

Let me go back and read the quote. Let me repeat it.

On August 26, 2002, here is what the Vice President said:

Simply stated, there is no doubt—

Get that—

Simply stated, there is no doubt that Saddam Hussein now has weapons of mass destruction. There is no doubt that he is amassing them to use against our friends, against our allies, and against us.

That is the end of the quotation.

On March 16, 2003, the Vice President said:

We will, in fact, be greeted as liberators.

Do you remember that?

On March 16, 2003, there it is, the Vice President said:

We will, in fact, be greeted as liberators.

Are these the “pernicious falsehoods” that the Vice President believes our troops have been subjected to? That is, of course, a rhetorical question. Far from questioning his own statements about the war in Iraq, the Vice President’s comments are a ham-handed attempt to squelch the questions that the American people out there are asking about the administration’s policies in Iraq. The American people should not be cowed. They should not be intimidated. And Senators should not be intimidated by these attempts to intimidate. The American people should not allow the subject to be changed from the war in Iraq to partisan sniping in Washington.

Instead, the American people must raise their voices—hear us—the American people should raise their voices—hear us, listen to us—the American people must raise their voices even louder to ask the administration the same simple questions: What is your policy for Iraq? Answer that. What is your policy? Is it stay the course? When will the war be over? How many more lives will this war cost? When will our troops return home?

Mr. President, the holiday season is almost upon us. Americans will soon sit down at their Thanksgiving tables. They will gather together to give thanks to Almighty God, give thanks to Him for the blessings that have been bestowed upon America’s families. As we gather, there will be an empty seat at many tables. Some chairs will be empty because a service member is serving his or her country in a faraway land. Other seats will be empty as a silent tribute to those who will never, never return.

Each of these troops has fought to protect our freedoms, including the freedom of Americans to ask questions—yes, the freedom to ask questions. Our troops have fought for that freedom—people back home, their families, might ask questions, their friends might ask questions—the freedom to ask questions of their Government, the people’s Government.

The whole picture, the truth is that the continued occupation of Iraq only serves to drive that country closer to civil war. They do not want us there. They do not want us there.

How would you feel, Senators, how would you feel if our country were invaded by another country? You would want them out. You would do anything you could to get them out. American troops are now perceived as occupiers, not as liberators. The longer we stay, the more dangerous Iraq becomes, and the more likely it is we will drive the future government further from a democratic republic and closer to religious fundamentalism and, not insignificantly, the more American and Iraqi lives will be lost—forever.

I, for one, believe that it is time to say “well done”—“well done”—to our brave fighting men and women. May God bless them one and all. Let us say, job well done, and start to bring the troops home.

Mr. President, I yield the floor and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BURNS). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### TRIBUTE TO LILY STEVENS

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, last night, as the Senate was working into the late hours of the night and tensions were running high, our esteemed and beloved colleague, the former chairman of the Senate Appropriations Committee, took me by the arm and pulled me aside. There was something he wanted to show me. There was something that my esteemed and beloved colleague, TED STEVENS, wanted to say to me and wanted to show me. There was something he wanted to show me. It was an article that his daughter Lily Stevens had written about the U.S. Capitol, and he wanted to share it with me.

I was touched by this. I know Lily. What a prodigious memory she has. Ah, what a rose in full bloom, what a lovely woman, Lily. She adores her father. He adores her.

With everything that was going on in the Senate at the time, Senator STEVENS was showing a father’s pride in his daughter’s accomplishment.

I have literally watched Lily grow up. In her article, she points out that her father was already a Senator when she was born, and while she was a baby, her father would bring her to the Capitol—I have seen him many times—and carry her around in a basket. I remember that, just as I remember how she attended a number of my parties, and I attended a number of hers.

I watched her grow into the remarkably—talented person she is today. She is a graduate of Stanford University and is currently a law student at the University of California at Berkeley. Lily is not only prodigious and intelligent, but she also is a polite, courteous, gracious, and charming young

lady. Senator STEVENS is so proud of her, and he has a right to be.

The article his daughter wrote is an outgrowth of her senior thesis at Stanford University, and as I read it, I understood why Senator STEVENS was so excited about it and why he wanted to share it with me. Titled, “The Message of the Dome: The United States Capitol in the Popular Media,” the article explores the ways in which the Capitol has served and communicated with the general American public over the years. It discusses the Capitol as a symbol to the American people and how the meaning of that symbol has changed over time.

This beautifully written article skillfully conveys the sense of wonder that awaits every first-time visitor to Capitol Hill. With a trip to the Capitol, Lily points out, a visit to Washington goes well beyond “a vacation in the leisure sense.” It becomes “an education journey, one in which the visitor can learn more about the government and the history of the United States.”

And Lily’s article makes fascinating and intriguing points about this building in which her father, Senator TED STEVENS, and I work. Visitors to the Capitol, Lily Stevens writes, while sharing certain common experiences, still find their own individual interests. As she quotes one author: “The Capitol means many things to many people.”

Lily Stevens makes the point about how the Capitol functions as a “national shrine,” a place for appreciating our democratic form of government and for praising our Nation, our history, and our national leaders. And she explains how, over the years, the Capitol has functioned as a church. Indeed, religious services were once held in this building. And the Capitol still performs many functions that are religious in nature, like funeral services for certain national leaders. Statuary Hall, she points out, can be seen and interpreted as “an American Westminster Abbey.” How about that?

There is so much fascinating reading in this article, I could speak long about it. I am asking that it be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and I urge all my colleagues to read it. I promise you, you will enjoy it.

Senator TED STEVENS is also entitled today to his own personal congratulations. Why? Today, November 18, is Senator STEVENS’ birthday. How about that? Senator STEVENS’ birthday, today. A wonderful man, a great legislator. Today Senator STEVENS is 82 years young. Oh, to be 82 again. Just to be 82 again, oh, my. I said to Ted: “The next 5 years are going to be the heaviest, Ted.” I know. Five years ago I didn’t need those canes, no. My feet and legs were still good.

Senator STEVENS and I have worked together in the Senate since 1968, and we have been on the Senate Appropriations Committee together since 1972. In all this time together, I have always known Senator TED STEVENS to be an

outstanding Senator, a great colleague, and a trusted friend. Oh, I realize he may grumble every now and then. He is getting a little bit grumbly. But you can forgive him for that.

You never have to be concerned about turning your back on him. He is honest. He is straightforward. And his word is his bond. Over the years we have had our spats, but never once did I doubt our friendship, our admiration for this country, its flag, each other, and our ability to work together.

So today, TED, I say in the words of the poet:

Count your garden by the flowers,  
Never by the leaves that fall.  
Count your days by the sunny hours,  
And not remembering clouds at all.  
Count your nights by stars, not shadows,  
Count your life by smiles, not tears.  
And on this beautiful November afternoon,  
Senator STEVENS, count your age by friends,  
not years.

I conclude my remarks by again congratulating Senator STEVENS on his 82nd birthday and on his beautiful daughter's marvelous work. I thank TED STEVENS for being a superb colleague and a great friend, a great servant of his people in Alaska, and for sharing Lily's article with me.

I ask unanimous consent to print the article in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"THE MESSAGE OF THE DOME:" THE UNITED STATES CAPITOL IN THE POPULAR MEDIA, 1865-1946

(By Lily Stevens)

Anyone who has spent a considerable amount of time in the nation's capital has a particular experience with the white building on the Hill. Growing up in Washington D.C., I never lost the wonder and excitement of visiting the Capitol. I cannot remember the first time I entered the building, as it was in a small basket carried by my father. He was elected to represent the state of Alaska in the Senate before I was born. As a little girl, I loved walking up the marble stairs within the building, feeling the grooves worn into the center of each step. I would run my hand up the shiny round banisters attached to the wall and shuffle my feet along step after step. The Capitol was a wondrous place that always seemed to be changing. I could have run for hours around the big tile circles on the floor, following one pattern until it made me so dizzy that I lay on the ground laughing, staring at the tall ceiling, until I got up to start my game again.

There were just so many things to look at: the marble heads on stands that towered above me, the paintings on the walls and ceilings, the many people who crowded the halls. Every time I walked into the Rotunda, I would lay my head down on the white circle that represents the center of Washington so that I could see all of the figures on the ceiling. My next stop in the Rotunda would be my favorite painting so that I could count the eleven toes on one barefooted man. In Statuary Hall, I would look for King Kamehameha, with his brilliant gold clothes. When I left the room, my neck would hurt from looking up at his enormous face, looming over six feet above mine. As I grew older, I knew every ghost story, and loved to tell the tales of Lincoln being spotted in his tall hat before stepping through walls, of the large cat that would appear in the Rotunda

and continually grow larger until it would finally disappear. I knew where alcohol was hidden during Prohibition, where the bomb had gone off in the early 1980s, and where to stand to hear the whispering secrets of Statuary Hall.

My fascination with the Capitol led me to this project for my undergraduate honors thesis at Stanford University. I wanted to explore the ways in which the Capitol has served and communicated with the general American public. I wondered why so many visitors had entered the Capitol, and what they were looking to find. In my thesis, I explored what the Capitol had symbolized to Americans and whether its meaning had changed over time. I thought of the many images and references to the Capitol that I had seen in the popular media and wondered how the building had been shown and described since its construction. In this excerpt, which include the first chapter, "All Roads Lead to Washington," we will look at Washington as a figurative center of the country, as the destination for anyone interested in learning more about the government and the nation.

Authors throughout the early part of the twentieth century described Washington as a natural destination for any traveler. In 1940, Marion Burt Sanford offered advice for a trip to the nation's capital to readers of *Woman's Home Companion*. She declared the city to be the country's focal point: "In front of the White House is the zero milestone from which all distances in the country are measured, so all roads lead to Washington." Her article rested on a puzzling premise. She claimed that Washington was a "zero milestone," and yet the nation's capital was certainly not at the geographical center of the country. Some capitals sit at a central location, convenient to every part of the country: Paris, France and Madrid, Spain for example. Washington, D.C., however, is on the eastern seaboard, and certainly not accessible for the western portion of the country. Yet taken in a figurative sense, Washington D.C. is a location that draws many visitors. As the federal capital, it is a destination for politicians, lobbyists, tourists, school groups, and others. Every person in the United States has a tie to the city, as the place where the laws are made and enforced and where the country is governed. Therefore, though Sanford's claim that "all roads lead to Washington" is, in the literal sense, a misstatement, it does offer an interesting way of looking at the nation's capital as a magnet for many types of people.

While the White House was the "zero milestone," Sanford suggested that the first stop for any traveler must be the Capitol. Even before any organized visits, the Capitol was a starting point for a memorable walk in the city: "If you arrive at night and are not too weary take the taxi to the Grant Statue below the Capitol and walk a mile down the wide silent Mall to the illuminated Washington Monument and the Lincoln Memorial. You will never forget it." Making a memory of visiting the monuments at night was the first on her list for a woman to do when coming to the city. The reader she addressed was a casual visitor, one who would be interested in seeing the major monuments as well as in experiencing the social side of the city. Sanford advised her readers: "The first day in Washington should be given to the Capitol and the surrounding buildings." She warned that in order to have a successful trip to the nation's capital, the visit must not be too hasty: "You can't see the House and Senate in action, or the rare private collections in the vast Library of Congress, or saunter past the embassies on Massachusetts Avenue on a hurried bus tour." Her proposed tour was a casual one in which women, their husbands,

and perhaps their families could enjoy as much time as possible at different points of interest.

Sanford's article reflected a common practice of any Americans, that of a short journey to Washington to visit and experience the monuments and nation's government. Central to this journey was a trip to the U.S. Capitol, for the visitor to wander the halls, see the building, and watch Congress in action. Many articles such as Sanford's described in detail the functions of the Capitol, the sculptures of Statuary Hall and the paintings of the Rotunda. All offered a virtual paper tour of the public monuments. These articles suggested that the Capitol and Washington D.C. were a major point of interest to Americans. Authors like Sanford encouraged a trip Washington. But what did the travelers hope to learn or find in the Capitol, and what types of visitors came? Why, in particular, was the Capitol such a popular destination for the traveler?

A trip to Washington was not usually a vacation in the leisure sense; rather, it was an educational journey, one in which the visitor could learn more about the government and the history of the United States. Some articles focusing on the Capitol or Washington referred to travelers as "pilgrims." This term for visitors to the Capitol evoked both a religious tone and a reminder of the country's history. In one definition of the word, pilgrims are religious devotees, often covering large distances to reach a particular sacred spot. In his essay "Geography and Pilgrimage," Surinder Bhardwaj defined the religious pilgrim in terms of three characteristics: "... the religiously motivated individual, the intended sacred goal or place, and the act of making the spatial effort to bring about their conjunction." Pilgrims can also be travelers in search of a spiritual revelation or enlightenment, wanderers without a concrete destination. One dictionary entry for "pilgrim" declares that the word is applicable to any traveler, whether on a religious mission or not. A pilgrim can be anyone who leaves home behind to make a journey. In another definition, the term "pilgrim" labels the early European settlers of the United States who fled their countries, suffering hardships on their trip across the ocean to be able to practice religious freedom and develop their own communities. This definition is perhaps not as relevant to the idea of visitors to the Capitol, but the reference to the founding of the United States is poignant and instructive—and would not have been lost on American readers.

What constituted a "pilgrimage" to the Capitol, and who were these "pilgrims"? They all came to the nation's capital to see the workings of the government and the history of the buildings, but pilgrims were many different types of people. They were schoolchildren brought to the building by their teachers to learn a civics lesson. They were historians on a pilgrimage to see the sites where certain senators sat and certain documents were signed. They were mourners who came to pay last respects to assassinated presidents and unknown soldiers. They were also women like Clara Bird Kopp, who wrote an article for the *National Republic* describing her daylong journey around the Capitol. Entitled "A Pilgrimage to the Capitol," her article showed ways in which an everyday person could make a casual pilgrimage to the Capitol, see their senator or congressman and make a connection with the building. Pilgrims, therefore, could come with a specific interest, could be on a trip to learn something new about the government, or could just come to experience the Capitol.

What did these pilgrims hope to find? Certainly not on a religious mission, they went to Washington in search of knowledge about

the government. The idea behind many of these trips was that the complex structure of the United States Government and its three branches could somehow be slightly decoded, slightly more understood if one traveled to Washington. Seeing parts of the government in action, whether Justices presiding in the Supreme Court or Senators arguing on the floor, would lead to a deeper understanding of the functions of the government. Along with the live experience of viewing the Congress within the Capitol came the opportunity to peruse the architectural, artistic, and historic elements of the building. Not only did the Capitol present highlights of the country's history through artwork, it also held memories of great events that took place within its walls, whether joyful or sorrowful. While some who entered the Capitol and wrote about their experience saw themselves as pilgrims of democracy, others were casual visitors. Still others were professionals in search of a certain statute or room. Some were visitors on a mission, at the Capitol to lobby, protest, or otherwise participate in the process of democracy.

One of the most visible and common groups of "pilgrims" in the Capitol was schoolchildren. Every American education included an exploration of the federal government, and often a trip to Washington accompanied this lesson. In an article for *National Geographic Magazine*, Gilbert Grosvenor included a picture of group of young Americans, with a caption that read: "A group of proud pilgrims on the steps of the Capitol." The paragraph of explanation below the image spoke of the phenomenon of pilgrims, of visitors to the Capitol:

Tens of thousands of Americans take a short course in patriotism and government annually by making a pilgrimage to Washington; but none of them get more of happiness and inspiration out of it than the members of the boys' and girls' clubs of the rural high schools. The boys and girls in this picture hail from the parishes of Louisiana and won a national poultry judging contest. They are seeing Washington under the guidance of one of their Senators and the Secretary of Agriculture."

For the students and their companions, presumably their teachers or guardians, the trip to Washington was a special honor. Grosvenor used them as models for his idea of the pilgrimage, which he described as "a short course in patriotism and government." These pilgrims were becoming better, more faithful citizens through their trip to the Capitol and Washington. Grosvenor equated enhanced patriotism with a first-hand experience in Washington, as though visiting national buildings like the Capitol would naturally inspire feelings of pride in the government and in the country. While most visitors did, in effect, take "a short course in . . . government," not all necessarily left the Capitol with patriotic feelings, as we will later discuss.

Several articles in education periodicals complemented Grosvenor's positive view of the school-age child's reaction to a pilgrimage to Washington by suggesting knowledge of the Capitol should be basic like reading, writing, and arithmetic. In the *National Education Association Journal* as well as in *School Life*, articles highlighted the Capitol and suggested reasons why a visitor might be interested in the building. One unidentified author of such an article spoke of the general visitor to Washington: "Next to himself and his home town or city, the average citizen is interested in his country, its laws and lawmakers, its seat of government. In April and May . . . Washington's parks and drives reflect the lavish mood of nature and countless visitors climb the steps leading to the Capitol." The author boldly stated that any

"average citizen" has a natural interest in the government and that the trip to Washington, DC was a trend of "countless visitors." Most of the articles in education magazines took this interest of the "average citizen" as a given, and described aspects of the Capitol or Washington for the pilgrim. Behind all of these articles was the idea that children and adults alike would become better, more knowledgeable citizens by being pilgrims, thus partaking in a common experience with many other Americans.

Although many shared in the common experience of visiting the Capitol, each individual might have found a different interest. Writing in the *National Education Association Journal*, Mildred Sandison Fenner suggested: "The Capitol means many things to many people." Her article appeared during World War II, at a time when Washington had become a center of focus for the world. She used the Capitol, as a house of government and a national monument, to reach out to many types of Americans and world citizens. She divided people into seven categories and addressed a section to each, explaining what aspects of the U.S. Capitol would be of interest to those people. Her categories: travelers, architects, artists, historians, teachers, "all American citizens," and "all Citizens of the world who believe in the four freedoms." By commenting on all of these specific interests, she was able to describe almost every intrigue about the Capitol, as well as explain her ideas about what it meant to all people. Travelers, she said, would remember the Capitol as their first sight if they arrived at Union Station. Speaking of the architects' interests, she was able to describe the basic appearance and dimensions of the Capitol, as well as speak of the architects who contributed to the building. Artists, she said, would be interested in the "paintings and sculptures of great historic and patriotic interest." Her passage "to Historians" was the longest, mentioning several moments in the Capitol's history. She wrote of the laying of the cornerstone, the move of the national capital to Washington, the burning of the Capitol in 1814 by the British, the completion of the dome during the Civil War, and more.

According to Fenner, the Capitol embodied a variety of meanings for the various visitors. For those who led the school trips to Washington, the Capitol could be seen as a key to a broad history. "To teachers," she wrote, "the story of the capitol is an even broader one, embracing the history of the country itself." Of course, she also admitted that "[t]o all American citizens," the Capitol represented the basic actions of government, the legislative body and the basic process of democracy. She expanded this idea in her last section, addressing "all citizens of the world who believe in the four freedoms." To these people, Fenner claimed, "the Capitol of the United States is the 'arsenal of democracy.' To these millions it is a symbol of hope and a prophecy of the future."

As a symbol of hope and prophecy, the Capitol became a "national shrine," a term that appeared in a 1947 article in the *Saturday Evening Post*. Author Beverly Smith remarked upon the ways in which the building served as a center for praising the government, for remembering the past: "The Capitol is part shrine, part hangout. It has been called 'the Caaba (holy of holies) of Liberty,' . . . Rufus Choate said, 'We have built no temple but the Capitol.'" The Capitol served as a national shrine, or civic temple, in a variety of ways. As a mostly secular shrine, the Capitol assumed a role of a place for worshipping democracy, for praising the nation, its history, and its leaders. In addition to the artistic remembrances of great moments past, it embodied a certain history of its

own, from the burning of the Capitol during the War of 1812, to the memories of documents signed, deals arranged, and people who visited. It was a shrine that celebrated the past, present, and future of the country.

Like the idea of a "pilgrim," the use of the word "shrine" to describe the Capitol conveyed religious connotations. Though it did not function as a religious shrine, and though the United States on principle supported a separation of church and state, the Capitol did have some involvement with religion. Gilbert Grosvenor described one way in which the Capitol functioned almost like a church: "For some years religious services were held in the old Hall of Representatives on Sunday afternoons; Lincoln attended them during the war period, when the hall was crowded because many churches had been converted into barracks." The national shrine also held funeral services for leaders, in addition to the national tradition of leaders laying in state within the rotunda. Grosvenor also commented that the placing of statues in that "old Hall of Representatives," transformed the room into more than just Statuary Hall: "The floor of this room was raised to its present level when the hall was converted into an American Westminster Abbey." Relating the room to an American Westminster Abbey certainly had religious overtones, but he was most likely referring to the memorializing of leaders and notables that took place in the room through sculpture.

Aside from memorializing American history through art, the history of events within the Capitol itself reflected important moments in the development of the United States. As the *National Education Association Journal* declared, "The history of the Capitol is the history of our country." Memories of the great and disappointing moments of the past that occurred in the building illustrated various times in the country's history. "If you study this building long enough," Beverly Smith wrote for the *Saturday Evening Post*,

" . . . you can learn America's history since Washington's day. In the very first Congress which sat here, Jefferson was elected over the devious Burr on the thirty-sixth ballot, saving the young republic from who knows what oblique destiny. Here Andrew Jackson escaped assassination when two pistols missed fire. Here Representative—formerly President—John Quincy Adams died, on that couch now in South Trimble's office. In this building were voted all our wars since 1800. Lincoln worked here as a congressman. Here Woodrow Wilson pleaded, and Franklin Roosevelt spoke, tired and tense in his chair, after his return from Yalta."

Her readers received a crash course in some highlights and low points of American history and pride. Notable events include the deaths of officials within the building, the actions of the Congress, and the presence of great leaders. These events were not readily apparent to the tourist. In order for a visitor to appreciate what history the building held, they had to have a tour guide, or a literary tour guide such as Smith, explain these moments.

Many of these articles gave an insider's account of the past, including both popular and little-known stories of the Capitol's history, for it was not through the casual pilgrimage that a person could notice these spots and instinctively know what happened in the past. Gilbert Grosvenor also included some stories of moments past in "The Wonder Building of the World." He wrote of Statuary Hall, the former chamber of the House of Representatives: "Here Lincoln, John Quincy Adams, Horace Greeley and Andrew Johnson served in the same Congress. Here Henry

Clay welcomed Lafayette, who replied in a speech said to have been written by Clay. Here John Marshall administered the oath of office to Madison and Monroe." The preservation of the country's history through memories such as those Smith, Grosvenor, and Fenner described was an essential element to the appreciation of the shrine.

In addition to holding stories, the national shrine preserved key moments in American history through art. For the artistic "pilgrim," the halls of the Capitol were filled with visual history. Visitors could peruse the art within the Capitol and learn something about the past entirely on their own. Fenner mentioned her own preference for some of the works: "Among the better oil paintings are those of Stuart, Peale, and Trumbull." Congress had commissioned Trumbull's paintings in the early nineteenth century to commemorate scenes of the American Revolution. Throughout the Capitol, frescoes offered allegories of great leaders or of basic principles of the republic. Works of art hung on walls in offices and hallways, all portraying different moments in America's past. However, the paintings that hung in the Rotunda were not of particular interest to authors, perhaps because any visitor to the Capitol could observe them. More important to these literary pilgrimages were little known stories and facts about the national "shrine."

Both preserving a memory of the past and praising great leaders through sculpture, Statuary Hall was the center of much debate on the early twentieth century, and a common destination for the "pilgrim" especially interested in the arts. Dedicated by the House and Senate to be a place where each State could send sculptures of two people of accomplishment, the Hall became a source of many extreme opinions. While some people enjoyed the sculptures and admired the idea of placing leaders from each State within the Capitol, many others described it as a "chamber of horrors," due to the poor quality of the sculptures and the bad arrangement of figures. Gilbert Grosvenor was of the former opinion, and gave a positive view of Statuary Hall. "An unwarranted phrase," he wrote, "has made it popular to call Statuary Hall a chamber of artistic horrors. Such designation does injustice to the art and the history of the room where the House of Representatives met for 40 years and which now exemplifies a really fine memorial idea. Setting clear his feelings about the hall in the beginning, he continued on to explain how it came to be. A law was passed in 1864 to create Statuary Hall, which he said was so that: "the States could use it as a place to do national honor to the memory of their sons and daughters renowned for civil and military service, each State being entitled to place two statues here." At the time that most of these articles were being written, there was but one woman among the collection of statues, Frances E. Willard. Statuary Hall attracted many visitors who came to gaze at the statues as well as to experience the "whispering" phenomenon of the elliptical room; a person standing at one focus of the room could hear a person whispering at the other.

Many authors, artists, and other citizens did not view Statuary Hall in so pleasing a light as Grosvenor. Lambert St. Clair wrote an article for Collier's, "The Nation's Mirth-Provoking Pantheon," in which he described the Hall in detail, attacking it artistically. Not only were the sculptures themselves terrible, but their placement around the room also left much desired: "The arrangement obviously is bad. Forty-one statues are crowded into a space which might accommodate ten artistically . . . Guides expect to grow wealthy rescuing lost tourists when the

entire ninety-six are placed." He did not merely dislike the positioning of the statues, but also the statues themselves. He explained that they had no artistic continuity, as a wide variety of artists had completed them, and that State Legislatures had often favored cheaper statues over ones that were more aesthetically pleasing:

"Zachariah Chandler, the latest addition to the hall, wears neatly creased trousers and a new white topcoat with fashionable roll lapels. Lewis Cass, who stands beside him, is clothed in a suit so badly wrinkled that one look will make a tailor's hands twitch. General Lew Wallace's right coat sleeve is laid open halfway to his elbow and rolled back while his left sleeve is drawn tightly about the wrist. Daniel Webster's coat is woefully in need of pressing. The dress worn by Miss Frances E. Willard, the only woman in the group, appears to have been slept in."

St. Clair maintained that he was not alone in his opinion, and related the story of a "merry war" that was ensuing at the time. The conflict arose between the lieutenant governor of Kansas, Sheffield Ingalls, and an artist who had completed one of the statues. St. Clair explained that Ingalls was attempting to have the statue of his late father, Senator John J. Ingalls, removed from Statuary Hall. Ingalls' motivations reflected his worry about the sensation surrounding the room: "Reverence for his parent made such action imperative, the son said, inasmuch as the entire collection of statues had, due to their poor arrangement and, in many cases, inartistic execution, become ridiculous and mirth-provoking curiosities to tourists." Ingalls' concern that his father would become the source of ridicule and mocking shows the impact that the phrase "chamber of artistic horrors" had on how Americans thought about Statuary Hall. Though it originally was intended to honor great leaders, the artistic failings made it a controversial room.

Former leaders were also honored in the "national shrine" through the tradition of laying-in-state. On these occasions, the Rotunda was turned almost into a funeral home or church as Americans came to pay last respects to the deceased. Many presidents have lain in the center of the Rotunda, mostly those who died in office. The ceremony had a strong impact on the participants, as Catherine Cavanagh described in an article for Bookman:

"The solemn Rotunda of the Capitol has been made almost unbearably solemn by funeral services which have been held there—notably those of the three presidents who died by the hands of assassins—Lincoln, Garfield and McKinley. And one who has looked upon the silent form of one of our rulers lying under the lofty canopy of the dome can never forget the awe of the occasion. The long black line in front, and the long black line behind, in the procession of reviewers are forgotten—one seemed alone with the august dead in the vast grandeur of the chamber typifying the core of the Nation."

To Cavanagh, visiting a leader lying in state not only was a solemn occasion, but also was an opportunity to have solitary time within what she sees as the Nation's figurative heart. As one waited in line to visit the coffin, it was an occasion to ponder all of those who have passed. Authors strongly associated the Rotunda with these services: to the National Education Association Journal, mentioning the tradition of laying in state was a natural part of a description of the rotunda. A general explanation of the size and shape of the Rotunda was accompanied by a reminder of several services that had taken place within the room: "Here Lincoln's body lay in state; here multitudes

passed before the flower-laden catafalque of the unknown soldier prior to interment at Arlington." The ritual of paying respects to the unknown soldier began after World War I, and has continued to be a part of the post-war tradition for all major conflicts. By placing the coffin of the Unknown Soldier in the Rotunda before it is interred at Arlington Cemetery, the country has been able to symbolically mourn for all those who died in war. At the same time, this tradition makes the statement that deceased presidents as well as those who die fighting for the United States deserve the same respect and honors.

The national shrine did not only praise those leaders and notables of the past. As a way of honoring the nation and democracy, some revered the leaders who worked within the Capitol at the time. Grosvenor concluded his long article on the Capitol by saying that the present deserved as much attention and commendation as the past. He included members of the House, Senate, and Supreme Court in his praise. He began by stating a common practice of people to overlook the present: "Amid the glamour of history, some are prone to discount the achievement of the present and the abilities of those to whom have been entrusted the duties of lawmaking and law-administering. But the student of the past knows that the wail of the 'decadence of the times' is one which has gone forth in every age." Grosvenor concluded his article by reminding the reader that those current leaders could some day be given great honor: "The men of to-day who are making the history of America will, in turn, have their meed [sic] of recognition, and in some future time their effigies in bronze and marble will be placed in Statuary Hall as comrades in glory with the Founders and Preservers of the Republic." In some ways, Americans paid tribute to the actions of their leaders every day by listening to debates on the floor of the House and Senate and by visiting their delegations' offices.

However, not all who came to the "national shrine" found people, or actions, worth praising. In one book, *Historic Buildings of America*, "famous authors" took a critical look at American institutions and traditions that were generally accepted and praised. A chapter by Charles Dickens, "Within the Capitol," attacked the motivations of all politicians within the chambers. Though Dickens' excerpt was likely written during the early 19th century, its inclusion in this early 20th century book suggests its message resounded with readers years later. Dickens wrote:

"I saw in them the wheels that move the meanest perversion of virtuous Political Machinery that the worst tools ever wrought. Despicable trickery at elections; underhanded tamperings with public officers; cowardly attacks upon opponents, with scurrilous newspapers for shields, and hired pens for daggers; shameful trucklings to mercenary knaves whose claim to be considered, is, that every day and week they sow new crops of ruin with their venal types, which are the dragon's teeth of yore, in everything but sharpness; aidings and abettings of every bad inclination in the popular mind, and artful suppressions of all its good influences: such things as these, and in a word, Dishonest Faction in its most depraved and most unblushing form, stare out from every corner of the crowded hall."

Dickens would have been one of the critics who Grosvenor attacked in the conclusion to this article. Writing an impassioned account of the characters of leaders within the building, Dickens was far from praising those who made or enforced the laws. Though Dickens was not praising the actions of those politicians within the shrine, he was exercising the right of free speech, a basic principle on

which the democracy was founded. As a British citizen, he brought a slightly different perspective to his view of the Congress, but his attack reflects the basic right to offer criticism. Therefore, though he did not admire the actions of these particular leaders, he was valuing an ideal that the "national shrine" was intended to represent.

Just as Dickens criticized the government openly and thereby enjoyed one of the privileges of democracy, so have millions of Americans come to the Capitol in order to express their grievances. Their roads led to Washington for a different purpose: for a pilgrimage of protest. These protests could easily be the subject of an entire paper, and so I will just take a look at one of the protests as an example of the many that have occurred. In an article for *New Republic* in 1931, John Dos Passos described a "hunger march" that took place at the Capitol. The situation was tense as a group of men proceeded up Constitution Avenue to the expanse between the Capitol and the Library of Congress. Dos Passos gave a picture of the scene to the reader:

"The marchers fill the broad semicircle in front of the Capitol, each group taking up its position in perfect order, as if the show had been rehearsed . . . Above the heads of the marchers are banners with slogans printed out: 'in the last war we fought for the bosses: in the next war we'll fight for the workers . . . \$150 cash . . . full pay for unemployed insurance.'"

These men had come to the Capitol to seek government aid during the Great Depression, and though the banners may have changed for each different group that came to protest, the general process of a protest pilgrimage was familiar. This group had come to Washington, like many, to raise awareness about their plight and to get the attention of lawmakers within the Capitol. In his article, Dos Passos took a highly cynical tone, describing the dome of the Capitol that "bulges smugly" and the Senate Chamber as a "termitte nest under glass." He also suggested that the Capitol building itself played an active role in the protest, for as the men shouted their demands, Dos Passos claimed that "a deep-throated echo comes back from the Capitol facade a few beats later than each shout. It's as if the status and the classical-revival republican ornaments in the pediment were shouting too." For Dos Passos, the Capitol took on a human quality, with the status seeming to participate in the march as well. The pilgrimage of protest such as this "hunger march" was but another way that the ideals embodied in the Capitol, the "national shrine," could be expressed.

Underlying many of the articles that discussed the Capitol as a pilgrim's destination was the idea that the building belonged to the American public. These articles attempted to relate a more human side to the Capitol, one that could describe the formal white building as a familiar place. The American public should think of the building as theirs. Beverly Smith suggested throughout her article that though the Capitol was a shrine, it should also be thought of as accessible, even as "a friend." She quoted a fellow journalist: "I am not one of those who can sneer at the Capitol," wrote Mary Clemmer Ames, a lady correspondent in Washington 70 years ago. 'Its faults, like the faults of a friend, are sacred.'" Her entire article contrasted the Capitol as shrine with the Capitol as a hangout, which created a picture of the building as a national space that should be a comfortable place for pilgrims. She declared that the building was a friendlier place than its image suggested, an idea that appeared in other representations of Washington from the time. Similarly, in

an article entitled "Nerve Center of the World," Albert Parry wrote that Washington could still be thought of as a small town, even though its importance was growing on the national and international scene, "If anything," he wrote, "Washington is a charming Southern town which has grown large and cosmopolitan without losing its drawl." In these and other articles on the Capitol and Washington, journalists were demystifying the formal ideal of the Capitol, making it a more accessible place.

Smith in particular wanted Americans to see ways in which the Capitol belonged to them. In one story she related a physical way in which everyday Americans left their mark on the building:

By day in the sunshine or at night under its floodlights, the great dome looms white and pure. But, if you climb the long spiral stairs to the little galleries around the dome, you see that every inch of the surface within human reach is covered with writing, in pencil, ink, crayon and lipstick—all the small familiar chirography of the American people: Jimmy loves Marge . . . Kilroy was here . . . Mr. and Mrs. G. Wallace Shiffbaur, of Minesota . . . Hubba, hubba. Hearts and arrows. Periodically the writing is painted out, but a new swarm of tourists and honeymooners covers it up again, quick as magic. "What can you do?" says a guard. "It's their Capitol, ain't it?"

Though the dome appeared to be completely "white and pure," she informed her readers that upon closer look, it was filled with graffiti, the kind that normally covered bathrooms and college hangouts. It was quite an image that she presented; as a whole, the Capitol seemed formal, pure, and stately, and yet on close inspection, it was partially made up of the marks of everyday Americans. The guard who watched people daily write upon the dome merely shrugged his shoulders at the practice. He saw no problem with the signatures, as he believed the building upon which they were writing was their property as citizens of the country.

The Capitol as a destination and a place for pilgrimage drew countless number of Americans to its step. The roads and paths of many different types of pilgrims led to Washington and to the United States Capitol. Pilgrims to the Capitol were sometimes eager, sometimes critical. They came to see their leaders in action, to wander the halls, to view the places where certain events occurred, and to participate in the democratic process. They encountered or red about a space that could become as familiar to them as an "old comfortable home." By appealing to different interest, these journalists made the building understandable and intriguing to all types of readers and visitors. The *Woman's Home Companion* offered advice on how to organize a trip to Washington and the best times to visit the Capitol; the *Saturday Evening Post* wrote stores full of human interest, including both formal descriptions and little-known facts. Besides the stories of contemporary life, articles focused on the Capitol's interior: paintings and sculptures that celebrated great moments in the history of the United States and great leaders past. Mentor published articles specific to its readers, focusing on the art within the Capitol. Through these articles, authors reached out to readers to make the Capitol more accessible to all. The civic space, the "shrine," offered visitors and readers alike a glimpse of the past, the present, and the future. Authors invited readers to consider the building as belonging to all Americans, and not as an untouchable place. While Americans no longer participate in the ritual of signing their name on the dome, they still come to experience the Capitol as countless have

done before them. The Capitol remains a central destination for all who find themselves on a road that leads to Washington.

#### IN THANKSGIVING

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, as the City of New Orleans and countless other communities along the U.S. gulf coast continue to clean up from the twin disasters that were Hurricanes Katrina and Rita, as Florida reels from yet another major hurricane there, as U.S. casualties in the Iraq and Afghanistan conflicts soar above 2,000, and as scandal engulfs the White House itself, it might seem difficult to find anything to be thankful for on this Thanksgiving.

For many families in the United States this holiday season, the tables, if tables they can find to set, will be set with fewer plates than usual, and the fare might be somewhat skimpier than in years past. Their homes are in ruins, their jobs lost, their friends and family members scattered, and their prospects for rebuilding the lives they once knew are uncertain. It can be difficult to take the long view in the face of such circumstances, or to reflect on history with any equanimity, even though history is replete with examples of recoveries from terrible disasters. One has only to think of Hurricane Camille, or the Great Depression, or World War II, or the San Francisco earthquake, the great Chicago fire, to find evidence that out of the ashes of war and devastation can come the rebirth of cities, communities, and economies. There is hope.

There is also much worth celebrating as families sit down to their Thanksgiving tables. We may be grateful that the loss of life to the hurricanes was not greater. We can all celebrate the tremendous outpouring of support that spontaneously erupted from the hearts, hands, and wallets of Americans outside the gulf coast disaster zone and from friends around the world who were glad to come in their turn to our assistance as the United States has in the past come to theirs. Communities all along the periphery opened their doors to welcome refugees from the storms, and volunteers flooded into the area in such force that relief organizations were overwhelmed. The public response to the gulf coast disasters was truly inspiring and heartwarming. It proved that a core value of this Nation, its sense of community, remains strong and vital.

We can also celebrate the ability of our Nation's first responders to learn from their mistakes. While the planning and response to Hurricane Katrina was in most people's estimates pretty abysmal, the preparation for and response to Hurricane Rita was a little better. And, unfortunately for the people of Florida, they have gotten a lot of practice in the last couple of years, and their preparations for and response to hurricanes is well rehearsed. There is much we can learn from these terrible