wounded. The admixture of abstract symbols with numbers restricted the physical product to a memorial exhibiting numerical configurations of the numbers four (students killed), or nine (students wounded), or thirteen (students killed and wounded). Referring to the figures accompanying this article, the first and second place winners certainly adhere to this rule; and, in addition, the runners-up conform to this latent ordering. The Dalton evidence, above, infers that runners-up were selected in accordance with the latent rule, and personal inspection of all design submissions by the authors of this article is further confirmation.
In contrast to the latent ordering used by jurors, the rules of the competition would have permitted a more general national symbolic statement about the war and its relation to May 4, such as inferences to American issues of the time i.e. "the Hawks and the Doves" including names, or something of the sort, of the students killed and wounded.

The latent ordering used by jurors tended to filter out competitors who are not participants in the current genre of the art world. Though the competition rules and publicity went to great lengths in observing competitor anonymity and strived for large numbers of competition participants, this democratic, fair and egalitarian set of ethics were not observed by the jurors' filter. Therefore, the final product of the competition was essentially an elitist selection. For example, Sprieregen (1986) in his speech at Kent State noted that in the VVM competition, one juror spent only three hours in reviewing the over 1,400 designs (he noted as well that it takes over forty-five minutes just to walk by and observe, not to mention read the site plans for this many entrants) and selected two, one of which was the eventual winner (Maya Lin). Though Sprieregen made this statement as evidence of the winning design's absolute virtue and jurors' fine selective abilities, it is more accurately evidence of the swift, crisp effectiveness of the elite filter. The virtue in this process is the ease in filtering out the ridiculous entrants and producing further innovative enhancement of a current aesthetic; however, an aspect that is not so virtuous is the filter's tendency to accent rather than diminish the inevitable populist criticism which may prevent actual building of the memorial. As mentioned above, populist criticism from Tom Wolfe and veterans groups for a less elitist memorial were assuaged by various mediating institutions, whereas in the Kent State situation this was not possible due to the university's role as advocate.
Summary and Conclusions

This essay has proposed and utilized a general model for understanding the creation of public memorials. Drawing on the work of Barry Schwartz we have merged collective memory theory with the process of memorial building. The May 4, 1970 memorial was initiated through a linkage with the past, as with the VVM. The VVM's collective memory amalgamates important symbols of American experience associated with the Vietnam era. A similar division is apparent with Kent State's memorial, but the social institutions allowing that divisiveness to play itself out as a process are not formally in place; however, this is illustrative of the uniqueness in Kent State's situation. The ensuing process of building the memorial and its use after construction create new situational accounts establishing its meaning in collective memory.

Schwartz takes issue with Mead's (Maines, et al 1983 p. 164) "use value of pasts" because this notion does not semiotically formulate meaning (Schwartz 1986 p. 160) and imposes undue instrumental and practical effects upon collective memory. The point advanced in this paper emphasizes the social process of creating an appropriate analogy with the past which has a general utility in creating meaning consensus about an event in the present. This is a semiotic act, but its outcome is also notably practical in establishing community solidarity over the event. Schwartz (1986 p. 160) states "collective memory becomes a significant force in a dialectic of social change." We argue that the symbols of the VVM and the social process unfolding at Kent State involve a dialectic of symbolic interaction producing collective memory that has the very practical effect of establishing community consensus and solidarity.
NOTES

1. We have made use of Becker's work (1963) associated with the labelling perspective for the general organizational structure of the social process model.

2. The notion of "support personnel" in the art world is derived from Becker's (1974, 1982) use of the term. Becker, in an example notes, "Marcel Duchamp outraged many people by insisting that he created a valid work of art when he signed a commercially produced snowshovel or signed a reproduction of the Mona Lisa on which he had drawn a moustache, thus classifying Leonardo as support personnel along with the snowshovel's designer and manufacturer." The notion of support personnel can apply as well to political and bureaucratic entities.

3. Pictures of the May 4, 1970 event may be found in the "Scranton Report" (U. S. Presidents Commission on Campus Unrest, 1970).

4. An analysis of the collective behavior and social movement aspects of May 4 as well as its legal dimensions may be found in Hensley and Lewis (1978: passim).

5. According to the art historian Kenneth Clarke (1981 pp. 30-31), "our contemporary rejection of representational images must be taken seriously by historians and still more by artists, who have no hope of winning a competition or being chosen for an international exhibition unless they conform to extant artistic conventions."

6. The design submissions were on display for several days in a campus building. Several of the entries were vivid representations of National Guard troops aiming weapons at students. All winners of first, second, and third places, as well as the runners-up, however, used some aesthetic configuration to symbolize the students.
First place by Ian Taberner - Note the four appendages symbolic of the students killed at Kent State May 4, 1970.
Second place by Bruno Ast - note walls and pillars symbolic of students killed and wounded at Kent State May 4, 1970.
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Monument and memorial building is one of the more dramatic forms of symbolic expression. This form of symbolic expression represents aspects of a community's collective history; and its existence thereby serves to crystallize consensus and solidarity. The building of the memorial is a dialectic of symbolic interaction explicated through use of a social process model. This article will first describe the theoretical issues involved with collective representation and memory. The theoretical base when applied to the activity of memorial building generates a social process model. The model is described by application to the building of various memorials, but particular interest will be focused upon the Vietnam Veterans Memorial in Washington, D. C. The model suggests how creation of this type of symbolic work involves a complicated organization of social norms or conventions. Part of this organization involves merging norms from a specialized genre of the art world with norms of collective representation residing in the non-professional community. Administrative bureaucracies and political institutions play important roles as well. After the authors explicate the social process model, they apply it to the experience of memorializing students killed and wounded at Kent State University on May 4, 1970. Erection of this memorial involves a process of constructing collective memory in such a way as to create moral unity within the community.

In 1985 a Kent State University committee recommended a memorial be built on the campus expressing the themes of inquiry, learning, and reflection concerning events of May 4, 1970, and its impact on American society. A national competition for a memorial design was conducted early in 1986.
This article analyzes the proposed building of such a public art work constructed to memorialize students killed and wounded on May 4, 1970 at Kent State University. We begin with discussion of several theoretical positions that together establish the foundation for a social process model. Emile Durkheim’s discussion of collective representation and George Herbert Mead’s theory of collective memory are merged with a more contemporary theoretical statement from Barry Schwartz. We derive from this theoretical perspective a social process model that develops from three components: community socialization concerning the event; significant personalities and groups who make a case for building the memorial; and involvement of powerful social institutions. Evidence from experience gained in construction of several earlier memorials, but most particularly the Vietnam Veterans Memorial in Washington, DC, is used to substantiate the social process model. With explication of the model completed, we analyze the recent history of a proposed construction of a memorial to commemorate events of May 4, 1970 at Kent State University.

The Theory of Collective Memory

For Durkheim (1961, p. 420), totems and rites are representations of a mythical past, and he stresses their importance in affecting the collective consciousness and memory. In speaking of rites as “glorious souvenirs” that give men strength and confidence, Durkheim frames the importance of invoking the ritual attitude through representations. For Durkheim, “the principal forms of art seem to have been born of religion,” and therefore artistic representation is a primary component of the ritual attitude. In Durkheim’s view, through performance of ritual, “... a man is surer of his faith when he sees to how distant a past it goes back and what great things it has inspired.”

Recollection of historical events sacred to the collective memory, and presented to the community via various art forms, is functionally similar to use of the totemic totem and ritual in making man “surer of his faith.” An important aspect in this regard is shown in the ways a memory achieves legitimacy as a collective representation. Barry Schwartz (1982, p. 396) addressed this point by discussing the ways in which commemorative art is selected for appearance in the U.S. Capitol Building in Washington, DC. Paintings are not hung in the U.S. Capitol “because of their priority and factual importance but because this priority and this importance have become and remained convenient objects of consensus among later generations.” This consensus of meaning significant to the present generation is a restatement of Durkheim’s conviction about the ritual attitude.

The social process of establishing artifacts, which come to represent an aspect of collective memory, is discussed by a number of other authors including Schwartz (Halbwachs 1925, Mead 1938, B. Schwartz 1982, 1983, 1985, et al. 1986), who generally take a stance that past events are formulated to give significance and relevance to the present. Schwartz (1982, p. 376), in his discussion of Halbwachs’ (1925) work on the social context of remembering and forgetting, notes that the earlier author “promotes the idea that our conception of the past is entirely at the mercy of current conditions, that there is no objectivity in events, nothing in history which transcends the peculiarities of the present.” Halbwachs’ radically relativist approach to the establishment of collective memory is modified by Schwartz, who takes the middle road between absolutist approaches attaching an objective and unchanging meaning to historical events, and the relativist approach where meaning is based exclusively upon the vagaries of contemporary observers.

According to Schwartz (1982, p. 396), “the past cannot be literally constructed; it can only be selectively exploited...” and “the exploitation cannot be arbitrary...” For “The events selected for commemoration must have some factual significance...” In another of his works, Schwartz et al. (1986) makes use of his theory of historical selectivity in collective memory to demonstrate how an aspect of Jewish history, the Roman siege of Masada in 73 A.D., was selectively used by modern Jews to provide a collective account for their contemporary experience in Palestine. Schwartz terms this process “recovered history,” and quotes George Herbert Mead’s interpreters (Maines, Sugrue, and Katovich, 1983 pp. 163–165), such that Mead conceived of the past as serving the present in accordance with two functions. The first function is in “redefining the meaning of past events in such a way that they have meaning in and utility for the present...” and “[T]he functional character of reconstruction is contained in its contribution to present meanings.” The second function is to provide “practical value in solving situational problems.” Schwartz discounts the second function of “the use value of the past” in favor of the notion that perceptions of the past are considered to be “valid not for their utility but because of their objective fit with reality (Schwartz, 1986, p. 160).” Schwartz terms this “objective fit with reality” the “congruence principle” and characterizes the pragmatist (Meadian) version as the “pleasure principle.”

Schwartz (1986, p. 161) argues that “we may trace the content of collective memory to a congruence principle rather than a pragmatist version of the pleasure principle.” For Schwartz, coupling of an event from the past to the present does not involve a self-serving selection of arbitrary bits and pieces whittled and fashioned to fit conveniently into a slot in the present. Instead, as he shall say, the past fits and is analogous with the present because it has been appropriately selected by the historian, sociologist, or poet. Schwartz’s inference is that the past fits appropriately with the present because in some way the past is structurally the same as the present in that past events set forth the template for all future events. Schwartz (1982) touches upon this notion in an earlier work quoting works of Levi-Strauss (1963), Elide (1963), and Shils (1975), thereby showing the structuralist influence and importance of origins in providing patterns for the present. Thus, he strives to steer a middle course between the extremes of absolutist and relativist approaches. Though it is not completely clear how he can then make use of the terms appropriateness and selection (because to select or appropriate the past to fit with the present is a radically creative act devoid of a structuralist underpinning), his approach is useful in that he implies the inference of comparing past with present analogically. The present is truly unique and does not fit easily into an old prefabricated box from past construction. The work of applying an analogy is involved with creative selection of aspects that appropriately fit with entirely new circumstances; therefore, history repeats itself only in the sense that the historian can strive creatively to demonstrate similarity. The analogy is objective only in the sense that its constituent historical facts are generally agreed on; and the analogy is relative only in the sense that historical facts are selectively superimposed on presently existing circumstances to fulfill cogen mnemonic needs of the community.

Though Schwartz discounts the pragmatist Meadian version accounting for collective memory, a merger of Schwartz and Mead is fruitful in explaining collective memory as it pertains to memorialization. This merger leads us to a theory of historical analogy. In constructing an analogy between the present and the past, a representation is generated...
that supplies meaning for an event. Use of the past to form an interpretation of the present is therefore involved both with the congruence principle and the pleasure principle. The present is similar to the future in that its meaning is essentially unknown, and to provide the present with meaning, it is critical that meaningful reference be made to the past.

The creation of analogy is one of the most important and complex elements of human cognition because it provides us with abstract, symbolic meaning. For example, use of analogy is a primary element in Common Law jurisprudence where the principle of stare decisis or precedent provides linkage with well-established past decisions. The artist or poet grasps this analogous or metaphorical linkage with past works when she sculpt a shape or turns a phrase thereby reintroducing commonly known forms in extraordinarily different terms. T. S. Eliot (1932, p. 247) explains this artistic coupling in his statement:

When a poet’s mind is perfectly equipped for his work, it is constantly amalgamating disparate experiences; the ordinary man’s experience is chaotic, irregular, fragmentary. The latter falls in love, or reads Spinoza, and these two experiences have nothing to do with each other, or with the noise of the typewriter or the smell of cooking; in the mind of the poet these experiences are always forming new wholes.

Though the content of analogy is important, it is but an ephemeral vehicle in providing meaning, for as C. S. Lewis (Black 1962, p. 38) cautions us, analogy is “a temporary tool which we dominate and by which we are not dominated ourselves, only because we have other tools in our box.” Similarly, Durkheim (1961) stresses the point that content of the rite or significance of the totem is of much less consequence than the solidarity these symbolic items convey to the community. The social process of memorialization involves building an appropriate physical artifact that analogically links past community events with the present, establishing meaning for the collective memory, and thus enhancing community moral unity.

A Social Process Theory of Memorial Building

Howard S. Becker (1974, 1982) has stressed that art is a form of collective activity. This is most evident with forms of art that are public, such as art that memorializes community personalities or events. Public memorials are intricately enmeshed in a network of social conventions, forgotten beneath the weight of stone, iron, or bronze in the artifact rising from the desert at Giza, striding the Champs Elysees in Paris, or welcoming the ships in New York harbor.

We divide our social process theory of collective memory into three parts: socialization of the community to the building of the memorial, making a case for building the memorial by significant personalities and groups, and the part played by the powerful community institutions (bureaucracies associated with the art world). The theory will be explicated using the example of the Vietnam Veterans Memorial and then applied to the proposed memorial at Kent State University commemorating the events of May 4, 1970.

Socialization of the Community to the Building of the Memorial

Community events are associated with a stock of knowledge. Events occur of national and international moment, but their importance or meaning is not immediately evident. Later, an account of the extraordinary event is created to situate it within the stock of historical knowledge available to the community. The event in this way is coupled by analogy with the known history of the community.

Aileen Saaarin (Carter 1978, p. 52) has commented that conceptions of events and personalities must reach a maturity before memorialization can even be considered. Time must pass to heal wounds and fade conflicts generated by events, but time also nurtures reflection, and provides maturity for memory invoking a perspective that situates experience within an appropriate historical context.

The historical perspective is necessary to determine the significance of the event as it applies to subsequent experience. When the community senses a need to recollect the past in the form of a material statement such as a memorial, specialists are called upon to create the appropriate statement. The specialists’ work involves crystallizing all the bits and pieces of memory into a single objective representation in accordance with the art world’s current genre. The meaning of the memorial is created both through the social process whereby it is conceived and in the activities it generates after construction.

The artifact used to memorialize is a part of this social process. The Statue of Liberty is now a hallowed memorial to many notions currently interred in the American consciousness, but the current meaning of this memorial was not evident before or at the time of its construction. It is inconceivable that a similar monument of its scale and aesthetic bearing be repeated, as has been proposed, in San Francisco harbor or anywhere else! The very form of monument exemplified by the Statue of Liberty is a product of the nineteenth century. Not only is it a symbol of liberty and a remnant of a certain way of memorializing, but something much more. Modern abstract monuments as Eero Saaarin’s Gateway Arch (1962–1966) in St. Louis, Missouri and so-called ‘living memorials’ such as memorial bridges or highways show a different conception and set of conventions for memorialization, but they have taken on a multidimensional set of new conceptions. The present meaning of these artifacts has come to be very different from conceptions of memorial origins. Community socialization makes use of an analogy with past experience which instigates building the original artifact, but these analogy-artifacts are eventually cast aside onto the conceptual midden of past generations. The current meaning comes to appear as sovereign truth and reality.

Saaarin’s requirement of maturity for memorialization of collective memory has been achieved by the Vietnam Veterans Memorial on a somewhat accelerated basis. The instigation for memorializing the fallen soldiers of the Vietnam war was originally based on a similar need as with all wars—to stimulate memory of the past conflict—but each war is unique and the unique meaning eventually comes to be imposed upon the memorial during the building and after its construction, making this memorialization completely independent of past conceptions. Socialization of the community to the events of Vietnam is still marked by that era’s “Hawk-Dove’’ (pro and anti war) schism. The Vietnam Veterans Memorial manifests the continuation of wartime ideological differences on the war: part of the memorial commemorates the soldiers who died (the black granite walls), and part (the three bronze soldiers) represents a more traditional and heroic, though subdued, depiction of events, similar to the Iwo Jima Second World War memorial.

Making a Case for Building a Memorial by Significant Personalities and Groups

With a stock of knowledge available within the community concerning an event from the past and its establishment as a significant marker in the community’s history, a case
must be made for commemoration of the event. After a memorial is built, accounts of its relevance seem obvious as do reasons for its original erection. This post hoc corpus of knowledge is not nearly so obvious before construction because it developed as a result of the monument itself. The original fact that the monument was built signifies an initial importance to the event in the context of history, but the event, itself incarnate as with all experiences remembered and forgotten, has no intrinsically imbedded meaning. The meaning must be established.

Bartholdi's Statue of Liberty, which now possesses an admirable reputation, was much less venerated in 1886 at its unveiling. A case had to be made for the appropriateness of the statue. First, just the torch from the statue was displayed in the United States, and attention was focused on the appropriate virtues of the statue for several years before it was built. After having been shipped to the U.S. from France it was stored in warehouses until the American community was sufficiently prepared for its erection. Even after erection much community comment continued to explain further its appropriateness. Emma Lazarus' poem ("Give me your tired, your poor, . . . "), inspired in 1883 by early renditions of the statue, played a major role in establishing the statue's significance. The "Mother of Exiles" meaning was crystallized in 1903 with the inscribing of Lazarus' poem on a tablet in the pedestal. The "New Colossus" in New York harbor had taken on a meaning which was not so readily evident in Bartholdi's original conceptual motivations for its creation. Most Americans are now convinced of its significance as the gala festivities during the summer of 1886 displayed.

A good argument can be made that Bartholdi's statue was motivated as a memorial to himself (Gschalder 1966), but in order to realize construction a more generalized public account was necessary. Whatever the original stimulus for construction, to promote American-French friendship or a symbol of the "Mother of Exiles," the public monument is ultimately the subject of an ongoing community negotiation where advocates argue their case and thereby eventually establish community consensus.

An ongoing process of making a case and establishment of community consensus is evident in connection with the Vietnam Veterans Memorial both before erection and at the present time. The Vietnam Veterans Memorial Fund began the task of amalgamating public support for the memorial. This small movement gained momentum and support from a wealthy benefactor, leading eventually to the design competition and construction. However, the memorial is still very much involved in a process of building consensus about its meaning. This can be seen in the pattern of creative social uses the memorial is generating. The U. S. Department of the Interior maintains an archive of the various memorabilia, such as teddy bears, worn-out flak jackets, and combat boots, left by persons near a name on the granite walls; and the act of pencil-tracing the name of a friend or family member from the wall onto the Vietnam Veterans Memorial brochure has become an institution. Veterans wear old uniforms to the site. A television booth uses only the heroic bronze portion of the Vietnam Veterans Memorial and not the black walls to appeal to its clientele; and one of the authors observed a copy of the Uniform Code of Military Conduct in laminated plastic ("I will never surrender of my own free will . . . " et cetera) left at the feet of the three bronze figures, evidence of hardness in an old schism between hawk and dove. It is obvious that the two portions of the Vietnam Veterans Memorial, the walls on the one hand and the bronze statue on the other, have come together to symbolize a consensus about an agonizing time in American collective memory.

Symbols of Collective Memory

Characteristics of significant personalities and groups can be derived from Garfinkel's (1956) reference to "the denouncer" in his exposition of status degradation ceremonies, though we portray the characteristics in a more positive light. The significant personality may occupy a public office, though this is not a requirement, but he must be, or at least must become, a public person. The case for a memorial must be presented as if the event has public significance, and though the significant personality has a vested interest, this interest is generated from public sources. Therefore, it is made to appear as a community effort and not strictly personal. Relevance of the event is not supported by personal interests alone, and the personality has authority to speak on behalf of the community only because he or she now represents those community interests. The significant personality acts as sponsor for the ultimate values of the community, and must, as Garfinkel (1956) notes, make the dignity of the supra-individual values of the community regarding the memorial salient and accessible to view.

Part of the work of the significant personality is in obtaining the support of others through creation of a voluntary association of persons who share similar interests. This association can capitalize on its power by gaining financial support from private and public sources and by pressuring formal and informal political groups such as lobbies and politicians. Obviously the job of the significant personality is furthered if the first portions of the process model have been fulfilled, in the sense that the community is well-informed of the event and the case has been made.

The role of Jan Scruggs (Scruggs and Swardlow 1985), an enlisted combat veteran of Vietnam, in the building of the Vietnam Veterans Memorial was critical and shows how a person with relatively simple means can "capitalize" an initially small asset into a very large enterprise (Hess 1983, Howett 1985). Scruggs began with his life's savings of approximately $2,000 from the selling of his small farm and used it to create an organization of veterans, The Vietnam Veterans Memorial Fund. Later this organization played a role in gaining support in Congress to set aside a plot of land for the project. Scruggs fulfills Garfinkel's requirements as a significant individual who personifies the role of a proper advocate for the Vietnam Veterans Memorial. Scruggs has personal interests, which are amplified by other veterans and survivors of the fallen. His marshaling of support from others to finance the memorial design competition fulfilled the practical requirement of creating the means for erecting the memorial. The fine-tuning of the analogy with the past is thus performed by the significant personality or group making a case for building the memorial.

The Power of Community Institutions in Building the Memorial

Though significant personalities play a major role in generating community support for the creation of the memorial, existing community institutions have a role in regulating initial decisions to build the memorial as well as in actual construction. Part of the work of the significant personality is to engender support from powerful political groups, but it is then the role of administrative bureaucracies to filter, translate, and negotiate decisions to meet formally instituted community norms. The legitimate authority and role of community institutions is critical and can direct a case in a multitude of unpredictable directions.

A bureaucracy whose authority includes evaluation of a memorial plan can change the direction of the original decision in a variety of ways.
Though community institutions or bureaucracies are usually thought to present impediments to creative attempts by the community, this is in no way always the case, for on some occasions these institutions can actually facilitate and protect community efforts from excessive incursion of special interests. The essential point in this connection is that these bureaucratic entities can act to place a conservative community filter on the entire process of memorial building, and, as is the case with a judge in a court of law, act as arbiter when contending community groups are at odds. Community institutions then act as arbitrators in building the memorial and often have authority to provide final permission to proceed. If this arbitral element of the social process model is missing, a serious impediment may occur in the process, thus preventing construction.

Institutions played a significant role in building the Vietnam Veterans Memorial. Because the memorial was to be built in Washington, DC, plans to build the design had to be filtered through a formidable system of bureaucracies. First, after Congress mandated the land, all considerations for the memorial—design, landscape, planning, aesthetics—had to be approved by the National Capital Planning Commission, the Commission of Fine Arts, and the Department of the Interior. The architect, Paul Spreiregen, selected to administer the Vietnam Veterans Memorial design competition, has commented (Spreiregen 1986) that the Vietnam Veterans Memorial would not have been built without the "bureaucratic structure" provided by these institutions, for after the winner of the design competition, Maya Lin, was named some Vietnam veterans groups did not support the selection. However, the design was already in the bureaucratic works, making it extremely difficult to simply ignore, no matter how powerful the arguments and political power of opponents. Eventually a compromise was reached by the two sides through mediation within the bureaucratic structure.

Existing community institutions play an important creative role in interpretation and support of memorial building, and it cannot be said that these institutions' work is essentially disruptive. Because of the time it takes to filter design ideas through large administrations, this greater amount of exposure leads to a negotiated statement having a much larger constituency than would be the case otherwise; therefore, the controversy has time to play itself out in the community milieu, thus softening particularist influences from powerful elites and engendering wider community legitimacy.

The marshaling of support from powerful groups and persons is critical to the success of memorial building. Obviously, politically powerful and wealthy persons play major roles; however, in memorial building specialized interest groups in the art world exert significant power due to the social deference and responsibility given them by the community. When memorial advocates decide to create an appropriate aesthetic metaphor, they defer to art world professionals, which, in the case of memorial building, means architects, sculptors, and landscape designers. This is a group of powerful elites, which has specific interests and authority. The interests and authority prevail in the selection of an aesthetic. If the aesthetic is to be imposed in a personal residence, or a corporate building, there may be criticism from the community, but critical vehemence is curbed because territory is private. A public monument presents a heightened level of emotion in the ensuing polemic because territory is not private. In the case of memorials, the aesthetic becomes an aspect of controversy with contending sides often consisting of community power against the interests of an art world elite.

In the case of the Vietnam Veterans Memorial, Jan Scruggs was able to incorporate the Vietnam Veterans Memorial Fund to erect a national monument honoring those who had died in the war. In 1979, legislation was introduced in Congress to allocate land for the planned memorial and the project was eventually signed into law by President Carter in 1980. Though the Vietnam Veterans Memorial Fund was able to gain significant power from veterans and some of their associations, a key element in the initial impetus was from H. Ross Perot, the Texas computer magnate. Perot provided the seed money for a competition to select the memorial design.

In the Vietnam Veterans Memorial construction, significant controversy tended to be associated with the question as to the type of physical manifestation to be erected. A compromise was reached between Vietnam Veterans Memorial Fund supporters of Maya Lin's granite walls and Perot backed supporters of a more representational bronze design by Frederick Hart. Marshaling support from powerful groups provided the art world "support personnel" for building the memorial. When a public possession, whether physical or symbolic, is being considered for some form of manipulation by the community, a single entity cannot legitimately impose itself without an outcry from other sectors. The drawing of an analogy is therefore a community-embedded creation.

The May 4, 1970 Memorial at Kent State University—
A Social Process Analysis of Collective Memory

Method

The authors come to this research from unique perspectives. The first author has been a member of the Kent State sociology faculty since 1972. He is a sculptor whose works have appeared in the Cleveland Museum of Art and elsewhere. He submitted an entry into the Kent State University May 4, 1970 design competition. The second author has been a member of the Kent State University sociology faculty since 1966. He has written on the Kent State shootings and was a member of the first Memorial Committee. In addition to these background experiences, the authors used university documents, public presentations, and personal interviews as sources of data for this study.

Brief History of the Issues

Kent State University and the campus shootings on May 4, 1970, were symbols of the tragedy of America's involvement in Vietnam. What surprises many is that May 4 controversies continue to generate regional and, often, national attention addressing legal, social, and artistic issues. The wound inflicted on that day has taken long to heal. Shortly after noon May 4, 1970, on a grassy knoll near a dormitory parking lot, a contingent of Ohio National Guardsmen opened fire for a period of 13 seconds, striking 13 Kent State University students, some of whom were nearby, others of whom were distant. Four students were killed, one was permanently paralyzed, and the others were wounded in varying degrees of severity. 5

As is true of many issues in American society, controversy moves quickly to the courtroom. 6 The legal struggle that followed May 4 spanned the decade of the seventies. Local, state, and federal courts became involved in extensive criminal and civil proceedings. No criminal convictions were ever obtained in regard to the deaths; however, in 1979 an out-of-court settlement was reached. The parents, students, and their attorneys received $275,000 paid by the State of Ohio.
While calls for a memorialization of the event began almost immediately after the shootings, the only noteworthy event of this nature, which occurred before the serious work on a university sponsored memorial in 1985, was the Segal controversy in 1978. A private foundation, on its own initiative, commissioned the well known sculptor George Segal to do a memorial sculpture for Kent State University. Segal’s piece was based on his previous sculpture using biblical themes of Abraham and Isaac. It showed a middle-aged man, knife in hand, preparing to kill a bare chested youth kneeling in front of him.

The university rejected the sculpture saying it was inappropriate and too violent. The Segal sculpture was eventually donated to Princeton University where it resides today.

In 1985 a Kent State committee recommended that a memorial should be built that expressed the themes of inquiry, learning, and reflection about May 4 and its impact on American society, and early in 1986 a national competition for a memorial design was conducted. This event, unlike others in the history of May 4, seemed free from controversy until it was discovered that the winner of the design competition was not an American citizen, a violation of the competition rules. After several months of negotiation, the submission that took second place in the competition was chosen as the memorial design to be built on a site near the shootings.

In the summer of 1986 after selection of the design competition winner, another controversy developed over a resolution unanimously adopted by the American Legion’s resolution committee opposing plans to build a memorial to May 4. The resolution entitled “Kent State Memorial to Terrorists” generated considerable comment in the media. Most people objected to the Legion’s use of the word “terrorist” to describe in blanket terms all the students involved in demonstrations on May 4. Particular noteworthy was the case of Sandy Scheur, one of the slain students, who was not participating in the demonstrations but was on her way to class at the time of her death.

Socialization of the Community to the Building of the May 4, 1970 Memorial

The social process model guides our analysis first to analyzing elements of socialization as they pertain to the May 4 memorial. In order for an event to have memorial consequence, a corpus of historical experience from normal times must be juxtaposed with historical information about the event. Knowledge of normal times is contrasted with the significant event, leading to a stock of knowledge informing the community concerning that event.

We can divide this stock of knowledge into three categories: people, locations, and issues. As to people, there are two core groups, the 13 slain and wounded students on one side and the Ohio National Guard on the other. In any discussion about May 4, 1970, these two entities are always in the spotlight. Surrounding these two core groups are others including the families of the students; the National Guard commanders; the president of Kent State in 1970, the Governor of the State of Ohio.

The second category of location involves the site of the original confrontation. The Commons is a large grassy field in the center of the Kent State Campus. It was the location of many political demonstrations in the 1960s and 1970s, and it is an important part of Kent’s cultural life.

Last, the issues category is part of the stock of knowledge and can be expressed in the form of several questions: Did students have the right to assemble on the Commons? Should the Ohio National Guard have been brought onto the Kent State University Campus? Were the National Guardsmen justified in firing their weapons? This stock of knowledge about people, location, and the issues is communicated in a variety of ways. First, there are informal channels with information moving in ways that resemble common patterns described by collective behavior scholars. Next, the media was involved in codifying the stock of knowledge for the community, which resulted in setting the agenda as to what is important in discourse about May 4. Regional papers such as the Akron Beacon Journal and the Cleveland Plain Dealer were the important sources for setting this agenda.

Finally, scholarship becomes part of the socialization process. Books and articles continue the socialization process begun by informal networks and mass media. The May 4, 1970 event is the topic of a large number of books and articles with an annotated bibliography running to over 30 book pages (Bills 1982). Last, the memorial effort itself becomes part of the socialization process particularly in light of the controversies that have to be explained. Memorialization of May 4, 1970, began with community support for a memorial design competition. Though the facts are evident, they had to be placed together in a form that supplied an initial analogy appropriate to that time, or a way of setting forth a symbolic consensus about the events. It is naive to believe that the historical facts incarnate are sufficient to symbolize events, for a social process has to play itself out in order to reflexively give meaning by analogy to the past. The events at Kent State must be tied into past events, such as Vietnam, in order to have wide community consensus.

Making a Case for the May 4, 1970 Memorial by Significant Personalities and Groups

Accounts of events on May 4 are of course not absolute or intrinsically relevant but must be negotiated. For example, the notion that the Cambodian incursion in 1970 led to May 4, is obviously too simplistic. An appropriate account of events is not so straightforward. Attempts at promoting the appropriateness of a memorial can be seen in the discussions leading up to decisions to build. Advocates for the memorial feel that portions of the community are unconvinced and must be ‘set straight’ as to the appropriateness of the memorial. Statements by the President of Kent State capture these ideas in a succinct way. President Michael Schwartz (1986, p. E-3) commended on the validity of May 4 as a significant event with an historical import that must be remembered:

May 4 is not just Kent State’s burden. It is a burden carried by the entire society. It was an unprecedented event, and it must not be repeated.

The official account of the event is stated by President Schwartz:

And then, during an awful period of American History when there was some question in the minds of many of us as to whether the American university, or indeed even the republic, could survive, this university suffered its greatest tragedy. The university became a victim and, just as has so often been the case, the victim was blamed for its own victimization. Last year we continued a major effort to come to terms with that. The time was right for healing, for peace and thought, for learning and reflection. The time of playing childish games of praise and blame were over. The time had come to remember and move forward.
The argument supporting the appropriateness of the memorial is aimed at linking Kent State to greater national issues. For example, the comparison of Kent State with the Boston Massacre of 1770 was often mentioned. Also, President Schwartz's comments became directed not so much toward the significance of the event as to overcoming opposition from that part of the community which was in disagreement with the official account. President Schwartz continues:

Thinking that all was resolved, last summer we faced the Ohio Department of the American Legion's resolution critical of our efforts to make peace, to heal, to bring perspective. We must understand that the attack to control ideas is not just something that happens in totalitarian countries. Book-burning occurs whenever anyone, anywhere attempts to shape the quest for knowledge in his own image. We are victorious over small minds and the perpetrators of discord. We are victorious in remembrance of senseless events that nonetheless have meaning. And we must go home. Home to the real purpose of a university, which is to learn from human events.

Making a case for the memorial is an advocacy exercise in which participants must overcome arguments running counter to the "appropriate analogy" of memorial builders. Some advocates have a major stake in the issue. In the Kent State case, it is easier to identify significant groups than individuals. Indeed, one group dominated activities seeking to create a memorial. This was a student organization called the May 4th Task Force. This group was formed in the mid-1970s to educate the Kent State community about May 4 and its aftermath. In 1982 the leadership of the Task Force appealed to Brage Golding, then President of the university, with the idea of establishing a memorial to the four slain and nine wounded students. Golding refused, saying that such a memorial was not desired by the majority of the Kent State University community. After this rebuff, the May 4th Task Force stepped up its campaign with a public campaign including letter writing, speeches, petitions, and endorsements from various faculty and student groups. In 1983, President Michael Schwartz received a petition from students and agreed to take the issue to the university's Board of Trustees. The Board of Trustees in 1984 instructed the president to set up a committee to study the memorial issue. In 1985, the May 4 Memorial Committee, which included faculty, administration, students, alumni, and Kent community members, responded to the President with a report calling for a memorial. Such a conclusion was not foregone. Indeed, as late as October 1984, the committee was sharply divided on the issue of whether or not to have a memorial. With the decision made by the University Board of Trustees to build a memorial the next step was seemingly simplistic and pragmatic, but turns out to be one of the more troublesome aspects of the process. Several existing social institutions were called into play: first, the institutionalized means of choosing a design was structured through an established design competition process; and second, with the winning design chosen, social mechanisms were activated to raise funds to do the actual building. The May 4 Task Force had acted to link events at Kent State into the context of American collective consciousness, and the design competition was the next step toward formal legitimation. Both President Schwartz and the May 4th Task Force had acted to initiate a link between events at Kent State with other historical occurrences. An analogy was drawn giving Kent State's "burden" significance in American collective memory.
After the president in consultation with others in the administration and faculty had decided on having the national competition to select an appropriate memorial, a direction was therefore taken to democratize the selection process and thereby ostensibly decrease any charge that particularistic groups had exerted undue influence. The notion of a national competition gives the appearance of an objective selection process; however, this does not take into consideration the powerful effect of the various elites associated with the professional areas of art, architecture, and landscape design, who are called upon to administer the competition. Paul Sprüerengan, the architect in charge of the Vietnam Veterans Memorial, was called in to administer the May 4 memorial competition. He selected the jury, which consisted of artists, landscape architects, and was chaired by an environmental author.

One of the difficulties in building the May 4 memorial in contrast with the Vietnam Veterans Memorial was the problem of conflict resolution. This was particularly acute when the winning submission was challenged because the designer was a Canadian citizen. This was a clear violation of the competition rules which stated that, "Competitors must be U.S. citizens at the time of registration" (Kent State University, 1986a, p. 11, eligibility rule 1.1). After several months of fruitless negotiation between the university and the Canadian designer, the second place winner in the competition was chosen as the memorial design. In February 1987, the designer of the original submission sued Kent State University for breach of contract and violation of civil rights (Garmon 1987, p. 1). A need for arbitration was clear. However, at Kent State there was or is no such arbiter, for the university administration that could act in this capacity was actually an advocate. For this reason there was no available party to negotiate any dispute.

When conflict occurred with the Vietnam Veterans Memorial, there were several organizations including the National Capital Planning Commission, the Commission on Fine Arts, and the formidable Department of the Interior (under James Watt) that acted as arbiters in the Vietnam Veterans Memorial building process. These institutions appropriately negotiated the design selected by the panel.

One of the most prominent criticisms of the winning design in the Vietnam Veterans Memorial competition centered on the charge of elitism. Sprüerengan mentions in his book on memorial competitions (Sprüerengan 1979) that one of the chief criticisms of competitions is that the winning design may be selected, but the memorial is never actually built. Public memorials have an inherent egalitarian interest which is not often recognized by artistic elites. Tom Wolfe’s (1982) highly critical (and in the opinion of some, inappropriate) comments on elitism associated with selection of the Vietnam Veterans Memorial design exemplify the populist tendencies that come out as a result of memorial building. Sprüerengan (1986) mentioned in a speech at Kent State University that he did not feel it was appropriate to include a veteran on the Vietnam Veterans Memorial jury panel because of the potential for controversy, and this same attitude was obviously implemented in the May 4, 1970 memorial jury selection.

The controversy over the Vietnam Veterans Memorial involved political, social, and even sexual elements. The winning design in the Vietnam Veterans Memorial competition, according to some, did not depict the fighting soldier representationally, and it was an obviously non-masculine design according to others. After long negotiations, the more representational Frederick Hart bronze sculpture (one of the contenders in the original competition), with inclusion of the American flag, was selected to accompany the Maya Lin design. Another question to be worked out centered on where the Hart sculpture and flag should be placed in association with the Lin design. One of the original suggestions made by a committee supporting the Hart design was to place the bronze sculpture below on the surface of the Lin design in the vertex of the V with the flag on the higher surface. As Elizabeth Hess (1983, p. 125) notes, "the committee wanted the statue in the center of Lin’s walls—in effect penetrating her V."

The governmental institutions which reviewed memorial building set the context as mediators in the controversy which ensued over the Vietnam Veterans Memorial, and a compromise was reached. In the Kent State University case this set of institutions was not available to act as mediator. The rules for the competition included the statement, "The memorial should be harmonious with its site. It should be an artistic ‘incident’ alongside a pedestrian pathway" (Kent State University, Design Program, 1986b, p. 16). Also included in the rules of the competition, the comment, "The form of acknowledgement of the four students who died and the nine who were wounded will be a matter for the competitors to decide, as will other elements of the design of this reflective site. However, in keeping with the wishes of the families of the four deceased students, the form of their acknowledgement is to be of the most modest nature" (Kent State University, 1986a, p. 10).

It was quite obvious from the rules of the competition that some form of recognition of the four students killed and nine wounded should be made, but that this recognition should not directly represent particular students. The Design Program rules state, "The Memorial design is to include a physical expression regarding the four students who died (Kent State University, Design Program, 1986b, p. 16, requirement 11)." The desire on the part of the university administration for a non-representational and apolitical memorial design was to a great extent portrayed earlier in the furor over the representational Segal sculpture. The Segal controversy was specifically left out of pamphlets which advertised and discussed the memorial competition. It is quite apparent now that a representational type design was not to be selected by the jurors. This is evident for several reasons: the jury composition, the style of modern memorials, as well as the specific history of the Segal controversy at Kent State University.

According to James Dalton, Director of the Kent State University School of Architecture and Environmental Design, the four runners-up in the competition were selected in accordance with their compliance with the first, second, and third place winners’ essential abstract aesthetic code. Confirmation of this is indicated by reference to the figures accompanying this article. Also, an informal conversation (Gregory 1986) with Sprüerengan after the results of the competition were announced revealed that jurors decided prior to their reviewing submissions that they should look for designs which "symbolically" depicted students killed and wounded.

The latent rule structure used by the jurors then was founded on their professional training and experience and the specific requirements for the May 4 memorial, together generating the informal a priori agreement concerning a design: the memorial should be an abstract statement symbolically representing only the students killed and wounded. The admixture of abstract symbols with numbers restricted the physical product to a memorial exhibiting numerical configurations of the numbers four (students killed), or nine (students wounded), or 13 (students killed and wounded). Referring to the figures accompanying this article, the first and second place winners certainly adhere to this rule; and, in addition, the runners-up conform to this latent ordering. The Dalton evidence
First Place Award

First Place Award made to Ian Taberner, a landscape architect, who has depicted students killed by the open-air rooms (concave appendages) off of the walkway, and students wounded by the 9 gashes into the hillside opposite and between appendages.

Second Place Award

Second Place Award made to Bruno Ast, a landscape architect, who has depicted the 13 students killed and wounded by the paving pattern and the sheared walls. The sheared wall piece is transposed upon the landscape as a pylon.
infers runners-up were selected with the latent rule, and personal inspection of all design submissions by the authors of this article is further confirmation.5

By contrast to the latent ordering used by jurors, the rules of the competition would have permitted a more general national symbolic statement about the war and its relation to May 4, such as inferences to American issues of the time, i.e. "the Hawks and the Doves"10 including names, or something of the sort, of the students killed and wounded. The latent ordering used by jurors tended to filter out competitors who are not participants in the current symbolic genre of the art world. Though the competition rules and publicity went to great lengths in observing competitor anonymity and striving for large numbers of competition participants, this democratic, fair, and egalitarian set of ethics not observed by the jurors’ filter. Though it is rather predictable that the jurors’ selection would reflect the tastes of the art world, a more eclectic jury could have headed off this possible criticism. The rules of the competition tend to encourage participation by a diversity of competitors. Spreiregen (1986) recalled in his speech some of the entries in the Vietnam Veterans Memorial competition submitted by non-professionals. He mentioned that some proposals appeared to be “drawn on the kitchen table” and “poignantly” depicted bronze flak jackets and combat boots. Many were encouraged to compete, but few were realistically eligible.

The final product of the competition was essentially an elitist selection. For example, Spreiregen (1986) in his speech at Kent State noted that in the Vietnam Veterans Memorial competition, one juror spent only three hours in reviewing the over 1,400 designs (he noted as well that it takes over 45 minutes just to walk by and observe, not to mention read the site plans for this many entrants) and selected two, one of which was the eventual winner (Maya Lin). Though Spreiregen made this statement as evidence of the winning design’s absolute virtue and jurors’ fine selective abilities, it is more accurately evidence of the swift, crisp effectiveness of the elite filter. The virtue in i.e., “the ease in filtering out the ridiculous entrants and producing further innovative enhancement of a current aesthetic; however, an aspect that is not so virtuous is the filter’s tendency to accent rather than diminish the inevitable populist criticism which may prevent actual building of the memorial. As mentioned above, populist criticism from Tom Wolfe and veteran groups for a less elitist memorial were assuaged by various mediating institutions, whereas in the Kent State situation this was not possible due to the university’s role as advocate.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

This article has proposed and utilized a general model for understanding the creation of public memorials. Drawing on the work of Durkheim, Mead, and Schwartz, we have merged collective representation and memory theory with the process of memorial building. The May 4, 1970 memorial was initiated through an analogous linkage with the past, as with the Vietnam Veterans Memorial. The Vietnam Veterans Memorial collective memory amalgamates important symbols of American experience associated with the Vietnam era. A similar division is apparent with Kent State’s memorial, but the social institutions allowing that divisiveness to play itself out as a process are not formally in place; however, this is illustrative of the uniqueness of Kent State’s situation.

Symbols of Collective Memory

The ensuing process of building the memorial and its use after construction create new situational accounts establishing its meaning in collective memory. The point advanced in this article emphasizes the social process of creating an appropriate sovereign analogy with the past, which has a general utility in creating meaning consensus about an event in the present. This is a semantic act, but its outcome is also notably practical in establishing community solidarity over the event. As Durkheim (1961, p. 432) reminds us:

To become conscious of itself, the group does not need to perform certain acts in preference to all others. The necessary thing is that it partakes of the same thought and the same action; the visible forms in which this communion takes place matter but little…Men who feel themselves united, partially by bonds of blood, but still more by a community of interest and tradition, assemble and become conscious of their moral unity.

Schwartz (1986, p. 160) states "collective memory becomes a significant force in a dialectic of social change." The process of amalgamating the collective past with an unclear and incoherent present constructs a meaning for the collectivity which solidifies its moral unity. We argue that the symbols of the Vietnam Veterans Memorial and the social process unfolding at Kent State involve a dialectic of symbolic interaction which is needed in producing that moral unity. It is our hope that this research will generate research on these visible symbols of past and present. Many examples come to mind, from the ancient history of Egypt to the wars between France and Germany, where Rameses II, Napoleon, and Hitler as well as many others concentrated on building, desecrating, and seizing national memorials.
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NOTES

1. We have made use of Becker’s work (1963) associated with the labeling perspective for the general organizational structure of the social process model.
2. In a recent media announcement (WKSU, National Public Radio 1987) an Ohio association of nurses-veterans of Vietnam is petitioning to build a memorial near the Vietnam Veterans Memorial in Washington, DC. Though a nurse association is powerful, it does not serve nearly so large a constituency as the Vietnam Veterans associations, making it difficult to gain adherents for this advocacy.
3. According to Spreiregen (1986), Maya Lin, a Yale undergraduate architecture student, began her memorial project as a class project for the Vietnam Memorial competition, but with a strange twist, her class instructor wanted the students to do a satirical design. Lin’s original design depicted dominoes (signifying the domino theory in Southeast Asia) sinking into the ground at an angle. Other students suggested it may be a good serious design. Her actual submission was a simplistic, near surrealistic pastel drawing of a black wedge on a green field. Her more illuminating written description of the design according to Spreiregen swayed and convinced the jurors.
4. The notion of “support personnel” in the art world is derived from Becker’s (1974, 1982) use of the term. Becker, in an example, notes, “Marcel Duchamp outraged many people by insisting
that he created a valid work of art when he signed a commercially produced snowshovel or signed a reproduction of the Mona Lisa on which he had drawn a moustache, thus classifying Leonardo as support personnel along with the snowshovel's designer and manufacturer. " The notion of support personnel can apply as well to political and bureaucratic entities.

5. Pictures of the May 4, 1970 event may be found in the "Scranton Report" (U.S. President's Commission on Campus Urest 1970).

6. An analysis of the collective behavior and social movement aspects of May 4 as well as its legal dimensions may be found in Hensley and Lewis (1978:passim).

7. According to the art historian Kenneth Clark (1981, pp. 30-31), "our contemporary rejection of representational images must be taken seriously by historians and still more by artists, who have no hope of winning a competition or being chosen for an international exhibition unless they conform to extant artistic conventions."

8. Entrants to the May 4, 1970 memorial competition were encouraged to ask questions about the memorial site, rules, etc., by writing the competition organizers. In January 1986 the listing of questions with answers (Kent State University 1986c) was mailed out to the registered entrants in a 17-page booklet. One question was "Is it necessary to have an 'expression' or 'symbol' of the nine students who were wounded . . .?" The reply to this was "There is no requirement for this, but if you wish to propose such an expression or symbol as part of your design, do so."

9. The design submissions were on display for several days in a campus building. Several of the entries were vivid representations of National Guard troops aiming weapons at students. All winners of first, second, and third places, as well as the runners-up, however, used some aesthetic configuration to symbolize the students.

10. Tom Grace (Morrison and Morrison 1987, p. 335), one of the Kent State students wounded on May 4, 1970, suggests that the memorial should state "straight-out, simple facts" as: "On May 4, 1970, units of the Ohio National Guard—Company H, 107th Armored Cavalry (Troop G) and Company A, 145th Infantry Regiment—shot and killed four student protesters and wounded nine others during a demonstration against the U.S. invasion of Cambodia."
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