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A How Do We Commemorate War? The Message and Culture of the Soldiers’ and Sailors’ Monument
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Abstract

The way in which a society chooses to memorialize war creates what Low and Oliver refer to as a “culture of commemoration” (Low and Oliver, 2012). This paper explores the ethical ideals expressed in The Soldiers’ and Sailors’ Monument in Cleveland, Ohio from 1894 by analyzing the form, function, impact, and reception of the piece. This monument unites ancient traditions and modern ideals through the combination of a dedicatory column with lists of names and a powerful visual narrative. I will place this war memorial in dialogue with three others: The Vietnam Veterans Memorial Wall in D.C, the funerary monument at Adamclisi located in modern day Romania, and the Column of Trajan in Trajan’s Forum, Rome. These monuments utilize similar methods of representation; a list of names in the former two and a columnar form with visual narrative in the latter. When placed in dialogue with these similar monuments, key relationships emerge surrounding the individual and the collective, sacrifice and glory. While the ancient Roman monuments serve to promote the glory of the Empire, the Soldiers’ and Sailors’ Monument sets the precedent for the Vietnam Veterans Memorial Wall in honoring the lives of individual soldiers. Thus, we can understand not only the message behind this commemorative monument, but the culture that has produced it.
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There is an inherent dichotomy within all aspects of war. In any martial conflict, there will always be multiple sides, multiple perspectives. When representing war in monuments and memorials, a choice must be made. What perspective will be shown? What story will be told through this representation? Will it be one of glory and victory, or pain and sacrifice? Will it emphasize the soldiers, or the country they fought for? We can never fully separate these opposing ideas, for in war one is not possible without the other. Therefore, there is a tension between the individual and the collective in war monuments, a tension between remembering the triumphs in war, while acknowledging the suffering of martial violence. In representations of war certain concepts will be emphasized. A choice must then be made as to which idea that will be. It is this choice that creates a narrative that will influence how an event is remembered, a choice that is shaped by society, and dependent on the status of those making it. The question then becomes—how does this choice impact those who interact with the monument? What commemorative culture is created by those choices?

This paper will focus on one particular example of a war memorial, The Soldiers’ and Sailors’ Monument in Cleveland Ohio, analyzing the form and function to create a context for the culture of commemoration shown in this war memorial. This monument uses both ancient traditions and modern ideals through the combination of a dedicatory column with lists of names and a powerful visual narrative. I will place this war memorial in dialogue with three others: The Vietnam Veterans Memorial Wall in Washington D.C, the funerary monument at Adamclisi located in modern day Romania, and the Column of Trajan in Trajan’s Forum, Rome. These monuments use similar methods of representation, namely, a list of names in the former two and a columnar form with visual narrative in the latter. When placed in dialogue with these similar monuments, viewed across time and geographical locations, key relationships emerge.
surrounding the individual and the collective, sacrifice and glory. Understanding these relationships will allow us to understand its culture of commemoration.

Commemoration appears in many forms, from the public to the private, including literary accounts, commemorative actions, and war monuments and memorials. The way in which a society chooses to commemorate war creates what Low and Oliver refer to as a culture of commemoration (Low and Oliver 2). This culture need not be created by a central authority. However, acts of commemoration that stem from a centralizing power often have the largest impact on a society. Large scale public monuments, such as the ones discussed in this paper, both influence and are indicative of a society’s idea of what form commemoration should take.

In order to fully understand a society’s culture of commemoration, we must understand the societal impact of a chosen form. One impact that large scale public monuments have is an effect on collective memory. War does not affect only those fighting in it, it affects entire societies. As such, anyone viewing the monument will have some sort of connection, some response. Whether forming an idea of a recent event while viewing a monument at the time of construction, or relating one’s own idea of war and commemoration to a monument from hundreds of years ago, an impact will be made. This visual form of commemoration presents a public story - the story the makers want to be remembered. As such, the makers are able to alter or influence the collective memory, shape the ideals of a society, and form a specific commemorative culture. When viewing war monuments in this light it is important to understand what the intended meaning might be, who is presenting this idea, and why it is being shown, to better understand the whole of a society’s culture of commemoration.

The Soldiers’ and Sailors’ Monument (fig. 1) in Cleveland, OH, was originally proposed by Major William J Gleason and dedicated in 1894 to “commemorate the valor and patriotism of
the Union Soldiers and Sailors of Cuyahoga County, State of Ohio, in the War of the Rebellion, from 1861 to 1865” (Gleason 13). Sculpted and created by Levi Scofield, a veteran himself, it combines a Romanesque column, topped with a statue of Lady Liberty, standing above a memorial hall. There are four sculpted scenes raised on pedestals outside the hall, depicting the Navy, the Cavalry, the Artillery, and the Infantry. Inscribed along the column’s shaft are the locations of 30 battles in which the commemorated men fought. Inside the tablet room, the four walls of the base of the column are adorned with carved bronze relief panels with life-size figures enacting key events. These are “The Beginning of the War in Ohio”, “Emancipation of the Slave”, “the Northern Ohio Soldiers’ Aid Society, Sanitary Commission, and Hospital Service Corps”, and finally “the Peace-Makers at City Point”. Above the panels are life-size portrait medallions featuring prominent Ohioan generals, captains, brigadiers, and colonels. Along the four walls are tablets inscribed with the names of the over 9000 men who fought from Cuyahoga County. Included with the names are the location where each man served and their rank. They are ordered first by regiment, then company, and then alphabetically. Above the tablets are eight life-size bronze busts of men who died in battle. These eight men were elected by the veterans who were still surviving at the time of construction (figs. 1—10). This is a grand monument, celebrating and honoring these men and serving as a reminder of their sacrifice.

One monument from ancient Rome that can be compared to the Soldiers’ and Sailors’ Monument is a funerary altar at Adamclisi, reconstructed in figure 11 (see Appendix). This is a large altar placed at the far extent of the Roman empire with sides measuring about 12 meters long and 6 meters high (Cooley 67; Hope 91-92). The exact date and purpose of construction of this monument has been debated by scholars; however, one thing is agreed upon—inscribed along the sides of this altar are the names of Roman legionaries and auxiliaries killed in battle.
under an emperor whose name is now lost (Cooley 67; Hope 92; Turner 277). We must ask ourselves the question: does this list of names serve the same purpose as the list of names in the Soldiers’ and Sailors’ Monument? While including the names of fallen men does indeed serve to commemorate and memorialize their sacrifice, this is not the sole purpose—or even primary purpose—of the monument. A key factor of the monument is the inclusion of the soldiers’ homelands which, as Turner argues, emphasizes the far reaches and vast extent of the Roman empire (Turner 300). It has been estimated by Cichorius that 3,800 names and origins may have originally been listed, but only about 60 exist today (Turner 282, 289). Even so, from the 60 entries we have today, it is evident that soldiers were listed from nearly every part of the empire (Turner 289-282). The location of the altar itself, at the very edge of the empire, already exemplifies the vastness and success of the Roman empire. In conjunction with the inclusion of the men’s origins, we can see that this monument emphasizes the conquests and military successes of the collective empire, rather than focus on the sacrifice of the soldiers themselves.

In addition, we must take into consideration both the location of the monument and the time in which it was constructed. Two other war monuments are placed in close proximity to the altar (fig. 12). One is the well-known Tropeum Traiani located about 200 meters southwest from the altar. This massive victory trophy dedicated to Trajan was built around CE 108/9, as indicated from fragments of its inscription (CIL III 12467). Located on a high plateau and visible from the Danube, it is much more conspicuous than the altar (Cooley 70). About 130 meters north of Trajan’s Trophy and directly in line with the altar is a second trophy, and it has been suggested that this trophy was in honor of the emperor Domitian (Cooley; Turner). It is important to note that this trophy seems to have been built around the same time and with the same material as the altar. This fact, along with an understanding of the Dacian wars fought by
both Domitian and Trajan, suggest that the altar was built under Domitian to honor the fallen men from a lost Dacian battle. If this is the case, then it would appear that Trajan’s Trophy was placed here as a message of victory to counter the message of sacrifice that the altar portrays. The placement of Trajan’s Trophy near the funerary altar indicates that the Romans were not content with the final remembrance of sacrifice.

This idea is further emphasized by the fact that war memorials specifically commemorating the individual soldiers who died in battle are practically nonexistent in ancient Rome. As discussed by Cooley and Hope, the only other instances related to soldiers memorialized in this way were a suggestion by Cicero and a documented act of commemoration by Germanicus, the nephew of the emperor Tiberius (Cooley; Hope). The former instance refers to a speech Cicero made proposing a public monument to commemorate and honor the soldiers who died in the battle against Antonius.

You then have fared most admirably, being the bravest of soldiers while you lived, and now the most holy of warriors, because it will be impossible for your virtue to be buried, either through the forgetfulness of the men of the present age, or the silence of posterity, since the senate and Roman people will have raised to you an imperishable monument, I may almost say with their own hands. Many armies at various times have been great and illustrious in the Punic, and Gallic, and Italian wars; but to none of them have honours been paid of the description which are now conferred on you. And I wish that we could pay you even greater honours, since we have received from you the greatest possible services. You it

---

1 Both Cooley and Turner agree that the most logical conclusion is that the altar was made under Domitian. The location of Trajan’s battle makes it seem unlikely he would place a monument here, and the relationship between the two emperors supports Trajan demolishing Domitian’s trophy, leaving the altar, and erecting his own.
was who turned aside the furious Antonius from this city; you it was who repelled him when endeavouring to return. *There shall therefore be a vast monument erected with the most sumptuous work, and an inscription engraved upon it, as the everlasting witness of your god-like virtue.* And never shall the most grateful language of all who either see or hear of your monument cease to be heard. And in this manner you, in exchange for your mortal condition of life, have attained immortality. (Cicero *Philippic XIV.33*)

This passage indicates that the concept of memorializing the war dead in such a way had never been done before. Additionally, it is important to note that—like the altar at Adamclisi—this proposed remembrance is not without an underlying alternative message. We see later in Cicero’s speech that ultimately he wanted to provide a visual condemnation of Antonius and display the distinction and greatness of the Roman Empire, its senate and its people.

*Wherefore it will be the greatest possible comfort to their relations, that by the same monument are clearly displayed the valour of their kinsmen, and also their piety, and the good faith of the senate, and the memory of this most inhuman war, in which, if the valour of the soldiers had been less conspicuous, the very name of the Roman people would have perished by the parricidal treason of Marcus Antonius.* (Cicero *Philippic XIV.35*)

Likewise, an excerpt from Tacitus in which the commemorative actions of Germanicus are relayed, can be viewed as using death and sacrifice for an ulterior gain. Tacitus describes, in great detail and pathos, Germanicus visiting a site of defeat and gathering up and burying the remains of Roman soldiers. However, he then contrasts this emotional response with that of Tiberius who was displeased with this action. Ultimately, Tacitus’ goal is to portray Tiberius in a
negative light, rather than focus on the commemoration of the soldiers (Hope). These two literary examples then complement the altar to show that it was indeed an exception to the rule. The ancient Roman culture of commemoration when representing war on this monumental scale tended to favor the importance of the strength of the collective empire over memorializing individual sacrifice.

The funerary altar and the Soldiers’ and Sailors’ Monument can be compared to a recent monument, the Vietnam Veterans Memorial Wall in Washington D.C (fig. 13). This complex and controversial monument has been referred to as both ‘The Black Gash of Shame’ and ‘The Wall That Heals’. Inscribed on the two black granite slabs, which meet together in the shape of a “V”, are the names of those who fought and died or went missing in action during the Vietnam War. While using the same method as the funerary altar at Adamclisi and the Soldiers’ and Sailors’ Monument, the effect of the Vietnam Memorial Wall (hereby referred to as “the Wall”) is quite different, and that is due to both the reasoning behind the construction of the Wall and the method by which the names are shown. The United States’ involvement in the Vietnam War, lasting from 1956—1975, divided the nation. Over two million American citizens fought in the war, with over 58,000 never returning. By 1967, a majority of people felt it was a mistake to send troops to Vietnam. The antiwar movement had expanded greatly, with those going so far as to set themselves alight in protest (Parr 54). Veterans returning home felt unwelcome and disrespected. Jan Scruggs—the figurehead of the Vietnam Veterans Memorial Fund (VVMF)—stated,

Upon returning from the war, I, like many others, found that being a Vietnam veteran was a dubious distinction. The true tale of the Vietnam amputee being told ‘It serves you right’ after returning to college illustrates the psychological
quagmire that the youngest-ever corps of U.S. veterans endured upon coming home. To many it was, and still is, an embarrassment to admit having served in Vietnam. (qtd. in Hagopian 80)

A similar story is shared by Tom Carhart: “When I came home from Vietnam in the December of 1968 I was literally spat upon in the Chicago airport as I walked through in my uniform. That spit hurt; it went through me like a spear. Welcome home!” (qtd. in Parr 56). Veterans had to endure not only the haunting memories of their time in Vietnam, but treatment such as that is outlined in these anecdotes. Scruggs along with two other veterans, John Wheeler and Robert Doubek, saw a need for a memorial to honor those that gave their lives and to provide a way for veterans and the public to heal. Thus, the VVMF was formed, with a mission to create a memorial with the following criteria: “to include the names of the dead and missing, to be reflective and contemplative, not to be a political statement about the war, and to blend with the site” (Parr 56).

The winning design, by 21-year-old Chinese American Maya Ying Lin, an architecture student at Yale University, achieved just that (fig. 14). By setting the memorial into the grass lawn of the Constitution Gardens, with the ground gradually sloping done to the face of the stone, the sight lines of the Garden itself remained intact—an important criterion to the Commission of Fine Arts and the National Capital Planning Commission (Hagopian 93). Lin described the structure as a cut in the earth, an initial violence that in time would heal as the grass grew up to the surface of the stone. The names inscribed are listed in chronological order, starting at the vertex point and moving along the wall so that in time, the last name met the first, the line circling back to itself and closing the sequence (Parr 68). However, the controversy of the war extended into the memorial as well. Many veterans and other officials spoke out in
protest against Lin’s simplistic design. Carhart denounced the design as a “scar”, a “trench”, and a “black gash of shame” (Hagopian 102). Despite the attempts to separate the memorial from all political aspects of the war, it was still protested. Carhart again claiming the monument made the Vietnam War appear shameful, thus undermining the United States’ international position by reinforcing antiwar sentiments (Hagopian 109). In addition, the gender and racial identity of the designer was received negatively. In Lin’s own words, “It took me months to realize obviously a lot of people are going to be extremely offended that the creation of the ‘American’ Vietnam Veterans Memorial is not only not a veteran but she is a ‘she,’ she is ‘Asian’ (qtd. in Parr 14). While the memorial attempted to bring together a divided nation, there was still much controversy and outrage, thus displaying the effect of public war memorials and the importance of understanding them.

It is important to note that the inscribed names on the Wall do not include any more information other than a full name. This is significant for it asserts that every single person who is listed on this wall is equal. It does not serve to differentiate them due to their status in war, but to unite them in death. This is in direct contrast to the altar at Adamclisi, which not only organized the list of names by rank but included their origin as well. Another connection between these two monuments is that they both commemorate battles that were not won.² However, each monument deals with this issue in a different way. The altar promotes the expanse of the empire, attempting to emphasize glory over failure, while the Wall attempts to separate the individuals from the political aspect of the war and focus on their sacrifice.

In the altar the individual is commemorated but for the purpose of showing the expanse of the empire and establishing a relationship between the soldiers and the emperor (Turner 278).

² If we agree with Turner and Cooley that is was commissioned by Domitian.
The Vietnam Veterans Memorial Wall on the other hand, represents the individuals in order to remember their lives and their identities. In addition, the memorial has attempted to separate the individual names from the political aspect of the war, while the altar can be viewed as promoting a political ideal. However, the individuals listed on the Wall still become part of a greater collective. In her submission, Lin describes her design: “These names, seemingly infinite in number, convey the sense of overwhelming numbers, while unifying those individuals into a whole. For this memorial is meant not as a monument to the individual, but rather as a memorial to the men and women who died during this war, as a whole” (qtd. in Parr 56). In this way, the individuals still become part of a greater collective, but here the collective is the group of soldiers who sacrificed their lives, while in the altar the collective is the empire itself.

How does the Soldiers’ and Sailors’ Monument fit into this narrative of war and memorialization? How does it address the tension between the individual and the collective as illustrated by the altar and the Wall? A visual comparison can be drawn between all three, for all present a list of names in visually different ways. Let us start with the form. For the altar, it appears to have been raised on a platform and one would have had to walk around the monument in order to read the names. This emphasized the status of the Roman army and acts as a physical separation between the viewer and those being commemorated. The Wall creates a cut into the earth, slowly engulfing the viewer at the vertex, allowing the list of names to rise and overwhelm. The Soldiers’ and Sailors’ Monument has a similar method of engulfing, as the viewer is placed inside a room surrounded by names on all four walls. This method of surrounding the viewer with this list of names confronts the sacrifice these people made as well as their individuality. The choice of color also creates a different feel. Both the Soldiers’ and Sailors’ Monument and the altar show a traditional dark lettering on a light background while the
Wall inverts this and makes the surface reflective. The effect of this reflective, dark surface, is to make the Wall more introspective and somber, again prompting the viewer to remember the sacrifice of those listed.

The list of names on the Soldiers’ and Sailors’ Monument is similar to the list on the altar at Adamclisi in that each name is tied to a specific rank thus visually associating each individual identity with their status in the army. Additionally, both monuments include place names—for the altar it is the place names of where the soldiers were from; for the Soldiers’ and Sailors’ Monument it is the place names of where they fought. The difference here is that in the modern monument, place names emphasize the sacrifices of the individual soldiers, while in the altar, place names highlight the power and glory of the empire.

The visual aspect of Soldiers’ and Sailors’ Monument elicits comparisons to the Column of Trajan, another ancient Roman monument (fig. 15). This nearly 100-foot-tall, Tuscan column of Luna marble was dedicated to Trajan by the Senate on the 18th of May, 113 AD. The column is set on a block about 5 meters wide and 5 meters high, covered in low relief depicting military trophies of enemy arms. Inscribed along the 17 drums that make up the column itself are low relief depictions of the campaigns of Trajan in Dacia between 101 and 106 AD. These show the life, organization, and activities of the Roman army (Richardson).

Both the Column of Trajan and the Soldiers’ and Sailors’ Monument use scenes of war to represent events that happened during the war each is commemorating. However, they are also carefully chosen scenes to present a particular viewpoint. A majority of the scenes on the column of Trajan are rather peaceful depictions of travel, construction, and imperial address, emphasizing virtues such as justice, clemency, and moderation (figs. 16—19). Here, depictions of individuals such as Roman soldiers, women, or Dacians, are used to present Trajan in a
particular light. To present him as the one who restored order to the Roman military and expanded imperial control. We can better understand the reasoning behind these scenes when we view Trajan’s reputation through this excerpt from Pliny the Younger:

But nurtured though you were on the glories of war, you have remained a lover of peace, and for this your moderation commands our greater praise…. You have neither fear of war, nor any desire to cause one… proof alike of valour and of moderation, the one denying battle to the enemy wanting it, the other denying battle to yourself…. an emperor coming home with true and genuine honour, bringing peace and the end of strife, and the submission of his enemies so evident that none shall be left to conquer…. And your recent moderation has ensured that whenever you are compelled to war, offensive or defensive, for the honour of your realm, you will be known to win triumph through victory, not to seek victory in order to triumph… How wonderful it was of you (for one idea suggests another) to rekindle the dying flame of military discipline by destroying the indifference, insolence and contempt for obedience, those evils of the preceding regime … For ours is not a prince who sees in preparations against his enemies a threat directed at himself, after the fashion of his predecessors, who feared to fall victim to their own harsh practices and so were glad to see a falling off of interest in the soldier’s life, slack training and lowered morale, while swords grew dull and blunted through disuse. (*Pan.*, 16—18)

We can see here that Trajan was praised for his moderation and for restoring order and discipline. Therefore, we should view these scenes in this light. They helped to shape the collective memory by praising these actions and qualities of Trajan and focusing on him more so than any others.
Similarly, the Soldiers’ and Sailors’ Monument uses carefully chosen scenes to shed a heroic light on the men it commemorates. Two scenes—the Infantry Group and the Emancipation of the Slave—capture this idea. The Infantry Group represents the Color Guard. As the Monument Commissioners describe, the scene is “from an actual incident of the war, and depicts with vivid truthfulness, as the sculptor saw it, the gallant defense of the flag of the 103rd Ohio Infantry, at the battle of Resaca, where the lion-hearted sergeant Martin Striebler and his gallant guard of eight corporals stood before the enemy’s fire until they were all killed or wounded” (qtd. in Upton 497). Although this passage is not visible to those visiting the monument, the heroism described here parallels the level of detail and emotion with which each figure is represented and creates a sense of awe and admiration in the viewer. Inside the tablet room, The Emancipation of the Slave presents this powerful scene of Abraham Lincoln removing the shackles of a figure emancipated from slavery with one hand while with the other handing him the arms of a Union soldier. Abraham Lincoln is not only freeing him from slavery, but granting him the constitutional rights and responsibilities of citizenship. This scene shows what these men have been fighting for and further emphasizes why they deserve commemoration.

A key difference between the heroic scenes on the Soldiers’ and Sailors’ Monument and those on the Column of Trajan is the identity of the individual. The individuals on the Column of Trajan do not have their own identity unless they are depictions of Trajan himself or an important Dacian whose identity would further emphasize Trajan’s power. Those shown on the Soldiers’ and Sailors’ Monument for the most part do have their own identity. The figures shown in each of the aforementioned two scenes are named and identifiable, thus the figures themselves create a memorial to each individual involved. It is interesting to note that in the “Emancipation
of the Slave”, the slave represented does indicate a real person—Daniel Romley Fields—but not necessarily a real event. Fields was born in Louisiana in 1849, but was able to escape slavery and find freedom in Cleveland. He worked with the sculptor, Levi Scofield, and posed specifically for this scene.

Another interesting note is that the Soldiers’ and Sailors’ Monument was the one of the first monuments after the civil war to depict African Americans. In addition to Fields, an unnamed African American in the “The Navy Group” scene is shown. This scene is one of the earliest depictions of both black and white men fighting side by side. While this shows the monument is taking strides towards what the North was fighting for and emphasizes the men’s heroism, it should also be noted that at the time of construction only 22 United States Colored Troops were included in the Roll of Honor. As recently as July 4th, 2019, on the 125th anniversary of the monument, the addition of 107 USCT was made (*fig. 20*). This example is indicative of how a society can change over time and how war monuments reflect that change.

Another issue stemming from individual versus collective representation is the depiction of “person type”. I use this term, person type, to refer to a figural representation that is not meant to represent a real person but rather a group of people and for a specific purpose. We see this a great deal in the Column of Trajan. As Dillon discusses in length, one type of person we see represented frequently is women. These women are not included for commemoration and are not meant to be viewed individually. Rather, they are meant to be viewed in a context that further emphasizes the ideas I have already mentioned—moderation, justice, and discipline. As Dillon argues, the appearance of women and children at peaceful public gatherings and the lack of female war victims has essentially erased war stories of violence against women in an effort to
assuage a deep-seated fear of the Roman army (Dillon 260). This serves to further promote Trajan’s glory and success as Emperor.

While most of the figures on the Soldiers’ and Sailors’ Monument do represent real people, the outdoor scenes represent a person type. Those shown in the Navy, the Cavalry, and the Artillery groups are referred to as “No. 1” “No. 2” etc. However, they are not used in the same way that women are in the column of Trajan. Here, these unnamed men serve as an example of what those commemorated experienced, putting the emphasis on their lives as soldiers and their sacrifice, not necessarily to promote their glory or the glory of the Union.

To further examine this concept of how the individual is represented we can also compare the columns on each monument. The Column of Trajan was originally topped with a statue of the emperor himself. Clearly, this is a monument dedicated to Trajan so his representation is expected. However, by placing Trajan atop this column at such a height, he takes on an allegorical connotation, standing in for the empire as a whole and its victory. In the Soldiers’ and Sailors’ Monument the allegorical figure is just that—not a depiction of a real person (fig. 21). Here, we do not have the commemorated person or persons representing an overarching concept—rather, the abstract concept of Liberty is given an identity of its own separate to that of those being commemorated. When viewed in context with the rest of the monument we can see that Liberty is being shown as the driving force for the soldiers, the reason behind the fight. She is the highest figure, the most noble cause. In contrast, by linking Trajan himself with the concept of victory and the empire, the Column emphasizes his personal power and authority.

Understanding all these connections and comparisons, we can now understand more fully the culture of commemoration in which the Soldier’s and Sailor’s Monument was created. Overall, the representations of war in ancient Rome focus more on the glory and victory of the
empire. In contrast, many public representations of war in modern America choose to focus on remembering the sacrifice of the individual soldiers. Using ancient methods of representation, this monument introduces a focus on the individual soldier, and promotes remembrance of their sacrifice thus setting a precedent for the way in which our society memorializes war. This precedent is played out in the Vietnam Veterans memorial wall to an even greater extent, creating a somber method of reflection and remembrance. In this way, the Soldiers’ and Sailors’ Monument enables us not only to understand the collective society, but to illustrate how war monuments themselves shape collective society.
Appendix

**Figure 1.** The Soldiers’ and Sailors’ Monument, Cleveland OH.

**Figure 2.** Detail of the column of the Soldiers’ and Sailors’ Monument

**Figure 3.** The Artillery Group

_Monument’s Website_

**Figure 4.** The Cavalry Group
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Figure 5. The Infantry Group
Monument’s Website

Figure 6. The Navy Group
Monument’s Website

Figure 7. The Tablet Room inside detail. Monument’s Website.
Figure 8. Example of the portrait medallions. Monument’s Website.

Figure 9. Example of the busts inside the tablet room. Monument’s Website.
**Figure 10.** Indoor bronze relief scenes. Starting with top right and working in clockwise direction: “The Beginning of the War in Ohio”, “Emancipation of the Slave”, “the Northern Ohio Soldiers’ Aid Society, Sanitary Commission, and Hospital Service Corps”, “the Peace-Makers at City Point”. *Monument’s Website.*

![Diagram of the Funerary Altar at Adamclisi](image)

**Figure 11.** Reconstruction of the Funerary Altar at Adamclisi, Brian Tuner, *World Losses and Worldview: Re-viewing the Roman Funerary Altar at Adamclisi.*

![Plan of the Memorial Area](image)

**Figure 12.** Plan of the Memorial Area. Turner 2013.
Figure 13. The Vietnam Veterans Memorial Wall, Washington D.C.

Figure 14. Maya Lin with her winning design, May 4th, 1981. Bettman/Getty Images.
Figure 15. The Column of Trajan, Trajan’s Forum, Rome.

Figure 16. Detail of the Column of Trajan. Left bank of the river Apus, a fort is under construction, connected by a bridge to a marching camp. Trajan stands with two officers (12) gazing northwards. Rossi 1971.
Figure 17. Detail of the Column of Trajan. Legion entering Pontes. Rossi 1971.

Figure 18. Detail of the Column of Trajan. A long period with no important battles. Trajan with officers beside him reaching a river and watches the legionaries step onto a small wooden bridge. Legionaries open a road in the woods. Rossi 1971.
Figure 19. Detail of the Column of Trajan. Trajan lands on the Dalmatian coast, where he is warmly welcomed by the population and meets the local authorities. Rossi 1971.

Figure 20a.
Figure 20b. Additions to the Roll of Honor of the Cuyahoga County Soldiers’ and Sailors’ Monument. Taken by the author at the monument.

Figure 21. Detail of the depiction of Liberty.
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