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Introduction

Just a few years after the terrorist attacks on the World Trade Center in New York City in 2001, architects and government officials announced their intention to rebuild at the site of the devastation. New York Governor George Pataki unveiled plans to erect the world’s tallest skyscraper to an expected height of 1,776 feet—a level intended to mark the year America declared its independence. The patriotic tone of this decision was reinforced by the young son of a police officer killed at the trade center who joined Pataki at the announcement and read the Declaration of Independence. The building’s architect, Daniel Libeskind, even called the new edifice the “Freedom Tower,” and explained that it was intended to “echo” the image of the Statue of Liberty which stood nearby, and commemorate the “strength and resilience of the human spirit.” Eventually the design for the new tower was modified for apparent safety and security reasons and came to resemble the Statue of Liberty a bit less, but the commemorative and aesthetic intent to reaffirm the central American political ideals of freedom and liberty and the hope to invoke the legacy of the popular statue in New York Harbor remained.¹

It comes as no surprise to see Americans turning to the Statue of Liberty and the political dream it represents in a time of national crisis. The ideal of liberty helped to
drive the American Revolution in the first place and has been articulated continually by Americans ever since. Since its dedication in 1886, liberty’s central monument has captured the imagination of people in the United States and abroad, as well. The importance of the statue cannot be doubted; the many ways in which it has been used, interpreted, represented and described, however, is less clear. Centrality and prominence did not insure uniformity of thought and understanding. Essentially simple in design, the Statue of Liberty has been used and reused by political philosophers, government officials, business leaders, tourist promoters, activists, and just plain ordinary people in ways never envisioned by its original designers—who were French and not American. At its inception it was meant to stand for a universal political dream for all people and for the special friendship between France and the United States. Over time it became much more than that. Without a doubt it gradually became more patriotic than universal—an image tied to one nation more than all of humankind. The French connection tended to recede from view. Left to the resources of entrepreneurs it was sometimes celebrated as a symbol of American capitalist enterprise. In the hands of cynical cartoonists it might even be used to criticize the Untied States for not adhering to some of its ideals. The rhetoric surrounding the dedication of the Freedom Tower suggested a fighting spirit needed to defend one nation more than a declaration of the rights of all men and women. The ongoing project to give the Statue of Liberty meaning—the central focus of this study—captured the imagination of citizens from all sectors of American society and continues today. In this report, the ways that the statue served to organize thought about liberty is explored from various perspectives, including its place in civic ceremonies, its image in wartime, its close link to the story of American immigration, its relationship to
racial minorities, and even its reconfiguration in a culture filled with the constant circulation of artistic and commercial images.

Even at its birth in the political ideology of the eighteenth century, liberty did not arrive in a neat and tidy package. Thomas Paine in his famous pamphlet of 1776, *Common Sense*, used the term liberty to advocate rejection of the power of the British monarch. Clearly many shared his understanding. But even in the age of Paine, as historians such as Michael Kammen have suggested, liberty held other implications. Some saw liberty as emancipation from any form of political or even religious authority. Liberty in this formulation was a natural right of all men who resented any restraint whatsoever on the exercise of their personal pursuits. In this sense liberty was part of the universal faith in human nature expressed by the Enlightenment to free the human mind from the constrictions and authorities of the past. Mainly, however, as Kammen suggests, during the era of the American Revolution liberty was linked to the concept of property or material possessions. Activists such as The Sons of Liberty actually took “Liberty and Property” to be their slogan. The idea was that all men—not just royals or nobles—were entitled to the unrestricted pursuit of property as a basis for establishing personal happiness. Free men would establish governments such as the United States not simply to overthrow a repressive king but to preserve the idea that they could be free to accumulate wealth and goods. These revolutionaries used the idea of freedom both to oppose unjust authority and celebrate the right to be acquisitive. Kammen wrote that liberty and property were highly “compatible” in the late eighteenth century.²

Over the next two centuries liberty came to be associated with other concepts as well, although its original meanings never went away. Kammen notes that in the
nineteenth century liberty was tied more to discussions of the social order. There was a growing fear that complete liberty—men competing against other men without some form of governing authority—would lead to social chaos or—to use a term of the time—“licentiousness.” In this era there was a realization that political stability was necessary for future economic growth but that it could be undermined by an excessive amount of inequality or unrestrained competitiveness for property at all costs. Abraham Lincoln said as much at Gettysburg when he proclaimed that the nation was originally conceived in “liberty” but that in order to honor all the men who died on this Pennsylvania battlefield citizens had to join the dream of liberty (and the end of slavery) to a determined effort to create a government of the people, by the people, and for the people. The Civil War president called for a balance between personal liberty and the need for the government to serve everyone in an equitable manner. In the period after World War I—and especially during the 1930s—Kammen detected that liberty was invoked more and more with the idea of justice for all. The sense was evident that some degree of order had to temper the free pursuit of property, and calls were made for government intervention into social and economic life. Few called for an end to personal liberties and rights but prominent leaders did talk of the need to insure “equal justice.” There was a concern that democratic processes and institutions needed to be protected if personal liberty was ultimately to survive, a concern that was accentuated by the rise of totalitarian states in Germany and the Soviet Union in the twentieth century. The simple defense of liberty without an equal commitment to institutions that insured fair treatment for all was deemed insufficient as a basis for the political community.³
The Changing Face of the Statue of Liberty recognizes the mutability of the meaning of liberty over the course of two centuries and seeks to relate public uses and interpretations of the Statue of Liberty to that unstable process. In this study the monument in New York Harbor becomes both a site for conducting civic discussions on the meaning of liberty and an image circulated through the culture of America and the world expressing all kinds of points of view. The story begins in the eighteenth century and the period of great revolutions in France and America. In fact, ongoing debates in France between liberals and royalists led to the conception of the statue in the first place.

Chapter One will look at how liberty was already a multi-dimensional concept during the American Revolution that stood for both a conception of individual political rights and a new political order based on the authority of one’s human nature rather than on the authority of one’s rank. It is well known that slaves and others did not attain equal rights in the new American nation. Political rights were certainly granted to greater numbers, and doctrines were established that would help to improve the lot of others over time. Some, of course, used their newfound freedom to pursue happiness and goods in the marketplace. Yet, there were those who argued at the time that the pursuit of liberty carried a responsibility to support institutions such as political parties that would help spread the benefits of liberty to as many people as possible.

The thought and action of French liberals commands attention in Chapter Two. The idea for the statue came from these men who hated the legacy of monarchy in France and who were committed to Enlightenment ideals of political rights for all men. Yet, they equivocated—as did many Americans—when it came to extending rights to all, and were reluctant to extend too much authority to the royalists at the top of society or the
poor masses at the bottom. Edouard-René Lefebvre de Laboulaye, the French intellectual and liberal scholar who first thought about a statue in America, was a very careful observer of events in the United States, and admired greatly both the crusade against slavery and the leadership of Abraham Lincoln. His idea for the monument was driven in part in 1865 by a desire to honor the fallen president. Yet, French liberals also insured that the final design of the statue would temper any idea of liberty and equality being realized through popular protest by favoring a final design for the monument that celebrated the rule of law rather than rebellion in the streets as a way to alter society.

Once in America, the monument became the site of elaborate civic ceremonies that tended to favor the expression of one meaning of liberty over another. Chapter Three looks at some of these key celebrations, starting with the dedication of the monument in 1886. Accounts of these festivities reveal that they were shaped by strong disagreements over what the statue represented. In fact, at the two most elaborate ceremonies ever held at the site—the dedication event and the 1986 centennial celebration—powerful business leaders and government officials took control of events, and saw to it that liberty was closely associated with the pursuit of property and wealth. In nearly all of the civic ceremonies, those with less political clout—workers, minorities, women—and the idea of equality for all were pushed to the margins of civic life.

Chapter Four examines how the Statue of Liberty came to hold a special place in the story of American immigration over the course of its history. The opening of the immigrant processing station at Ellis Island in 1892 in the shadow of the monument certainly facilitated this association, as did the popularity of Emma Lazarus’s poem, “Mother of Exiles,” which was written in response to the plight of Russian Jews. Cold
War tensions reinforced this connection and further advanced the image of the Lady in the harbor as an emblem of America as a refuge for the poor and persecuted of Europe, and as a place of unlimited opportunity. Sometimes this image glossed over the very real drawbacks and difficulties of settling in America, but it was a view—a romantic view—that was dominant for decades and continues to persist. In addition to masking immigrant setbacks in the United States, it was a story that tended to favor the European side of immigration at the expense of trials encountered by newcomers from Latin America and Asia. And as this study will show, it seldom spoke to an older discussion from the nineteenth century of the ability of the statue to remind Americans how the rise of liberty was also about the end of slavery and the need for equal rights for racial minorities.

Not surprisingly, tales of immigrant success and uplift did not always resonate in the African American community. Chapter Five reveals that Blacks sometimes resented not only the celebration of the immigrant but the veneration of liberty in America. During civic ceremonies the Black press was quick to debunk romantic versions of the statue and of American history. Even mainstream publications picked up on the reality of racism, lynching, and violence in America. In 1937, the year after Franklin D. Roosevelt spoke of the statue as a sign of liberty in a world menaced by Fascism, *Life Magazine* carried a photo of four of the “Scottsboro boys” who were falsely accused of raping a white woman in Alabama looking out the window of their New York lawyer’s office at the Lady in the background. Years before, a leading black spokesman, W.E.B. Dubois, wrote in his autobiography of sailing past the statue on a return trip from Europe and
being unable to imagine the same sense of hope he assumed some immigrant arrivals had felt.

Wartime tended to diminish the celebration of the statue as a sign of economic opportunity in America and even somewhat the call for universal rights for all men and women. At moments like this the homeland had to be defended, and the monument came to be seen by men sailing overseas as a symbol of a home to which they might never return. Stories in Chapter Six about perceptions of the Lady during the great wars of the twentieth century show that the image served well the need to sell war bonds and mobilize for the defense of America and its families. Returning servicemen were often moved by the sight of the statue as they returned to New York following the conflict—knowing then that they had survived. During the war in Vietnam this sense of defending home was not nearly so noticeable, but rhetoric surrounding the dedication of the Freedom Tower in 2003 suggested that the traditional links between the statue and home during periods of war had not evaporated.

There is some consistency in many of the predominant interpretations of the Statue of Liberty over time. We can understand reasonably well how it could be used as a sign of political freedom or as a restatement of the glories of American capitalism. And we can see how some citizens could come to resent such statements when they were expounded excessively. But in the age of mass culture—especially over the past half-century—the expansion of advertising, television, film, and the internet has disrupted the entire process of representing and debating political ideals and has led to such an abundance of meaning as to bring confusion and chaos. Chapter Seven looks at this issue and the many ways in which the statue was subjected to the whims of advertisers,
creative artists, and even tourist promoters. Indeed, in our time the statue has come to be placed on everything from tourist posters to trinkets. It is often seen not only as a symbol of America but as one of New York City. The very meaning of liberty has been essentially trivialized. The historic meanings still exist, but now they must fight for public attention with the city boosters, web designers, and hucksters. It is not new to say that the meanings of the Statue of Liberty have varied and changed over time. In part, this study hopes to suggest more precisely what those meanings were and exactly when and how they changed. But it also suggests that at the end of the story the quest to understand liberty and its most famous monument is not becoming easier but more difficult.

3 Ibid., 68-72, 133-56.
Chapter One
The Birth of Liberty in America

Historian Eric Foner has suggested that the term freedom has been a “battleground” in the nation’s history where citizens have demanded rights in its name and denied those same rights to others. He sees the story of freedom as a story of “accomplishment and failure” in which people “forever contend” about the central ideal of their political world.¹ In the era of the American Revolution, citizens put the idea of freedom or liberty to a number of uses as they denounced taxes, disavowed their status as subjects of a king, and created a new basis for the exercise of political power. The old order of aristocratic and royal privilege was no longer acceptable to men who wanted to be free and more influential in the running of political affairs. This meant that revolutionaries began to think not only of new ways to live free of higher authority, but of how to run a political community—or nation—on grounds that were different and less hierarchical. The birth of freedom had both personal and social or collective dimensions. It contained a new vision of political power that blended the various meanings of liberty and the hope that personal and collective wishes could be realized. This was the idea of popular sovereignty. Power on earth was no longer vested in the king—or, for that matter, even in God—but in “the people” who were equal by virtue of the fact that they were human. Human nature as a basis for political power transcended any claims to power by aristocrats or, in centuries to come, by dictators. A new nation conceived in liberty was meant to acknowledge not only the arrival of the dream of individuals who possessed greater license to pursue their own forms of happiness in the here and now, but also the idea that individuals would take away the locus of political influence from
religious and royal authorities. Theoretically, all people now had a right to freedom, not
because they shared common ancestors or were part of a select congregation or even a
member of a royal family, but simply because they were human beings.

The invocation of human freedom in revolutionary documents such as the
Declaration of Independence would fundamentally shape the course of American history
and provide inspiration for an ideal of human rights that would drive the political dreams
of millions for decades to come. Abolitionists, feminists, and anti-totalitarian protestors
throughout the world would take inspiration from the dream of human liberty and equal
political power that was articulated so expressly in 1776. In one sense, this strain of
thinking was a product of the Enlightenment with its recovered faith in some of the ideals
of the classical age of Greece and Rome. The literature of social criticism in eighteenth-
century England continually drew on the models of classical republics and their traditions
that were disapproving of corruption in public life and of despots. Corruption in England
at the time, moreover, was seen not only in the autocratic power of royalty but in the
emergence of a new mercantile society dominated by banks and trading companies. As
Gordon Wood has explained, many Englishmen “set classical models and morality
against the spreading commercialization” of the time.²

In late eighteenth-century America, invocations of the classical age, a time before
kings and the Church exerted so much influence over European life, raised questions not
only about the corruption and injustice of political power, but about the need to recognize
the potential of human agency. It was at this point that new forms of revolutionary
thinking exhibited the faith of the Enlightenment in human reason and the ability of men
to shape their own futures on earth. Belief in human agency directly contested religious
and royal authority and was central to the newly emerging ideal of liberty. But human agency was not simply a given or a direct result of the fact that one was human. It could only be realized in a political community where individuals were free and in which they continually worked to protect their freedom or oppose tyranny. In the eighteenth century, the worst political nightmare that could befall a free man was considered to be slavery. In ancient Rome, for instance, political thought held that freedom from slavery was obtained collectively through constant participation in political life and resistance to despots. By the time of the American Revolution, however, these acts of participation and resistance were seen more as individual deeds. Thus, George Washington became a hero because he was seen to take purposeful action as an individual to, first, resist tyranny, and, second, take an active role in public life. Virtuous free men did what needed to be done to maintain liberty in their own lives and in public life. Ironically, this veneration of individual agency often turned into a justification for slavery. For some, slavery could be seen as the result of a failure of an individual to sufficiently resist their own subjugation.

It is well known that at its inception the new American nation did not abolish slavery and create political freedom for everyone, but it did provide the foundation for such changes at a later date. The Constitution of the United States accepted the reality of slavery in states where it already existed. The human ideal of freedom against enslavement and domination—like any ideal—was muddled by the complexities and contexts of politics in the late eighteenth century and by the necessity of reaching a compromise between the North and the South. It must be remembered that the revolutionaries who drove the creation of the American nation were not slaves or
impoverished workers, moreover, but mostly men of some substance and standing. The counter-images of slavery and freedom may have helped to define their political world, but their understanding of what they wanted was more specific to their social situation and the time in which they lived. By and large they were opposed not simply to the power of the king of England, but to the whole structure of society, which for too long had been grounded in a hierarchy that granted immense privileges to a class of aristocrats but not to them. The advantages enjoyed by elites were grounded not in merit or respect for all men, moreover, but in the realities of birthright and inheritance. Aristocrats already possessed freedom from deprivation as well as an exceptional level of political power. Men of some means like Benjamin Franklin and a rising class of merchants now ached to attain some of the standing and influence aristocrats had for so long enjoyed. And one way they could do that was to invoke a wider sense of who held sovereignty—all men—and the ideal of liberty for all. The system of privilege perpetuated for centuries by kings and aristocrats kept most common people from playing meaningful roles in governing society. In fact, such a system frustrated the development of a sense of civic responsibility since the assumption of civic tasks had no meaning in a society where politics and power were predestined and contingent more on family background than on individual achievement.4

The drive to foster the active participation of citizens in the exercise of power and the creation of the future was a central feature of another tradition blended into the meaning of revolutionary era liberty—civic republicanism. This outlook on political and personal life took up the faith of the Enlightenment in human reason and its hatred for enslavement, but added a more specific set of tenets which would be used to eventually
destroy monarchy in the New World and in France in the eighteenth-century. The overthrow of the old order, of course, did not all happen at once. There were dramatic moments such as the announcement of the Declaration of Independence in 1776 and the execution of the French king, Louis XIV, in 1793. But basically republicanism undermined monarchical society, in the words of Gordon Wood, “gradually” and discredited the fundamental ideas that supported it such as hierarchy, inequality, patronage, and the cult of dependency.⁵

At its core, eighteenth-century republicanism was a vision of a new way to conduct public life. Free citizens were obviously to be the source of political authority with the king removed, but they were never thought of as devoid of a powerful and distinctive set of obligations. The republican tradition at the heart of the American Revolution was never meant to simply defend the individual’s right to be free of tyranny or enable the pure exercise of human agency without regard to the needs of the common good. Free men needed also to become virtuous men, and they could not do so unless they moderated whatever personal desires they had and took an active interest in public life, insuring that it did not become unfair and unjust. They had, in other words, a responsibility to see that government and society were fair and responsive to the needs of all citizens. Thus, republicanism and liberty were never imagined at the time without a strong democratic component. True personal independence necessitated taking an active role in public life in a way that transcended the simple pursuit of self-interest. In classical thinking a man consumed with self-aggrandizement was considered to be a slave of that desire and estranged from civic independence. In the eighteenth century the same ideal pertained. Enslavement to a king or even to the marketplace was to be avoided.
Self-interest had to be balanced with behavior that was considered virtuous; liberty was contingent not only upon the realization of personal desires, but willingness to sacrifice them for the “sake of the community.” As Wood so incisively writes, private virtues such as frugality and industry were important. Public virtue was even more crucial, however, because when men acted above self-interest they preserved the ideal of a free society above the control and influence of any one interest—such as a king or God or a rising mercantile class. Thomas Jefferson even concluded that a desire for this sort of moral behavior was an innate part of human nature. He realized, of course, that some men were more inclined by nature than others to move beyond their own selfishness. He wrote, however, that “the want or imperfection of the moral sense in some men” is “no proof” it is lacking in the entire species. Jefferson felt that God had invested most men with this “moral sense” but that—in the secular tradition of the Enlightenment—men should act in a benevolent manner not to please “the Creator” but to improve the lot of those in need. For Jefferson such a benevolent society was necessary for man’s happiness on earth, and such a society was better run on notions of love than hate or egoism. Jefferson is clear on this point:

Self-love is no part of morality. Indeed, it is exactly its counterpart. It is the sole antagonist of virtue, leading us constantly to our propensities to self-gratification in violation of our moral duties to others. . . . Take from man his selfish propensities, and he can have nothing to seduce him from the practice of virtue.

At the moment of its birth liberty was a call not only for the end of tyranny over the individual but an appeal for a society where no one individual, creed, or race predominated and where citizens worked to create a community based upon mutual love and respect.6
Of course, revolutionaries like Jefferson also thought that it was natural for men to exercise their self-interest, and they should, therefore, have the freedom to pursue it. And in the late seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries, another way of validating human nature as a source of power instead of rulers began to emerge from developments in the marketplace. In this instance an ideal of human freedom emerged that was less concerned about exercising virtue in society and restraining personal desires and more intent upon allowing the free pursuit of material rewards in a dynamic new marketplace. Certainly the public actions of virtuous men could challenge the power of the aristocracy, but so could the intense drive of merchants and businessmen to seek their fortunes without interference from political authorities. Besides, not everyone who chafed under the rule of the king was attracted by the appeal to virtue and the common good. Certainly there were those who were, like Washington and Jefferson, but these men and others could not deny the attractions of material gain. Thus, the ideology of liberalism came to challenge the dream of civic republicanism in the complex notion of liberty that began to take hold in the eighteenth century. If republicans had faith that freeing human nature inevitably produced virtue and freedom, liberals had an equal amount of trust in the supposition that a prosperous and just future would be ensured if men were simply allowed to be self-seeking. Liberalism enshrined economic rights alongside political ones and valued free trade as much as it valued the idea of free men.7

The rise of a free market was one of the fundamental transformations of the seventeenth century. The expanding power of the market in England at the time began to alter not only economic life, but political life as well. Labor tasks became more specialized; goods in manufacturing and agriculture were produced in increasing numbers
not for self-sufficiency, but for sale to distant markets. Governments now had to deal with new issues such as the supply of money or the location and protection of markets. Joyce Appleby has explained well how countless writers began to fashion a social philosophy in this environment that sought to legitimate the idea of “self-interest” and actions designed to maximize the ability of common people to increase their material resources. She sees in hundreds of tracts and treatises of the time on trade the defense of the market and the critique of the king as the “chief regulator of economic life.” These writers began to press, she argues, for “economic freedom” and expressed confidence in the exercise of human nature and desire to seek what was good not only for the individual but for society as a whole. Thus, a book like Adam Smith’s *Wealth of Nations* could offer a rationale for the value of “self-improvement through economic efforts.”

In America fundamental economic changes began in the half-century before the 1770s. Some historians feel that colonists from various social backgrounds now exhibited an increased sense of economic ambition, and consequently came to see British commercial policies as unwarranted infringements on their personal lives. In the middle of the eighteenth century, colonial life was marked by an expansion in population and immigration, an increase in agricultural exports, and a rising standard of living. More people came to own land, and more farmers now produced for larger markets. Individuals were drawn into economic systems and issues far beyond their own locales and came to share with other colonists they did not know a growing antipathy toward British restrictions on their pursuit of wealth. It comes as no surprise to learn that visions of free trade drove protests against British monopolies and power in the 1760s and 1770s. “Fetter not commerce,” Patrick Henry proclaimed in the 1760s, “let her be
free as the air.” As Appleby observes, Americans now eagerly drew on the strong connection between “material ambitions and the spirit of freedom.”

Upper-class colonists could be attracted to the principles of classical republicanism not only because it offered them a greater role in the exercise of power in society, but because it inferred the need for men of intellect who stood above the common masses. What linked their desire for liberty to the needs of the lower orders, however, was a belief much more profane in its foundations—one that sanctioned the aggressive pursuit of private wealth and goods. Liberalism was even more egalitarian than republicanism. And together they provided the revolutionary era with an explosive mix of thought as well as a conception of liberty. These strands of thought were not completely separate by any means. Liberalism—derived from rising expectations in the marketplace—was not totally lacking in calls for self-restraint. John Locke himself talked of the duty men had to exhibit some “mastery” over their natural inclinations for gain. He and other proponents of liberalism did uphold a sense of “accountability of the individual to the community.” Adam Smith imagined both a world of abundance and of justice and fairness. Men like Locke and Smith also were tied to strains of religious and secular thought that called for “benevolence” on the part of self-seekers, but clearly they were more inclined to champion ambition than virtue in the economic world. In the end, the heirs of liberalism and republicanism in Revolutionary America were successful because they blended this larger set of ideas and appealed to interests and instincts that were both idealistic and practical. They offered the promise of both enhancing one’s assets and sharing power to a greater extent. To be sure, they felt that men who participated in this national venture needed to keep some sense of balance between their
benevolent and selfish drives. It remained to be seen through the subsequent course of American history whether these strands of liberty could be kept in a state of equilibrium.\textsuperscript{10}

The political achievement of launching America is well known. A new government was created, a president selected and thirteen colonies were merged into a new nation. The creation of modern nations in America and France in the late eighteenth century brought forth a new vision of human destiny which pointed more in the direction of happiness on earth rather than in an afterlife, and which pushed aside both the power of kings and of God to shape belief. As subjects became citizens the source of moral authority changed as well. Human nature and ordinary individuals were now considered legitimate judges of what was right and proper to a greater extent than they had been. New nations were charged with the responsibility of securing citizens' rights to pursue these earthly goals. But how were citizens of the late eighteenth century and those that followed them to think about all these innovations? How would they summon up freedom in their minds and sustain the project of the revolution to advance the cause of human liberty, happiness on earth, and a just society? We know that copies of the Declaration of Independence and stories of George Washington’s civic virtue were published in books and studied in schools. Yet, the new nation also needed visual signs and symbols, not only to replace the images of the old order, but to help people imagine what liberalism, liberty, and republicanism meant.\textsuperscript{11}

The process of creating a national iconography started immediately. The public proclamation of the Declaration of Independence set off what has been called “public vilifications of the king’s body.” In New York, crowds destroyed a statue of George III
riding on a horse. In other towns the king’s portrait and reproductions of the royal arms were “ceremoniously burned.” In many ways George Washington became a key symbol of the new nation, replacing the discredited English king and attaining some level of secular deification. He was, however, more the symbol of republican virtue and elite leadership than of a radical upheaval in political power and the release of liberalist dreams. With the ascendancy of Thomas Jefferson in American politics after 1800, things associated with the third president, such as the Declaration of Independence, came to occupy more symbolic space. Indeed, it was not uncommon in the first decade of the nineteenth century for Americans to perform separate celebrations on the Fourth of July. One was grounded more in the image of Washington and virtuous leaders, and the other was associated more with Jefferson and his declaration of equal rights for all as a reminder that liberty meant not only freedom from England but sovereignty and power for all of the people.12

It is important to note that despite the popularity of Washington and Jefferson as national icons, America itself was more likely to be symbolized by feminine images during its formative decades. Allegorical figures of women were immensely important to people in the eighteenth century. John Higham has explained that such figures in the Atlantic world were derived from the era’s faith in classical humanism and mythology. He notes that continents, kingdoms, and many other places were represented by female forms that reminded people of goddesses that had graced Roman coins and medals. And, we can add, these goddesses took people's minds off loyalty to monarchs. The political philosophies of republicanism and liberalism, moreover, carried with them tremendous hope for a better and more ethical life for people on earth, and this hope could be better
figured in the form of a woman, which stood for goodness and purity. Early American icons did assume male forms as well, but female forms, often called interchangeably “Liberty” or “Columbia,” were dominant and pervasive.13

Early iconography reflected the range of desires incorporated into early national consciousness. Even before the Revolution the New World had often been symbolized in the form of an Indian princess, which was actually a pejorative image suggesting that the New World was less civilized than the old. Patriots in the new nation sought to proclaim both their newly acquired power and the universal ideals that drove their uprising in the first place. The Continental Congress had no trouble inventing masculine icons to infuse proclamations of national identity with power. It selected the American bald eagle in 1782 as the national emblem and placed it on the Great Seal of the United States. The magnificent bird, Higham suggests, did “male things, like swooping, soaring, and standing guard.” In classical mythology the eagle was associated with Zeus, the king of gods, and carried connotations of “decisive power.” Additionally, early Americans certainly recalled in many ways the deeds of the “founding fathers.” But prominence among nations and the actions of powerful men were not the only elements of national identity and certainly not entirely consistent with the wide, moral vision of liberty. Thus, when it came time to design coinage in the new nation, Congress, in fear of the growing power of the new presidency, opted for a neoclassical female figure called “Liberty.” Indeed, it was a female figure alternately called "Columbia" or "Liberty" that became the major personification of the new nation, and was widely reproduced. Higham attributes the creation of this image to “poets” who wanted a classical image to rival the British “goddess” Britannia. Copied from Roman coins, Britannia usually signified the power of
the nation but also the idea that the nation had to guarantee the rights of Englishmen. By the end of the Revolution itself, the “young goddess” could already be seen on American maps and almanacs—often “waving farewell” to Britannia. In the 1790s Americans were already singing the patriotic tune “Hail Columbia.” Columbia not only announced political independence from England and the end of backward images for the New World, but it was also tied intimately to a desire to associate American identity with the “transnational symbol of human rights.” The multivocal nature of these icons reflected well the tensions inherent in the emerging identity of the new nation between aspirations that were more nationalistic and celebrated power and dominance, and those that were universal and affirmed liberty for all.14

Before the Civil War abolitionists in America—along with many other groups—frequently used the figure of Liberty or Columbia to symbolize their political desires. Anti-slavery advocates liked to picture a “helmeted Liberty” standing on broken chains and whips and holding a pole or standard topped by a Liberty Cap, a symbolic link to the ancient Roman tradition of bestowing a Phrygian cap on newly freed slaves. By the early nineteenth century, artists in Europe and America used the cap when they wanted to invest Liberty with the connotation of radical or popular uprising as a means to emancipation from tyranny. Not everyone in the new nation, however—particularly defenders of the Southern system of slavery—was comfortable with a national identity grounded in popular political protest and equal rights for all. This point was made explicit in a competition created by the national government in the 1850s to create a statue to top the dome of the Capitol building in Washington. The final design—the Statue of Freedom—which stands atop the Capitol today was a figure of Columbia that
resembled in part the older image of the Indian Princess.\textsuperscript{15} (fig. 1, p. 28) The creator, Thomas Crawford, won the commission by conforming to the wishes of Jefferson Davis, the head of the Capital Building Program, to remove a Liberty cap and any reference to the defeat of despotism that had marked competing designs. As a Southern senator, Davis was quite aware of the abolitionist use of these symbols and the manner in which they discredited the Southern states. Thus, in Crawford’s design, the head of the statue carries an eagle’s head and feathers that look like a helmet and seems more militaristic than anti-tyrannical. No chains or shackles lie at her feet.\textsuperscript{16}

Hiram Powers, Crawford’s strongest rival, lost the commission precisely because of his defense of the universal right of men to rise up and take their political freedom by whatever means they could. His vision for many evoked too much the ideals of equality and democracy. At the time, Powers was America’s most influential sculptor and was working on his own “statue of liberty” in Italy, hoping to find it an honored place in the United States. Only a plaster model of the Powers’ creation, “America (or) Liberty” (1848-1850), remains and stands today in the Smithsonian American Art Museum.\textsuperscript{17} (fig. 2, p. 29) It is starkly classical in design, showing little of the influence of nationalism, such as the flag or an eagle. Powers was disillusioned by the return of highly authoritarian governments in Europe after the political upheaval of 1848 and intent on celebrating the universal value of human freedom over the defeat of tyranny. Liberals like Powers were more inclined to picture Liberty as a “robust woman of the people” who was partially nude, leading a mass protest and standing over a fallen oppressor. Certainly liberals had few reservations about giving this woman a pole and a Liberty Cap. In early versions of this work, Powers used the cap. In the model that survives the cap is gone,
but her breasts are bare, and she strides with her left foot forward to crush a chain, “the emblem of despotism.” Removing the cap was not enough for Davis, however. He still did not like the fact that Powers retained the broken chain, and realized how popular such a statement was with the abolitionists. In this battle over proclaiming American identity just before the Civil War, the most humanitarian and democratic dimensions of that identity could not be stated at the nation’s most central location.\(^{18}\)

The Civil War would not only end slavery in America but would also challenge the ability of feminized and classical forms to represent national identity. Shirley Samuels has indicated that allegory tends not only to simplify complex realities, but actually displaces from public view serious tensions that affect society. Nineteenth-century America was deeply troubled, not only by discord over slavery and race, but also the subordination of women, and ethnic and class conflict. The violence of westward expansion, slavery, or even domestic conflict usually did not emerge in the popular figures of Columbia or Liberty. They were used, in fact, to see that they did not. The Civil War changed all this. The hope was ruptured that figures such as Liberty could obscure a view of the nation that was violent and corrupt. In part, as Samuels shows, this was due to the extreme encounter with carnage that war brought to American life. Photos of dead bodies and trains filled with the wounded and the dismembered moved through American towns. Higham noted as well that the experience of war transformed the use of “America’s classical goddess.” This female form was sent to war and became “unladylike” as she was now associated with images that called for volunteers, for battle, and for revenge. He wrote that instead of donning her liberty cap she now brandished a sword in her right hand, exemplified by the Currier & Ives lithograph, \textit{Spirit of ’61}.\(^{19}\)
America’s national identity was becoming increasingly militarized and, as it was, Liberty lost some of its transcendent connection to human rights and moral purity and became more a statement about military power and valor. But a more masculine and militarized nation was less accepting of female symbols and less clearly associated with the founding ideals of republicanism and liberalism. This is not to say that the liberal nation never had to defend liberty. But as the nation came to acquire and exercise a power and identity of its own, it sought images that were more heavily masculine; the transcendent, universal quality of liberty now had to compete for public space with a version that was more nationalized. Thus, Samuels finds that after the Civil War the image of Columbia began to decline in use and popularity. Lincoln now became the leading American icon: a symbol of defending liberty, but also affirming the power of the nation itself. In his allegorical form he, too, denied many of the tensions that afflicted national life. He did not deny liberty per se, but he affirmed more the idea of a united nation under the guidance of strong men. National power now became an ideal for Americans as much as liberty, equality, and republicanism.

---

5 Ibid., 95-97.
8 Ibid., 166-72.
9 Patrick Henry quoted in ibid., 184.
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Chapter Two
The French Connection

Liberty had to be imagined in France as well as the United States. France was the site of the other great liberal revolution of the eighteenth century, and the impact of its political transformation on Europe and the rest of the world was immense. Both the American and French revolutions overturned traditional ideas of monarchical power, and established—in theory—governments based on the idea of popular sovereignty and citizens' rights. Unlike America, however, royalist sympathies did not die easily in France, and severe tensions between advocates of the old order, emerging liberals tied mostly to the middle class, and discontented toilers and peasants at the bottom of society resulted in continued and bloody conflict over the next century. During the era of the French Revolution itself, political power swung back and forth between the lower orders, who instituted a reign of terror with widespread use of the guillotine against former elites, and powerful dictators like Napoleon who blended dreams of royal grandeur, liberal reforms, and national power. Napoleon did not by any means lead a return to the rule of kings or clerics. He actually expanded the new, secular nation and the ideal of civil rights for many citizens. He did so, however, while also infusing French nationalism with a heightened sense of military and diplomatic influence throughout Europe. In actuality he managed to sustain attachments to the older royalist order in France with his designs on world power and grandeur, and advance the cause of the secular-liberal state at the same time.¹

The bad feeling between liberals and monarchists was still palpable in France by the mid-nineteenth century. During the July Monarchy, from 1830 to 1848, the nation
was ruled by a royal figure in the form of Louis Philippe, in what amounted to a constitutional monarchy. The secular and liberal reforms of the revolution were too entrenched and could not be erased, but many in France still could not accept the ideal of popular sovereignty. The desire to merge the new dream of liberalism and republicanism with a sense of (royal) order and hierarchy was driven mostly by French liberals who had attained some degree of standing through education and economic mobility. These rising and powerful men were taking advantage of the growth in the French industrial economy and new opportunities for advancement through merit rather than heredity. What this new middle class feared most was disorder or extremism, whether it came from unruly mass protest at the bottom of society or zealous monarchists at the top. Over the course of the July Monarchy, however, these liberals came to celebrate even more their sense of individualism—the idea that they alone were responsible for the success they enjoyed in the world. Thus, pressure built for a greater measure of liberalization or democracy in French politics. Liberals, encouraged by the publication of Alexis de Tocqueville’s *Democracy in America* (the first volume in 1835, the second volume in 1840), renewed efforts to expand public education, and promoted the expansion of suffrage. During this era, the popular press in France became increasingly critical of Louis Philippe and the idea of monarchy in general. In part, this stance was pushed by an increasing celebration of individual honor and meritocracy. The king and his family were ridiculed constantly in the press and in cartoons as the antithesis of liberalism and individualism. In such a climate, the achievement of successful men came more to define what was honorable and masculine in French society. “Even the masculinity of royalists was questioned—because they had not earned their standing through merit,” one historian wrote. “Imagined as
weak men, their ability to defend the nation and its women was inevitably cast into
doubt.”

The hopes of middle-class liberals to contain both monarchist tendencies and
lower-class discontent were ruptured dramatically on several occasions in the mid-
nineteenth century. In 1848 the Paris working class revolted, disillusioned by rising
unemployment and failures to gain more rights. Some fifty thousand plebeians took up
arms, and nearly 1,500 were killed in battles with government troops. State repression
followed with a “bourgeois militia” patrolling worker suburbs. Some thirteen years later,
the anger of the lower classes erupted again. This time the clash was not only directed
against a government that was highly elitist in character but also against the political and
economic turmoil of the Franco-Prussian War. Under a Prussian siege in the winter of
1870-71, workers protested material hardships, food shortages, and even the
government's inability to win the contest with the enemy. Lower-class Parisians again
lashed out against a conservative government and “capitalist elites,” and formed a
Commune to run their own affairs. Conservatives reacted in anger and horror, however,
and spoke of the rise of “criminal and dangerous” classes. State repression of the
uprising was brutal: thousands were killed, and women and children bayoneted. There
were distinct limits to the ideal of liberty in nineteenth-century France.

Civil unrest and a lingering attachment to despotism contributed to the highly
contentious political climate in France from the 1830s to the 1880s. Liberal republicans,
committed to many of the ideals that initially drove the revolution, battled constantly with
royalists, although both sides contributed to the steady growth of a secular and powerful
nation-state during the period. Despite the expansion of the state bureaucracy and the
steadfastness of liberals, however, monarchists still managed to attract “passionate loyalty” and “bitter opposition.” In two periods especially, the early 1850s and the early 1870s, France witnessed a strong resurgence in autocratic control and despotic sentiments. In the early 1870s, in fact, Louis Napoleon and the Third Republic actually enjoyed a majority in the National Assembly. It was not until the following decade, under pressure from city growth and an expanding industrial marketplace, that liberals were able to take a firmer grip on political power and arrest the royalist tide.⁴

The man who first thought of the idea of the Statue of Liberty came of age in this era of political turmoil. Edouard-René Lefebvre de Laboulaye⁵ (fig. 4, p. 44), a leading French scholar and liberal of the period, was born in 1811 and was influenced substantially by the political crosscurrents of his times. Laboulaye was no friend of monarchy, but he detested even more such uprisings as those of 1848 and 1871. He stood fully for the ideal of liberty but wanted this cherished political ideal grounded in a government of laws—rather than in one bent on revolution or repression—and in a system built on parliamentary rule, universal suffrage, and a free press. Intellectually, Laboulaye was influenced substantially by the thinking of French writers such as Benjamin Constant and Alexis de Tocqueville. From these writers he derived a strong faith in the fundamental tenets of liberalism—the ideal that political authority resided ultimately in the individual and not in either despots or will of the “masses.” It was the will of the individual that should rule society and, for liberals such as Laboulaye, modern governments were instituted to create a stable social order and guarantee the right of the individual to pursue liberty and happiness.⁶ Like Tocqueville—and unlike some French liberals of the time—he drew inspiration from the history of liberalism in America, and
the fact that it expanded after the American Revolution (and before the Civil War) without dramatic episodes of internal violence. He was especially impressed with the growth of democratic institutions in America in the early nineteenth century such as political parties and public schools that were free of powerful influences from religious authorities.7

After liberals lost the brief hold on power they achieved following the collapse of monarchists in the 1848 revolution, despotism returned—with the help of the military—in a coup d’état in 1851 which again brought a strong authoritarian government to France in the form of the Louis Napoleon who acted as sort of a “prince-president.” This turn of events caused Laboulaye to take a more aggressive tone against royalists in his writing over the next twenty years. Liberal political opposition came under much fire from this regime, and some of Laboulaye’s colleagues lost their positions, but this did not deter him from expressing his liberal views in a number of ways. Part of his work included a work of fiction, *Paris in America* (1863). In this story a young Frenchman dreams of living in a town called Paris which is set in New England. Only here can the young man live a life where he is free to say what he thinks and not worry about political repression. Obviously, the same could not be said for life in France at the time. Laboulaye also followed the drama of the American Civil War and fully backed the crusade against slavery. For him it was important to support anti-slavery movements in the 1850s and 1860s not only because he thought slavery was immoral, but also because it was a way to protest repressive tendencies in his own country. Laboulaye had no trouble siding with the North. He frequently engaged in public debate with French sympathizers of the South—often mercantile interests tied to the Southern cotton trade. In 1861 he delivered a
series of lectures that argued slavery was wrong and that the South was responsible for instigating the war. He called upon Frenchmen to remember Lafayette and the “glorious memories” of the struggle for “liberty.”

It was at the end of the American Civil War that Laboulaye first expressed his idea for a “memorial” to American “independence” that would ultimately be crafted by the efforts of both Americans and Frenchmen. According to Frederic Auguste Bartholdi—the artist who would design the Statue of Liberty—Laboulaye told him and other guests of his dream at a dinner party in 1865 held at his “charming retreat” at Glavigny near Versailles. The French scholar was thinking of commemorating the shared commitment of American and French liberals to the liberal ideals that had driven their revolutions. He was moved by the American crusade against slavery which culminated in the Civil War and the death of Lincoln. But he had intentions that were as much nationalistic as ideological, for he worried over the need to sustain the liberal critique in France against royalists—a project he felt a statue in America could assist. He was also quite aware that close ties to the United States could facilitate the effort of France to expand his commercial and political power in the world in the face of British domination. When the political crisis of 1871 erupted in France, a time in which the war with Prussia had discredited the monarchists and working-class rebellion evoked desires in the middle class for law and order, Laboulaye had a particular problem. He had sided with those who called for a plebiscite, which meant in effect keeping the “imperial regime” of Napoleon III—such were his fears of popular unrest. This move brought him criticism from liberals themselves and thus forced him to reassert his liberal credentials by proposing again the idea for his statue. In conversation with a number of friends and
supporters Laboulaye resurrected his idea, and suggested to Bartholdi that he go to America and “propose to our friends over there to make with us a monument” to commemorate the one hundredth anniversary of the birth of liberty in America and the memory of France and American friendship. As Bartholdi told the story, Laboulaye promised that if the artist could formulate a “plan that will excite public enthusiasm,” he would work to organize the financial support necessary to see that his vision was realized.

Laboulaye began to solicit funds in earnest in 1875 when he organized the Franco-American Union. Fundraising before that time was difficult because France was burdened with the need to pay war reparation to the Germans, and it was hard to muster enthusiasm for any other form of contributions. Royalists, of course, would not be enthusiastic about backing a drive to build a monument to political freedom, and Laboulaye was forced to rely mostly on his inner circle of liberal friends. Few in number, the group was nevertheless distinguished. It included the prominent historian and politician Henri Martin and descendants of Frenchmen who had fought in the American Revolution such as Lafayette and Rochambeau. Despite distributing appeals in the press and organizing banquets and a concert, money was slow to materialize. Some funds came from exhibiting the head of the statue under construction in Paris in 1878. Campaign goals were only reached in 1880 when a national lottery was established to offer prizes to those who gave. A trip by Bartholdi to America in 1871 also failed to loosen the pockets of a number of wealthy U.S. citizens including Cyrus Field and Peter Cooper.⁹
It was Bartholdi who translated Laboulaye’s dream into the statue we see today. An ambitious artist who sought recognition and the support of prominent men who could underwrite creative endeavors, Bartholdi was every bit the nationalist that Laboulaye was but certainly much less the political philosopher. He was raised in comfortable circumstances in Colmar, and like most Alsatians he lamented the loss of his home province to the enemy after the Franco-Prussian War. Having served in the French armed forces during the conflict, he was very much interested in restoring French influence in the world—including strengthening the nation’s ties to America. This is not to say that he did not in a general sense share Laboulaye’s liberalism. Indeed, just after the Franco-Prussian war he wrote to Laboulaye, telling him that he was working on a design for the statue and that he was reading some of his words on the topic of “liberty” and hoped to “honor” their friendship which he felt was crucial in his effort to obtain the necessary subsidies to get the monument built. In 1871, Bartholdi paid his own way to New York to secure the support he desired.10

Bartholdi worked in an artistic tradition that recalled images from antiquity in an effort to both recover a sense of republicanism and foster an appreciation for monuments of colossal proportions. Throughout Europe after the 1870s, as secular and liberal states seized control of public life from the last vestiges of monarchy and the church, a wave of public monuments appeared in this classical tradition. These structures grew out of a desire to imagine the nation or state as not only powerful but also above any special interest, whether it be the working class, aristocrats, industrialists, or a religious group. That is why they borrowed their shape and form from a distant past—before the nation-state—with no clear connection to any one political interest in the present. As Eric
Hobsbawm has noted, the “mass production of public monuments” reflected a desire to create abstract images that restated the reality of national authority over any of the ideologies and dreams of either the left or the right. The French artist had already experimented in one colossal project that would prove to be a forerunner of the Statue of Liberty. In the 1860s he had traveled to Egypt in hopes of gaining support for an idea he had to build a huge lighthouse at the entrance to the Suez Canal, a French enterprise supervised by Ferdinand de Lesseps. Seventeen years later both men would represent France at the dedication of the Statue of Liberty in New York. For now, however, Bartholdi dreamed that a gigantic monument at the entrance to the canal would launch his artistic career. In a watercolor entitled “Progress” or “Egypt Bringing Light to Asia,” he offered a huge female figure holding aloft a torch atop a large pedestal emerging from the water near the canal entrance.  

In using a Neo-Classical form, Bartholdi was influenced by massive structures like the pyramids of Egypt or imagined reconstructions of the Colossus of Rhodes. As with most artists of his time, he was also quite aware of the Roman Goddess of Liberty, which had stood on a hill in Rome in the third century B.C. In classical Rome liberty essentially meant not being a slave. By the nineteenth century, classical representations of liberty came to carry a much wider range of ideas that included individual rights as a basis for political sovereignty. The Roman goddess, moreover, was pictured as a heavily robed female holding a scepter alongside a broken jar which was meant to be a symbol of “confinement.” She was crowned by a Phrygian bonnet, which was frequently bestowed on slaves when granted their freedom. In modern France the image of the liberty goddess with the red cap was used frequently after the 1789 revolution as an allegorical symbol of
popular protests for democracy. Its quintessential expression in French culture was the 1830 painting by Eugene Delacroix of “Liberty Leading the People” \(^\text{12}\) (fig. 5, p. 45), which was meant to commemorate the 1830 July revolution that overthrew the “reactionary” King Charles X. In this depiction a militant, bare breasted woman with a red cap is seen leading the lower orders in a violent assault against tyranny. This was not, however, an image Laboulaye or Bartholdi could endorse. When he spoke on behalf of the fundraising effort for the Statue of Liberty in Paris in 1876, in fact, Laboulaye directly criticized Delacroix’s figure as one wearing the red bonnet who “walks on corpses.” \(^\text{13}\)

Bartholdi made sure that his final design for the monument in America projected a more conservative version of the classically inspired figure of liberty. His heroic defender of freedom emerged finally with a “sunburst motif” on her head—reminiscent of Bartholdi’s ideal of the Colossus of Rhodes—rather than the controversial red cap, which had proved troubling to conservatives in America and France in the nineteenth century. The “bonnet rouge” of the French Revolution was gone. Heavy robes now covered the female body, as the liberal values of the age were made to seem pure; gone were the bare breasts of earlier and more radical versions. In Delacroix’s painting, Liberty carried the French tricolor and a rifle tipped with a bayonet. In Bartholdi’s statue she holds high a torch to symbolize the light of freedom and a tablet of laws inscribed with the very American date of July 4, 1776. Homage is paid to the American Revolution, but the message is that one revolution like that was enough. Liberty would now gradually “enlighten” the world with her torch and her message under the careful direction of elite and powerful men. \(^\text{14}\)
The retreat from radical depictions of liberty should not be seen as a return to authoritarian visions of government and society. The ultimate form and shape that the Statue of Liberty took was not grounded in any longing for a return to the grandeur of monarchies, but more in an expanding sense of confidence in the possibilities of the new industrial age. The great revolutions of the late eighteenth century had created liberal nations and gradually brought an end to despotism and slavery. Industrialization, technological growth, and the possibilities for amassing great wealth through daring and initiative helped to transform the meaning of liberty or freedom into a celebration of wealth and entrepreneurship. That is why most of the supporters who led the fundraising drives in France in the 1870s were men of commerce and engineers such as de Lesseps. A rising industrial class in France believed in the possibilities of commerce and trade, and was eager to support projects such as the Suez Canal, the expansion of railroads, and trade with America. Not surprisingly Bartholdi’s first contacts and supporters in the United States were prominent men in the iron industry, such as Peter Cooper and Abram Hewitt, who had influential political connections. And in the 1880s, French state policy under Jules Ferry was aimed at enhancing overseas trade and expansion. Ferry, as president of the French Council of Ministers, decided to sponsor the final stages of the construction and arrange to ship the statue to New York under the auspices of the French government, so strong were the ties between free enterprise and national authority.\(^{15}\)

The statue that stands today is, in fact, an interesting merger of classical idealism on the outside and the new faith in capitalism and technology on the inside. Bartholdi presented to the world a monument of grandeur, a feminine form with flowing robes striding forward and carrying a torch on high. It possesses much of the idealism of
classical republicanism and liberalism. And his choice of situating it in New York
Harbor insured that it would become the most public of monuments—a shrine to the idea
of the liberal nation—to be seen at a true international crossroads. Liberty could not have
stood at all, however, if it were not for the ingenious skeletal iron framework erected by
Gustave Eiffel, one of the most creative French engineers of his time. The artful exterior
of thin copper sheets ultimately rests on this core tower, which is really a system of
lightweight trusses that connect to the exterior skin at thousands of points. From building
iron railway bridges in France, Eiffel had learned how to use hinged and flexible joints
that could withstand not only great weight and changes in temperatures, but the
tremendous weight of trains. The Statue of Liberty could withstand high winds in New
York Harbor and stand tall because its heavy top did not have to rest on parts below but
on Eiffel’s inner foundation. Three years after it was dedicated in 1886, this true believer
in the possibilities of industry and technology built the thousand foot high Eiffel Tower
for the 1889 Exposition Universelle in Paris, which was designed to celebrate the coming
of age of France—especially after the defeat of the Franco-Prussian War—as an
international power in commerce and industry. For Eiffel, his Paris tower would
proclaim “our country’s industrial might” and the “vast progress” it had made in
engineering. For Bartholdi, his statue represented his crowning achievement. He gloried
in the public acclaim that came with it and, with other men on the rise in his time, the
idea that free men could not only break from the control of the old order, but advance the
cause of material progress and nationalism to unimagined heights. 13
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Chapter Three
Americanizing Liberty: Celebrating the Statue

On a rainy day in October, 1886, businessmen, politicians, ambassadors, and other influential people gathered on Bedloe’s Island to watch the unveiling of the Statue of Liberty. Speeches and newspaper commentaries focused on the political significance of the statue both as a symbol of liberty and as a physical expression of a French-American political alliance. Many of the speakers referred to Lafayette’s help in the American Revolution to establish the political friendship between the two countries and celebrate the “birth” of American liberty as well. The Pittsburgh Dispatch reported:

“France and America have erected the image of Liberty to light the world. Having done so it is their duty to so maintain the idea that its light shall be steady and permanent.”

The land and water parades in which everyone who wished was allowed to participate, the huge number of newspaper headlines that celebrated mass participation, the illuminated avenues and fireworks were all intended to impress the day and its ideological implications on the minds of all participants. But by the end of the dedication ceremonies it was clear that the new monument would do more than represent any joint venture between America and France. At the ceremonies in 1886 and at major civic celebrations at the site in years to come, the Statue of Liberty would become increasingly part of a heritage that was defined as uniquely American.

Civic celebrations at the statue in 1886, 1916, 1936, and 1986 all played vital roles in making “the Lady in the Harbor” an American icon. These public events allowed citizens to articulate various meanings of freedom and liberty, and discuss political values central to American life such as patriotism, democracy, and capitalism. In a sense the
statue became a capacious symbol capable of carrying much of the vast cultural weight of what came to be known as the nation’s patrimony. Franklin Roosevelt recognized the cultural power of the statue in 1936 when he claimed that it inspired “a sense of appreciation of our priceless heritage of liberty and a renewal of the realization of our obligation to pass that heritage on to the generations that are to follow us.”

Fifty years later, Thomas H. Kean, governor of New Jersey, commented that “Liberty and Ellis Island are the symbols of this nation’s heritage,” linking these sites to both the nation’s immigrant past and ideals about economic opportunity.

Heritage is a fundamental concept in most societies. It consists of ideas, values, monuments, and stories designed to stimulate among people a sense of a collective past and shared present and future. Heritage is sustained in heirlooms and gravestones, battlefields and landscapes, personal memories and monuments. Gettysburg stands as part of America’s heritage, as does the site of the World Trade Center. Williamsburg offers a view of nation’s inheritance, as does the Smithsonian, the Rocky Mountains, and even a 1950s television set in a museum. The process of fashioning heritage is ongoing and shaped by many groups and individuals. In a sense it results from a discussion and often a conflict over what a society should draw from its historical experience. Heritage can be nostalgic and even a gross distortion of historic events, but expressions of and debates about heritage are central to a group’s identity. This chapter looks at the ways the Statue of Liberty became part of the cultural and political inheritance of Americans at a number of pivotal civic ceremonies over the first century of its tenure on American soil. While the dedication speakers emphasized American political ties to France established during the American Revolution, the suggestion that the statue would stand for Franco-
American friendship was displaced over time by other meanings grounded more fully in the political culture of America itself.

The stress on American heritage at the statue’s ceremonies often occluded serious divisions and tensions in American society. The years between the Civil War and World War I were full of debates on many important issues of citizenship and patriotism: African Americans were struggling to improve their lives economically, exercise their right to vote, and benefit from other constitutional rights; women were fighting for the right to vote and to carve out more influential roles in the public sphere. The middle and upper classes perceived potential dangers in the dual citizenships and loyalties of newly arriving immigrants, in politicized workers who struggled for better working conditions and higher wages, and in Southerners whose return to full participation in the Union was barely more than a decade old. Many people were uncertain what kind of values were being passed on, and feared that American values (and the social structures they supported) were disappearing. Alarmed by the apparent rifts in American society, prominent citizens began to believe that instruction in and celebration of an American heritage was necessary to create a sense of community. Perhaps because the statue’s pedestal was funded by subscriptions from a broad cross section of ordinary people, organizers in 1886 began to see the unifying potential not only in the ideal of liberty but in the statue itself.

Unfortunately, those teaching heritage—including those organizing the dedication and other Statue of Liberty commemorations—often linked this “American” identity to a version of liberty and heritage that ignored issues of race, class, and gender. Like many monuments, the Statue of Liberty has been used by different factions to symbolize a
unifying idea, a sanctity of memory. However, unlike many national monuments, particularly those related to war, the statue’s commemorations are not generally used to emphasize duty to the nation, but rather what the nation offers to its citizens. In these ceremonies, the philosophy behind the statue led commemoration organizers to focus on one key ideal which all Americans were supposed to share equally: liberty. Despite divisions of class, race, gender, ethnicity, and geography which separated Americans, theoretically liberty was available to all citizens. These ceremonies—well publicized, well attended, and strongly reinforced by mass media well before the actual events—celebrated the ideal of liberty open to all Americans by right of birth or naturalization.

The unique role of the Statue of Liberty is to embody this idea of liberty. The statue was not sent over from France to commemorate a particular person or event, but rather to represent an ideal that Americans had believed—and to some extent still believe—they uniquely possess. Because most Americans felt intimately connected with the rewards of liberty, in time the statue was able to appeal to people across the country in a way that regional or more historically specific monuments could not. The statue was adopted by the country as a symbol of America’s heritage of liberty and as an icon of the nation itself. Its unique position as representative of a core American value has allowed officials to celebrate a heritage of personal freedom at the statue’s commemorations, emphasizing a shared history built upon the individual liberties most Americans enjoy. Even in a period overshadowed by fear of war, as in the 1936 celebration, the government spokespeople stressed American freedom from government control rather than citizens’ duties.
The wide appeal of the statue did not mean that civic ceremonies at the site were devoid of disagreement. Contestation over heritage is not unusual. Due to its insistence on shared history and characteristics, heritage has the unique quality of being both exclusionary and multivocal. In defining a common bond, heritage necessarily creates an excluded group of people who do not participate in this definition. At the ceremonies of 1886, 1916, 1936, and 1986, there were competing elements within each ceremony over the supposedly unchanging value of liberty. Several competing themes ran through the different commemorations at the Statue of Liberty, but the most important of these was the place of liberty as the core of American heritage. As a powerful symbol, the statue both represents and challenges common notions of liberty for Americans. As David Procter notes, the statue can “redirect political consciousness, establish normative national values, energize political policies, and ultimately give form to the U.S. persona.” While all commemorations are multivocal, those occurring at the Statue of Liberty had tremendous potential power, because they could challenge or reinforce existing notions of the American past and present, and redefine or reaffirm the core value of liberty assumed to bind the country together. Protests against government and corporate concepts of liberty occurred at the dedication, and the meaning has been debated ever since; the Statue of Liberty remains hotly contested symbolic property.

As in all commemorations, rather than being a simple, straightforward celebration, the ceremonies were a vital presentation of culture which many different interest groups tried to co-opt to garner publicity and acceptance for their vision of the United States and the world. The very creation of some versions of liberty provoked discourse from those who believed they were excluded. The American past is neither
perfect nor uniform, and liberty is not a static heritage value, but an ideal that has been contested and sought after throughout American history. Three factions contested American liberty at the commemorations: government spokespeople, business and corporate interest people, and the “common people” most visibly represented by political interest groups. Within the broader discussion over the meaning of liberty, these three factions debated the national, international, and universal appeal of the statue. Participants and commentators at each ceremony did their best to link the statue with their goals and define liberty according to their agenda.

The dominant strain, usually offered and jointly reinforced by government and corporate interests at the ceremonies, defined liberty as the opportunity to realize personal goals without restraint and inferred that this opportunity had been available to all in American society. In 1886, the dedication planners focused on the symbiotic relationship between liberty and capitalism, arguing that only the presence of both allowed the United States to be strong. For the festivities of 1916, this idea changed slightly to include the presence of technology, supported by corporate systems, as a vital part of American liberty. Fears about World War I also allowed liberty to be spoken of as a guarantee of peace and a uniquely American quality, for Europe had succumbed to war. Organizers of the fifty-year anniversary of the statue in 1936, occurring in the midst of the Great Depression, presented liberty as the ability to engage in capitalistic behavior without government intervention, and stressed the hope that people willing to work hard would see economic rewards. The centennial of the Statue of Liberty in 1986 reflected Ronald Reagan’s belief that liberty was individual opportunity and the absence of governmental limitations upon personal freedom.
Conversely, in each ceremony dissident arguments focused on a lack of personal freedom and civic equality. Hegemonic characterizations of liberty as a plentitude of personal freedom without limits imposed by government or corporate interests excluded women, some immigrant groups, and African Americans. With the notable exception of African American groups, these contestations of the dominant discourse were largely presentist, choosing to foreground a contemporary lack of rights rather than past injustices. As each ceremony occurred, there was tension over which group’s vision of liberty would dominate the official celebration.

1886—Capitalism: The Bedrock of Liberty

October 28, 1886, was a long time coming. Originally, the statue was supposed to be erected as a centennial gift for the United States in 1876, but it was delayed because of funding issues: while France agreed to pay for the statue, the United States had to come up with the money for the pedestal. A newspaper article in June 1882 stated that Bartholdi wanted to inaugurate the statue on the hundredth anniversary of the Treaty of Versailles, September 3, 1885. The Statue of Liberty was completed in Paris by January 1884. There were several failed attempts to get funding from both the government and the people of the United States. The final successful campaign of 1885-86 was orchestrated by Joseph Pulitzer in the New York World, which referred to the statue as “The World’s Bartholdi”—a clever turn of phrase underscoring the populist spirit of the pedestal fund and linking the name of the newspaper with the statue—and included illustrations with Uncle Sam holding his hat out to collect the American people’s donations. (fig. 6, p. 87) Although Bartholdi wanted to inaugurate the statue earlier, he
had to settle for a date in 1886 of no particular historical significance. This meant that no particular historical connection drew attention from the monument’s embodiment of liberty. This would prove helpful for later entities working to link the statue with a vision of liberty connected to the mythos of American heritage.

The dedication ceremony was full of spectacle and pomp to make up for ten years of expectations, and to solemnize the international ties celebrated in the dedication. As the newspaper accounts announced, “Baptized with raindrops the Bartholdi Statue of ‘Liberty Enlightening the World’ was yesterday dedicated in the presence of a million people with fitting ceremonies and all resounding hosanna.”

The religious tone of this comment captures a sense of the grandeur the dedication organizers hoped participants would see. Huge and magnificent, this event impressed its spectators as a solid beginning to international accord and a celebration of a “permanent” American value: liberty.

Both the spectacle and a sense of unity were reinforced by the participation of many ordinary Americans in the various events. From the funding of the pedestal to the celebration itself, newspapers were eager to demonstrate a connection between the masses and Bartholdi’s statue, and by extension, the participation of the masses in the celebration of American liberty. Newspaper accounts claimed that over 20,000 individuals of different ethnicities, trades, and organizations marched in the parade, which lasted around two and a half hours. The World published the names of those who participated in its article, “In Liberty’s Ranks…” The diversity of the parade’s participants was remarked upon by French reporters as well; their accounts included mention of “a company of Negroes that marched along—some dark like ebony while others were nearly white.”
The parade took place along a lighted avenue; New York City’s Mayor William Russell Grace had suggested that people living along the parade route illuminate their homes as the procession passed.\textsuperscript{12} The lighted parade foreshadowed the celebration of technology and freedom that would come to dominate much of the 1916 commemoration.

After the main parade came a naval parade, with many boats escorting President Cleveland’s boat and staying to watch the statue’s unveiling. Around 3500 people got tickets to attend the dedication ceremony on Bedloe’s Island, though no record was kept of their names.\textsuperscript{13} The dedication, called Bartholdi Day, was a first intimation of the national appeal of the statue. It was celebrated as far away as Baltimore:

\begin{quote}
A feature of the performance at Ford’s Grand Opera House to-night…was a public recognition of Bartholdi Day and of the efforts of THE WORLD in raising $100,000 to complete the pedestal.… The enterprise of Manager Ford was highly appreciated by the large audience….
\end{quote}

Speeches at the dedication and the newspaper articles reflecting on them tended to the patriotically grandiose, establishing and cementing their speakers’ ideas of the definition of liberty, and emphasizing liberty as part of American citizens’ essential heritage. President Cleveland affirmed America’s unique relationship with liberty when he stated: “We will not forget that Liberty has here made her home. Nor shall her chosen altar be neglected. Willing votaries will constantly keep alive its fire.”\textsuperscript{15} In this verbal promise, Cleveland invokes a key aspect of heritage: it must be passed on to the next generation if it is to endure. In a similar vein, the November 1st \textit{Washington Critic} asserted that the Statue of Liberty

\begin{quote}
…will be a no-less constant reminder of the mission with which America seems to have been providentially invested—to point the way of mankind to the blessings of free and equal citizenship and illustrate the excellence of institutions founded on the popular will.\textsuperscript{16}
\end{quote}
In these speeches and many others of the period during and after the dedication, liberty was presented as something all Americans had achieved, something that drew Americans together, perfected and unchanging. No need existed in America to agitate for more. Americans’ mission was to preserve the perfection that it had now achieved and, from time to time, to spread this ideal to other corners of the world.

While the emancipation of African Americans from slavery had been one of the original motives for the gift of the statue, the reality of slavery as part of the American past rarely interrupted the narrative of an unbroken legacy of liberty shared by all Americans during the celebration of the statue. None of the people on the official platform on Bedloe’s Island were African American. When speakers and newspaper reports mentioned slavery at all, they did so in a manner that suggested slavery had been the only bar to American freedom’s completion, and was now inconsequential. An article in the *New York World* asserted: “Liberty, too, is every American’s birthright, since the foul blot of slavery was removed. There are here no castes, no fixed classes, no aristocracy except of the mushroom and self-manufactured variety.”

The worsening conditions for African Americans across the nation, women’s struggle for suffrage, and debates over the consequences of unchecked capitalism were largely ignored. The poet and Cuban freedom-fighter, José Martí, observed the ceremonies for a South American newspaper, and wrote of the event: “Those who have you, O Liberty, do not know you. Those deprived of you must not merely talk about you, they must win you.”

After the patriotic praise, the most pervasive theme in the dedication was the businessmen’s refrain of the connection between wealth, capitalism, and liberty. Even
their physical presence was considered noteworthy by the press. The *New York World* stated:

> It was an imposing group that sat or stood on Liberty Island yesterday. Their names are the names of men known not alone in metropolitan circles, in cosmopolitan clubs, but throughout the varied channels of the world’s outworkings. Their voices are recognized in the halls of legislation. \(^{19}\)

Power of all types was signified through corporate participation. This was especially true of Chauncey Depew, the keynote speaker at the dedication. Depew, a senator and the president of the New York & Hudson Railroad Company, stressed connections between business and liberty throughout his speech. His reputation alone was apparently enough to bring capitalism and business to mind. José Martí remarked that Chauncey Depew was “all that talent represents—except generosity. Railroads are his business, emperors his public, the Vanderbilts his friends...and his wealth can be reckoned in millions.” \(^{20}\)

The presence of these men at the dedication reinforced the connections between the idea of liberty and America’s capitalistic economic system.

> It was not only through their participation in the ceremony that businessmen affected the dedication, however. Many of the speeches and newspaper articles detailed connections between capitalism, wealth, and liberty. As John Garnett said in the introduction to his account of the statue’s history and dedication:

> ...the United States, enjoying a period of peace, has flourished and become one of the mightiest nations upon the earth. In this the French saw the beneficent results of liberty, and cried, “Behold! where liberty reigns how prosperous and mighty is the land!” \(^{21}\)

This heritage of liberty made America uniquely strong, uniquely powerful, and an example to other nations. To Garnett, capitalism and peace together with liberty allowed the kind of prosperity that helped America become an ideal to which other nations could
aspire. Similarly, an article in the *New York World* suggested that the motto of the United States should be

“Liberty, Equality, and Property”—an association that was very much part of the understanding of liberty in 1776. For as Liberty is the aim of a Republic and Equality its condition, so Law is its protection and Property its anchorage.22

Here we see one of the high-minded ideals of the Declaration of Independence reconfigured: it is not the pursuit of happiness that allies with life and liberty as inalienable rights, but property that anchors and stabilizes American liberty. Even the sculptor of the statue noticed the corporate spirit of the dedication ceremony. Bartholdi, upon being introduced to President McGee and the rest of the board of the Produce Exchange in New York City, said, possibly humorously, “I am sorry not to be able to speak quite in the characteristic way of the temple that has been spoken of here—the Temple of Commerce.”23

Alongside its decidedly corporate aspects, Bartholdi Day was presented as a day for the masses as well. *The World* announced that the highlight of the day was the “unprecedented outpouring of men, women, and children...of the nation” who attended the events with “unfeigned solicitude and genuine cordial participation.”24 The fact that the newspaper had promoted fundraising for the pedestal in populist terms certainly contributed to its positive depictions of public participation. In fact, during the campaign the journal had reasoned that public contributions would help prevent “any syndicate of patriotism among the capitalists” and that it was better to build the base from the “dimes of the people, not with the dollars of the rich few.”25

In some respects during Bartholdi Day, the “great masses” were held in suspicion. Liberty itself became a charged term as anarchists used it in the 1880s as a call to erode
the power of corporations and government. The Haymarket Riot—a Chicago strike that ended in a bombing, chaos, and eight anarchists condemned to death for propagating a culture of violence among their followers—occurred the same year as the dedication. Lucy Parsons, the wife of one of the eight, had visited New York only two weeks before Bartholdi Day in an attempt to raise money for an appeal for her husband.26

These ideas were echoed in the campaign of Henry George, who was running for mayor of New York City during the festivities, and only narrowly defeated a few days after the dedication. George stressed the ever widening differences between different social classes in the city, arguing that the economic inequality of capitalism was weakening the liberty of the working class, and workers deserved an equal share in the products of their labor.27 At a time which some historians characterize as one of political apathy and disgust, there were parades in George’s support, and he nearly defeated a candidate who was well funded from the Tammany Hall political machine.28 With the memories of Haymarket still fresh, this kind of popular support worried some businessmen, especially because George did not hide his strong views about liberty and capitalism. He charged,

It is not enough that men should vote; it is not enough that they should be theoretically equal before the law. They must have liberty to avail themselves of the opportunities and means of life; they must stand on equal terms with the reference to the bounty of nature.... This is the universal law.29

George’s liberty depended on an equal economic base and opportunity for all, rather than the stability of owned property. In another speech, he argued that “in every age the witnesses of Liberty have stood forth, and the martyrs of Liberty have suffered.” Vocal about the limits of American liberty, on which few at the dedication had remarked, George drew on a different sense of heritage than the celebration organizers, one in
which American men had struggled for the liberty they had achieved, and one for which more sacrifice would be necessary. The martyrs of liberty and even the violence of the Civil War which had allowed African-Americans the right to vote did not appear in the dedication speeches, which tended to present liberty as a static value with only the “blot” of slavery staining the American experience.  

Contemporary minds noticed the debate between official ceremonies and Henry George over the idea of liberty. In fact, the *New York World’s* “cry for Liberty, Equality, and Property” as the American motto is very much a rejection of George’s demand for “Liberty, Equality, and Fraternity” that he made in a speech to French-American guests arriving for the dedication. *The World* claimed that the image of the statue “will stand forever to teach mistaken men that here, on this broad continent, there is boundless space for ‘Liberty, Law and Order’ but not a single foothold for License, Lawlessness, and Anarchy.” The firm determination in the tone suggests the fear that so many felt about social upheaval as well as the determination not to allow another Haymarket riot. An editorial cartoon in *Puck* “Georgism” with “Anarchism,” “Socialism,” and other evils pulling on the statue and its torch with ropes, the light of which was labeled “Constitution” with beams such as “Free Schools” and “Equal Rights.” The caption read: “Our Statue of Liberty—She Can Stand It.” (fig. 7, p. 88) From the parade for George the day before the dedication of the statue, to the keynote address of Depew which referred to George and the anarchists, the specter of class conflict hung over the celebration of corporate America during the dedication.  

Protest against class divisions and the problems of capitalism were not the only form of disagreement on the day of dedication. Women, too, took the opportunity
offered by the dedication of a female statue representing liberty to argue for more civic influence. Since the elections were coming up, suffragettes were a presence in New York both before and during the dedication, as newspaper articles noted. The participation in the dedication of those working for suffrage was uncertain; they had been told that no women would be allowed on Bedloe’s Island during the dedication ceremony, and there was confusion over the boat they would be allowed to ride during the water parade as late as the day before the ceremony. The New York State Woman Suffrage Association, offended, chartered their own boat—the John Lennox—to take their own unofficial role in the festivities, giving speeches on the occasion. Lillie Devereux Blake, the president of the Association, denounced the unveiling as “a gigantic lie,” adding that “in erecting a Statue of Liberty embodied as a woman in a land where no woman has political liberty men have shown a delightful inconsistency.” Despite these protests, speeches declaring American liberty a fixed and flawless concept continued at the dedication and were read by citizens in the newspapers the following day.

In the end, the question of whose version of liberty prevailed at the celebration was moot. Neither the glowing speeches of the speakers nor the furious protests captured the public’s attention for long. In fact, the statue generally failed to capture the public mind in a substantial way in 1886 and for the next few decades. This failure is metaphorically represented in the fact that the icon’s torch did not shine nearly as brightly as originally promised when boosters claimed it would be seen some fifty miles out to sea when lit. Most New Yorkers could hardly see it from the Battery. In 1904 a citizen wrote plaintively to the New York Times seeking to determine who was responsible for the “dilapidated condition” of the Statue of Liberty site and observed that it was far from
an attractive place for people to visit.\textsuperscript{38} Perhaps because the statue was still mostly seen as a New York monument, or because it was not linked to any national holiday or historical event on an annual basis, its influence and popularity remained quite modest and would stay that way until the era of World War I.

\textbf{1916: The Scientifically Lighted “Miss” Liberty}

In December, 1916, another civic celebration held at the statue captured public attention. This time Americans had elected to celebrate the nation’s technological progress on the thirtieth anniversary of the icon by flooding it with electric illumination. During the event Ruth Law, a female airplane pilot, flew around the Lady with magnesium bulbs hanging beneath her plane that spelled out “Liberty” when lit. Her performance was enlivened when “the national colors were played upon her by a huge searchlight.”\textsuperscript{39} Thousands on the pier watched the spectacle that once again affirmed the nation’s material gains. Rather than long speeches on Bedloe’s Island, President Woodrow Wilson merely tripped an electrical switch from a boat in the harbor to cause the statue to become bathed in radiant light. Later Wilson and some two thousand guests retired to the luxurious Waldorf Hotel to dine and celebrate the end of the festivities amidst many speeches. During this commemoration, the distinction was substantial between the public who funded the illumination and watched the spectacle, and the elite group that dined with the president. Overall this celebration mimicked the dedication ceremonies: the illuminated parade, the cheering crowds at the pier, and \textit{The World} even duplicated its original subscription appeal to fund the lighting of the statue. Nonetheless,
significant differences existed between what happened in 1916 and what had taken place three decades earlier.

Unlike the first celebration, science was now one of the overriding themes and, in a sense, replacing the more explicit veneration of capitalism in the past. The business contingent in all this stressed the importance of corporate support for technological innovation in a free country. As Henry Latham Doherty, the owner of Cities Service, a large utilities company, ended his 1916 appeal to the convention of the National Electric Association for funds, he stated, “I urge all of you to do what you can to make this a patriotic movement which also will result in a grand demonstration of splendid lighting methods.” While patriotism was important, an opportunity for publicity was equally worthy of mention, and for many businessmen scientific progress was also part of American heritage. Historian Ruth Cowan claims that for over two centuries support for technology has been seen as a hallmark of American culture and one of the factors that makes the United States seem different from Europe. Early twentieth century ideas about nature, gender, social status, politics, and skill were also associated with ideas about technology. Connections drawn between capitalism, innovation, and political liberty actually drew strength from the celebration of the introduction of electricity to the torch; it was another way of showing how the statue was becoming enmeshed in a broader discussion that celebrated all things American.

The governmental theme of liberty at the 1916 commemoration drew its strength from a different sense of liberty—duty to nation. This focus was due to the rising cloud of war that hovered over the festivities, for World War I had broken out in Europe two years before. Driven by war concerns and the Progressive reform movement which
made explicit calls for communal needs and improvement, this commemorative event emphasized duty over personal freedom as the highest quality of Americans. President Woodrow Wilson’s speech at the celebratory dinner following the lighting of the statue called for greater attention to the rights of newly arrived immigrants and for less “self-adulation” in American life. Other speakers noted the war abroad and the possibility of the need to defend liberty in the world. Ralph Pulitzer claimed that in the past, “Liberty’s Statue had stood apparent to the gaze of all throughout the peaceful brightness of daylight.” But now he feared the future of this ideal was threatened, and called the present “hours of troubled darkness” in which there was doubt if Liberty could still beckon men as it had before.

The combination of war and the perceived need for national loyalty helped to further move the icon into realm of the nation’s heritage. John Purroy Mitchell, the mayor of New York, furthered this association in 1916 when he stated that “beyond all else...the Statue of Liberty symbolizes the spirit and soul of America, the origins of our Nation, and the best that America has been and is and all that she hopes to be.” For the mayor and his listeners, the statue was no longer celebrated because it called to mind capitalism or an alliance with France, but because it was a physical manifestation of the American heritage of liberty. Now it seemed the defense of America and what was perceived to be uniquely American was on the minds of citizens. Not surprisingly at the Waldorf dinner American flags and emblems were to be found everywhere, but no image of France was evident.

If the French were not in evidence, another group—kept at bay during the dedication—seemed to be gaining ground. With the suffrage movement gaining attention
by 1916, newspapers carried daily stories about women involved in the electoral process and Wilson’s waffling over whether or not he supported their right to vote. Just one year earlier, *Puck* had published a magazine cartoon designed by Ray Evans that satirized the uneasy relationship between Wilson, the suffragettes, and the statue. It depicted the monument with a banner that said, “Wilson for suffrage” draped around her neck. \(^{46}\) (fig. 8, p. 89) In 1916 the suffrage movement and the lighting celebration intersected dramatically when the National Woman Suffrage Association “bombed” the presidential yacht as it traveled to the celebration by dropping petitions urging a suffrage amendment out of an airplane. New York newspapers also highlighted women’s roles in the subscription process to gain funding to light the statue. Whether because the statue was a woman and women felt a special connection to it, or because heritage had often been the domain of women in the previous half-century, or even because volunteerism in civic acts became a way for women to exhibit some degree of political influence, women organized a campaign to see the Statue of Liberty fully lit in New York Harbor. \(^{47}\)

Women across the country contributed time, money, and effort to the lighting of the statue. According to *The World*, women were among the first to see the statue fully illuminated. Members of the General Federation of Women’s Clubs met on board in New York Harbor, and arranged for the statue to be lit by the floodlights of battleships anchored in the harbor. These women were so impressed by the sight that they decided to work for its permanent illumination “before the boat reached its landing.” The story stressed that through a national fund drive thousands of women would contribute to this effort. And contribute they did. Some of their projects were simple and others were elaborate. Vaudeville actress Claire Rochester became the *World’s* “Liberty Girl,”
driving across the country to personally solicit donations from small towns along the way. Like many of the volunteers, she seems to have been both politically and practically inspired, for she claimed she not only wanted to advance the statue project but to set a woman’s automobile record across the nation. Headlines continued to insist that the drive to light the statue was mainly a female program. Girls who helped to solicit funds became part of the what the World called the “Liberty Army.” In comparison with the attention given to women’s activities, reports of male contributions to the overall campaign were hardly noted at all.\footnote{48}

On the night of the celebration itself, the statue was not the only “woman” of note. Ruth Law—the airplane pilot set to circle the statue pulling electric bulbs spelling out the word “Liberty”—was reported by one paper to be serving as a symbol of the “aspirations of modern womanhood.” References to both Law and the icon in the harbor noted the sense of strength they evoked. It was at this time that references were made increasingly to “Miss Liberty.” Liberty Girls enlisting in a Liberty Army and wearing Liberty sashes and carrying Liberty banks helped raise funds everywhere in America.\footnote{49} Though this was not the first time such a title had been used to describe the statue, it was now used more frequently and with a greater sense of affection than in the past. “Miss Liberty” was rapidly acquiring an emotional status as a national symbol and treasure.

The 1916 celebration offered opportunities for the public to participate in the ceremonies, as did the dedication event a half century earlier. The press noted the massive state and local efforts at collecting donations to light the monument; Boy Scout and Girl Scout “honor guards” went door-to-door to solicit donations, and some communities sent donations on behalf of their entire populations. \textit{The World}
continuously ran advertisements telling readers “How You Can Help Along the Illumination of the Statue.” And the press estimated that a crowd of some 100,000 watched the commemoration’s parade.  

The popularity of support for the 1916 event was somewhat disputed years later when a publication of the National Park Service claimed that a large donor completed the fund raising effort when public efforts fell short, and argued that the public interest was superficial. Another dinner at the Waldorf reinforced an elitist tone for this fund drive where only 1,200 guests were invited, and the New York Times called the gathering “more distinguished than any that has gathered in the Grand Ball Room of the Waldorf-Astoria Hotel in years.” Others caught this spirit as well. Ruth Law told a reporter that her flight around the monument would be “dignified” and that she did not do “stunts.” The elitist tone of much of the celebration was captured in an advertisement run just before the celebration got underway which indicated the committee arranging the dinner for President and Mrs. Wilson had decided at the last minute to “admit ladies as guests to the main floor, as well as to the boxes at a subscription of $7 per plate.” The ladies, of course, could not attend unescorted.  

Worries about the war and future struggles also came to fruition. Less than a month after the Statue of Liberty was illuminated in the harbor, John Grier Hibbon, President of Princeton University, published a speech in New York Times which discussed the outbreak of war in Europe and the international crisis that now existed. The university leader claimed that America did not want to fight but that we should be willing to do so if our national honor required it. He argued that Americans sometimes had to fight for the freedom of other peoples and that this ideal was part of what the statue
represented to all.\textsuperscript{53} Four months later the nation would be at war, and the statue suddenly appeared on posters selling Liberty loans, calling for army recruits, and supporting patriotic events. In the World War I era the statue would come quickly to fulfill Ralph Pulitzer’s image of a beacon for a troubled country, and Hibbon’s desire to have it stand as a symbol of world freedom. By the time the war was over, the statue had become permanently established in the arsenal of images and symbols that Americans used to express national identity and a sense of national purpose. Peace now prevailed, but in few short years tensions emanating from the reality of hard times and another specter of war would cause millions again to turn to the Lady in the harbor in an effort to reach some understanding of what the United States stood for and where it might be headed.

1936: Shadowy Fears and Determined Hopes

Compared to past celebrations at the statue, the 1936 commemoration—the fiftieth anniversary of the initial dedication—was rather quiet. There were no freewheeling plane stunts or huge illuminated parades. Excitement over electricity had long passed, and the nation was struggling with the Great Depression. Democracy itself now appeared to be in trouble at home and in the world where aggressive Fascist states looked to expand their power over others.\textsuperscript{54} Many now sought not to launch a festival but rather to attempt to define just what liberty meant. An international poetry contest co-sponsored by the National Life Conservation Society and the National Park Service, and a national high school essay contest arranged by the Ladies Auxiliary to the Veterans of Foreign Wars invited students to define the Statue of Liberty and, by implication, state
what liberty meant to them as individuals and as citizens. The contest became quite popular, with more than 100,000 entries nationwide. For many who were immersed in the day-to-day life of the Depression, the idea of the unencumbered pursuit of wealth was reaffirmed and the hope that it would return with the end to hard times was stressed above all else. For others who were worried about the civil war in Spain and the rising political tension in Europe, there was a sense that the fight against the Depression may soon be superseded by the need to fight for peace. In such unsettling times, Americans looked for a sense of stability and hope in their heritage and in images that seemed reassuring and permanent.

The era of World War I had ensured that the statue was now part of the nation’s heritage—one worth defending. By 1936 its central importance was verified time and time again. On New Year’s Day in that year a group of thirty men and women from ten states gathered at the statue to celebrate the monument’s fiftieth birthday with no prompting from business or government leaders. In 1936 some Americans even recalled the ties to France that the icon evoked. In July, 1936, on the 147th anniversary of the Bastille Day—which the Times called the “anniversary of French freedom”—a two-day celebration was held at the statue. The full weight and many dimensions of America’s heritage—already encompassing the statue in 1916—returned to shape thought and discussion about the icon at this commemorative moment. National essay contests—already becoming popular in the 1920s—were launched on the meaning of liberty and American culture. Changes in the National Park Service itself furthered the emphasis on the idea of national heritage. As Verne Chatelain, the park service’s chief historian explained in 1935, the mission of the agency was now to stress “heritage,” and
to “recreate for the average citizen something of the color, the pageantry, and the dignity of our national past.” While the 1936 event may have been short on pageantry, it was immersed in a sense of dignity and honor. National values such as liberty, economic opportunity, and freedom of speech were venerated in conscious contrast to the despotism and chaos on the rise overseas.59

The written record of the public participation in this celebration is quite strong. The Ladies Auxiliary to the Veterans of Foreign Wars held an official essay contest for high school students during the event to promote American values and celebrate emotional attachment to the statue. While the ladies’ organization claimed that the contest was to help students better understand the relationship between France and the United States, the theme of the contest was entitled, “What the Statue of Liberty Means to the American People.” In addition to substance, contest officials insisted that grammar and narrative flow were important—although not as paramount as heritage and patriotism.60

A concurrent poetry contest stressed both the need to express the allure of the ideal of liberty and the need to demonstrate that it was part of the culture of every region in the country. Thus, event planners published an anthology of the poetry from “every section of our land and many lands across the sea.” Contest rules indicated that poems had to demonstrate the “deep emotion” of a traveler returning home through New York Harbor and seeing the statue, the “heart-breaking” nostalgia an immigrant family felt when remembering the monument, and the “deep spiritual significance” of the statue during its fifty-year tenure.61 These emotions expressed through poetry were meant to
inspire patriotic loyalty, pride in heritage, and nostalgia for the American past—a past
and a heritage now seen as completely praiseworthy and beyond reproach.

Edna Falk, the winner of the essay contest, exemplified this sense of a sacred
heritage. She believed:

Despite what a politically-minded American says or thinks about our present
liberty nearly every one feels a certain glow of pride in this country when he picks
up the newspaper and reads of dictatorships, revolutions, and oppressions in other
lands. True, there are sweatshops, unequal opportunities, and injustice here, but it
lies within our power to correct these things if we only will.  

Pride in American achievements was defined in contrast to worsening political conditions
elsewhere. America was seen as a blessed nation and still improving. Falk also echoed
another of the celebration’s major themes in her essay when she supported the potential
for economic opportunity in the Untied States. “It remains, despite temporary conditions,
that of all countries America is the land of opportunity for those who will give their
loyalty and their best service to God and man,” she wrote. “True, there is the man who
has failed to succeed, but he would have failed anywhere, and certainly there are more
chances to succeed in America than in any other country.” For Falk “true liberty”
consisted of both the chance to acquire wealth and property and the right to speak your
mind. Liberty had both economic and political dimensions that were widely praised in
the 1936 celebration.

The conflation of liberty, democracy, and capitalism led to fears that economic
instability could topple the statue and the reality of liberty itself. One newspaper
exclaimed that both France and the United States were now bending every effort to
preserve the liberties for their people that had been obtained by their “fathers” and the
hope of economic security. Business leaders voiced fears about the vulnerability of the
American capitalist and corporate system. Some expressed that fear with strong attacks on not only Fascism but Communism. The Hearst newspaper chain ran an ad in one anniversary booklet for the 1936 event stating all Hearst papers stood for “Americanism” and opposed any form of despotism. “They are ever vigilant and active in the preservation of American liberties and American ideals,” the notice announced.66 Jacob Klinck, head of the group that had honored the monument on New Year’s Day and a Deputy Grand Master of the Freemasons, linked the celebration of liberty to the threat of Communism which “substitutes the State for God.” According to Klinck, “Communism would put the soul into slavery while with our belief we put the soul into eternity.”67

Franklin Delano Roosevelt supported the effort to define liberty both economically and politically, and in terms that spoke not only to domestic needs but to the growing sense of crisis in the world. In his 1936 address at the statue he invoked the story of American immigration to serve both these goals. He referred to the statue as “one of America’s places of great romance,” and stressed that immigrants to this nation risked all to gain a second chance at improving their material wealth. He saw immigration as a rejection of the more restrictive political life of the Old World, claiming that Europe was a place where “the ambitions of a ruling class and the times conspired against liberty of conscience, liberty of speech, liberty of person, liberty of economic opportunity.” He felt that after centuries of wars and dynasties there was no longer any “hope” in Europe for economic or political freedom. In contrast to the Old World, Roosevelt characterized America as a land where immigrants “found a home in which the things they most desired could be theirs—freedom of opportunity, thought, and the right to worship any God.”68
Roosevelt’s vision of America as a land of freedom did not escape criticism. Scholars have noted that during this period Roosevelt had actually rejected pleas that America grant asylum to political and religious refugees from Germany. In an article appearing in the *New Republic*, James Benet noted that immigrants had recently been deported who espoused “anarchist” sentiments and that there were clear biases in American immigration policy. Benet ended his piece with a blunt challenge: “It says in the *World Almanac* that the Statue of Liberty was scrubbed in 1934 until it looked bright and cheerful. It had begun to look dingy. No wonder.”

Roosevelt also invoked the theme of heritage to advance the cause of peace. As the commemoration unfolded, the rise of Adolph Hitler and the civil war in Spain were very much on people’s minds. Government officials and private citizens spoke of the renewed tie between liberty and the hope for world peace. Roosevelt himself was clear on this connection. “For each generation the more patriotic part is to carry forward American freedom and American peace by making them living facts in a living present,” he declared. In 1936 Americans could not take satisfaction in simply saying that the statue represented the virtues of a virtuous nation. The president himself suggested that they may also have to fight against enemies in the world if they hoped to conduct further celebrations of the statue and what it represented.

Roosevelt was not alone in his proclamations on peace and war. Even the Ladies Auxiliary to the Veterans of Foreign Wars echoed his sentiments. These women claimed in 1936 that they stood for “maintaining true allegiance to the Government of the United States of America and fidelity to its Constitution and Laws, for fostering true patriotism; for maintaining and extending the institutions of American freedom; for equal rights and
justice for all men and women and for preserving and defending the United States of America from all of her enemies.”

Reminiscent of earlier Hearst newspaper ads, this statement saw liberty as a fragile ideal which could exist best in times of peace and which may have to be defended. Clearly, these women saw that more than essay contests may be needed in the years ahead. Since most had loved ones who had served abroad, they took the words “preserving and defending” quite seriously.

An image that encapsulated the national and international value of the statue appeared prominently in Falk’s essay. She wrote about the experience of an American traveler viewing the monument upon returning from a trip abroad. “There she is, a symbol of Home to each returning traveler viewing the statue, as she holds up her great torch to enlighten the world, but with her feet planted firmly upon an American pedestal.”

There was talk of world events and war and peace in 1936, but such talk was far from a simple declaration to defend broad political ideals. It was also very much—as Falk sensed—a time when citizens had to face the issue of possibly defending their homeland, calling on their closest emotional connections to those parts of their heritage that stirred their emotions the most.

1986: One Hundred Years of Personal Freedom

The centennial celebration of the statue’s dedication was an extravaganza of spectacle, participation, and publicity. More elaborate than the other festivals held in the twentieth century, many people found the centennial celebration, with its fireworks, speeches, naval parade, and commercialization, much more than a civic event. President Ronald Reagan and French president Francois Mitterrand both gave speeches, Hollywood
celebrities such as Elizabeth Taylor joined the festivities, and several hundred immigrants took oaths as new citizens.  The event was far removed from the more sober ceremonies that marked 1936, but had some definite connections to the tone of the original dedication celebration in 1886.

The scope and tenor of the celebration was very much an effort to revive positive and uncritical views of the American nation after the turmoil of Vietnam, Watergate, and economic setbacks of the 1970s.  Showing the talent and inclination to foster patriotism and good feeling about America that he had demonstrated during the 1980 election, Ronald Reagan seized the chance to expand the statue’s centennial into a major extravaganza called “Liberty Weekend.”  Events were planned for the Fourth of July weekend rather than the October date that coincided with the 1886 dedication.  This choice allowed planners to cement the symbolic meaning of the statue to the rhetoric of American heritage, patriotism, and identity.  Lee Iacocca, then CEO of Chrysler Corporation and the chair of the Centennial Committee, emphasized this renewed sense of national pride when he introduced the president at the beginning of the ceremony as the “man who made it fashionable to be a patriot again.”

Certainly the celebration’s lavish and nearly continual use of spectacle and star power was intended by the government to promote national pride and acceptance of certain mythologies of the American heritage—especially the romanticized link between the nation’s immigrant past and the ideal of unparalleled economic opportunity for all.  Scholar Simone Davis claimed that the “very restoration and rededication of the statue can be figured as a material reclaiming of a carelessly lapsed tradition.”  As she noted, the physical restoration of the Statute of Liberty lent a potent symbolism to Reagan’s
themes of the revival of liberty and patriotic sentiment. Commercial sponsors echoed these themes in their calls for people to contribute to the refurbishing of the statue. An American Express ad proclaimed that the Lady in the harbor needed restoration because it was not only a symbol of liberty but a “symbol to the world of what all America stands for.”

Part of Reagan’s fostering of national pride was to convince American citizens that they lived in a country where liberty and love of freedom were pervasive, then suitably defining liberty so that this idea was seen as self-evident. Reagan looked back to the early republic to give his definition of liberty the historical mythos of heritage, and found an appropriate voice in the words of Alexis de Tocqueville. For the president, as well as de Tocqueville, the American dream of liberty was defined by the absence of legal barriers and limitations on the individual. This definition of liberty as a central theme of American heritage to foster unity became more explicit in another of Reagan’s speeches during the commemoration. He stated that what made Americans “a people” was “our love of liberty.” This presumption of an American consensus dominated much of the 1986 event, and was reflected again when the president commented on a parade of naval vessels, comparing the freedom of the ships to move through the ocean and chart their own course to “our conception of liberty” and to be “as free as the wind.”

These sentiments were repeated time and time again in commercial advertising surrounding the celebration, as well as at the ceremonies of the Freemasons’ 100th anniversary service of the pedestal dedication in 1984. The Reagan administration and the many corporate sponsors of the statue’s centennial redefined the idea of liberty into
something uniquely American rather than a universal entitlement of all men, part of a heroic account of American history in perfect alignment with the wishes of the nation’s founders.\textsuperscript{81} The monument had become thoroughly Americanized.

A romanticized story of immigration to America was deployed continuously to enrich this uncritical version of the nation’s past, present and future. Immigrant motivations were separated from the complexities of history and reduced to a single minded pursuit of liberty itself. In many of the officially publicized immigrant narratives, newcomers were portrayed as people who came seeking economic freedom more than any other kind. One spokesman claimed that immigrants came because they knew material rewards awaited them and that the America had “streets paved with gold.”\textsuperscript{82} Similar interpretations came to dominate much of the discourse of the celebration. A Catholic priest asked Americans to be ready again to welcome newcomers to the nation’s shores, and not forget where they came from and where they were going.\textsuperscript{83}

Selling the story of American immigration as one of the defining factors of American heritage also allowed Reagan to neglect other American stories that challenged his portrayal of America and American liberty, such as those of African Americans and Native Americans. As Davis charges, Liberty Weekend allowed officials to invent a “pain-free past” for America.\textsuperscript{84} Reminiscent of Franklin Delano Roosevelt’s use of an idealized vision of immigration at the 1936 celebration despite the reality immigration restrictions and his refusal to allow large numbers of war refugees into the country, Reagan’s immigration policy was described as “hardline.” Boime pointed out the contradictions between the rhetoric of Liberty Weekend and Reagan’s actual policy, which welcomed Communist refugees but did not encourage those seeking to escape
terrible situations in South America, and even lent support to fascist movements. These disjunctions indicate how disconnected the evocation of heritage can be from past and present, losing the country in a gentle mythology rather than the hard realities of both.

While echoing Reagan’s ideas about liberty, corporate sponsors were eager to use the statue in advertising. Businesses that donated money to the restoration campaign were allowed to use the official centennial symbol in their marketing, thus encouraging consumers to support the restoration of the statue—and by extension, the country’s image—by their patronage of certain companies. Reagan’s connection between liberty and the economic opportunities offered by capitalism made it even easier for corporate goals to fit around widespread ideologies about liberty. In their ads, many companies echoed the idea of America as a land of economic opportunity, and urged people to buy their products, not only to help fund the statue restoration, but to support American liberty. Like the American Express card ad quoted above, advertisements urged Americans to restore the hundred-year-old symbol of freedom and justice, and by default, to use the product as well. Nicholas Kittrie, a reporter for the Christian Science Monitor, wrote:

The time has come to reassert our revolutionary commitment. Our position and goal have not changed from those articulated in the Declaration of Independence. We believe in the rights of people to self-determination. We believe in private property and in free enterprise. We believe that enlightened self-interest and political as well as economic competition are essential ingredients for bringing change and progress.

Reiterating many of Reagan’s components of liberty—referring to the early republic through the Declaration of Independence, linking liberty to free enterprise, and finally defining liberty as the free expression of enlightened self-interest—Kittrie challenges
anyone who might protest against corporate involvement, as well as echoing the idea of American exceptionalism.

However, as at all previous celebrations, the official government and corporate discourses about liberty did not go uncontested. Many people objected to the corporate tone of the proceedings. In a column run during the spectacle of Liberty Weekend itself, Anna Quindlen humorously complained about the many corporate uses to which the statue was put: “…the foam rubber Liberty headdresses, the Liberty bikinis, the facsimiles carved from paraffin, marble, chocolate or soap, the television advertisements with people talking in deep voices about ‘golden doors’….” Alienation from the ceremony’s commercialism was also strongly reflected in Rushworth Kidder’s newspaper article of July 2, 1986. Kidder went to Liberty, Maine, to see how the commemoration was being celebrated in a town of that name. Noting the absence of Statue of Liberty paraphernalia around town, even on official government buildings, Kidder questioned a resident about it and got the response, “It just seemed too clichéd.”

Feminists also used this opportunity to protest the overtly corporate tone of the ceremonies. In 1986 Women Rising in Resistance, an organization fighting for women’s rights, tried to reclaim the statue as a symbol for “women and women’s causes.” Some of their activities included singing “You Can’t Kill the Spirit,” encircling the statue hourly, and passing out “a petition demanding that the U.S. government give the monument to women to compensate for failing to pass the ERA [Equal Rights Amendment].” These activities demonstrate that the statue still retained resonance as a symbol for people contesting hegemonic interpretations of liberty and protesting their lack of civil rights.
Many people also pointed out the falsity of the images Reagan projected with regard to the nation’s tradition of liberty, especially in his neglect of several different groups. African Americans in particular felt so alienated by Reagan’s notions of heritage and liberty that some publicly wondered if the Statue of Liberty had any meaning for African Americans. Jim Haskins wrote an article to convince African Americans that they did have a relationship with the statue, and commented: “A common saying among blacks is that the Statue of Liberty has always had her back toward us.” Others publicly protested Reagan’s characterization of the American past and present-day liberty. Roger L. Green, chairman of New York’s Black and Puerto Rican Legislative Caucus, helped organize a demonstration on June 28, just before Liberty Weekend, to call attention to the African American experience and to “contrast the concept of liberty with current problems of the homeless, black veterans, and black children living in poverty.”

Conclusion

The American past is neither perfect nor uniform, and liberty is not a static value of heritage, but an ideal that has been contested and pursued throughout American history. Each celebration of the Statue of Liberty featured its own debates about American heritage and liberty. The dedication’s focus on capitalism and liberty concealed deep concerns about the nature of capitalism. In 1916, fears about World War I led to debates about the nature of liberty, its role as a guarantee of peace, and its uniquely American quality in contrast to Europe, which had succumbed to war. Organizers of the fifty-year anniversary of the statue in 1936 during the Great Depression, presented liberty as the ability to engage in capitalistic behavior without
government intervention, and stressed the belief that people willing to work hard would see economic rewards. The centennial of the Statue of Liberty in 1986 was a commemoration that reflected Ronald Reagan’s belief that liberty was individual opportunity and the absence of government limitations on personal freedoms.

The Statue of Liberty offers a physical site for Americans to celebrate the relationship between their personal histories and the collective histories that construct the national sense of self. For example, each year the Ladies’ Auxiliary to the Veterans of Foreign Wars holds a “birthday” celebration for the statue every October. From a ceremony in 1938 when the statue was presented with a giant birthday cake, to one in 1954 when the Korean Ambassador to the United States gave a speech about freedom and democracy, to the 2004 celebration which 1000 members of the Ladies’ Auxiliary, VFW, and Junior Girls’ Unit attended, these privately organized celebrations at the Statue of Liberty have continued. Whether in the midst of a publicly sponsored or privately funded celebration, or in individual visits to Liberty Island, Americans have gathered at the Statue of Liberty to celebrate their citizenship and their participation in American freedom since the early twentieth century. The statue’s designation as a World Heritage Site in 1984 has not hindered this process. Whether it has added another layer of meaning to the meanings visitors celebrate at the Statue of Liberty remains to be seen.

The scholar David Lowenthal claims that heritage “is still the term that best denotes our inescapable dependence on the past. What we inherit is integral to our being.” It is certainly true that the United States defines itself both by its vision of the future and its ideals of the past. Images of founding fathers setting up a government that would protect its citizens from too much legal interference, or immigrants carefully
selecting the country which would allow them the most freedom to conduct their lives, are both inspiring and challenging. While a perfect past may be comforting in some senses, it can also force honest citizens to hold idyllic visions of the present and the future. While national symbols like the Statue of Liberty can be used to represent these ideals, such symbols can also provoke discussion about the real lives and needs of citizens. Commemorative events at the statue have always provided the opportunity to confront the truth that national heritage does not always accurately or fully represent national experience. Celebrating the meaning of the Statue of Liberty can bring attention to what is lacking in civic and personal freedoms in contemporary reality.
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Chapter Four
The Immigrant’s Statue

Amid the dazzle of fireworks, salutes from tall ships, and invocations of liberty, viewers of the 1986 Statue of Liberty centennial witnessed numerous celebrations of America’s immigrant past. The fundraising campaigns for the statue’s restoration and officials’ Liberty Weekend speeches heralded the monument as a national icon of immigration. Performances and broadcasts featured ethnic dance, international folksongs, and patriotic ballads honoring the rags-to-riches stories of hardworking newcomers. The media also showed immigrants from around the globe being sworn in as American citizens. During the centennial and the decades that followed, others concerned with immigration and America’s image as a nation of newcomers linked the statue with their efforts, but with a different message. Indeed, they depicted America’s immigrant past and present in a more sobering light. Immigration activists and other public figures referenced the statue in rallies, speeches, and press commentaries to protest the closing of America’s reputed “Golden Door.” In fall 2003, the Immigrant Workers Freedom Ride adopted the statue as the symbol for their labor rights campaign, and others, too, noted discrimination and racism against newcomers from the Caribbean, Latin America, and Africa.

The statue has long stood at the center of a wide-ranging public discussion of liberty’s many meanings, but its transformation into a symbol of American immigration is especially striking. The plight of immigrants was mentioned neither in Revolutionary-era discourse on freedom nor in the deliberations of Frenchmen who planned the monument in the mid-nineteenth century. Yet, its association with the story of a “nation of immigrants” grew powerful in the twentieth century. This chapter explores how the statue became central to a particular version of the American immigration story. This story was highly positive and often romantic in its
tendency to see migration to the United States as an exercise in economic improvement and as an enactment of individual liberties. Interestingly, the strong attachment between the monument and newcomers actually peaked after restrictive and racist legislation of the 1920s significantly curtailed immigration. This chapter explores that irony and the statue’s sometimes ambiguous relationship with immigration, which exist despite the monument’s much-heralded iconic status in the minds of newcomers and others. From the monument’s dedication through the early twenty-first century, immigration’s most vehement advocates and opponents have crafted counter-narratives either to restrict immigration or to fight for newcomers’ rights. In some cases, those counter-narratives have invested the statue with a more civic notion of liberty emphasizing freedom to participate in public affairs.

The Birth of a Story of American Immigration

Bartholdi and Laboulaye intended the statue as a monument to “republican stability,” rather than an emblem of America’s welcome to newcomers. Indeed, historian John Higham states that the monument’s meaning had to “change profoundly before Americans could see its uplifted torch as a beckoning light to the huddled masses of the Old World.”¹ He and historian Rudolph Vecoli astutely argue that the statue’s public association with immigration did not fully flower until after immigration had significantly decreased in the 1920s and 1930s. They note, too, that the monument’s initial link with immigration existed primarily in newcomers’ own minds. Still, the statue’s more pervasive link with immigration did begin early in its life, produced gradually through a mingling of newcomers’ impressions with public representations.² As immigrants and others began to associate the monument with immigration, they invested it with concepts of liberty which were more about personal freedom but and a bit less about the
need to meet obligations to insure that society was fair and free for all. It was this sense of personal liberty that heavily shaped national narratives and the idea that liberty was “the motive force that had peopled the wilderness and made the country that emerged what it was.”³

Even before the millions of immigrants who arrived in America in the last years of the nineteenth century and first years of the twentieth began associating the statue with their experience, certain newcomers already in the United States, along with members of the literati and the press, began linking the monument with immigration. They did so especially during campaigns to fund the monument’s pedestal. The best-known literary link between the statue and immigration, and the one that would have the longest lasting if not most immediate impact, was Emma Lazarus’s sonnet, “The New Colossus.” The sonnet was written for a December 3, 1883 auction to raise money for the pedestal. Writing with Jewish refugees from the 1881 Russian pogroms in mind, and influenced by socialists like Henry George, Lazarus cast the statue as a “Mother of Exiles,” who offered respite to the “huddled masses, yearning to breathe free.” Like American and French liberals before her, she construed liberty as the opposite of despotism or tyranny.⁴ The poem was not affixed to an interior wall of the pedestal until 1903 and was not read at the dedication. However, it was read at the auction and thus shaped elite New Yorkers’ and visiting dignitaries’ impressions of the statue.⁵ Moreover, it was representative of a growing body of poetry linking the statue with immigration. Edmund C. Stedman’s poem, published in Harper’s Weekly at the time of the dedication, implored,

Oh ye, whose broken spars
Tell of the storms ye met,
Enter! There are no bars
Across your pathway set.
Enter at Freedom’s porch,
For you I lift my torch,
For you my coronet
Is rayed with stars.⁶
Similarly, John Boyle O’Reilly’s “Liberty Enlightening the World,” was published in the *New York World* for the dedication and proclaimed,

> And hither ye weary ones and breathless,  
> Searching the seas for a kindly shore,  
> I am Liberty! patient, deathless,  
> set by Love at the Nation’s door.  

Such poems, along with “The New Colossus,” marked the beginning of the monument’s public association with immigration.

In addition to the verses they published, newspapers’ reports also highlighted the statue’s maternal welcome to immigrants. The *New York Evening Telegram* stated, “Standing upon the threshold of New York, which is the doorway of the Union, she will seem to offer the freedom of the New World to the thousands that shall flock to us from the Old…that freedom which gathers the downtrodden and oppressed to her bosom….“ Moreover, one newspaper’s report on the affixing of “The New Colossus” to the pedestal’s interior wall directly influenced public perceptions of the statue. This event was reported only briefly in the *New York Times*, but it did prompt one letter to the editor to mention both statue and sonnet in advocating more open immigration policy. Thus, while Higham is correct in stating that the Statue of Liberty’s pervasive public link with immigration would not fully develop until later in the twentieth century, it is clear that this association began to emerge early in the monument’s life.

Poets’ and other writers’ connection of the statue with immigration was reinforced powerfully by Joseph Pulitzer and his readers. Pulitzer used the pages his *New York World* to launch a vast public fundraising campaign for the building of the pedestal. Himself a Hungarian immigrant, he emphasized the need for America’s masses to fund the project to show solidarity with France’s common people, who had partially funded the monument’s construction. While Pulitzer did not direct his pleas specifically toward immigrants, his appeals did circulate in New
York immigrant newspapers like *Il Progresso Italo-Americano*. No matter where they read the appeals, many immigrants responded. Indeed, letters like one from a Russian Jew not only included a donation, but urged fellow newcomers to contribute as well:

> Please accept the enclosed small sum and add it to your Fund for the Bartholdi Pedestal. …I would send you more if I could, as I know how to appreciate liberty, because I am a Jew and emigrated from Russia to this city a few years ago. I think that the Germans who fled in 1848 to this country and the Jews who came here a few years ago from such countries where they have been persecuted as Russia, Germany, Hungary and Rumania, ought to support you in your noble undertaking, as I am one of them and know my feeling.\(^{11}\)

Thus, Pulitzer and his respondents encouraged immigrants to embrace the statue with a sense of collective ownership. Moreover, Pulitzer’s publication of such letters in the *New York World* publicized newcomers’ links to the statue for all readers to see, strengthening the monument’s public association with immigration.\(^{12}\)

> Once the pedestal was completed and the statue placed upon it, speeches made at the monument’s October 1886 dedication continued to highlight immigration, paving the way for later, stronger associations. Chauncey M. Depew offered the following:

> The rays from this beacon, lighting this gateway to the continent, will welcome the poor and the persecuted with the hope and promise of homes and citizenship. It will teach them that there is room and brotherhood for all who will support our institutions and aid in our development, but that those who come to disturb our peace and dethrone our laws are aliens and enemies forever.\(^{13}\)

The next speaker, French delegate A. Lefaivre, stated similarly,

> Among the thousands of Europeans who are daily conveyed to these hospitable shores, no one will pass before this glorious emblem without immediately perceiving its moral greatness and without greeting it with respect and thankfulness.\(^{14}\)

Ironically, Depew intended to forestall the statue’s symbolic association with all newcomers. In the wake of Chicago’s Haymarket Riot, which had broken out in May of that year following police violence at a labor strike, Depew extended welcome only to those who did not threaten
capitalism and its beneficiaries’ individual liberties. Even Lefaivre’s milder words attached a price tag to immigrants’ freedom in the form of the unflinching reverence they owed to the statue and the country it represented.\textsuperscript{15} Despite their attempts to narrow the Statue of Liberty’s welcome, such speeches continued to link the monument with immigrants in the public mind.

Long after the dedication speeches ceased to ring out, and as immigrants sailed past the statue in increasing numbers following Ellis Island’s 1892 opening, the monument’s connection to immigration continued to grow. Widely circulating popular magazines’ illustrations portrayed peasant steerage passengers saluting the statue. Moreover, newcomers’ personal reactions to the statue interacted with such depictions, especially those directed at an immigrant audience. While newcomers’ emotional reactions to the statue were certainly genuine, their impressions were sometimes influenced by popular culture and advertising images.\textsuperscript{16} Immigrants’ adoption of the monument as their symbol did not yet make it into a national icon of immigration, but their reactions did lay the groundwork for this phenomenon.

Various publications and printed materials circulating between America and Europe planted the Statue of Liberty in potential immigrants’ consciousness long before they set eyes on the monument itself. An early-twentieth-century Jewish New Year’s card published in Germany showed the statue standing amid images of progress, salvation, and faith, including a factory, a train, ships, anchors, life preservers, and Stars of David.\textsuperscript{17} (fig. 9, p. 165) Additionally, materials produced by the shipping lines that carried immigrants to America featured the statue. Cunard and Holland-America postcards showed the monument alongside their ships, while the cover of the guidebook \textit{Dall’Italia NewYork: Guida dell-emigrante 1902} portrayed immigrants gazing at the statue.\textsuperscript{18} Such transatlantic awareness and images of the monument simultaneously reflected and produced its symbolic value for immigrants. Printed materials encouraged newcomers and
potential immigrants to embrace the statue as their monument, even as the images’ creators capitalized on immigrants’ prior appreciation of the statue.

Newcomers’ arrival narratives confirmed that they had indeed heard and talked about the statue long before coming to New York. As Celia Rypinski recalled, “I saw the Statue of Liberty. And we all ran out and I prayed because I heard so much in Poland about it.” In 1916, an immigrant boy’s prior expectations of the statue informed his decision to contribute money toward its illumination:

Why do you know that before I came to America I had heard so much about the wonderful statue in New York Harbor that I looked forward with a great deal of pleasure and anticipation to seeing it when I came over? I was sorely disappointed, as we landed at night and left the city within a few hours and I did not get a chance to see it. I don’t want other people who came across from the other side to be disappointed as I was.

Mela Neisner Lindsay’s memory of her own and her father’s 1905 arrival affirmed not only knowledge of the statue, but also awareness of “The New Colossus” very soon after it was affixed to the monument’s pedestal:

…he recited in a voice barely audible but from the depth of his soul, the words he knew were inscribed at the base of the statue. He had learned them over two years before when he first decided to come to America. Later, I memorized the words in my school room in Kansas, where my family found new life as American farmers.

Newcomers’ narratives often articulated strong, emotional visions of individualistic liberty in connection to the statue. Although contested and complicated throughout its history, a variety of individualistic visions of liberty would become central to the statue and its place within a story of American immigration. Often, immigrants’ references to the monument as a symbol of their liberty mirrored and participated in a larger process of anticipating and glorifying new life in America. As Handlin explains, immigrants made “America” into a symbol of their aspirations toward individual liberties. They often used the statue in the same way. For those
like Edward Corsi, the monument was “This symbol of America—this enormous expression of what we had all been taught was the inner meaning of this country we were coming to....”

The individualistic liberties with which arriving immigrants invested the Statue of Liberty—as linked to preconceptions or early impressions of America—often emphasized hopes for new prosperity and wealth. Frequently, they conflated New York’s grandeur with hope for the future. Marta Forman recalled of her first glimpse of the statue and New York City in 1922, “‘That I will never forget. It was almost night, and you could see New York. Manhattan Island, all the lights! …And I was so excited.'” Sara Asher also remembered New York’s lights and skyscrapers in connection with her first sighting of the monument. Similarly, Celia Rypinski described the wondrous view she beheld along with her first glimpse of the statue: “I admired Brooklyn—I saw such pretty streets, and the green hedges. Brooklyn is a beautiful city, so green, and the green hedges that you trim. That was something new to me.”

Arnold Weiss’ memory of his 1921 arrival from Poland highlighted the monument’s link with the wealth he hoped to find in America:

Seeing the Statue of Liberty was the greatest thing I’ve ever seen….What a wonderful sight! To know you’re in this country. God, just think of it! I remember as a child people used to say to me, “In America you’d find gold in the streets. The streets of gold! And as a child I said to myself, “Gee, we’re in America. Now I can go out in the streets and pick up gold.”

In contrast to this childhood naiveté, an Italian immigrant who arrived in 1917 linked the statue’s promise of economic liberty not with urban grandeur and golden streets, but with individual thrift and industry:

…I shall never forget when we first saw the “Statue of Liberty,”…everyone hollering and screaming and crying with joy. It all meant that we entered a into a country of freedom and “Liberty” to all…. My father was already here paving a way for us, and by working and saving and self-discipline, he was able to save money to bring his whole family to a new life.
Other immigrants who associated the statue with individual liberties emphasized salvation and protection of rights from abuses endured in old homelands. Moreover, they often imbued the monument with divine and maternal qualities. An elderly Ukrainian woman stated, “When you see that Liberty Statue, when you see that open hand, it’s the greatest feeling. It’s like going to heaven and God accepts you.” Likewise, Celia Rypinski and others remembered their first sighting as an occasion for prayer and thanksgiving to God. Recalling his own and fellow passengers’ reaction, Edward Steiner expressed similar feelings: “The steerage is still mute…. Slowly the ship glides into the harbor, and when it passes under the shadow of the Statue of Liberty, the silence is broken, and a thousand hands are outstretched in a greeting to this new divinity to whose keeping they now entrust themselves.” The statue’s welcome was magical for some children. Mela Neisner Lindsay recalled, “The statue lady looked down on me…. I knew at once that she had recognized us, had even waited for us! ‘Oh, Papa,’ I cried, pointing into the swirling sea mist, ‘the goddess has waded into the water to meet us!’”

The first view of the Statue of Liberty upon entrance into New York Harbor’s calm waters also represented literal and metaphorical respite, conflating freedom from old homelands’ turmoil with freedom from steerage’s discomforts. While newcomers’ narratives of such experiences articulated a largely individualistic vision of liberty, some also captured the collective and cathartic experience of finding peace and freedom from past abuses. Sara Asher recalled,

…about four or five o’clock in the morning we all got up. The whole boat. Everybody came out after such a trip, came out on the boat and facing the shore…. The sunshine started, and what do we see? The Statue of Liberty! Well, she was beautiful with the early morning light. Everybody was crying. The whole boat bent toward her because everybody went out…everybody was in the same spot. We had been sinking and we survived and now we were looking at the Statue of Liberty.
Here, the first sighting of the monument embodied immigrants’ hopes for a new life in America, as the sun appeared to illuminate the statue as if on cue. Mela Neisner Lindsay recalled her family’s and her fellow travelers’ reaction after she had been led up from the “deep well of steerage into the daylight of a new world,” and highlighted freedom to realize fullest individual potential through learning:

“See,” he [her father] said, “how even now, she holds high the torch and brings the book. Surely, this is the beauty of freedom and knowledge!” Extending his free arm to Mama and my sister, he pressed them forward. “Look, my family,” he cried, “so that you will see and always remember.” As we stood silent with Papa’s strong arm around us, the morning sun broke though the mist and washed the sails of countless small ships with silver light. All around us people thrilled to the long awaited sight. Some sang songs of praise in strange tongues. Some wept for joy. Others remained silent, their eyes glistening with fierce hope.35

In contrast to these idealized visions, some immigrants soon realized that their first glimpse of the statue marked but a temporary respite. Eleanor Lenhart recalled of her 1921 arrival from England that the statue “was a beautiful sight after a miserable crossing...opening a new world to those who would accept the challenge. Well—we did. And the challenge began the moment we entered New York Harbor.” She then described the days her family spent quarantined and “treated like cattle” on Ellis Island.36 Mrs. Roy Abdnour, who came from Lebanon, recalled that her first view of the monument was followed by deportation, necessitating a second attempt to enter America.37 But despite the hardships some recounted, most immigrants articulated a positive and individualistically oriented vision of America and its liberties, emphasizing improvement over what was left behind and the promise of what was to come.

After sailing past the statue, newcomers did not leave it behind in the harbor or in their memories. In both private life and public arenas, they continued to build off the meanings they had first attached to the monument, and fashion new meanings for it in connection to local, national, or international events. In their families, immigrants told their American-born children
stories of joyful and tearful first sightings, and they continued to emphasize the monument’s offer of opportunity. They repeated such stories decades later in letters accompanying donations for the statue’s 1986 restoration, and in poems and essays written for the monument’s centennial. In popular culture, print, and public spaces as well, the Statue of Liberty continued to be associated with immigration. The cover of a 1912 piece of Yiddish sheet music showed the monument and a young, newly arrived immigrant. Other images produced during the peak years of immigration and circulating within New York immigrant communities continued to highlight the monument’s maternal welcome. A 1909 New Year’s card produced by the Hebrew Publishing Company in New York showed “Liberty” unlocking America’s gates while another American symbol, the bald eagle, hovered above. The card’s translated caption read “Matron America Opens the Gates of a Just Nation.” Among Catholic immigrants, the statue also retained religious meanings, as in the case of an Italian immigrant woman who placed a miniature replica of “Santa Liberta” on her bureau next to her Madonna of Montevergine. For a Russian immigrant who constructed a statue replica atop his West 64th Street warehouse in 1902, the monument perhaps continued to symbolize new economic opportunities.

While the statue retained its individualistic associations in some instances, in others it became linked with civic responsibility and collective survival amid the best and worst that America offered. Here, the monument no longer just symbolized personal hope; rather, it came to represent civic liberty in connection to immigrants’ efforts to help one another and to exercise their rights. Guides published by and for newcomers often featured the statue, as exemplified by the title page of an 1893 booklet produced by the Bogopolor Unterstutzungs Verein, a New York-based benevolent society promoting mutual assistance and sociability among Jewish immigrants. Immigrant newspapers, which provided valuable information and helped shape new
communities, likewise featured the statue. The monument appeared on the cover of an 1898 New York Czech publication called *Americky ‘Sbornik*, on the Ukrainian newspaper *Svoboda’s* masthead in 1921, and in the *Armenian Encyclopedic Almanac 1925*.43

In addition to immigrants’ own uses of the Statue of Liberty in connection with civic liberty and participation in American society, others adopted the monument in promoting newcomers’ education and their assimilation. The statue appeared on citizenship manuals and English literacy materials published by public authorities and civic organizations. In a public school pageant, a child dressed as the statue welcomed her schoolmates, who were clad in ethnic dress.44 (fig. 10, p. 166) By 1923, school textbooks like *The History of the American People* and *My Country, A Textbook in Civics and Patriotism for Young Americans* instructed immigrants’ children in civic participation and included photographs of newcomers saluting the statue. Three years later, a curriculum bulletin showed that fourth-graders as far from New York as St. Louis, Missouri were learning about the statue’s significance to immigrants.45

International events, especially World War I, also shaped immigrants’ perceptions and uses of statue in connection to individualistic and civic liberty. Wartime references revealed heightened American identity and patriotism, as well as visions of liberty tied to former homelands and global issues. A German immigrant said of his willingness to help fund the statue’s 1916 illumination, “Well, I am not an American, but I have enough patriotic feeling in me to see the Statue of Liberty, standing for what she claims to be, illuminated at night as well as by day, so I will gladly give my share….?” Another subscriber, who identified himself as an “anti-hyphen immigrant,” highlighted the monument’s representation not only of assimilation, but of freedom of expression and potential world peace:

Well do I first remember the thrill it gave me when first observing Miss Liberty on my arrival from Europe a few years ago. I consider that every immigrant to the land of
Washington, Jefferson and Lincoln, who has found that liberty here is not a myth, even if it be only the freedom of expressing one’s opinions about the doings of the Government, should willingly subscribe to this fund…. If all the European nations now at war had absorbed the ideas that led to the building of Miss Liberty…they surely would not be slaughtering one another in such a barbarous manner as they are doing.46

In addition to illumination efforts, Liberty Bond campaigns, as part of the “One Hundred Percent Americanization” assimilation crusade, encouraged immigrants to associate the statue with civic liberty and responsibility. They contributed to the monument’s transformation into an icon of American immigration by significantly advancing its public and officially sponsored link to newcomers. Government-issued posters implored, “Remember Your First Thrill of American Liberty,” or “You came here seeking Freedom—You must now help preserve it,” joined illustrations of newcomers saluting the statue to promote civic duty. Such notices reached immigrants in the foreign-language press.47 (fig. 11, p. 167) Moreover, President Woodrow Wilson’s speeches echoed such sentiments and called for increased displays of patriotism. Some immigrants responded by staging pageants and ceremonies featuring the statue. According to the Bohemian-American newspaper Denni Hlasatel, “one of the most attractive items” in an April 26, 1918 “Liberty Day” parade in Chicago “was the ‘Allegoric Carriage’ upon which girls representing thirty different nations were grouped around ‘Liberty,’ posed by Mrs. F. Pressnet.”48

Both the “anti-hyphen immigrant” and Chicago’s Bohemians referenced the Statue of Liberty as a symbol of assimilation and civic responsibility, perhaps attempting to ward off nativist reprisals that the war had unleashed. Indeed, native-born Americans sometimes suspected their immigrant counterparts of harboring conflicting loyalties or accused them of outright disloyalty to America. Such beliefs resulted in attempts to restrict immigration and deport some newcomers already in the country. Despite these threats, some World War I-era
immigrants expressed loyalty to new and old homelands, and invoked the statue to express desires for liberty in America and Europe. While advocating civic responsibility, such references came full-circle to foreground hopes for individualistic liberty in old homelands.

Chicago’s Bohemian immigrants discussed links between personal and political individual liberties in America and in Bohemia. They used the statue in farewell ceremonies for Bohemian-Americans joining the Bohemian army to fight Austria-Hungary. Denni Hlasatel reported the event as follows:

The second part of the program was begun with a battle song.... The last verse of the song was sung before a Statue of Liberty.... The dedication was clothed [sic] in the following words: “Take this banner and battle courageously under it for the liberty of our enslaved old homeland; bring it victoriously to our Mother, Prague; carry it through Czech and Slovak lands as the symbol of the love which the American Czechs and Slovaks harbor for the motherland....” An apotheosis of Slovak volunteers serving in the various Allied armies, and also of Slovak girls rendering homage before a Statue of Liberty, closed the memorable evening to the strains of the “March of the Czechoslovak Army.”

The statue’s significance to this community was again evinced when Czech soldiers formed a human Statue of Liberty to celebrate President Wilson’s October 1918 proclamation of American support for an independent Czech Republic.

Polish-Americans likewise used the statue in ceremonies and parades honoring American and Polish patriotism. As described in the Polish immigrant newspaper Dziennik Zwiazkowi, an event honoring Chicago-area enlistees in the American and Polish armies used the monument to highlight individualistic liberty and Poland’s struggles against autocratic rule:

St. Casimir’s Parish held a great celebration yesterday on the occasion of the consecration and unfurling of two service flags, Polish and American.... Behind the flags marched the figures of “Uncle Sam” and “Liberty,”...following whom five young women dressed in American costumes carried an American service flag containing 521 stars....

In addition, the ceremony’s speeches emphasized past cooperation between Poles and Americans like Casimir Pulaski and Thaddeus Kosciuszko to achieve liberty during the American
Revolution. They called for further cooperation to defeat the Germans and secure individualistic liberties for Poland. Other Polish-American parishes held similar ceremonies and parades featuring a statue-like “Goddess of Freedom.”

By the 1920s, the Statue of Liberty had become a key symbol of liberty for the many immigrants who had streamed to America’s shores in the preceding decades. It was also becoming increasingly linked with immigration in the public mind. While the monument sometimes signified civic liberties, individualistic ones often prevailed and would become increasingly dominant. Indeed, immigrant arrival narratives’ conception of liberty as a lofty ideal, detached from the realities of daily life, as well as their positive portrayal of the immigrant experience and its link to the nation, would serve later celebrations of capitalism and nationalism in connection with the statue.

Emerging Contestations of the Statue and the Story of American Immigration

Despite many immigrants’ positive responses to the statue and the idealized visions of liberty attached to it, less positive views of the immigrant experience and the monument also shaped the statue’s story. As Albert Boime notes, “A monument to liberty may be subject to monopolization by those who are able to control public discourse, but it will never be without its deconstructing critics.” The statue was contested in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries both by immigrants and those opposed to their presence on American shores. Nativists ironically helped link the statue with immigration, although to them the monument usually represented not newcomers’ liberty, but American values and native-born individuals’ rights. Occasionally, they also saw the monument as a symbol to be rejected because of its ties to immigration. In response to nativism and other hardships, some immigrants saw the statue not
as a welcoming “Mother of Exiles,” but as a cruel guardian of the nation’s “Golden Door.” For them, she symbolized ideals of liberty but not the actual experience of life in America.  

Nativist uses of the statue arose amid efforts to protect native-born Americans’ political rights, economic opportunities, health and welfare, and social values through immigration restriction. Although not significantly curtailed until World War I’s outbreak and 1920s legislation, attempts to restrict immigration and cast aspersions on newcomers were well afoot in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. The 1850s anti-immigrant and anti-Catholic Know-Nothing Party experienced a revival in the 1880s, and the American Protective Party, founded in 1887 with a similar agenda, reached its zenith by 1896. In 1894, Boston elites formed the Immigration Restriction League to limit migration from Southern and Eastern Europe through literacy requirements. The twentieth-century incarnation of the Ku Klux Klan targeted not only African Americans, but immigrants, Jews, and Catholics. Often, organized labor joined such groups’ efforts, seeking to protect native-born workers’ jobs amid unemployment, inflation, and falling farm prices. Several early acts legislated these groups’ sentiments. The Chinese Exclusion Act of 1882 denied citizenship and excluded laborers. Other legislation that same year barred lunatics, idiots, and paupers from entering America. Bans in 1903 and 1907 excluded anarchists, beggars, epileptics, imbeciles, young orphans, and tuberculars.

The press captured the public opinion behind nativist groups and legislation, sometimes referencing the Statue of Liberty as a symbol eschewed by immigration opponents because of its links to newcomers. An 1892 anecdote in the *New York Times* asserted,

> There is a woman in the city who…has not yet looked at the Statue of Liberty, and will not, because “she stands there in the harbor beckoning to all Europe to come over.” When she crosses the bridge she seats herself with her back to the bay, so that she may not inadvertently let her eyes rest upon the statue, or perhaps that she may express her contempt for the welcoming attitude of the goddess. The recent importation of typhus to
our shore had doubtless added to her disapproval of the hospitality which Miss Liberty attitude typifies.\textsuperscript{58}

Three years later, New England patrician and \textit{Atlantic Monthly} editor Thomas Bailey Aldrich voiced such fears in his poem “Unguarded Gates:”

\begin{quote}
O Liberty, white Goddess! is it well
  to leave the gates unguarded? On thy breast
  fold Sorrow’s children, soothe the hurts of fate,
  lift the down-trodden, but with hand of steel
  stay those who to the sacred portals come
  to waste the gifts of freedom.
  Have a care lest from thy brow the clustered starts be torn and trampled in the dust.\textsuperscript{59}
\end{quote}

Nativists linked the statue to immigration most starkly in political cartoons critiquing foreigners’ threats to American liberties and values. They portrayed the monument as a symbol of a nation besieged by pollution, housing shortages, disease, and the onslaught of anarchists, communists, and other alleged subversives. Such images appeared mainly in middle-class popular magazines. They appeared in response to proposed increases in New York’s immigrant processing capacity or in connection to specific political campaigns. When a new immigrant processing station was proposed on Bedloe’s Island in 1890, a cartoon in \textit{Judge} depicted the statue as “the future emigrant lodging house.” Expressing fears about the statue’s literal desecration by newcomers, as well as fears about immigrants’ threat to the liberty it represented, the cartoon showed the monument encumbered by a tenement-style fire escape and clothesline. That same year, \textit{Judge} published a scathing image of a sneering statue raising her robe to protect it from the newcomers “European Garbage Ships” dumped at her feet.\textsuperscript{60} \textit{Puck}’s Louis Dalrymple painted a still starker picture, depicting the remnants of the statue collapsed amid the squalor of immigrant shacks. Atop the pedestal, New York’s Republican leader “Boss Platt” posed pompously.\textsuperscript{61} (fig. 12, p. 168) Plans to turn Bedloe’s Island into an immigrant processing station were abandoned, but the 1892 opening of Ellis Island provoked similar responses. \textit{The
Evening Telegram published a cartoon of the Statue of Liberty holding her nose, instead of raising her torch, as “the Dregs of Europe,” flooded her feet. In her other hand, she clutched a bottle of carbolic acid, and her tablet read, “Immigration stopped for twenty days. Why not twenty years?”

Early twentieth-century cartoons continued to depict the statue as a symbol of American liberties threatened by immigrants. A 1909 Puck cartoon titled “The Fool Pied Piper” warned of political subversives, especially those associated with the Black Hand society of nationalists and anarchists in Italy, Spain, and Serbia. The cartoon’s pied piper, his flute labeled “lax immigration,” led a pack of ruinous rat-like figures labeled “Incendiary,” “Bandit,” “Convict,” and “White Slaver.” Their faces caricatured Southern and Eastern European men, and the statue clasped her hands to her face in alarm as they emerged from the ocean. After the outbreak of World War I and the Russian Revolution, cartoons continued to portray the statue under attack by foreigners often identified as Bolsheviks.

The xenophobic attitudes that inspired the above images peaked during World War I and into the 1920s. Drawing on fears of wartime immigrant disloyalty and of the potential for a massive influx of impoverished and dissident newcomers from war-torn countries, restrictionists succeeded in limiting immigration more fully than before. Their efforts and success stemmed in part from anxiety over the world-wide rise of Bolshevism, increasingly radical American labor activism, and the potential—voiced by a growing eugenics movement based in New York—for racial pollution within the American population. As fears mounted, politicians aimed to limit immigration in a variety of ways. The 1917 Immigration Restriction Act required newcomers to pass a literacy test. Enacted over President Woodrow Wilson’s veto and despite warnings that it would tarnish America’s welcoming reputation, the law did little stem the tide of immigrants.
Subsequent laws tried different tactics to limit alleged undesirables’ influence. The 1918
Immigration Restriction Act allowed for the deportation of immigrants belonging to or with
suspected ties to radical groups. Later and more influential laws were based on a racialized
quota system, which limited entrance of those groups judged inferior or unassimilable to an
Anglo-Saxon and Protestant-defined American way of life. The laws excluded such people,
especially Southern and Eastern Europeans and Asians, by fixing a low figure for the number of
such newcomers annually allowed into the country. The Quota Act of 1921 set entrance figures
according to a given group’s percentage in the population as of the 1910 census. This
formulation favored Northern and Western Europeans, since many Southern and Eastern
Europeans had arrived after that time. Still more restrictive, the Quota Act of 1924, also known
as the Johnson-Reed Act, set figures according to the 1890 census and limited overall annual
migration from Europe to 150,000. Together, these laws reduced immigration by approximately
85 percent, and similar provisions remained in the National Origins Act of 1929.

While supported by many, such measures sparked criticism among immigrants and their
advocates. Their critiques questioned America’s espoused welcome to newcomers and their
protests of restrictions sometimes invoked the statue as the immigrants’ symbol. English-
language newspapers, whose editors and readership may have largely favored restriction, rarely
employed the Statue of Liberty to critique anti-immigration legislation. But the foreign-
language press, whose readership was more sympathetic, did reference the statue on occasion. A
1924 cartoon in the socialist Yiddish-language newspaper Groyser Kundes portrayed President
Warren G. Harding “stealthily extinguishing Liberty’s flame while a United States Senator tries
to read the bill by its dimming light.” Observers from abroad also used the statue to critique
American immigration policy. Referring to the monument’s status in light of new immigration restrictions, one Frenchman remarked “We, too, raise monuments to the illustrious dead.”

The irony of enshrining America’s welcome to immigrants while simultaneously excluding them was embodied in President Calvin Coolidge’s designation of the Statue of Liberty as a national monument in the same year that the National Origins Act of 1924 was passed. Such ironies were not lost on immigrants of the 1920s or earlier eras. Many found America to be neither land of liberty nor of opportunity, and more than one third returned home voluntarily or involuntarily, driven by choice, harsh circumstance, or deportation. Consequently, not all newcomers embraced the statue as the “Mother of Exiles” and symbol of American liberty so often celebrated in arrival narratives. Instead, they invoked it as a symbol of liberties denied amid American hypocrisy and repression.

Such critiques dated back to the nineteenth century, occurring in response to pedestal fundraising campaigns, immigrant deportations, nativist legislation, and court cases involving newcomers. Pulitzer’s and others’ fundraising campaigns, which came shortly after the Chinese Exclusion Act of 1882, provoked the following response from Saum Song Bo in his 1885 “Chinese View of Statue of Liberty:”

…A paper was presented to me yesterday for inspection, and I found it to be specially drawn up for subscription among my countrymen toward the Pedestal Fund of the Bartholdi Statue of Liberty. Seeing that the heading is an appeal to American citizens, to their love of country and liberty, I feel that my countrymen and myself are honored in being thus appealed to as citizens in the cause of liberty…. The statue of Liberty holding a torch which lights the passage of those of all nations who come into this country. But are the Chinese allowed to come? As for the Chinese who are here, are they allowed to go about everywhere free from the insults, abuse, assault, wrongs and injuries from which men of other nationalities are free? …Whether this statute against the Chinese or the statue to Liberty will be the more lasting monument to tell future ages of the liberty and greatness of this country will be known only to future generations.

Later in his essay, he emphasized specific freedoms of education and citizenship the statue supposedly represented, but which were in fact inaccessible to Chinese-Americans.
Early twentieth-century immigrants and those concerned with their plight continued to question the statue’s capacity to symbolize American liberty for newcomers. In the wake of President Theodore Roosevelt’s crackdown on socialists and anarchists, a 1908 edition of the Italian-American publication *Il Gruppo La Questione Sociale* used the statue to highlight hypocrisy regarding freedom of the press. It described America as:

…proud of the gigantic monument which rises at the mouth of the Hudson, [and] on the one hand guarantees the liberty to write our thoughts, while on the other it strangles our voice and breaks our pen. Under the skin of the Statue of Liberty is hidden, insidious and wicked, St. Ignatius Loyola.\(^71\)

During the Red Scares of World War I and the 1920s, deportees and those affiliated with radical political or labor movements contested the idealistic vision of the statue’s promises. For them, the Statue of Liberty represented a standard America failed to meet. Instead of enshrining hope, opportunity, and maternal protection for immigrants, it stood powerless against the ravages of American capitalism. Reacting to her deportation in 1916, Russian Bolshevik and feminist Aleksandra Kollontai asked,

Is that the Statue of Liberty? So tiny, lost in the noise of the harbour and framed against the soaring skyscrapers of the Wall Street banks. Was this powerless, tiny figure shrinking before the all-powerful gigantic skyscrapers, those guardians of financial deals, the Statue of Liberty we had pictured to ourselves?\(^72\)

One year later, Giuseppe Iannarelli, an organizer for the Worker’s International Industrial Union, expressed similar sentiments in a speech:

When the Italians enter this country they see the Statue of Liberty and they breathe freely thinking to themselves that they have at last left the autocratic government and are in the land of the free. Shortly after their arrival they realize their mistake, they become slaves to the capitalists who own them soul and body.\(^73\)

Radical leader Emma Goldman asserted the statue’s impotence in the face of hardship, and she likened America to other repressive regimes. Although Goldman, who came to America in 1885, did not see the statue upon arrival, she included a fabricated account of a first sighting in
her autobiography, *Living My Life*. There, the statue symbolized immigrants’ dreams for liberty in their new homeland:

Ah, there she was, the symbol of hope, of freedom, of opportunity! She held her torch high to light the way to the free country, the asylum for the oppressed of all lands. We, too...would find a place in the generous heart of America.\(^7^4\)

Later in her autobiography, Goldman contrasted such idealism with the bitter realities the statue had come to represent. Describing her 1919 deportation to the Soviet Union, she wrote,

Through the port-hole I could see the great city receding into the distance, its sky-line of buildings traceable by their rearing heads. It was my beloved city, the metropolis of the New World. It was America, indeed America repeating the terrible scenes of tsarist Russia! I glanced up—the Statue of Liberty!\(^7^5\)

In 1920, radical Carlo Tresca, in his New York newspaper *Guardia Rossa*, decried the denial of individual liberties through repression of free speech, police brutality, and lynching. He proclaimed:

When the ship which transported us to America passed before the historic, colossal Statue of Liberty there was a joyous rush to the side; all eyes were fixed on that torch of light, seeking to penetrate the breast of that woman, symbolizing the most dear of human aspirations, *La Liberta*, to see if there was a heart within which beat for all of the political refugees, for all of the slaves of capital, for the disinherited of the world...Now I am disillusioned.... Perhaps I will pass again, still a pilgrim of the faith, before that statue. Like so many of my comrades—perhaps I will be DEPORTED before these vibrant pages will be read by the Italian workers who suffer, aspire, struggle. Oh, that torch will no longer shine the light it did!\(^*^7^6\)

Still more grimly, anarchist Luigi Galleani responded to the prison death of Andrea Salsedo by transforming a symbol of welcome into one of violent repression:

This monstrous colossus [sic], this republic of the heart of anthracite, with the forehead of ice, with the goiterous throat; this statue of cretinism...whose hands are armed with a whip, from whose lips are suspended a knife and a revolver....\(^7^7\)

The xenophobic climate that fueled deportation and persecution of immigrants persisted through the 1920s, culminating in the notorious trial of Italian immigrants and alleged subversives, Nicola Sacco and Bartolemeo Vanzetti. They were charged with armed robbery and
murder at a Massachusetts bank in April 1920, and their conviction and execution in August 1927 sparked a flurry of scathing critiques featuring the statue. While these occurred primarily in foreign mainstream and socialist presses, these reports and accompanying cartoons were paraphrased and described in American publications like the *New York Times*. Most cartoons transformed the statue’s torch or other features to denounce capitalism, repression of free speech, and travesties of the American justice system. Just before the executions, *De Notenkraker*, a satirical supplement to the Amsterdam socialist paper *Het Volk*, showed the torch belching clouds of smoke, with the caption, “Liberty’s flame turned into smoke.”

Likewise, a cartoon in Vienna’s socialist *Abend* depicted the statue raising a gibbet in place of her torch and showed workers and socialists enslaved by greed; thus, the cartoon used the statue to represent the capitalism’s corruption of the American justice system. More scathing still were images of the monument with the electric chair in which Sacco and Vanzetti were to die. The Paris *Martinal* published a large front-page image of the statue “holding aloft an electric chair instead of the torch of liberty.” Likewise, German-born artist George Grosz depicted a blood-spattered Statue of Liberty with its torch replaced by an electric chair. It stood before an American flag reversed to signal distress. Even a newspaper like *Acht-Uhr Abendblatt*, described in the American press as “not radical in its views,” published cartoons of the shattered statue tumbling into the harbor, replaced by an electric chair. After the executions, Secretary of the Miners’ Federation and outspoken critic of the Sacco-Vanzetti case A. J. Cook echoed such sentiments at a London demonstration that denounced American capitalism and the executions. He stated, “The Statue of Liberty now stands before the world as a monument of murder.”

From the 1880s through the 1920s, vocal nativists and disillusioned immigrants contested the statue’s place in a positive American immigration story. These critiques set the stage for
similar contestations through the twentieth and early twenty-first centuries. Whether presenting the statue as a symbol tainted by links to newcomers, as a symbol of a way of life threatened by foreign incursion, or as a symbol of the cruel ironies and hardships immigrants faced, the counter-narratives produced during this period did link the statue with immigration. But other narratives would have to grow from the statue’s more positive and often individualistic associations before it could be fully transformed into a symbol of American immigration.

Wartime Transformations from the 1936 Commemoration through the Post-War Period

The rise of fascism, wartime refugee crises, and specific celebrations of the Statue of Liberty in the 1930s and 1940s continued to connect the monument with immigration and various visions of liberty. Indeed, the World War II era proved pivotal for the statue’s transformation into a revered icon of American immigration. This transformation depended on reconceptualizing immigration as a romanticized part of the nation’s past, emphasizing past newcomers’ civic contributions, and depicting the monument’s significance to select, worthy refugees. The dominant narratives advanced to effect this change would begin to strip the statue of its links to prior decades’ contentious class and racial struggles, and would also help shield it from new controversies. Ironically, such distancing and civic emphases were necessary for the statue’s emergence as an icon of American immigration. As Higham astutely observed,

So long as millions of immigrants entered ‘the golden door,’ the Statue of Liberty was unresponsive to them…. After the immigrant ships no longer passed under the New Colossus in significant numbers, it enshrined the immigrant experience as a transcendental national memory. Because few Americans now were immigrants, all could think of themselves as having been immigrants. The Statue of Liberty helped them to do so. Since it belonged to all the people and on the broadest level symbolized that nation as a whole, the statue connected the special heritage of newer Americans with the civic principles of all Americans. Fundamentally, the new meaning engrafted on the Statue of Liberty in the second quarter of the twentieth century worked to close the rift that mass immigration had opened in American society.84
The statue’s transformation occurred in multiple arenas and was occasionally contested in them as well. The National Park Service, which began administering the statue in 1933, highlighted its representation of Franco-American friendship and abstract liberty. Politicians’, press, and other publications’ rhetoric advanced the monument’s link with past immigration, present refugees, and individual and civic liberties. Refugees’ reactions to the statue joined these affirmations. But as before, immigrants and their advocates also contested the statue’s meaning. Some supporters of more open policy noted that America’s welcoming image contrasted bitterly with reality. Immigrants themselves sometimes reacted ambivalently to the monument.

Political rhetoric of celebrations and commemorations figured prominently in making the Statue of Liberty into an icon of immigration. To an even greater extent than the 1886 dedication ceremony, the 1936 celebration of the statue’s Golden Jubilee advanced this transformation. President Franklin Delano Roosevelt’s Jubilee speech played an important role in this process, representing immigration as a central and romanticized part of the nation’s past and emphasizing newcomers’ capacity for Americanization and desires for individual liberties. He also highlighted immigrants’ potential for civic contribution and defense of liberty at home and abroad. Roosevelt introduced these themes by stating, “For over three centuries a steady stream of men, women and children followed the beacon of liberty which this light symbolizes,” and continued, “Within this present generation that stream from abroad has largely stopped. We have within our shores today the material out of which we shall continue to build an even better home for liberty.” Roosevelt connected this idealized portrayal of America’s immigrant past explicitly to the statue, asserting, “It is the memory of all these eager-seeking millions that makes this [the statue] one of America’s places of great romance.” While conscious of the nation’s
xenophobic climate, Roosevelt did not reference past or present harsh realities of immigration. Rather, he portrayed newcomers’ industry, courage, and moral strivings in America, where they found “the things they most desired…freedom of opportunity, freedom of thought, freedom to worship God…[and]…the freedom to live.” He also listed an array of individual freedoms including, “liberty of conscience, liberty of speech, liberty of the person, [and] liberty of the economic opportunity.” But typical of wartime uses of the Statue of Liberty to promote responsibility and patriotism, Roosevelt also advanced a civic vision. He asserted that immigrants “not only found freedom in the New World, but by their effort and devotion they made the New World’s freedom safer, richer, more far-reaching, more capable of growth.” In a strong conclusion to his speech and in reference to aggression abroad, Roosevelt tied the strands of past immigration, civic contribution, and liberty together, strengthening the statue’s links to these ideas and emphasizing the need to progress toward peace. He reminded Americans, “Liberty and peace are living things,” and proclaimed,

The realization that we are all bound together by hope of a common future rather than by a common past has helped us to build upon this continent a unity unequalled in any similar area or similar-size population in the whole world. It was the hope of those who gave us this statue and the hope of the American people in receiving it that the Goddess of Liberty and the Goddess of Peace were the same…. To the message which America sends to all the world must be added her message of peace.  

While others may not have articulated the statue’s significance so clearly, Roosevelt was neither alone in construing it as a symbol of past immigration, nor in highlighting immigrants’ potential to become Americanized, civic-minded citizens. On the latter point, one New York Times contributor said of the immigrant,

Often, perhaps, he is more American than many of the native-born. For him, the Statue of Liberty, first seen from the sea approach, has a poignant meaning, the guarantees of civil liberty are as new as this morning’s dispatches, and he can hold up his head with a new pride when his “final papers” are given him.
Regarding immigration’s role in the nation’s past, Attorney General Robert H. Jackson echoed Roosevelt’s sentiments in promoting solutions to Europe’s mounting refugee crisis. At the United Palestine Appeal Conference in January 1939, he stated, “even our own Statue of Liberty no longer beckons the oppressed,” and recommended Palestine as an alternative for refugees.90

While many shared the president’s views, his Golden Jubilee assertions sparked criticism of the nation’s actual policies. Writing for New Republic in 1936, James Benet critiqued the Roosevelt’s romantic vision. Like critics of earlier decades, he pointed out the harsh realities faced by newcomers, as well as occasions when America’s ostensive welcome fell ironically and tragically short. He juxtaposed excerpts from Roosevelt’s speech with reminders of recent deportations and increasing dangers faced in 1930s Europe, stating,

The crowd stops listening to the amplifier and turns to watch the harbor. No doubt it is thinking about the particular Liberty to which the statue is dedicated, the freedom of asylum: “Shall we refuse the unhappy fugitive from distress that hospitality which the savages of the wilderness extended to our forefathers arriving in the island?” (Friedrich Beyerbach, a refugee from Germany, entered the United States as a stowaway on the S.S. “Leviathan,” August 6, 1934. He was returned to Germany October 10 of that year.)91

Benet also noted the disjuncture between Roosevelt’s inspirational words and his administration’s policies:

He talks about the stream of immigration that built the country, the freedom that the immigrants found, and mentions too that “with this present generation that stream from abroad has largely stopped.” The rest is hope, symbols, faith, concerning liberty. If he had wanted to talk about the right of political asylum, he might have mentioned as an achievement of his administration the Palmisano Bill, passed in 1934, granting preferential treatment to Tsarist Russians which made their presence in the country legal and contained provisions for granting them citizenship. That same year Otto Richter, who had been forced to flee from Germany after the Reichstag Fire, when Storm Troopers beat him in an attempt to make him confess complicity in the fire, was arrested for deportation in San Francisco during the general strike.92

Furthermore, he criticized the President for consigning immigration to the nation’s past and for obscuring the challenges faced and overcome by many immigrants:
There is a lot of history in the speeches. There is not, though, much history that has to do with Joseph Pulitzer, who came here as a penniless immigrant himself and rose to be editor of a great paper. Pulitzer, storming and sweating in his office, browbeat the American people into putting up the $100,000 for the pedestal so that the Statue could be erected.  

Concluding that the Statue of Liberty was now a tarnished symbol of hope for immigrants, Benet quoted a World Almanac assertion that the monument “had begun to appear dingy.”

Despite such critiques, developments outside the political arena continued to transform the statue into an icon of immigration. Publications’ references to “The New Colossus,” as well as the sonnet’s increased visibility at the statue itself, helped effect this change. Like political utterances, references to the poem noted immigrants’ centrality to America’s past and their civic contributions. After its brief introduction to immigrants and others in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, the sonnet reentered the American consciousness and became more firmly linked with the statue in the late 1930s. It was popularized particularly by immigrant journalist Louis Adamic in his attempts to highlight newcomers’ contributions to American history. Hoping to promote ethnic pluralism and tolerance, Adamic quoted the poem in his books, including My America and From Many Lands, as well as in his pamphlets and public lectures. The sonnet also circulated in magazines, children’s stories, high school history textbooks, and political rhetoric throughout the 1940s. Starting in 1948, it became a regular feature in the World Almanac. Additionally, the poem’s link with the statue became more visible to the public in 1945 when the commemorative tablet bearing it was moved from the pedestal’s interior to the main entrance. “The New Colossus” also gained special resonance amid rising concern over the persecution of Jews and the plight of refugees. While immigration policy was not substantially altered to accommodate wartime refugee crises, the poem’s resurgence helped redefine America as a haven for victims of Nazi and fascist persecution. Thus, the statue that the
poem celebrated came to serve this function and was further transformed into an icon of American immigration.\textsuperscript{95}

While this transformation depended partly on distancing the Statue of Liberty from past immigration and on praising newcomers’ civic contributions, connecting the monument with refugees through the “The New Colossus” signified another important part of this process. Politicians, writers, and publishers promoting America as a haven for wartime refugees also advanced the statue’s iconic status. Invocations of the monument in calls for liberal immigration policy joined its symbolic welcome of past immigrants with assertions of immigration’s ongoing centrality to American identity. However, such references extended the statue’s welcome only to wartime refugees rather than to all immigrants. Roosevelt’s October 1939 speech to the Intergovernmental Committee in Washington exemplified this attitude in calling for aid to current and future refugees: “Remembering the words written on the Statue of Liberty, let us lift a lamp beside new golden doors and build new refuges for the huddled masses yearning to breathe free.”\textsuperscript{96}

Through calls for refugees’ admittance and coverage of their arrival, politicians, the press, and advertisers continued to use the statue through the war’s end to advance America’s image as a welcoming wartime haven. Postwar rhetoric continued to define America as a refuge to select war victims, rather than a home to all potential immigrants. Commenting in 1946 on the shift from mass immigration to the relatively small number of refugees entering America, one \textit{New York Times} writer stated, “We may never return to the old days when Emma Lazarus wrote her inscription for the Statue of Liberty.” He further noted the impossibility of saving the whole world’s “huddled masses,” but thought the nation should welcome “some of those most sinned-against of Hitler’s victims.” Echoing Roosevelt’s 1936 belief in immigrants’ civic
potential, he noted that not only would such action fulfill the obligations of common decency, but “some of the children who arrived [after the war] may be among our most useful citizens a decade or two hence…” On an optimistic note, he concluded with rhetorical flourish, “The lamp still shines,” and thus brought the statue’s association with aid to immigrants into the nation’s present.97

Postwar celebrations also used the Statue of Liberty to represent America as a wartime haven. The statue’s 1946 sixtieth anniversary celebration on Bedloe’s Island included twenty-one European refugee children, who joined with French delegates and members of civic, religious and patriotic organizations to pay tribute to the monument. The children’s presence poignantly recalled the statue’s role as “Mother of Exiles,” especially for those who had lost their families. A photograph published with the New York Times article on the event showed men and women in European ethnic costume posed in front of the statue with American and French flags. Thus, the image conflated the statue’s role in welcoming past immigrants with its role in welcoming refugees.

Despite positive images set forth by the press, this celebration also occasioned critique of American refugee policy and the statue’s iconic status. City Councilman Stanley M. Isaacs, speaking at the celebration under the auspices of the American Committee for the Foreign Born, criticized the government for not admitting more of Europe’s homeless. Likewise, American Jewish Congress officer Bernard Harkavy advocated changing “the American policy that keeps the doors of America closed to all but a trickle of the Jewish emigrants from displaced persons’ camps in Europe.” Mrs. James Cannon’s welcome to French delegates declared that “we should rededicate ourselves to the freedom and justice” exemplified by the statue, as “the torchbearer of freedom of the Western world.” Thus, she implied that Americans’ dedication to refugees had
A few days later, Rabbi David de Sola Pool linked the celebration of the statue’s sixtieth birthday and the admittance of more refugees, urging Americans to recall that the nation had been and continued to be enriched by immigrants’ contributions. Such writings and speeches contested consigning immigration to the nation’s past. Instead, they emphasized immigration’s ongoing and critical relevance in the present. Just as earlier immigrants and their advocates had invoked the monument to point out America’s broken promises to immigrants, these men and women used the statue to highlight America’s shortcomings as a haven for the oppressed.

Despite criticisms and limitations of American immigration policy during the 1930s and 1940s, the United States did admit many who sought either temporary or permanent asylum. As during immigration’s peak years, these wartime newcomers’ positive responses to the statue mingled with public representations of its link to their experience to advance its transformation into an icon of immigration. The New York Times, one of the nation’s most widely read newspapers, featured the statue as the object of immigrants’ praise, thus publicly asserting its significance to them. The press also referenced the monument in asserting that America was a haven and land of opportunity for refugees. Such coverage reinforced Roosevelt’s 1930s vision of America’s and the statue’s welcome. It also reinforced consensus in a nation which generally supported the war, but which remained divided over immigration policy.

During the late 1930s and early 1940s, famous or wealthy immigrants remarked on the statue’s significance. As reported in the New York Times, violinist Erika Morini said after her late August 1939 arrival, which followed closely the announcement of the Nazi-Soviet Non-Aggression Pact, “I’m so happy to be here…. When I saw the Statue of Liberty I just cried. It always touches me, but this morning it did more than ever.” Similarly, poet Sir William
Watson’s widow explained, “The United States is the only country left where the gates are open to all. I wept when I saw the Statue of Liberty, and I knew that my daughters and I would like to stay here forever if we can.” For this new group of wartime immigrants, the statue continued to be a welcoming “Mother of Exiles.” For readers of this press coverage, the statue increasingly became an icon of America’s welcome.

Refugees’ positive reactions to the statue continued as the war continued and as children were evacuated to America in ever greater numbers. A 1940 *New York Times* article reporting the arrival of over two hundred British children described the following:

The children were gathered together on the after deck in the tourist class where they traveled and as they stood huddled on the canvas-topped hatch-cover to pose for the newsreels their escorts told them to sing. They sang a song heard much at home, “There’ll Always Be an England,” but the words were lost in mumbles. They gazed around at the skyline, at the Statue of Liberty, and talked among themselves.

Later, the article mentioned two specific children’s reactions:

Audrey Hamilton, 10, of Chaddesden, Derby, said she had a birthday celebration on board, with a cake that she shared with her young brother David. Some one asked David how he liked the idea of coming to America. “He is very glad to come,” said Audrey precisely. “But he misses his mother a great deal. We are very excited at seeing the Statue of Liberty.”

Audrey Hamilton expressed personal interest in the statue and highlighted the monument’s significance as a “Mother of Exiles.” But the article’s description of children being posed and told to sing for newsreels revealed that not all immigrant responses to the statue were spontaneous. Rather, some were carefully orchestrated to project America’s image as a welcoming haven. By constructing such a poignant image of welcome that included the statue, newsreel images contributed to the monument’s iconic transformation. Just after the war’s end, a *New York Times* article describing temporarily evacuated children’s return to Europe was accompanied by a photograph of the children waving to the statue at the earlier time of their arrival into New York Harbor. Other post-war articles continued to describe refugee children
greeting the monument with waves and outbursts of song. Those who did not view the Statue of Liberty upon arrival expressed an interest in seeing it as soon as possible, and tours of New York City given to recently arrived children and young adults included visits to the monument.\textsuperscript{104}

Adults who came to the United States as war brides or under the 1948 Displaced Persons Act also expressed joy in words and in song when they first glimpsed the monument.\textsuperscript{105} Dolores Marie Ramey, an Algerian woman of French and Spanish descent, arrived in New York as a war bride in December 1944, at age 19. Writing to the statue at the time of its centennial, she asserted, “The day I had to go through Ellis Island was the most wonderful day of my life.” She also recalled the kindness of those who helped her at the processing station, and professed both her American identity and her love for the “beautiful lady.”\textsuperscript{106} Holocaust survivors Jacob and Helene Pepper also wrote to the statue at the time of its centennial. They had arrived in 1948, and they contrasted the monument’s embodiment of liberty and hope to the horrors they had endured in Europe:

\begin{quote}
We were many years in concentration camp by Hitler which our freedom was lost with no hope or Dream. I lost father, mother, 3 sisters, and 2 brothers perished. Was agony, hunger, torture, no food, no clothes, no place to live…we pointed to the Lady, the Statue of Liberty, the biggest Dream I ever had. We were free people. Never believed this could happen. But did. We here 37 years and love it. Raised 3 daughters, nice warm home and working as good tailor, we are happy and proud of America and the Lovely Lady.\textsuperscript{107}
\end{quote}

For such newcomers, as for earlier generations of immigrants, the statue represented America’s welcome and respite. It also embodied individual liberties, especially freedom from persecution and hardship, as well as the opportunity to build a new life.

As in the case of evacuated children, displaced persons’ and others’ reactions to the statue joined with press commentary that asserted the monument’s centrality to their arrival. In reference to the impact of the Displaced Persons Act, one writer stated,

\begin{quote}
Today 813 displaced persons will arrive in the land of their dreams. Survivors of the
concentration camps and slave labor gangs of Hitler, they will glimpse at last the Statue of Liberty.... The group is the first of the 205,000 homeless persons to come to the United States under the Displaced Persons Act, and New York City will give the newcomers a rousing welcome. For today is a red letter day also for the city, which once again becomes the gateway through which immigrants pass in their quest for a better life in the new world.  

Similarly, another writer construed the statue as a monument who “greeted” refugees fleeing the horrors of war and Nazism and arriving in America’s “promised land.” Such commentary promoted the statue’s transformation into an icon of immigration by emphasizing America’s role as a haven for refugees, linking its promise of opportunity for the war’s survivors to its welcome of earlier immigrants.

But as in the peak years of immigration, wartime newcomers did not always apprehend the statue as a symbol of unconditional welcome or Americanization. Indeed, their more subdued and pensive accounts of first sightings provided a counterpoint to the others’ and the press’s adulatory expressions. Doctor and writer Martin Gumpert, who emigrated from Europe in 1936, referred to the statue in explaining the slow and sometimes banal process of becoming an American. He stated in his *First Papers*:

> That external transformation can proceed but slowly. When the socks begin to show holes, when the first pair of shoes is bought, the first new hat acquired—these are way-stations in a mysterious metamorphosis that penetrates into every pore of one’ being—until at last, after a long period of contemplation and readjustment, one makes up one’s mind to buy an American tie. He who can [be made?] to wear an American tie is a citizen beyond doubt. For the workaday man the miracle of America begins not with the Statue of Liberty, but with the shirts, that have much shorter tails here than in Europe, and with the shoes, that are not placed outside the hotel door at night....

Indeed, for Gumpert, even the liberty supposedly promised by the statue could not be idealized:

> Freedom is no paradise. It is filled with danger, and without aim or order it becomes chaotic anarchy. There is much chaos in America at this time. The land is not yet weighed down with the ties and experiences to which the old world owed its pseudo-security. This land of abundance still lacks many of the institutions which the impact of progress created over there....
Likewise, Laura Fermi, wife of Nobel Prize winning physicist Enrico Fermi, expressed doubts over the statue’s relevance for her family, who had fled Italy in 1939. She recalled her family’s first glimpse of the monument in her *Atoms in the Family*:

> Soon the New York skyline appeared in the gray sky, dim at first, the sharply jagged, and the Statue of Liberty moved toward us, a cold, huge woman of marble [copper], who had no message yet to give me. But Enrico said, as a smile lit his face tanned by the sea: “We have founded the American branch of the Fermi family.” I turned my eyes down to examine my children…. Their tailor-made coats and light-gray leggings were different from those of other children on the boat. …I looked at Enrico and at his markedly Mediterranean features…. “This is no American family,” I thought to myself. “Not yet.”

Like some earlier newcomers, Fermi and Gumpert recognized that the idealized vision of immigration to which the statue was central sometimes contrasted with actual experience. They experienced disappointments and questioned the nature and the extent of the liberty that America offered. Despite their qualms, intellectual and skilled immigrants like Fermi and Gumpert would figure prominently in America’s postwar self-definition and the statue’s concomitant emergence as an icon of immigration. During the postwar period, the United States not only admitted war victims for humanitarian purposes, but increasingly sought skilled workers fleeing communist regimes. The Statue of Liberty’s link to past, romanticized mass immigration—as opposed to its realities—and its associations with select immigrants’ combined civic contributions and individualistic pursuits, would continue from the World War II era through the Cold War period.

**The Statue and Immigration in the Cold War: The Late 1940s through the Early 1980s**

The statue’s emergence as an icon of American immigration during the Cold War took shape amid efforts to define American national liberty against communist repression, changes in immigration policy, and the proliferation of melting pot ideologies. As during World War I, America sanctioned selective immigration while consigning mass immigration to the nation’s
past. But now America’s welcome to newcomers and the statue’s links to it were based on opposition to communism instead of Nazism and fascism. From the late 1940s through the early 1980s, immigration policy shifted in focus from World War II’s displaced persons to skilled and educated refugees from behind the Iron Curtain. In connection with such policy changes and Cold War agendas, politicians and other public figures, speaking at celebrations or at ceremonies to mark the signing of new immigration legislation, imbued the monument with notions of personal liberty. At the same time, their statements and those made in popular literature connected the statue with melting-pot ideologies that emphasized more the civic nature of American freedom. During this period, museums exhibits at the monument played an increasing role in making it into an icon of immigration.

The end of World War II and the birth of the Cold War spawned changes in attitudes and policy relating to American immigration. Beginning in the late 1940s, both politicians and corporations encouraged admittance of asylum seekers from Iron Curtain nations, sometimes referencing the Statue of Liberty. An advertisement sponsored by the International Latex Corporation quoted Secretary of State George C. Marshall’s address to Congress advocating admission of approximately 850,000 displaced persons who were said to be middle-class skilled workers fleeing Soviet tyranny. Marshall based his plea in part on the statue’s significance as a symbol of America’s welcome to “oppressed and freedom-loving people.” The advertisement not only asserted the economic benefits Americans would derive from admitting hard-working skilled immigrants, but also emphasized that immigration policy “had become a test of our sincerity and moral leadership in the world.” It continued, “It we put up our own iron curtain against these helpless victims of chaos it will not be they alone who lose. We, too, will lose something precious—the respect of our friends and faith in ourselves.” Such rhetoric echoed
wartime pronouncements of newcomers’ contributions to the nation, but with the new goal of defining America’s moral superiority over communism, rather than its humanity in contrast to Nazism and fascism.

Legislative and other changes soon followed political and corporate utterances. Legislation of the 1950s left 1920s quota systems largely unaltered, but aimed to limit infiltration of newcomers thought to threaten American democracy and promote admittance of those fleeing communism. The 1950 Internal Security Act, the 1952 McCarran-Walter Immigration Act, and Nationality Act increased screening for subversives. Privileging refugees from communist nations, President Dwight D. Eisenhower secured special asylum for Hungarian fugitives in 1952, and for thirty thousand more after the failed Hungarian Revolution of 1956. As these measures rendered America’s welcome to newcomers increasingly selective, immigration through New York Harbor receded into the past when Ellis Island closed as an immigrant processing station in November 1954. While a few immigrant arrival narratives from the 1950s recall entry past the statue before and even after Ellis Island shut down, the closing marked the end of an era. It advanced the process begun by President Roosevelt in his 1936 commemoration speech of distancing the statue from actual mass immigration and turning it into an icon of a romanticized past.

In speeches about the Statue of Liberty and immigration, public figures echoed the anti-communist ideology behind the era’s legislative changes. They especially highlighted the statue’s representation of American liberty to refugees from Soviet-bloc nations. In 1953, Alexandra Tolstoy, daughter of the Russian novelist and founder of an aid organization for refugees from communism, spoke at the V.F.W. Ladies Auxiliary’s annual observance of the statue’s birthday. Espousing the monument’s association with immigration and civic liberty,
Tolstoy emphasized the necessity of active immigrant participation in upholding American values and promoting them worldwide. She construed America as “not only a haven, where people can live in freedom, earning their and their families’ living,” but as “the hope of their world!” In contrasting communist tyranny to American liberty, she emphasized individualistic liberties available in America, including freedom of movement, religion, and occupation. She concluded by defining the statue as the “symbol of brotherhood of men, of good will, unity and love for humanity,” and by quoting from “The New Colossus” to emphasize the monument’s continuing currency to refugees from communism.

In the 1960s, politicians continued to invoke the statue as a beacon of hope to the Cold War’s oppressed peoples. For them too, it symbolized America’s promise to those industrious enough to reap individual liberty’s rewards, and for those who would assimilate and assume civic responsibility for preserving the nation’s freedoms. Presidents sometimes associated the statue with such individual and civic liberties in advocating the quota system’s demise. In 1963, John F. Kennedy reminded Congress:

> The famous words of Emma Lazarus on the pedestal of the Statue of Liberty read: “Give me your tired, your poor, your huddled masses yearning to breathe free.” Until 1921, this was an accurate picture of our society. Under present law it would be appropriate to add: “as long as they come from Northern Europe, are not too tired or to poor or slightly ill, never stole a loaf of bread, never joined a questionable organization, and can document their activities for the past two years.” …Furthermore, the national origins quota system has strong overtones of indefensible racial preference.

He based further calls for more open admissions criteria on the “contribution that immigrants can make” and to “our traditions of welcome.”

After Kennedy’s assassination and as tensions continued with Cuba, President Lyndon B. Johnson endorsed and signed the liberalized immigration legislation that Kennedy had advocated. On May 11, 1965, Johnson visited the statue to join Ellis Island and the statue as
the Statue of Liberty National Monument administered by the National Park Service, and advocated abandonment of the quota system in favor of skills-based admission. When Congress approved the change on October 3, 1965, Johnson signed the legislation at the statue. He alluded to the Lazarus sonnet, and declared that the nation was returning “to the finest of its traditions.” He announced plans to receive large numbers of Cuban anti-Castro refugees even as the legislation he signed restricted overall immigration from the Western Hemisphere. The decision to make these changes and statements at the statue continued to connect it with selective acceptance of newcomers willing to abandon communism and promote the American way of life. At the same time, officially linking the Statue of Liberty to the closed processing center connected the monument to waves of migration now consigned to the past.

As politicians and other public figures used the statue to symbolize America’s welcome to refugees from communism, its link to past mass immigration, and a combination of individualistic and civic liberties, writers invested the monument with similar meanings. Through rags-to-riches and melting pot portrayals of immigrants, they spread the statue’s association with immigration before ever-wider audiences. Natalie Miller’s 1965 children’s book, *The Story of the Statue of Liberty*, told the story of the statue’s development up to the dedication ceremony and ended by describing its significance for past immigrants:

Since [the dedication,] Miss Liberty, who began as a sign of the friendship of two nations, has come to mean freedom for the whole world…. Immigrants coming to America to find a new life, looked on her as a friend showing them the way to the land of freedom and a better life. The book’s conclusion further emphasized the past in references to the “New Colossus” and the museum of immigration being built in the statue’s pedestal. For older readers, Herta Pauli’s 1965 popular history of the statue, *Gateway to America: Miss Liberty’s First Hundred Years*, cemented the monument’s association with immigration even more strikingly. Her text echoed
politicians’ calls for skills-based admissions criteria and praised newcomers’ civic contributions.

While she discussed a few later twentieth-century immigrants, she positioned mass immigration in America’s past. Describing the statue’s significance in past tense, she wrote that it “saw wave after wave of immigrants come in like the waves of ocean lapping around her feet,” who had “powered the wheels of American progress.”

Also highlighting past immigration and civic contributions, she asserted, “Miss Liberty herself needs only to look around to see what people study in a museum. Her lofty view is dotted with reminders of what immigrants have accomplished.”

Pauli then summarized the contributions of famed past immigrants like educator Angelo Patri, journalist Jacob Riis, and inventor Michael Pupin. She noted these immigrants embraced American liberty in exchange for foreign oppression, their civic-minded ingenuity, and aid to others. At the same time, she emphasized individualistic liberties in noting newcomers’ self-made success in a land of opportunity.

Tourism, too, played an increasingly important role in elevating the statue as an icon of American immigration. The monument had always been a major attraction for New Yorkers and visitors worldwide, becoming increasingly popular in the 1940s and the following decades.

While National Park Service visitor brochures from the 1940s though the 1960s did not emphasize immigration, the development of the American Museum of Immigration helped concretize the statue’s link to immigration for tourists. The AMI enshrined a narrative of immigration within the pedestal’s walls that portrayed America as a melting pot and a land of opportunity for select hardworking European newcomers. This interpretive program reflected Cold War ideology and the explicit aims of developers, who sought to depict an immigration story that would unify the American people. It also reflected the museum’s long road to completion. While the AMI opened in September 1972, the idea for the museum originated in
1952, when the American Scenic and Historic Preservation Society suggested to the National Park Service that such a museum be housed in the pedestal. Development officially began in 1955 when the Secretary of the Interior signed an agreement with the American Museum of Immigration, Inc.¹³⁰ Fundraising, construction, and management problems, along with clashes over exhibit design and content, delayed the museum’s opening for decades. By the time the AMI opened, its interpretive program conflicted with some historians’ and ethnic groups’ views of immigration. Because views of American immigration had diverged from the Cold War’s ideological narratives during the AMI’s two-decade development, the museum meant to unify Americans ironically sparked further contestations of the statue’s meaning.

In the earliest planning stages, AMI developers aspired to create a publicly and politically useful representation of America’s immigrant past. They asserted the statue’s appropriateness for a museum honoring newcomers’ successes in and contributions to the American melting pot. William H. Baldwin, trustee of the American Scenic and Historic Preservation Society of New York, stated that an immigration museum emphasizing unity out of diversity and showing immigrants’ search for political freedom and economic opportunity, could “renew our faith and strengthen America’s role in the world-wide struggle for men’s minds and aspirations.”¹³¹ Likewise, National Park Service historian Thomas M. Pitkin hoped the museum would foster national unity “in a time of conflicting ideologies, when the competition for the loyalties of group and individuals is keen,” by depicting immigrants’ contributions to a melting pot of “common national life.”¹³² As to the museum’s location, the National Park Service chose the statue for both practical and symbolic reasons; they hoped to make effective use of the pedestal, but also thought, as one report stated, “The foot of our great symbol of the American Ideal was the most appropriate place for presenting the fruits of that ideal.”¹³³ Likewise, Pierre S. du Pont
III proclaimed, “This is a nation of nations...united as one people we have created new freedom, and new opportunity for all. …the idea of telling [this story] at the foot of the Statue of Liberty is a splendid one.”\textsuperscript{134}

As planning proceeded through the 1950s and 1960s, fundraising and publicity efforts for the AMI continued to assert the statue’s significance to newcomers. Moreover, they continued to connect the monument with specific versions of an American immigration story. Fundraisers solicited support from ethnic organizations across the country. Films and television broadcasts, like Twentieth Century Fox’s 1956 film “Lady of the Golden Door,” or the 1966 special, “They Entered Through the Golden Door: The Immigrant Impact on America,” conveyed the monument’s immigration links to viewers.\textsuperscript{135} A publicity appearance on the “Ed Sullivan Show” by du Pont had the same effect. Additionally, the National Unity gatherings staged by AMI developers at the statue promoted melting pot ideology. A tree-planting ceremony at Bedloe’s Island, in which representatives of thirty-seven ethnic groups in traditional costumes participated, emphasized ethnic cooperation in shaping the nation’s future.\textsuperscript{136}

When the AMI was finally dedicated in 1972, the rhetoric of the melting pot and of immigrants’ hard work in a land of opportunity continued to dominate. President Richard Nixon, in dedicating the museum, stated that it portrayed immigration history as the story of people who “believed in hard work [who] didn’t come here for a handout. They came here for an opportunity and they built America.” Nixon’s statements were made amid ethnic Americans’ renewed interest in their heritage and simultaneous mobilization against affirmative action.\textsuperscript{137} As historian Judith Smith speculated, such rhetoric served Nixon’s attempts “to use the symbols of immigration history as a part of his strategy of racial polarization, [and] to divide working-class ethnic Americans from unemployed and presumably black welfare recipients.”\textsuperscript{138}
The AMI’s exhibits construed immigration as part of America’s past, promoted melting pot ideology, and highlighted success stories of famous, hardworking immigrants. These representations generally advanced individualistic visions of liberty. A brochure from the AMI revealed several of these themes. Describing the exhibits and summarizing the depiction of immigration the museum promoted, the brochure announced:

In the century before World War I roughly 35 million immigrants left Europe for the United States. The migration came in a series of waves, which crested in three peak periods: 1845 and 1855, during the 1880’s and between 1900 and 1914. “Places of Origin” shows typical villages and towns left behind by six European immigrant groups—the Irish, a great many of whom emigrated during the first peak period; the English and Germans, who were heavily represented in the second period; and the Italians, Poles and East European Jews, who came mostly during the last period. The following places were chosen to represent the six groups…County Mayo, the Ortenau, the Campanian countryside around Naples and Lowicz were rural areas; Manchester was a large industrial city, and Bialystok, a small one. In spite of their great cultural differences, similar forces acted upon these widely separated regions of Europe.

The AMI attempted to represent a cross-section of European groups from different periods and settings, but its exhibits neglected World War II-era, 1950s, and 1960s immigrants, failing to treat immigration as a contemporary phenomenon. Moreover, the brochure revealed the museum’s emphasis on European immigration. Exceptions included displays on Chinese Americans’ overcoming of persecution, and on slavery and famous African Americans, like Gustavus Vassa, Phillis Wheatley, and Claude McKay.

Elsewhere, the AMI’s exhibits emphasized immigrants’ triumph over adversity and contributions to American life after they had fled persecution abroad. Thus, they emphasized and imbued the statue with an individualistic conception of liberty, mixed with praise of civic responsibility. Writing fifteen years after the AMI opened, historian Mike Wallace summarized these elements of the museum’s interpretive program. He noted that while they illustrated newcomers’ difficulties, they drew “relentlessly upbeat conclusions” regarding immigrants’
ability to overcome problems. According to the exhibition text, newcomers faced challenges in the “teeming tenements,” but “at least there was hope and always the inspiring example of those who had succeeded by self-sacrifice and hard work.”

Wallace noted that throughout,

...the subtextual message was that the overcoming of adversity was always an individual triumph; apart from soldiers in wartime, the heroes of the AMI tended to be businessmen, inventors, and artists…there was no mention of collective activities and achievements of organized immigrants—of bunds, churches, or nationality groups, much less unions or radical political parties.

Wallace also explained that the AMI’s interpretive program did not address quota systems or their exclusionary results, instead asserting, “when the need has been urgent, America has re-opened her doors to the distressed.” Thus, the AMI advanced an image into the 1970s of America as a haven for specific deserving immigrants ready to contribute their talents and hard work toward strengthening the nation. At the same time, its exhibits further imbued the statue with conceptions of individualistic liberty and civic responsibility and advanced its emergence as an icon of American immigration.

While the AMI drew praise from some quarters and enhanced the Statue of Liberty’s image as a symbol of immigration, it also provoked further criticisms. Particularly in its later planning phases in the 1960s and 1970s, historians and members of different ethnic and racial groups protested the exhibits’ emphasis on European immigration, melting-pot ideology, militarism, rags-to-riches stories, and outdated characterizations of various immigrant groups. Criticisms reflected changes in historians’ understandings of immigration that had taken place since the museum’s initial conception two decades earlier. They also stemmed from emerging ethnic and civil rights consciousness. Additionally, they reflected changing conceptions of race. Whereas Southern and Eastern European Catholic and Jewish newcomers had been stigmatized as non-white during the early twentieth century, they had been assimilated as white by the 1940s; conversely, African Americans, Latinos, and Asians had not. Historians,
planners, and others consultants had initially agreed in the 1950s on the museum’s aims. It was to explain newcomers’ origins and motivations for immigration, foreground “Americanization” and the “flowing together of the various races, creeds and cultures into one main stream,” and assert the “contributions of nationality groups and famous immigrants to the developments of America in such areas as economics, culture, science, etc.”

But in subsequent decades, the museum’s focus on European immigrants, originally justified on the grounds that it mirrored demographic trends between 1815 and 1914, came under fire. In particular, African-Americans, Latinos, and Asians charged that the museum’s Eurocentric focus signified their ongoing marginalization in the historical canon. New York Congressman Adam Clayton Powell declared in 1965 that such representations ignored the “fantastic cultural contributions of Negroes in this country.”

Constance Baker Motley, the first African American woman Manhattan borough president, expressed similar concerns.

Americans of European descent, including some who had initially praised the museum, also challenged its depiction of their experience, criticizing both omissions and characterizations. In 1967, historian of Polish-American history and vice president of the Kosciuszko Foundation Eugene Kusielewicz offered the following critique: “The primary philosophy governing the preparation of the SCRIPT,” appeared to be the “presentation of that which is colorful to the eye appealing, rather than to that which would present an accurate and balanced picture of American immigration.” He also charged that the museum’s minimal coverage of Italians and Poles meant that “…a visitor would leave…with the impression that the two largest immigrant groups, presently in the United States…virtually do not exist.” His statements triggered an outpouring of criticism from the Polish-American press and the Polish-American community. Similarly, Congressman Frank Annunzio charged, “There is more to the Italian contribution than Italians
who work in the vineyards of California and a fisherman enjoying an Italian dinner.” He added, “I would appreciate your deleting the entire text about spaghetti, eggplant, peppers, chianti, pizza, etc…. I want to be associated with the exhibit that doesn’t touch the stomach of people, but touches their hearts!”

Historians, too, critiqued the AMI’s portrayal of immigration, especially its melting pot emphasis and Eurocentric focus. Immigration expert Robert Ernst summarized historians’ attitudes, stating, “The United States became more a salad bowl than a melting pot. [The] melting pot obscures the concept of cultural pluralism which many feel to be worth maintaining and defending.” Historians and community leaders from different ethnic and racial groups soon joined to revise the AMI’s interpretive program in the years leading up to its opening. A report of the AMI Historians Committee called for additional coverage of free African Americans in the pre-Civil War period, of Italians’, Poles’, Jews’ and other ethnic groups’ roles in the Midwest and industrial expansion, and of immigrants from the Near East. Additionally, some authors of the report questioned more fundamentally the museum’s overall melting pot framework and its disproportionate attention to newcomers’ role in America’s wars.

Similar criticism continued into the early 1970s, led especially by historians Higham, Handlin, and Vecoli, all of whom participated in AMI Historians Committee reviews. The approaching deadline for the museum’s opening forestalled serious revision of exhibits, but calls for revision and controversy continued right up until the museum’s opening in 1972. The committee’s last report called for the following immediate changes, among others:

...getting rid of WWI “Lost Battalion” exhibit, replacing it with one dedicated to immigrant religions. 2) Replace title “From the Old Empires” and make more distinctions between ethnic groups. 3) Eliminate all references to the melting pot and give more adequate recognition to Italian and Greek immigration. 4) Redo the “Refuge from Tyranny” exhibit to emphasize immigrants rather than Nazis. 5) Revise the last “summation” exhibit. 6) Check everything for accuracy.
Such contestations extended during and beyond the museum’s opening, with the press, historians, members of different ethnic and racial groups, and the National Park Service all joining the debates. One exhibit reviewer noted, “The overall impression you get there is that there are two ways to prove yourself as an American—one is to become rich and famous and the other—not as good—is to die in a war.” In his article written fifteen years after the AMI’s opening, historian Mike Wallace critiqued the AMI’s Cold War emphasis on militarism and the individual achievement of success while minimizing collective activism, and on famous men of European origin at the expense of others. He also criticized the AMI for downplaying exclusionary immigration policies, especially with respect to the World War II-era Jewish refugee crisis. Fortunately by the 1980s the AMI was deteriorating and the National Park Service launched plans to build a new museum at the old immigrant processing station at Ellis Island which was now being renovated along with the statue itself. The result was a much improved and more realistic set of exhibits of the immigrant experience. The promises and pitfalls of trying to settle in America were explained as was the fact that some were welcomed and some excluded. One reviewer of the new exhibition noted that it stood in “marked contrast” to the AMI and now refused to “sentimentalize the Golden Door.”

Such criticisms persisted though the 1980s until the AMI’s closing due to deterioration of displays and the opening of a new immigration museum at Ellis Island. By then, new plans were afoot to mark the statue’s centennial. This celebration of the statue marked the culmination of trends from the Cold War period and earlier eras. It promoted the monument’s links to individualistic liberties exercised by hard-working newcomers in America’s capitalist, melting pot society. Like the monument’s fiftieth birthday in 1936, the centennial also celebrated immigration as a romanticized phenomenon central to the nation’s past.
The Celebration and Contestation of an Icon at the 1986 Centennial

Despite contestations like those sparked by the AMI, many Americans of the 1980s saw the Statue of Liberty as an icon of immigration. It represented the nation’s welcome to past immigrants and to those currently seeking refuge in a democratic society. It enshrined immigrants’ dreams of carving out new lives in a land of opportunity, as well as their assimilation into Americans. The statue’s 1986 centennial not only reflected views already present within American society, but crystallized them before the public eye. It both reflected and continued to advance the monument’s iconic status. Fundraisers and advertisers during Liberty Weekend’s planning stages targeted ethnic groups and played up the statue’s association with past immigration. During the celebration itself, speeches, music, individual ceremonies, and media presentations portrayed immigration as a part of America’s past, rather than as a current and contentious issue. Moreover, the celebration centered on a carefully crafted narrative of immigration that positioned it as central to American history, while simultaneously crediting white European immigrants with American success. Festivities advanced melting-pot ideology and honored those newcomers who had succeeded through hard work and entrepreneurialism. President Ronald Reagan and others promoted personal freedom as the essence of America’s national identity and strength. In response to these messages and in the decade following the centennial, members of some ethnic and racial groups, along with the press, charged that Liberty Weekend presented a sanitized and too-adulatory portrayal of immigration history. Such a vision omitted some groups and failed to address America’s bias against non-European, non-white immigrant groups.
The centennial’s emphasis on immigration began in fundraising campaigns for the statue’s repair and in the planning and publicizing of Liberty Weekend. A public service announcement from the Statue of Liberty-Ellis Island Centennial Commission featured Charles M. Schultz’ Peanuts Gang, complete with Lucy playing the role of the statue and Linus and Sally playing the role of immigrants. When Linus and Sally noted the statue’s beauty upon their arrival to America, Lucy informed them that the monument needed repairs. While concerned about the statue’s condition, the Peanuts Gang concluded that love for the statue would inspire Americans to save it. Thus, the announcement reflected and promoted the statue’s link with newcomers by predicking its appeal on that association.  

The Liberty Centennial Student Campaign also connected the monument to past immigration. It aimed both to educate students about liberty as an American value, and to cultivate greater understanding of immigration and ethnic diversity in American history.  

Other campaigns highlighted not only immigration, but also the statue’s connection with personal liberty. A section of the Statue of Liberty-Ellis Island Foundation fundraising booklet titled, “Individuality is the Theme of Achievements Which Re-made America,” stated:

…during the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, opportunity for all remained more than a myth. It was a fundamental reality. We all know the stories. A hatmaker’s son from Minsk becomes a university president. A poor tenant farmer’s son from Kerry becomes a prominent attorney. A factory hand from Palermo patents a new process and himself becomes an industrialist. Not all success stories could be measured in money and prestige. Again and again, however, individuals rose from factory floor to front office, left a crowded tenement for a home of their own, worshipped in peace, watched their children graduate from school, and served their communities. They were achievements that were made in America.

As Kathy Jo Evertz speculated in explaining the success of the fund raising efforts, such approaches brought the statue “down to a level where she could be understood.” Thus, while advertisers capitalized on the statue’s preexisting association with immigration, they also strengthened it in the public consciousness by making it more accessible.
Some advertisements actively sought to include ordinary Americans in the immigration narrative the statue represented by tying the statue to an object with ethnic associations that they could purchase or, in the following instance, receive “free” for donating to the statue’s restoration fund. An advertisement which ran in the June 30, 1986, issue of the *New Yorker* featured a woman of European descent dressed in turn-of-the-century clothing, and its text stated:

Anna Kienzle Discovered America. America’s immigrants brought this country an appreciation for fine food and wine. Now you can enjoy hundreds of those ethnic recipes and a taste of Ellis Island history in Chateau Ste. Michelle’s spectacular 256-page book *Tastes of Liberty.* We’ll send you the hardbound book, a $40 dollar value, free when you donate $20 or more the to the Liberty Centennial Fund.163 (fig. 13, p. 169)

In making food immigrants’ primary contribution to American culture, the advertisement’s text constructs immigrant culture as an entity to be safely consumed, while its reference to “hundreds of those ethnic recipes” homogenizes immigration into the familiar “melting pot,” thus occluding the real cultural pluralism of immigration to America.164

Other advertisements tried to make their audience feel like a part of the immigrant “success story.” An advertisement placed in *Forum* by the AmerIcan Foundation perfectly exemplified this trend. In the graphic representation of the word “AmerIcan,” a small image of the statue replaced the “I,” and the text of this advertisement ran as follows:

I can. Two powerful words that sum up what being an American is all about. Having the freedom to follow our dreams. And the opportunity to turn them into realities. I can. There is no greater symbol of this spirit in America than the Statue of Liberty. But time and the elements have taken their toll on her. And today she needs restoration. And more. Our support. If you carry the torch for America, show it by sending your tax-deductible contribution to: The Statue of Liberty-Ellis Island Foundation. And when people ask who saved the Statue of Liberty, you can proudly say, “I did.”165

Through visual representation in the word “AmerIcan” and through its text, this advertisement conflated American identity and individualistic pride in the ability to succeed independently. Moreover, it mapped this message onto the statue. Its reiteration of the words “I can,” in the
In the years immediately preceding the centennial, mass culture and advertising strengthened the statue’s link with immigration. Their representations of the statue also emphasized hard work and individual achievement. An advertisement for the mid-1980s CBS miniseries *Ellis Island* included a drawing of a European immigrant man holding a suitcase and staring up at the Statue of Liberty. The advertisement’s text read, “They came to America to
find a new home and a new freedom. With the promise of a new life came fame, fortune, triumphs, and tragedies.”

Publications leading up to the centennial, like Richard H. Schneider’s 1985 *Freedom’s Holy Light*, also emphasized the centrality of past immigration and rags-to-riches success stories to American identity. He further noted the need to preserve the statue in order to honor America’s past and present ideals. Schneider’s book opened with a preface by Lee Iacocca stating,

> The Statue of Liberty has been a beacon for countless millions, and is still recognized throughout the world as a symbol of hope and freedom. Ellis Island was the gateway to that freedom, a gateway through which sixteen million people during sixty-two years passed on their way to a new life…. This symbol of hope and this gateway to freedom are now being restored and all Americans should take part. By helping rebuild the Statue of Liberty and Ellis Island, we can show the world that our nation still values our ideals of freedom, hope, and hard work.

Echoing Cold War representations of the statue, Schneider glorified hard work, creativity, and perseverance when discussing the monument’s ongoing relevance for recent immigrants like Cuban-American Dagoberto Jorge. Schneider placed Jorge’s feelings about the statue at the center of his experience of welcome and success in America, contrasted with repression in Cuba. He recounted Jorge’s anticipation at seeing the monument out of his airplane window upon his 1965 arrival in New York. According to Schneider, Jorge was “apprehensive about what waited for him after his plane landed. He felt that just seeing that symbol would give him the confidence he so desperately needed.”

Upon seeing the statue, Schneider reported that Jorge expressed himself in the emotional terms that previous immigrants had used:

> “She was just as I pictured her,” he says, “even from above she looked so majestic standing there in the middle of the harbor. And,” he added in awe, “she was raising her glowing torch to me! All of my doubts were washed away in seeing her. My heart lifted and tears filled my eyes as I knew deep within my heart that, yes, the Statue of Liberty was still there, truly there. I knew what the other immigrants seeking freedom felt when
they saw her for the first time from the decks of their ships,” he said. “And I could feel the same infusion of strength and confidence that they were given.”

Schneider went on to tell of Jorge’s fears, inspired by warnings in Cuba that the statue’s message of welcome no longer applied to immigrants on account of poverty, crime, and racism, but he then details his success in overcoming initial hardship. Throughout, Schneider contrasted the differences between American opportunity and Cuban oppression in telling Jorge’s story. He especially emphasized Jorge’s willingness to take “any work he could,” his initiative in learning English, his persistence and ingenuity in rising through the ranks at Guideposts magazine to secure a position as assistant art director, and his desire to “contribute to the American dream in every way possible.”

The narrative concluded romantically,

Every so often Dagoberto takes the subway down to the tip of Manhattan Island where waves lap at the Battery and says a quiet hello ‘to the Lady.’ ‘I look around and see people of all races…and I see God’s promise of liberty in every face. It’s a kind of light. I look out into the harbor and see that same light in the torch of the Statue of Liberty, and I realize that all of us, newcomers and generations-old citizens alike, have a holy responsibility to carry that light of tolerance and compassion wherever we go.’

During Liberty Weekend itself, specific ceremonies and events, as well as their media coverage, highlighted and glorified immigration. Television networks covered the swearing in of 250 new citizens at Ellis Island by Chief Justice Warren Burger, and ABC broadcasts featured similar smaller ceremonies across the nation as part of its coverage of the centennial. In addition, twelve living naturalized citizens received “Medals of Liberty” for contributions made to America. This ceremony was also broadcast on ABC.

In addition to ceremonies featuring new citizens, Liberty Weekend’s events and entertainment represented a festive melting pot as the legacy of American immigration. A mini-world’s fair featured international foods, arts, and crafts exhibitions. ABC news coverage showed dancing from a variety of ethnic groups dressed in brightly colored costumes. Such
festivities emphasized the positive side of immigration, without reference to hardships faced by real immigrants who may or may not have performed such dances. Also, the music played during ABC’s coverage featured medleys of European folk and classical favorites, such as “Danny Boy,” “Alouette,” and “The Blue Danube.” Indeed, the very construction of such musical medleys produced an aural melting pot consistent with prevailing festival ideology. Ethnicity was also highlighted in the programming of an international classical concert as part of the festivities. A song called “Living in the Promised Land,” performed at the closing ceremonies, whose theme was “Remember, Rejoice, Renew,” emphasized melting-pot themes and America as a refuge for those in need of a land of opportunity. The song’s first stanza highlighted these themes:

Give me your tired and weak
And we will make them strong
Bring me your foreign songs
And we will sing along
Leave us your broken dreams
And we’ll give them time to mend
There’s still a lot of love
Living in the Promised Land

Because the festivities, coverage, and advertisements circulated widely, and because their images were crafted so carefully, they helped build up the statue in the public consciousness as a national icon of immigration and individualistic liberty. By deliberately downplaying or outright omitting other narratives of liberty associated with the statue, the centennial foregrounded immigration as the key meaning attached to the monument. By focusing on immigrant success stories credited to individual hard work rather than to government or civic-minded assistance, and by encouraging Americans to envision themselves as participants in an ongoing American saga of independent entrepreneurial success and thrift, centennial advertisers reinforced individualistic interpretations of liberty.
These centennial celebrations did not escape criticism. Columnists, cartoonists, academics, and protestors questioned the accuracy of the commemoration’s rhetoric and pointed out the contradictions between the imagined and real dimensions of immigrant history. Some of these critiques countered the individualistic vision of liberty that dominated the festivities with calls to acknowledge the degree to which the ideal of liberty was contingent upon a sense of civic responsibility to insure a just society for all.

These contestations began during Liberty Weekend’s planning stages. Regarding the initial proposal to award of “Medals of Liberty” to twelve naturalized citizens, ethnic organizations and politicians complained that the recipients initially chosen represented only nine ethnic groups. In particular, members of Irish and Italian groups protested the exclusion of immigrant citizens of Irish and Italian descent, and politicians like Massachusetts Senator Edward Kennedy and New York Governor Mario Cuomo called for expansion of the awards list. In addition, picketers gathered outside the Park Avenue Foundation offices to protest the awards. A compromise was ultimately reached whereby eighty-seven New Yorkers, representing fifty countries and diverse occupations, who were naturalized citizens or seeking citizenship, received Mayor’s Awards at a ceremony occurring two days before the “Medals of Liberty” event, and more awards were presented to naturalized citizens at a banquet held in October.

Amid the celebrations honoring the accomplishments and contributions of upstanding naturalized citizens, columnist Russell Baker challenged not the lack of ethnic diversity or representation found in some elements of the festivities, but instead argued that adulatory celebration of upstanding and prominent individuals for their contributions to American liberty did not do justice to the complexities of American history. He asserted that it was often the “bad
guys” who forced Americans to contest, redefine, and ultimately strengthen ideals and practices of liberty. To counteract the dominant narrative, he wrote his own salute to such “trouble makers,” ranging from labor organizers to wife-beaters and Klan members, underscoring through this conflation of activists and clear-cut villains the complexities and difficulties of American liberty and tolerance. His ironic, sarcastic critique of “saintly immigrants” weeping at their first sight of the statue became a larger critique of the monument’s iconic status and of dominant individualist conceptions of liberty in America. He implied that reverence for a symbol is not enough to preserve American liberty:

The point is that in an America without rogues, felons, psychopaths, bigots, swindlers, liars, cheats, brutes, frauds, crooked politicians and corrupt cops liberty would have collapsed of terminal flabbiness shortly after the first few boatloads of saintly immigrants fell to their knees weeping pure thoughts upon first glimpsing Liberty Enlightening the World. To retain their muscularity, people committed to liberty require constant challenge from people who don’t know the difference between liberty and making a mess. It is only fitting then to salute the mess-makers, for they far outnumber the glittering successes who resulted from immigration to the New World.181

Thus, Baker’s emphasis on activist liberty sharply contrasted with the individualist strains projected throughout the centennial and complicated the statue’s iconic status.

Immigrant advocates and academics joined the press in pointing out the ironies of celebrating immigration amid widespread restriction. In California, advocates sponsored a “March for Justice and Freedom For All Immigrants and Refugees” that coincided with the centennial unveiling of the statue on July 4. A poster for the event featured the statue’s head against a backdrop of barbed wire, thus combining the symbolic welcome of immigrants with the real barrier that greeted immigrants entering America at its southern border. The poster also featured a graphic of the statue against a backdrop of the American flag, gave an excerpt from “The New Colossus,” and implored march participants to “Make her promise a reality.”182 (fig. 14, p. 170)
Cartoonists, in sometimes comical yet no less pointed critiques, also disparaged the centennial’s representation of immigration, highlighting the inconsistencies between celebratory pro-immigration rhetoric and anti-immigration policies or sentiment. As Roger A. Fischer notes, “contemporary cartoonists have exhibited an ever-increasing tendency to exploit Liberty…as a symbolic challenge to Americans to nurture ideals central to her genesis, ‘melting pot,’ ethnic diversity and respect for the rights of man.” He credits the rise in cartoon critiques to “the influx of Vietnamese refugees and then a virtual tidal wave of Mexican illegals, Haitians, Mariel boat people from Castro’s Cuba, and other Latin Americans fleeing civil wars, repression, and poverty into a nation already wracked by economic ills and social tensions.” A 1984 cartoon by Dana Summers protested exclusion of Latin American immigrants by showing construction workers painting a sign reading “No More Wetbacks” to replace the torch, ostensibly according to the government-authorized renovation plans. In 1986, A. Clyde Wells responded to the 1986 Immigration Reform and Control Act, which mandated penalties for employers who hired illegal immigrants and provided for legalization of certain undocumented aliens, with a cartoon titled, “My Melting Pot Runneth Over.” It showed the statue holding a “pot teeming with immigrants, her torch pointing downward, as if it were broken.” Another cartoon showed the statue reacting in sorrow to the drowning of Haitian refugees. Such cartoons, like press, political, and historical commentaries, contested the statue’s status as an icon of immigration.

Epilogue: Contemporary Debates

At the advent of the new millennium, the statue continues to be associated with immigration and advocacy for immigrants’ rights. Such associations occur in both benign contexts and more pointed protests. Indeed, after more than one hundred years, the statue’s
iconic status as a symbol of immigration is what makes it such a potent symbol for protest and advocacy of immigrants’ rights.

In a benign context, the Statue of Liberty appears on numerous websites advertising services or offering information for newcomers to the United States. It appears on a number of immigration law websites, including that of the American Immigration Law Foundation, as well as law firms specializing in immigration services nation-wide. On the American Immigration Law Foundation’s website, an artistic rendering of the statue from the waist up in blue with red and white stripes waving like part the American flag placed across her front is joined by various representations of the monument and immigrants, including famous images of early late nineteenth and early twentieth-century immigrants looking at the statue. Other organizations and corporations using the statue include USA Greencard, United States Immigration Support, the New York Association for New Americans, Inc., The National Immigration Forum, the American Immigration Center, and the portion of the American Civil Liberties Union website devoted to immigration rights and asylum issues. Most of these sites juxtapose the statue with text or other images that highlight inclusion and immigrants’ ongoing role in realizing individual dreams and contributing to a better nation. For example, the New York Association for New Americans, Inc. features a logo consisting of the statue’s arm and torch with the slogan, “The promise that guides us,” and states:

All people have within themselves the power to build a meaningful life and contribute to a better world, no matter how challenging their circumstances. NYANA honors this potential in all of us by reaching out to immigrants of every nation and by helping them realize their most cherished goals. Because of America’s great principles, we remain the most fertile ground for human achievement. And by linking the promise of each individual with the spirit of our country, NYANA continues to strengthen and enrich America with every immigrant we serve.
Similarly, the National Immigration Forum displays a logo of the statue from waist up, including the torch, juxtaposed against a blue background and red and white stripes that look like part of a waving American flag. Its slogan is, “To embrace and uphold America’s tradition as a nation of immigrants,” and its text continues with its mission statement: “The purpose of the National Immigration Forum is to embrace and uphold America's tradition as a nation of immigrants. The Forum advocates and builds public support for public policies that welcome immigrants and refugees and that are fair and supportive to newcomers in our country.”

The 2004 version of the American Civil Liberties Union page for immigration also features the Statue of Liberty in the context of immigration as broadly construed and ongoing, showing a photograph of the statue with the following text: “Immigrant Rights: Since this nation’s founding, more than 55 million immigrants from every continent have settled in the United States. In fact, with the exception of Native Americans, everyone living in this country is either an immigrant or the descendent of voluntary or involuntary immigrants.”

While these benign images do not challenge the statue as an icon of immigration, other contemporary representations of it do. Although the orchestrators of the centennial sought to unequivocally position the statue as a symbol of America’s welcome to immigrants, since 1986 advocates of immigrants’ rights and of racial, social, and economic justice have contested and renegotiated its symbolic status and individualist emphasis for their own political ends. Indeed, politicians, editorialists, academics and other public figures have used the statue to critique American immigration policy, immigrant workers’ rights, xenophobia, and racism on a national and international level. Frequently, their critiques conflate the statue’s symbolic message with that of Lazarus’s “The New Colossus,” often reworking the poem to reflect the reality behind the myth of American attitudes toward immigrants today. These contestations and renegotiations of
the statue’s meaning appear in a variety of forms, including articles and editorials in the African-American and left-wing alternative press, speeches, and protests. In their efforts, advocacy groups and individuals use the statue not only as a symbol of individual liberty, but also of civic liberty, insisting on the right to enter America freely and participate in the creation of a just and pluralistic society in which all people may live and work free from racist and economic exploitation. Such usages of the statue sometimes combine American national and universal liberty in their assertions that the fight for American immigrants’ rights is part of a larger struggle for global human rights.

Writers for alternative, ethnic, and African American presses have taken an especially active role in contesting dominant meanings of the statue in their advocacy of immigrants’ rights. Lorenzo Torrez invokes the statue in a March 2003 *People’s Weekly World* article to compare past immigration policy and welcoming attitudes towards Europeans with current policy and attitudes towards Mexicans:

> Once upon a time immigrants were welcomed with open arms…. The Statue of Liberty which stands in New York City’s harbor is a testament of the welcome given to arriving immigrants. Inscribed on the Statue’s base are these words of appreciation: “Give me your tired, your poor, your huddled masses yearning to breathe free!” There are no such statues on our west coast, our northern border with Canada, or our southern border with Mexico.¹⁹⁰

Here, Torrez conflates the meaning of the statue with the Lazarus poem and emphasizes the difference between historical acceptance of immigrants from all lands, including Mexico, with current restrictions and prejudices facing Mexicans today. He also uses the statue to point out that in the past, Mexicans were encouraged to migrate to the United States as a source of cheap labor to fuel expansion: “However, this does not mean that the poor and huddled masses have not been coming across the north, west, or southern borders. Millions were brought in by the trainload from Mexico in past years when our young country was expanding in all directions.”¹⁹¹
Overall, Torrez implies that the Statue of Liberty has been an icon of welcome, but that it does not currently apply to immigrants of color who enter across the U.S.-Mexico border.

While the writers and politicians above imply that the Statue of Liberty has little symbolic value for immigrants or American residents of color, other critics transform the statue’s iconic status as a symbol of welcome into an overt symbol of racism and rejection in addressing current policy towards white and non-white immigrants. In most cases, such transformations occur through rewriting “The New Colossus.” A 1992 article titled, “U.S. Shows Racism Against Haitians,” refers to the fact that this particular group of “huddled masses” were rejected for admission. In this context the message behind the reworking of the Lazarus poem is that the ideal of the welcome represented by the statue has been for newcomers who are European whites rather than for people of color.  

Similarly, an article covering a Philadelphia protest led by Liberian immigrants opens, “The Statue of Liberty welcomes newcomers to American with a special invitation to ‘your tired, your poor.’ But there has been a long-standing suspicion that that the big lady gracing Ellis Island apparently does not mean all non-white immigrants,” especially African and Caribbean immigrants. Regarding differences between treatment of African and European immigrants, protest organizer Samuel Wlue also states, “There is someone in Washington greasing the wheels for immigrants who are of a lighter complexion…. We do not receive the same treatment. It appears America’s motto is ‘give me your tired and poor if your skin is the right shade.’”  

The message, according to immigrants of color and their advocates, is that the statue is supposed to represent and welcome them, but it does not because of racist immigration policy.

Mumia Abu-Jamal’s “In the Joint: Slow Boat Back to Beijing,” takes the above critiques a step further, exploding the myth of immigration, exploring the consequences of the
historicization of the dominant narrative of immigration through tourism, and ultimately rejecting the statue as a symbol for contemporary immigrants of color. He uses the statue to highlight the historicized myth versus current reality of immigration policy towards people of color, and transforms it from an icon of welcome to a symbol of bigotry, fear, and repression through his reworking of Lazarus’s poem. Specifically, he critiques officials’ response to asylum seekers in the wake of China’s one-child-only policy, decrying the detainment of 136 Chinese refugees whose freighter ran aground near New York. He also critiques the Clinton administration’s handling of the Haitian and Cuban refugee crises. He writes:

The great myth of the “Melting Pot” still has resonance in this America of the ‘90s, even if belied by the daily images that cross our field of vision. America, in the 1990s, is a land itching with xenophobia, lashing out at foreigners with a barely-disguised frenzy. The shameful treatment of the Haitians, who were all but invited by candidate Clinton during his campaign, but jettisoned into grim concentration camps on Guantanamo once he became president, the caging of Cuban boat people, also at Guantanamo, and in Panamanian concentration camps for months on end, revealed the barred teeth and loosened the guttural snarl of the herald of “Liberty.” Ellis Island, after all, is a museum now, a tourist attraction. Refugees, especially black or Latino, need not apply. “Go back where you came from!” is Lady Liberty’s new line.193

Abu-Jamal challenges the melting-pot ideology that formed the core of Liberty Weekend rhetoric. He links the historicization of immigration, accomplished through museums that subsume immigration into tourism rather than acknowledging it as an ongoing concern, with racism towards current immigrants. He also transforms the statue into a symbol of bigotry, fear, and repression by re-sculpting her face into a “guttural snarl,” replacing the Lazarus poem with racist exclamations against Blacks and Latinos. Thus, he completely rejects the statue as a symbol of immigrants of color.

Despite claims that the Statue of Liberty failed to represent immigrants of color past or present, some immigrant advocates have attempted to reclaim it as their symbol for open immigration and the creation of a just society. Here, the statue is used not only to advocate
change in American immigration policy regarding who is allowed to enter the country and who is included in the dominant American immigration history narrative, but also to advocate improvement in immigrants’ rights and opportunities once in the country. An article titled, “From Capitol Hill: Has Lady Liberty Dropped Her Arm?” contrasts the value of the statue for past immigrants with the lack of value it has for immigrants of color today, and suggests that this discrepancy can be remedied through collective action. It states, “For millions of immigrants the Statue of Liberty and the words of Emma Lazarus’s poem were symbolic of what America would become for them. For thousands of Haitians fleeing that troubled island ‘Lady Liberty’ sends a different message.” The author then rewrites the poem as follows: “I know you are tired and poor, I even know that you want to breathe free, but would you please try to do these things somewhere else, because it’s too crowded and we have to draw the line somewhere?” Here, the writer transforms the statue into an icon of restriction instead of welcome, implying that the monument’s symbolic meaning does not apply to immigrants of color. After recommending new legislation to immediately admit more refugees, the article concludes, “Maybe with a little collective outrage we can get the Clinton administration to stop looking at numbers and look at people. With the rest of our strength we can all push ‘Lady Liberty’s’ arm back to the upright position.” Thus, the statue is also invoked to advance the cause of civic liberty through the creation of a just society, and is re-appropriated to advance all immigrants’ rights.

A June 1997 demonstration in Battery Park, within sight of the statue, enacted the above call to action. The event combined celebration of America’s immigrant heritage with a protest of federal policies affecting immigrants and a voter registration drive organized by the New York Immigration Coalition. In choosing a site near the statue to call for changes in welfare programs adversely affecting poor, elderly, and disabled immigrants, demand changes to an unwieldy
naturalization process, and register new voters, protesters capitalized on the statue’s iconic meaning. They transform it from a symbol of individual liberty espoused by centennial rhetoric, a symbol rejected by some immigration advocates, into a symbol of a just society embodying the ideals of civic liberty with the potential to represent all immigrants.195

More recently, the Statue of Liberty appeared as the key symbol for the Immigrant Workers’ Freedom Ride in 2003.196 (fig. 15, p. 171) Here, the monument functions as a civic symbol of immigrants’ rights, the rights of people of color, and labor rights. Modeled on the 1960s Civil Rights Movement rides, the IWFR organized buses of immigrant workers and their advocates to travel from Seattle, San Francisco, Los Angeles, Las Vegas, Houston, Miami, Boston, Chicago and Minneapolis in late September 2003. The IWFR culminated in a meeting with members of Congress in Washington, D.C., and mass rallies at Liberty State Park, New Jersey, and in New York City within sight of the statue in early October. The IWFR’s aim, in their own words, was to “demonstrate a broad national constituency for meaningful reform of immigration laws, while also encouraging civic participation by new and future citizens.” Their three specific goals were to promote “legalization and a ‘road to citizenship’ for all immigrant workers in this country,” to assert “the right of immigrant workers to re-unite their families” and to protect “the rights of immigrants in the workplace.” Additionally, they emphasized “protecting the civil rights and liberties of all people in the United States,” reinforcing the broader civic message that attacks on immigrants are ultimately attacks on all Americans.197 The event was sponsored and organized by groups and individuals including the AFL-CIO, major international union of national immigrant and civil rights groups, religious institutions, student and community organizations and government officials.198
The IWFR’s logo consisted of an image of statue’s head in the center of a yellow diamond-shaped road sign with the word “Freedom” below. This logo appeared on posters and internet announcements advertising the IWFR’s goals, on banners and placards carried by marchers, on the podiums from which leaders gave speeches, and on buttons worn by participants. For example, the symbol is visible at the October 4th rally held in New York City, at the march in Washington, D.C., as well as at other events nationwide. In Oklahoma, union members also carried a “liberty torch” as they marched.  The statue also appeared in connection with the IWFR as a symbol used by key participants in the event such as the Hotel Employees and Restaurant Employees International Union (HERE) and UNITE, a labor organization formed through the merger of the International Ladies Garment Workers Union (ILGWU) and the Amalgamated Clothing and Textile Workers Union (ACTWU). Both HERE’s and UNITE’s membership is dominated by immigrants, especially women from Latin, Asian, and African American communities. In the case of these organizations, the statue’s raised arm bearing the torch appears on emblems for the combined efforts of UNITE and HERE in the IWFR, with the Spanish text, “Si se puede!,” translated as “Yes, we can!”

In addition to the uses of the statue by the IWFR and related organizations, politicians, participants, and the press also emphasized the monument, either using it as a symbol of the government’s neglect of immigrants’ interests, or reclaiming it as a symbol for non-European immigrants and people of color. Ben Ehrenreich, describing the Liberty Park rally in New Jersey behind the statue, used the monument’s position, “her back, pointedly, to us,” to construe her as a symbol of U.S. neglect of immigrant workers’ rights. In contrast to this cynicism, IWFR participants, advocates, and political speakers appropriated the statue as a symbol for a more just, inclusive American and global society. For example, Robert Farrell, one the original Civil
Rights Freedom Riders commented regarding the IWRF, “The way we treat immigrants is a far cry from the poem on the Statue of Liberty—‘give me your tired, your poor.’ Part of our challenge is to make people aware of immigrant workers’ issues.” Here, Farrell claimed the monument as a symbol for all immigrants, despite the gulf between reality and the statue’s message. Participant Henrietta Castillo connected the statue as the IWFR’s primary logo with her own agenda and the event’s goal of reminding legislators that “America is not just for one ethnic group. It stands for freedom for all around the world. And immigrants deserve to be free, too.” Thus, she used the statue as a symbol of national freedom for immigrants combined and equated with global freedom for all, both requiring civic, activist liberty to ensure freedom from exploitation.

Indeed, the centrality of the Statue of Liberty in the IWFR’s campaign for immigrant rights may herald new chapter for the monument as an icon of immigration in which it will embody a mixture of individualistic and civic connotations of liberty. If the monument’s past and recent uses are any indication, its connections with immigration and the contests related to this central part of American culture will surely continue into the future.
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Chapter 5
African Americans and the Statue

The popular association of the experience of immigrants with the Statue has obscured the extent to which the monument was discussed and used within the African American community. Some Blacks embraced the monument wholeheartedly; others did so only ambivalently. Still others rejected it as a meaningful and relevant symbol of their experiences and aspirations. Whether accepting or rejecting the statue, African American uses of the monument construct a racialized version of America and its association with the ideals of liberty. These uses often emphasize the bitter ironies of America’s professed identity as a just and free society for all people regardless of race, and highlight the statue’s associations with civic dimensions of liberty by critiquing political, economic, and social discrimination and racist violence. Affirming the strength of the African American community, these uses challenge the dominant, romantic narratives in which the statue symbolizes welcome, opportunity, and individual liberty for immigrants, or patriotism to a nation where liberty and equality ostensibly exist for all.

The relationship between African Americans and the Statue of Liberty has been further complicated by whites’ uses of it in connection with African Americans. Despite, or perhaps because of, early associations with abolition, late nineteenth- and early twentieth-century white Americans sometimes used the statue in contexts which stigmatized African Americans or denied their rights or basic humanity. In the most extreme cases, whites used the monument in connection with acts of racist violence. Later in the twentieth century, whites in America and abroad used it to critique racial
inequality in American culture, or to advocate African American equality and advancement.

“African American community” is perhaps a misleading term—the diversity masked by that singular label means that any assumptions on how African American people understand and use the symbol of the Statue of Liberty must be undertaken with due respect and caution for that diversity. The uses of the statue as a symbol become problematic in the face of such diversity, because the promise of liberty that the Statue of Liberty represents is not shared equally among all American citizens or disseminated impartially to other peoples of the world. In the face of these contradictions, the statue still provides a symbolic resource for dialogue on the nature of American identity, polity, and equality.

**African Americans and the Statue of Liberty, 1885-1916**

On May 13, 1885, crowds gathered in the Place des États-Unis in Paris to celebrate the inauguration of the Statue of Liberty. Music from the Garde Républicaine band entertained the masses and provided music for the procession of dignitaries and officials who were called upon to speak. Among those gathered were several French ministers, American statesmen, Laboulaye’s son, and Bartholdi himself. Of all the speakers, only Henri Brisson, the President of the Council of Ministers, alluded to the Civil War in his discussion of the growth of American liberty. He stated: “The only tragedy that has marked your history during a hundred years demonstrated, moreover, what a grand teacher liberty is in everything…. Ah! you have shown, Gentlemen, what you were capable of doing; you can henceforth and forever return to peace.”

Despite
Bartholdi’s fascination with Africa and Laboulaye’s support of abolition, most of the official speakers chose to discuss French aid given during the American Revolution—perhaps inspired by the presence of the Marquis de Lafayette’s grandson—and expressed hopes for an abiding French and American political relationship.  

In America, any connection between the Statue of Liberty and African Americans was even more tenuous and problematic. As described in earlier chapters of this study, the abolitionist motivation behind the Statue of Liberty’s conception and its personification and symbolization of liberty gives the statue a unique place in the pantheon of national and ideological symbols. However, the main ideals of the Statue of Liberty generally represented in this time period—freedom to live without government interference and freedom of financial opportunity—did not coincide with what African Americans were experiencing daily in their struggle to achieve full citizenship and greater freedom. As Frank Barbour Coffin writes in “The Negro’s ‘America’,” from his Poems published in 1897,

My country, 'tis of thee,  
Sweet land of liberty,  
Would I could sing;  
Its land of Pilgrim's pride  
Also where lynched men died  
With such upon her tide,  
Freedom can't reign. 

Despite gains immediately after the Civil War, the potential for fuller rights and citizenship for African Americans gradually diminished during this period. With the end of Reconstruction and the beginning of the establishment of the Jim Crow South, African Americans lost rights, safety, and even a voice in how the Civil War was remembered and understood. Memories of the Civil War came to align with the Lost Cause.
ideology of the South; subsequently, African Americans—even those who fought in the Civil War—became represented as passive recipients of freedom and partial citizenship. Despite these challenges, African Americans did not passively accept the diminished opportunities offered them. From the Civil War through the 1920s, African Americans actively struggled to reclaim memorials they felt were important, such as the John Brown Fort. They created their own holidays, such as Juneteenth and Emancipation Days, and actively protested their exclusion from other memorials, seeking ways to gain freedom and a greater voice in cultural memories.

From the time of the statue’s dedication, attitudes toward the Statue of Liberty in the African American community suggested ambivalence and uncertainty. While the dedication of the Statue of Liberty was covered in some African American papers, others ignored it entirely. In the beginning, African Americans became involved with the Statue of Liberty to some extent—for example, ads in the African American Cleveland Gazette between April 25 and July 18, 1885 solicited donations for the statue’s pedestal. However, many other African American papers including the New York Freeman, a New York City paper, ran no ads regarding the pedestal funding and had little coverage of the statue’s dedication. Up to 1917 and America’s entry into World War I, African Americans rarely used the statue to symbolize their unequal status, if at all. This may be due in part to the way many white people had ignored the statue’s connection with African American emancipation, and in part to uses of the statue that linked it to African Americans in racist, even violent ways. Though African Americans had not given up fighting for freedom or civil rights, the Statue of Liberty was not widely used as a relevant symbol for their struggle until the advent of World War I.
One such example of the Statue of Liberty being used negatively by whites to further inscribe widespread racist images of African Americans dates back to before the statue’s dedication. In 1884, Currier and Ives published a lithograph designed by Thomas Worth to protest port charges, showing an African American woman in a statue-esque pose. Entitled “Barsqualdi’s Statue: Liberty Frightening The World. Bedbugs Island, N.Y. Harbor,” the lithograph depicted the woman with a startled expression holding up a burning piece of kindling as her torch with a rooster (symbolizing France) posed by her feet. Her bonnet mimics the spikes in the Statue of Liberty’s crown and her apron is an American flag. She holds a ledger labeled “NY Port Charges” instead of Liberty’s tablet. The illustration represents a larger tradition of racist caricature of African Americans; Worth himself was well known for his drawings of “Darktown” life. The image was meant as commentary on the corrupt New York Harbor Administration. (fig. 16, p. 240)

Another image of a Black statue, this one by Thomas Nast in 1892, was also used to comment on local and national politics. The two-part cartoon showed a Black Statue of Liberty holding a tablet labeled “The Force Home Rule Bill.” It was published alongside a caricature of an Irish woman (the Irish were also widely caricatured and stereotyped at the time) as the Statue of Liberty, holding a harp labeled “Home Rule” instead of the tablet, under the caption “The Tammany Force Bill—North.” The “Force Bill” was a movement by Republicans in Congress to use federal troops to insure free elections in the South. Nast was an ardent supporter of Reconstruction, and known for creating non-stereotyped images of African Americans, often in contrast with caricatured images of unreconstructed white Southerners. In this cartoon, he links and contrasts two
movements for self-determination of two oppressed groups, their potential for fomenting political and social unrest, and the resulting interventions of federal power—be it American troops or British troops—to restore order. The caricatured face of the Irish woman (representing Nast’s arch-nemesis, Tammany Hall, and his own anti-Irish bias) undercuts any positive associations between the two movements or the spirit of liberty behind them.\(^8\)

Despite such negative associations, African Americans did seem to feel some connection to the Statue of Liberty in the early days. As noted earlier, ads requesting donations for the pedestal ran in African American newspapers, and papers such as the *Christian Recorder*, based in Philadelphia, recounted the progress being made on Bartholdi’s statue. African Americans were also involved in the dedication: many marched in the Bartholdi Day dedication parade in New York. As André Gschaedler relates, “Reporters from France were particularly impressed by a company of Negroes that marched along—some dark like ebony while others were nearly white.”\(^9\) The *Cleveland Gazette* ran a two-page article about the dedication entitled “Enlightening the World” complete with pictures of all the major speakers and the statue, and a list of fun facts about the Statue of Liberty for its readers.

Perhaps the most enthusiastic account of African Americans participating in the dedication festivities was run by the *New York Freeman*, which related that Prof. C. A. Dorsey of Colored Grammar School No. 1 in Brooklyn had held a Liberty Day celebration in conjunction with the statue’s unveiling. This seems to have been a community event, with several important local community members attending. The article described Dorsey’s classroom as “gayly [sic] decorated with French and American
flags,” and mentioned that the central decoration was “a large picture of Liberty
enlightening the world surrounded by the stars and stripes of this great Republic.”

When the participants had assembled, the students sang “Columbia Free,” and gave
readings and recitations. The article ends on a hopeful note: “Much pride is taken in this
school whose members and improvement are constantly growing.” In this instance, the
African Americans who gathered at the school had found a way to make the Statue of
Liberty’s celebration meaningful. Liberty Day in the school celebrated the future of the
New York African American community through the education of their children.
Participants made strong connections between the interrelationship of freedom,
education, and community improvement.

The larger New York community did in some instances refer to the end of slavery
in the official dedication of the Statue of Liberty in 1886. For example, S. Miller
Hageman’s official poem of the dedication, a thirty-eight page ode to freedom, placed
freedom in religious, legal, and racial contexts. Lines such as “Freedom, for every living
man that stands upon the earth, / For all that be he black or white belongs to him by
birth” affirmed freedoms newly won for African Americans. The Cleveland Gazette
also reprinted John Greenleaf Whittier’s poem commemorating the dedication among its
articles covering the event. Whittier, a famous poet of the time and dedicated
abolitionist, wrote a poem celebrating the freedom of the United States that was fulfilled
by the end of slavery: “On Freedom’s soil with freemen’s hands / We rear the symbol
free hands gave.”

However, most speakers at the dedication did not highlight African American
struggles for liberty as an ongoing action, but as a finished chapter of history. For these
speakers, the Statue of Liberty monument functioned as a seal of triumphant closure on issues of race, slavery, and freedom. Chauncey Depew, the keynote speaker, claimed that “the development of Liberty was impossible” while slavery existed. Other than a few references to the problem of slavery and its solution, Depew did not refer to problems of voting, lynching, and other restrictions upon the freedom of African Americans. Instead, Depew sought refuge in a discussion of a far safer struggle for liberty than the Civil War, with its lingering problems of race, class, and statehood. Like most of the speakers at the inauguration of the statue in Paris over one year earlier, his main topics were the American and French Revolutions. The Reverend Richard S. Storrs of Brooklyn, whose prayer opened the dedication festivities, also spoke of slavery and race as finished triumphs. His prayer was printed at length in both the *New York Times* and the *New York World*, including the following passage:

> The Republics of the past were debased by hostility toward foreigners, by arbitrary and brutal power and by slavery. Even in the modern world, liberty was during long ages the monopoly of privileged castes or races. *Far different is our liberty which relies upon the equality of rights and duties for all citizens, which secures for each the same protection and extends to all a maternal solicitude without distinction of birth, wealth, opinion or color.*  

Storrs’s idealized picture of the country as a society where liberty had already been achieved for all, and only needed to be maintained, would probably have rung false in the ears of African American listeners. The reporter for the African American newspaper the *Cleveland Gazette*, which had the most extensive dedication coverage, neither reprinted nor discussed Storrs’s prayer in his article.

Perhaps due to the disparity between the ideals of freedom that the statue was said to represent and the reality that most African Americans experienced, their attitude
toward the statue was understandably ambivalent. A Philadelphia African American paper, the *Christian Recorder*, followed the Statue of Liberty’s progress intently from fundraising appeals to the dedication itself. The paper’s November 4, 1886 editorial was a sarcastic reaction to the pomp and bland patriotism of the celebration. After recounting the decorations and some of the speeches, the editorial stated:

To us, who are struggling to build a standing foundation for right life and growth, hardly thinking of looking to such heights as the conception of monuments building, all this display has somewhat the effect of the gilded mental phenomena of joyous dream, and passes away with too much of its regretfulness.\(^{15}\)

This comparison of the optimism and celebration of the dedication to a joyous dream emphasized the editorialist’s belief that official speeches at the dedication had little to do with the lives of most African Americans. The editorial further satirized the emphasis on business and economic opportunity at the dedication:

But when read the history of those Bartholdi statuists as it appears on the long page of their history, observing whence they came, out of what degradation and obscurity, out of what ignorance and vice, out of what barbarism and shame - all by internal energies, aided by that benign influence always given from above to the struggling energies of God's sons in their attempts to regain their divine excellence, we are encouraged to purer thoughts and nobler deeds.

Frustration at the disparity between the idealized version of liberty offered at the dedication and the daily lives of many African Americans led to a sarcastic disavowal of any connection to the Statue of Liberty.

The *Cleveland Gazette* had an even harsher reaction to the dedication. Just weeks after its lighthearted and approving description of the statue’s festivities on Bedloe’s Island, the editors of the *Cleveland Gazette* used the Statue of Liberty as a symbol to
protest the failings of liberty in American society. On November 27, 1886, the Gazette published an editorial:

> It is proper that the torch of the Bartholdi statue should not be lighted until this country becomes a free one in reality. ‘Liberty enlightening the world’ indeed! The expression makes us sick. This government is a howling farce. It cannot or rather does not protect its citizens within its own borders. Shove the Bartholdi statue, torch and all, into the ocean until the ‘liberty’ of this country is such as to make it possible for an industrious and inoffensive colored man in the South to earn a respectable living for himself and his family, without being ku-kluxed perhaps murdered, his daughter and wife outraged, and his property destroyed. The idea of the ‘liberty’ of this country ‘enlightening the world,’ or even Patagonia, is ridiculous in the extreme. ¹⁶

This editorial was the first instance where the idealized freedom enjoyed by United States citizens—symbolized by the Statue of Liberty—was contrasted against a violent reality by an African American writer. In a world where African Americans could be lynched with few consequences for the vigilantes, the statue’s promise of the ability to live a life free of government intervention—as many of the dedication speakers interpreted it—rang hollow. Many African Americans would have welcomed government intervention to end lynchings.

In 1893, the Reverend C. Aked wrote that he “sat under the shadow of the Statue of Liberty in Jackson Park and read these accounts [Ida Wells’s description of lynching] until I was wild.”¹⁷ In juxtaposing the violent vigilantism of lynching with the statue, Aked highlights the injustice of lynching in a land that boasted the Statue of Liberty. He could sit “under the shadow of the Statue of Liberty” reading accounts of the violence against African Americans, and thereby suggests that neither he or any African American could feel protected in that shadow. The promises of liberty the statue represented—the rights of citizenship and the freedom to live without fear—could not be part of his experience as an American as long as lynching continued.
A later connection between the Statue of Liberty and lynching focused on the statue’s femininity, using it as an image to justify lynching as the necessary protection of white womanhood against the predations of African American men. When the *New York Herald* protested the practice of lynching, Texas journalist W. C. Braun responded that he would be happy to send all Black people north, but if so “they had better ‘put sheet-iron lingerie’ on the Statue of Liberty or some morning they would ‘find the old girl with her head mashed in and bearing the marks of sexual violence.’”\(^{18}\) Braun’s representation of the Statue of Liberty as the embodiment of white womanhood sexually violated by African Americans from the South is an offensive, provoking use of the statue to justify the horrors of lynching. It also suggests the depth to which those who participated in or verbally approved of lynching saw African Americans not as part of the American polity, but as a profound threat to Southern white lives, white women, and white liberties. It illustrates the hatred and fear that African Americans faced from white Southerners as they struggled to claim their rights to full citizenship and full recognition of their human dignity.

There were attempts at setting limits on the opportunities allowed African Americans besides those imposed by fear and violence. Some Americans believed that ex-slaves should only be allowed restricted freedom. In an article also written in 1893, Chas. H. Smith’s “Have American Negroes Too Much Liberty?” argues that too much freedom had led to African Americans becoming citizens without morals, criminals, and a people without the necessary direction to prosper. While discussing the problem, Smith confidently stated that the alienation between the races was growing because “the white man is losing his sympathy and the negro his feeling of dependence. Too much
education and too little work is the prime cause of this growing antipathy.”  

Smith’s argument, published in *Forum*, a magazine dedicated to current events and opinions, represents a larger cultural argument about the status of African Americans at this time. While this article does not include the use of the Statue of Liberty as a symbol or cultural icon, it does represent an attitude toward African Americans and liberty which many African Americans faced in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. The frustration which African Americans must have felt confronting such attitudes, written in such matter-of-fact and condescending language, must surely have shaped their feelings toward the symbol of a nation that claimed freedom of opportunity for all.

At this time, artists continued to link the Statue of Liberty to the caricature tradition, much as Thomas Worth, the illustrator of *Barsqualdi’s Statue*, did. Sometimes white artists made interesting and unexpected links between African Americans and the statue. Sometimes these images were suggestive of the extent to which the Statue of Liberty had become iconic in American culture. A book written in 1891 by Francis Hopkinson Smith shows an African American holding a candle with the caption describing the character “like an ebony statue of liberty.”  

For example, an advertisement published in 1910 for Gold Dust Washing Powder portrays the Gold Dust Twins—two young African American boys balancing boxes of the powder on their heads. Theodore Roosevelt looms large over all, and Uncle Sam points to Roosevelt as the caption reads: “Roosevelt scoured Africa. The Gold Dust Twins Scour America,” and in smaller writing, “Let the Gold Dust Twins do your work.” In the far right background closest to the Gold Dust Twins, the Statue of Liberty stands. The image of the Gold Dust Twins for a cleaning product references the stereotype of African
Americans as menials and servants doing the cleaning in white people’s homes. The statue seems almost an afterthought in the image, but its use is part of a larger tradition in advertising of the period to represent American products by having them appear with the Statue of Liberty. It is therefore serving to mark the “Americanism” of the Gold Dust Twins product, while the Twins reference Africa by their race.

The Statue of Liberty was not entirely anathema to African Americans in the 1890s, however. In his *Autobiography of W. E. B. Du Bois: A Soliloquy on Viewing My Life From The Last Decade of the First Century*, Du Bois detailed a trip to Europe between 1892 and 1894. After describing his travels, Du Bois discussed his return to America by ship, amusingly telling about the immigration of some of the people on this ship and through his words in effect including himself in an immigrant narrative. He described the class system on the ship, the barriers of color in place, and the “half-educated men” on the ship coming to America for opportunity. As in many immigrant narratives, the Statue of Liberty occupied a place toward the end. Du Bois described his experience upon sighting the statue, not as a quasi-religious feeling or overwhelming joy, but rather with some amusement as he recalled an incident from his travels. As Du Bois related, when he saw the statue, “I know not what multitude of emotions surged in the others, but I had to recall that mischievous little French girl whose eyes twinkled as she said: ‘Oh, yes, the Statue of Liberty! With its back toward America, and its face toward France!’”

Du Bois thus subverted the traditional immigrant narrative: first placing himself as an African American among the white immigrants, second by reacting with amusement to the sight of the statue, and third by reminding the world that the Statue of Liberty was French, not American in origin. It may also have been that Du Bois saw the
statue’s position “with its back toward America” as ironically suggestive of the position that white America and the promises of American liberty had in relation to African Americans such as himself.

In 1895, a more favorable use of the Statue of Liberty was drawn by an artist whose race is unknown. A picture of a Statue of Liberty that looks remarkably like Bartholdi’s proposed statue for Egypt, holding up a book instead of a torch, is on the frontispiece of the Afro-American Encyclopaedia. In this instance, the statue enlightened the world with knowledge about African Americans and other “classes,” as the book states. Whether white or African American, the illustrator’s positive connection between the statue and the knowledge of African Americans shows the statue still had some currency as a positive symbol. It is interesting that the statue featured most closely mimics Bartholdi’s unmade Alexandria statue rather than its New York cousin. The Encyclopedia may have used the Egyptian statue’s connection to Africa as a closer symbol to its subject matter while subtly suggesting a familiar symbol with connections to freedom and enlightenment. As in the celebration of the dedication held at an African American school discussed above, education and liberty were seen as connected.

In 1906, however, a connection occurred between the Statue of Liberty that threatened African Americans’ positive association with the statue for the foreseeable future. In Springfield, Missouri, on April 14, 1906, there was a lynching of three African American men, two of whom were charged with the rape of a white woman. The men were dragged out of their cells by a mob that broke into the jail, hanged, then thrown into a pyre, and burned until little remained. In an ironic move, the mob took a Statue of
Liberty from the town center and placed it on top of the tower from which the men were hanged. The situation caused so much chaos and public outcry that the governor of Missouri had to call out the militia to supervise the town and attempt to arrest the miscreants.

The Springfield lynching was by far the most horrible connection between the Statue of Liberty and the violence and death meted out to African Americans. The *Cleveland Gazette*, an African-American newspaper, deemed the whole affair to be a “hellish orgy,” and stated that the men were hanged from the tower “surmounted by a sheet iron figure of the Goddess of Liberty….”

The Kansas City’s *Rising Son* also mentioned this connection, opening the story: “Around the statue of the Goddess of Liberty at Springfield, Missouri centered one of the most revolting tragedies ever recorded in the annals of crime.”

Understandably, the *Gazette* and other African American papers such as the Minneapolis-Saint Paul *Appeal*, the Wichita *Searchlight*, and the Wisconsin *Weekly Advocate* were more concerned with apprehending those who had performed this act and the horrible deaths of these men than the use of the Statue of Liberty. The Saint Louis *Palladium*’s furious article critiqued what they predicted as to be the short-lived duration of public disgust:

To-day the entire world is aroused, and indignation is high, but it means little so far as the poor, defenseless negro is concerned. Soon the ardor of public sentiment will be cooled, and the magistrates of the law will cease to be so vigilant as they are at present, and humanity will place her stamp of approval upon the Springfield butchery. The flag, for whose preservation the negro has fought and died, will not protect him.

More than one newspaper attributed the San Francisco earthquake, which happened soon after this event, to the wrath of God at the slaying of these innocent men.
Most white papers were horrified by the use of the Statue of Liberty in conjunction with these brutal deaths. The governor of New Mexico commented on this irony, while the governor of Missouri promised justice and told the *Cleveland Gazette*:

“The Statue of the Goddess of Liberty will have no right to stand in the public square of Springfield until justice is done.”

The most poignant reaction to the whole affair occurred in the white newspaper the *St. Louis Post-Dispatch*, owned by the Pulitzer family that had helped to organize the pedestal fundraiser for the Statue of Liberty. (fig. 18, p. 242) In a political cartoon published just a few days after the lynching, the Statue of Liberty is depicted with a snake’s face. The tablet the statue holds is turned so the audience can read “Liberty” printed across it. The arm with the torch is stretched out to the side, and supports the ropes of three African-American men hanging off it. Crows perch along the arm, and eye the hanging men viciously. The shadow of the Statue of Liberty stretches out along the bottom to form a picture of a gallows. Obviously the artist wished his audience to understand the incongruity of the use of the Statue of Liberty in the murder and torture of these men. In the end, however, the prediction of the African American St. Louis *Palladium*’s came true: no one was punished for the lynching, and the initial furor was cut short due to coverage of the tragic earthquake in San Francisco that happened a few days later.

Discussions of liberty in the African American community did not end during the 1900s and 1910s. In the African American newspaper *The Crisis* in 1913, Caleb S. Dutton published “Equality and Liberty,” an article calling for equality of opportunity for African Americans that claimed liberty as “so cardinal in democracy as to seem hardly secondary to equality in importance.” Despite this call for equality and liberty, Dutton
did not reference the Statue of Liberty as a symbol of what should be, perhaps because he did not wish to use a symbol contaminated by its use in lynching, or perhaps because the Statue of Liberty simply did not occur to him as relevant. Similarly, two stanzas of a poem published in *The Crisis* by Esther A. Yates in 1915 read:

And this is freedom? This is liberty?  
The place  
Where justice reigns? ‘Home of the brave and free’?  
Look! Trace  
The deepened furrows of servility  
Upon a burdened race!  

Jehovah, burn into our faith’s weak ray  
Thy might.  
We crave but half a chance to blaze a way  
To light,  
To dawn, from racial night.

Despite calling for liberty, even with the imagery of rays of light blazing through the darkness, Yates did not use the Statue of Liberty as a symbol.

1916 was the thirtieth anniversary of the Statue of Liberty. A gala occurred in New York both to commemorate the anniversary and to celebrate the illumination of the Statue of Liberty with floodlights. The *New York Age*, an African American newspaper based in New York City, did not mention the festivities, much as its forerunner, the *New York Freeman*, had largely ignored the dedication. The *Baltimore Afro-American* remained similarly silent. The *Cleveland Gazette*, which had originally run a two-page article discussing the dedication ceremonies, ignored the celebrations too. Instead, the *Gazette* chose to publish an editorial by the Reverend William Byrd about the South’s tendency to vote for Democratic candidates, African Americans’ inability to vote in the South, and the Republican Party’s need to reinvent itself as a party sympathetic to the
needs of African Americans.\textsuperscript{33} The article discussed President Wilson at great length, with no mention of the fact that at the time of the editorial, Wilson was in New York celebrating an official symbol of freedom. For their part, those at the official celebration did not mention African Americans, either. Even the somewhat tenuous connection between the Statue of Liberty and African Americans that had been noted at the dedication had been erased. The ambiguity with which the African American community had originally received the Statue of Liberty—characterized by excitement, interest, sarcasm, and frustration—had become silence.

\textbf{The Statue of Liberty’s Meanings for African Americans: 1917-1945}

On September 4, 1938, a new masthead graced the \textit{Atlanta Daily World}. That day and for the next sixty years, readers of one of the first successful African American dailies saw the Statue of Liberty on the newspaper’s front page, rising up between two globes and bathing them in beams of light.\textsuperscript{34} The statue had been scarce in African American public discourse during the twentieth century’s early years, but the new masthead was just one of an increased number of uses of the monument during and between the two world wars. African American references to the monument in the press and elsewhere appeared in connection with struggles against discrimination and violence, and in reference to African American institutions’ vitality.\textsuperscript{35} More occasionally, whites linked the statue to African American struggles and victories. But as in earlier years, African Americans approached the statue ambivalently. Increasingly into the 1920s, 1930s, and 1940s, it symbolized their liberty or their hopes for attaining it. But at other times it represented exclusion from freedoms reserved for whites.
As America entered World War I, the statue’s meanings for African Americans developed in connection with specific attempts to gain liberty, equality, and justice. These efforts and uses of the Statue of Liberty centered on wartime contributions toward the protection of liberty abroad; indeed, participation in the war became a crucial test of citizenship, especially for African Americans and other marginalized groups. At the urging of leaders like W.E.B. Du Bois and of war bond advertisements, many African Americans supported the war effort in hopes of claiming postwar rewards. Overall, 370,000 African American soldiers and 1,400 officers served in the military, and thousands more volunteered time and money on the home front. The monument also acquired meaning on the home front in connection with African Americans’ combating of discrimination, segregation, and violence within America’s borders.

The Statue of Liberty was not used as frequently to solicit African American wartime support as it was for European immigrants, but the *St. Paul and Minneapolis Appeal*, a Minnesota African American newspaper, occasionally ran Liberty Bond and other war-related notices featuring the monument. Such advertisements were part of a larger pattern in which African American newspapers linked the interests of the federal government to those of their own readers. One front-page notice appearing in October 1917, sponsored by the Federal Reserve Bank of Minneapolis, urged readers to ponder the choice between “Bonds or Bondage—Which?” It showed the statue posed in front of factory smokestacks symbolizing American industry. Two weeks later, a similar advertisement sponsored by the bank showed the same illustration and reminded readers, “Your Neighbors and Friends are Watching You. Don’t be a Slacker.” That edition of the paper also devoted its entire front page to an appeal titled, “America’s War Answer:
Our Second Liberty Loan.” It showed the statue juxtaposed against the Capitol Building. War-related notices featuring the statue continued in the Appeal the following year. In August 1918, a War Savings Stamp notice featured the “Torch of Liberty,” and private businesses, too, joined with government agencies in using the monument to promote patriotism. A January 1918 Purity-brand bread advertisement adopted the image of the statue with factory smokestacks and asserted, “We Must Win.”

While they ran in an African American newspaper, the bond and stamp advertisements were designed by government institutions for mass circulation and contained neither explicit reference to African Americans, nor appeals based on race. Instead, Minneapolis Federal Reserve Bank notices’ texts explained how bonds worked. They emphasized that bonds were loans, not donations, “every cent of which will be returned,” and that a “Liberty Bond is money which pays you a secured income for your home and family.” They urged readers to act as “an undivided nation” to protect lives abroad and at home. Likewise, War Savings Stamp advertisements espoused thrift and careful consumption for the sake of preserving life and liberty at home and abroad.

There is no evidence that the Statue of Liberty was included in these notices because of any race-specific association. Indeed, a full front-page bond advertisement published in the Appeal in September 1918 highlighted the statue’s association with European immigration. It showed a female figure of liberty with her arms outstretched to a crowd of white men and women in traditional European dress. Still, some ideas expressed in the notices may have held particular significance for African Americans, and the statue may have held meaning for them in this context. Reminders of community
surveillance, rhetoric of national unity, and promises of guaranteed investment return may have specially resonated with African Americans combating stereotypes of laziness, struggling against neighborhood segregation, and fighting for financial security and personal safety. The choice between bonds or bondage offered in one advertisement may also have recalled forbearers’ enslavement.\textsuperscript{46} While reader response is not certain, the statue as it appeared in these notices may have been understood as a symbol of patriotism and hope for a racially inclusive future.

The notices contained in the \textit{Appeal} implied that African Americans would reap the benefits of wartime investment, but such promises rang hollow to many throughout the war. Discrimination remained a daily reality on the home front and for African Americans serving in segregated units. As servicemen fought and died to secure the world’s safety abroad, lynching and other forms of racially motivated violence continued to claim African American lives at home. The \textit{Chicago Defender}, one of the nation’s most widely circulating African American newspapers, employed the Statue of Liberty to critique such ironies amid a war intended to promote liberties abroad that clearly did not exist for all at home. In July 1917, the paper printed an image of the Statue of Liberty representing “Liberty, Protection, Opportunity, Happiness, For all White Men’ and ‘Humiliation, Segregation, Lynching, For all Black Men.”\textsuperscript{47} This image not only protested racial inequalities, but in construing the statue as a monument to liberties reserved for whites only, it also evinced ambivalence toward the statue. Indeed, at a time when the statue was starting to be understood as a truly national monument, the \textit{Defender}’s image represented reluctance to embrace the symbol of a nation which would not fully include African Americans as citizens.
Still, the paper’s very use of the Statue of Liberty to critique racial injustice implied the monument’s potential value, even if the liberty it embodied did not yet extend to African Americans. Indeed, the following year, another Chicago Defender cartoon represented the statue more positively in connection with potential gains. This shift occurred amid rising optimism within the African American press during 1918. That year, newspapers noted that the growth of anti-lynching groups and attempts to ban the movie Birth of a Nation marked increased public awareness that racist violence and representations contradicted World War I’s mission of making “the world safe for Democracy.”

The Defender’s February 1918 cartoon, “The Old Mob and the New Keeper,” depicted the female figure of liberty fending off a crowd composed of figures representing “labor unions,” “Jim Crow legislation,” “segregation,” “cruelty,” “barbarism,” and “yellow journalism.” They wielded clubs and papers marked “injustice,” “social privilege,” “anti-Negro bill,” and “State Right Bill.” While the spirit of Abraham Lincoln looked on, Liberty shielded an African American man confined to a cell marked “prison discrimination,” and she held up a newspaper proclaiming “Freedom For All! Says President. Democracy Must Rule.”

Here, the statue emerged not as the representative of white liberty, but as the protector of African Americans and the messenger of the nation’s past and present leaders. While the image of Lincoln combined with that of Liberty could have recalled the statue’s links to abolition, the cartoon itself made no explicit connection. Instead, it appeared to represent the hoped-for extension of national ideals of liberty, equality, and justice to African Americans.

When World War I ended, African Americans hoped their wartime contributions would be rewarded, and the humiliation, segregation, and lynching decried earlier would
pass into history. Indeed, the all-African American 369th, 371st, and 372nd regiments had reason for optimism when they were honored with the Croix de Guerre for valor on Armistice Day in 1918. But upon return home and into the 1920s, many realized that dreams for racial advancement predicated on wartime service would remain deferred. Despite important gains made during the period, African Americans confronted a rising tide of prejudice, and their uses of the statue continued to develop in connection to specific struggles for liberty, equality, and justice. Military personnel returning to the South faced harassment and lynching at the hands of individuals and mobs intent on intimidating or killing those who had supposedly experienced too much freedom and equality during the war. Amid the overall ethnic and racial conservatism that would characterize the 1920s, organized racial terrorism also rose with the resurgence of the Ku Klux Klan. By the early part of the decade, the organization comprised millions of members nationwide. This revival sparked a series of investigations and exposés which placed the Klan on the national agenda in the press and in political arenas.

In this context, the African American press employed the Statue of Liberty to highlight the threats against the liberty the monument symbolized, and used it to inspire readers to fight racism. A May 1920 Chicago Defender cartoon showed the monument engulfed in a cloud of smoke rising from the scene of a lynching. With the caption “Stifling Liberty!,” the image evoked African American liberty, as embodied by the statue, under attack. This contrasted to the paper’s 1917 use of the statue as the symbol of African American degradation and white freedom, and instead continued the newspaper’s more positive representation of the monument as the “New Keeper” of African American liberty. A November 1923 cartoon titled “Dismantled” appeared in the
Pittsburgh Courier, an important Pennsylvania African American newspaper. It depicted the Klan’s transformation of the statue from a symbol of liberty into one of violent repression and racial hatred. The cartoon showed the monument’s torch falling to the ground, replaced with a Klan cross. The statue’s tablet read “white supremacy,” and her crown was cloaked by a Klan hood. The caption below stated,

With the torch of light, hope and inspiration torn down, and in its place the flaming cross of the K.K.K firmly planted, the Statue of Liberty has lost her usual significance. Imagine real homecoming Americans hailing her as of yore when they learn that she has been dismantled, disfigured and disgraced by the hooded mob that usurps court, judge and jury in America, and declares its constitution to be the guiding lamp of half a continent! 54 (fig. 19, p. 243)

Thus warning of the Klan’s threat to liberty, the cartoon accompanied an article summarizing investigations into the organization’s nationwide conspiracy to control American politics and legal processes. Significantly, and in contrast to the Defender’s 1917 representation, this cartoon’s assertion that “the Statue of Liberty has lost her usual significance” suggested that some African Americans of this period did consider the statue to be a symbol of their own liberty. 55

As African Americans of the 1920s decried Klan violence and intimidation, many also experienced triumphs and tribulations in the urban North. Thus, the statue’s meaning evolved in this context, as well. The Great Migration filled cities like Chicago and Detroit with large African American populations, creating new opportunities and new challenges for racial justice and harmony. African Americans sought and sometimes gained economic and social advancement in cities, but competition for jobs, services, and housing often combined with white residents’ prejudices to spark riots. The year 1919 marked a highpoint in these outbreaks, witnessing riots in more than twenty cities, including especially vicious upheavals in Chicago and Tulsa. Throughout the 1920s, riots
continued in cities like Detroit, especially when individual African American families attempted to integrate white neighborhoods.

The African American press responded to these events with extensive coverage and calls for justice, and these sometimes featured the statue. A July 1925 Pittsburgh Courier image of the Statue of Liberty appeared in connection with fears of mob violence, urban housing desegregation, and Klan threats. The monument stood atop a pedestal labeled “U.S.A.,” wearing a banner proclaiming “Liberty Intended for All.” In the background a Detroit newspaper was shown with the headline, “Moving of Colored Family Into White Neighborhood Starts War—Klan Meeting Called.” The neighborhood war of the headline was also depicted in the cartoon’s background, where a gorilla labeled “brute instinct” rose out of a mob carrying signs reading “mob law,” “bigotry” and “hate.” At the statue’s base a woman labeled “colored citizens” knelt as though praying to the monument for help, while two African American men gathered near the statue in postures of anger and frustration. (fig. 20, p. 244)

It is difficult to discern which specific incident inspired this use of the Statue of Liberty, but the scene of an angry mob unchecked by law enforcement was all too familiar for African Americans attempting to integrate white neighborhoods in the summer of 1925. From April through July of that year, mobs attacked such residents in Detroit four times, and in mid July, the city’s branch of the Klan mobilized. That September, the case of Ossian Sweet, an African American doctor who shot a member of a white mob that had gathered outside his newly purchased Detroit home, made headlines. In such cases, the police provided, at best, minimal protection. Thus, the appeals to the Statue of Liberty by the cartoon’s “colored citizens” highlighted the
inadequacy of police protection. The monument itself symbolized the promise of freedom from segregation and violence that the American justice system had made, but did not always fulfill. The cartoon’s title, “Yet Evolution is a Question to Some,” perhaps alluded to the irony, noted at the time by NAACP critics of desegregation violence, that whites claiming biological racial superiority would participate in such animalistic brutality. In this sense, the statue represented the promise of freedom from brutality and the racist stereotypes that fueled it. Overall, like the Courier’s 1923 “Dismantled” cartoon, this one, too, implied African Americans’ belief that the statue was supposed to represent all Americans’ liberty, including their own.

Despite continued racist violence and discrimination, many African Americans experienced economic and social gains during the 1920s and beyond. Amid this progress, the Statue of Liberty symbolized financial security and the vitality of African American institutions. The African American-owned Liberty Life Insurance Company of Illinois, which was founded in 1919 and later merged with two other companies to form the Supreme Life Insurance Company, used the statue as its logo. A 1925 advertisement showed the logo of the statue encircled by the company’s name, with the founder’s name written beneath it. As previously noted, the Atlanta Daily World adopted the statue in its masthead in 1938, and the monument became further associated with the African American press when, in 1944, it appeared in notices for National Negro Newspaper Week. The event commemorated the founding of the first African American newspaper 117 years earlier, and featured appearances by President Roosevelt and African American celebrities, including Paul Robeson, Cab Calloway, Marian Anderson, and Lena Horne. The notice’s text reinforced the emphasis on liberty, highlighting the African American
press’ role in “guaranteeing to all men a free, rich and stimulating place” in American society, and in “helping America to see that no one can be truly free until all are free.” Here, the statue symbolized belief in the inseparability of African American liberty and the fulfillment of freedom for all Americans; indeed, the former stood as the precondition for the latter.

Fights for liberty and against racial violence continued into the 1930s, as the urban riots and Southern lynchings that had stained the 1920s lingered into the following decade. African Americans and their allies worked for federal anti-lynching legislation, and protested the Southern legal system’s handling of African Americans’ cases in the courts. The statue continued to appear in the African American—and sometimes white—press in connection with such developments, and the monument continued to symbolize a liberty that was supposed to be attainable for all. A *Pittsburgh Courier* cartoon suggested the limitations of African Americans’ freedom and the challenges of attaining liberty. It showed the statue’s head on a coin, marked “Liberty” and “In God We Trust,” rolling over figures representing “injustices,” “lynching,” and “mob rule.” Its title, “What Price Liberty?,” asked what more was needed to make the statue’s liberty a reality for African Americans. The hand which held the coin was labeled “self-respect,” and implied that part of the answer lay with African Americans’ themselves.

In reference to Southern inequities and violence, other *Pittsburgh Courier* images used the Statue of Liberty to critique the justice system and race rioting. A cartoon called “A Beacon of Light for Dixie” depicted the monument’s raised torch breaking through an image of the state of North Carolina and of the *Raleigh News and Observer* newspaper. Its flame enlightened the scene with “Justice for the Negro South.” In contrast to
earlier images in which the statue represented liberty for whites only, and in keeping with many images of the 1920s, the monument here symbolized hope for African American freedom. In reference to riots, a September 1934 *Courier* cartoon titled “Flight!,” protested unrest in Princess Anne, Maryland. It showed the statue knocked to the ground, trying to flee the smoke rising from the city behind her. She had dropped her torch, and her tablet lay smashed beneath her.  

Here, the monument symbolized the fragility of African American liberty, but like the *Courier’s* and the *Defender’s* cartoons of the 1920s, it also suggested that the statue was supposed to represent African American liberty.

Instances of race rioting and injustice like those above occurred frequently across the nation during the 1930s, but the Scottsboro case stood out as one of the period’s starkest reminders of liberty’s limits. The case began in Alabama in March 1931, when nine African American teenagers were charged with gang raping two white women. Over the next seven years, the trials proceeded through the court system to the Alabama Supreme Court, and the defense brought the case of two of the accused, Haywood Patterson and Clarence Norris, to the United States Supreme Court. In July 1937, four of the accused were released after charges against them were dropped, while the other five remained in prison until they were paroled or escaped in the 1940s.

The Scottsboro trials captured headlines in African American and white newspapers nationwide and became the subject of editorial cartoons that sometimes featured the Statue of Liberty. A February 1934 image in the *Pittsburgh Courier* titled “The Light That Must Not Fail!” showed the statue’s raised torch with its arm labeled NAACP and its flame inscribed “Scottsboro Defense Fund.” The same cartoon, with
the flame simply marked “Defense Fund” appeared in the paper in August of that year. A few papers in the African American and white press continued to use the statue as one important phase of the trial ended. On July 30, 1937, four of the defendants who were freed—Olen Montgomery, Willie Robertson, Roy Wright, and Eugene Williams—arrived in New York City accompanied by their lawyer Samuel Liebowitz. Included in reports of their arrival and first days of freedom was a picture of the four being “introduced” to the statue and the liberty it represented. The photograph appeared in both the Chicago Defender and Life magazine, and it showed Montgomery, Robertson, Wright, and Williams looking out the window of their lawyer’s office, while Liebowitz pointed at the statue.

Within a few years of the Scottsboro trials’ conclusion, African Americans began considering their fight for liberty, equality, and justice in terms of war. As during World War I, and despite disappointments that participation in that conflict had not yielded hoped-for improvements, African Americans of the 1940s seized opportunities for advancement during World War II. Many saw themselves waging a two-front war against racism at home and abroad, and the statue’s significance continued to emerge in this context. African Americans appealed to America’s civic tradition of inclusive egalitarianism and to liberal and intellectual rhetoric of the period that construed World War II as a war against Hitler’s racism and racist imperialism worldwide. They enlisted for military service in record numbers, with a total of one million African Americans serving across the military’s branches, and they also purchased war bonds in abundance. But despite wartime gains, African Americans continued to experience
Throughout the war, African American press cartoons and editorials invoked the Statue of Liberty to urge and celebrate wartime participation, to symbolize the links between racism at home and abroad, and to highlight ironies within America’s mission of ending racism worldwide. The *Pittsburgh Courier’s* “Double V Campaign,” initiated in January 1942 with the motto “Democracy: Victory at Home, Victory Abroad,” contained one such reference. A February 1942 editorial published in connection with the campaign was accompanied by an image of the statue under attack by stone-throwing Nazis, segregationists, and Klansmen. The editorial’s text equated the Nazi threat to liberty abroad with threats posed by racist groups and individuals at home. The *Courier’s* use of the statue in the context of the Double V Campaign signaled its importance for African Americans as a symbol of American and international democracy. Like the *Courier’s* 1923 “Dismantled” cartoon of the monument transformed into a Klansman, this image highlighted liberty’s fragility, and it used the statue to urge African Americans to protect that liberty.

Many African Americans responded to calls like those published in the *Pittsburgh Courier* to defeat racism and protect liberty at home and abroad. In response, the African American press invoked the statue as a symbol of thanks and praise for their contributions. The Statue of Liberty appeared in a Thanksgiving cartoon published in the *Atlanta Daily World* in November 1942. Titled “Let Us Give Thanks,” the cartoon consisted of a simple drawing of the statue representing general gratitude. A cartoon titled “The Scroll Grows,” which appeared in the *Atlanta Daily World* in September 1942
and in another African American newspaper, the *New York Age*, the following month, highlighted African American servicemen’s accomplishments. It showed the statue holding up a list of eight African American soldiers’ names under the words, “Cited for Bravery in World War II.” Dorie Miller, the famed sailor who received the Navy Cross in May 1942, headed the list.  

One use of the statue in the African American press and in a patriotic celebration urged the combining of national patriotism with racial solidarity to win the war. The *Atlanta Daily World*’s notice for the celebration of Flag Day in June 1942 displayed an image of a popular propaganda poster titled “The United Nations Fight For Freedom.” The poster portrayed the Statue of Liberty rising up amid the flags of thirty-six Allied nations. Below, the caption noted that the poster would be distributed on Flag Day, and it explained that the Allies’ flags, juxtaposed against “our own symbol of freedom, the Statue of Liberty,” symbolized wartime cooperation. The caption further noted that many of the nations represented, including South Africa and several Latin American and Caribbean countries, had significant African or African-descended populations. Thus, while the statue represented African Americans’ belonging within the American nation, its use to inspire wartime contributions appeared in connection with appeals based on readers’ sense of belonging within the wider African diaspora.  

Another image of the Statue of Liberty in the African American press placed African Americans’ wartime contributions within the context of wider American multi-ethnic involvement. In January 1945, a *New York Age* cartoon titled “Her Nationality” showed the statue and spelled “LIBERTY” vertically with the first letters of surnames—Lahey, Iversen, Baldwin, Englow, Rosen, Tomasso, Yablonski—supposed to represent
different ethnic groups. The cartoon highlighting of the war’s and liberty’s inclusiveness in an African American newspaper was somewhat ironic. While World War II’s “melting pot platoons,” composed of soldiers from different regional, ethnic, and religious backgrounds, did produce a homogenized white American identity, such inclusiveness did not generally extend to African Americans, who served mainly in segregated units. However, to the extent that the war did provide African American soldiers the chance to mix with whites of different ethnic backgrounds during training or when not on active duty, perhaps the cartoon signified a liberty which seemed nearly, if not fully, in reach.

As suggested above, wartime espousals of racial inclusion and liberty for all did not always become reality for African Americans. Military segregation persisted not only in the separation of African American men and women into separate armed forces and women’s service units, but in medical treatment and the type of work units were trained to perform. Thus, the African American press invoked the statue to critique discriminatory policies affecting troops at home and abroad. An Atlanta Daily World cartoon used the monument to protest the Red Cross policy, in force until 1950, of separating African American and white blood. It showed the statue’s arm receiving blood from two conjoined tubes, one emanating from a white arm and the other from a black arm. The caption read, “Memo to the Red Cross—Do recognize that blood is blood and democracy will be the better for it. Our boys must not die for the lack of it—democracy or blood.” The image and caption thus mapped liberty, democracy, and survival onto the body of the Statue of Liberty. Indeed, the statue represented not just the survival of troops, but the vitality of the nation, and the newspaper’s use of the
monument asserted the necessity of both African American and white contributions to the maintenance of liberty.

African Americans’ experience of visiting the Statue of Liberty itself could also signify challenges to segregation, while highlighting the ironies of protecting liberties abroad not fully enjoyed at home. African American servicemen, WACs (Women’s Army Auxiliary Corps) and WAVES (Women Accepted for Volunteer Emergency Service) passing through New York City visited the Statue of Liberty, but as the Chicago Defender reported in March 1945, such visits were tainted by the presence of Jim Crow restrooms on the boat that transported tourists to Liberty Island. After describing the inferiority of African Americans’ facilities in comparison to those reserved for whites, the reporter explained that the separate facilities and customary use of them had likely lingered from the boat’s and crew’s previous service in Baltimore. The existence of these restrooms was an especially ironic reminder that the liberty the nation celebrated in symbols was not fully extended in reality. A photograph which juxtaposed the “Colord [sic] Crew Only” sign with the view of the statue out the boat’s window captured the irony perfectly. Its caption stated that the statue herself must “wonder when ‘democratic’ America will open its eyes to the light from her torch.” It further asserted that “the noble lady is directly humiliated” by the practice of segregation on board her vessel. Within the month, pressure from the press resulted in the removal of separate restrooms on boats carrying visitors to the statue. Such action showed that the statue was a symbol considered important enough, at least by some African Americans, to rescue from the tinge of segregation. Although affecting just one small area of transportation, it was a
victory in bringing the liberty the statue represented closer to African Americans’ experience.

By the war’s end, African Americans had cause to celebrate their own and the nation’s victories in preserving liberty abroad. But once home, they also had reason to fear that their own quest for liberty might remain unfulfilled. President Harry Truman would desegregate the military in 1948, but wartime segregation had underscored to many how fully racism was ingrained in America’s ostensibly egalitarian culture. Moreover, African American veterans faced no guarantees and many obstacles in obtaining benefits afforded their white counterparts. The GI Bill promised access to funds for education and job training, as well as home, farm, or business purchases, but many African Americans were excluded from these benefits. Other legislative efforts to ensure workplace equity also faced opposition. Amid a nation-wide housing shortage, African Americans trying to move into white neighborhoods or veterans’ housing developments encountered rioting and intimidation similar to that of previous decades.82

Joy at the nation’s victory and optimism for the future mingled with concern and questions about what that future might hold in African American press representations of the statue. A triumphant September 1945 cartoon in the New York Age bore the heading, “Victory!” and showed the Statue of Liberty’s raised torch behind arms hoisting rifles aloft.83 Moreover, an advertisement for Victory Bonds appearing in the Chicago Defender in December 1945 showed a returning soldier waving at the statue from deck of a boat. Its text explained that the bonds would pay for passage home for servicemen, provide for their medical expenses, and fund new job and property ownership
opportunities for them. In both cases, the statue represented the fulfillment of the promise of liberty for African American soldiers.  

If such uses of the Statue of Liberty represented the optimism that some African Americans felt, or at least the optimism that advertisers wanted them to feel, other uses of the monument captured the real uncertainty that many experienced. A cartoon appearing in the *Chicago Defender* in October 1945, titled “By the Dawn’s Early Light,” portrayed African Americans’ concerns and questions regarding the sureness of their victory and the security of their futures. It depicted an African American sailor looking off the deck of a boat toward the monument, his face a mixture of surprise and apprehension at what he saw: the statue holding up a question mark instead of her torch. While the monument was supposed to represent homecoming and hope for postwar liberty, this image evinced the ambivalence that African American servicemen felt toward the statue. As the sailor looked out “by the dawn’s early light” to see if a symbol of American liberty—not the Star-Spangled Banner this time, but the statue’s torch—was still there, he was not sure the flame of liberty shone for him.

African American soldiers looking out at the statue as they sailed into New York Harbor also experienced the mix of optimism, uncertainty, and ambivalence expressed in the images above. They expressed such attitudes in interviews and memoirs, and their reactions were also implied in press coverage of “Liberty Ship” arrivals. A *New York Times* story noted that the ship *Levi Woodbury*, which carried the all-African American Fifteenth “Red Tail” Division, made an extra circle around the statue before docking in New York Harbor, although the article made no mention of the troops’ individual reactions. The *Chicago Defender* included similar and somewhat more specific
coverage. An August 1945 picture titled “They’re Coming Home!” showed African American soldiers waving joyfully from the deck of their boat, and its caption noted that they were sailing past the statue.\textsuperscript{87} It is difficult to peer behind such joyful images of homecoming to know what African American soldiers were actually thinking when they sailed past the monument. One soldier’s reaction suggested that at least some African American veterans embraced the monument only ambivalently and reluctantly. That man recalled,

…the white soldiers up on deck said, ‘There she is!’ They’re talking about the Statue of Liberty. There’s a great outburst. I’m down below and I’m sayin’, Hell, I’m not going up there. Damn that. All of a sudden, I found myself with tears, cryin’ and saying the same thing they were saying.\textsuperscript{88}

Here, as in World War I, the soldier’s reaction showed the tension between African Americans’ claiming and rejecting of the statue as a national symbol of their own liberty.

Once back home, African Americans used the Statue of Liberty as a symbol in their quest for postwar liberty, despite ambivalence. The monument appeared in African American press attacks on old enemies and identifications of new allies. A June 1945 Chicago Defender cartoon titled “Trying to Put it Out,” conflated the image of the statue with that of President Truman.\textsuperscript{89} The President walked forward, holding a candle labeled “liberalism” aloft like the statue’s torch, but sneaking up behind him was a Southerner intending to snuff out the light with the help of “American Nazis.” The image of Truman cast as the statue represented liberalism’s potential to advance liberty by extending America’s post-war prosperity and democracy to African Americans. But like the Pittsburgh Courier’s 1942 cartoon of the statue under attack by Nazis, segregationists, and Klansmen, it warned that even though the Nazis had been defeated abroad, similar threats to liberty still existed at home.
Another press image used the Statue of Liberty to address threats posed by racists to African American liberty with reference to housing discrimination. A December 1945 Atlanta Daily World cartoon titled “The Peacetime Saboteur” invoked the statue to protest the restrictive covenants which helped maintain housing segregation. Used by developers for decades to attract “desirable” residents, especially in new urban neighborhoods, such covenants prohibited initial and subsequent sales of properties to African Americans, and sometimes Jews. The cartoon showed a white man representing “unamericanism” ascending a ladder of “restrictive covenants” to the monument’s torch-bearing arm. The man was armed with a hammer poised to pummel the statue’s upraised arm, which represented “the Constitution.” Overturning restrictive covenants was indeed an uphill battle. In 1948, NAACP lawyers won a reversal of a U.S. Supreme Court decision which had upheld covenants’ validity, but it took until 1968 to push through federal legislation against them. In the meantime, as in the Pittsburgh Courier’s 1925 cartoon in which African Americans appealed to the statue amid a housing riot, the statue represented hope for liberty, justice, and equality.

In most cases, African American uses of and references to the statue in the 1930s and during World War II had evinced a more open embrace of the monument than during earlier periods. But some immediate postwar uses, such as the Chicago Defender’s cartoon of the sailor staring at the statue’s question mark, or the returning veterans’ reluctance to acknowledge its significance, showed that doubts remained about the Statue of Liberty’s ability to embody African American liberty.

African-Americans and the Statue of Liberty: 1946 to the Present
On February 5, 1946, in Freeport, New York on Long Island, the four Ferguson brothers, who were all GIs—three of them in uniform—were refused service at a bus terminal restaurant, and got into an argument with the restaurant manager. The restaurant manager complained to the police, and a police officer later stopped the four men on the street, charging them with being drunk and disorderly, and suspecting that they had broken windows in nearby businesses. He later reported that one of them claimed to have a gun and reached for it, and he fired at first one, then a second man as an altercation broke out. Two of the brothers were killed, and a third was wounded in the shoulder. The men were in fact unarmed, but the police officer was not even reprimanded for the shootings. The incident drew demands for further investigation from a number of organizations, including the American Civil Liberties Union, the Communist Party, a New York Committee for Justice in Freeport, the American Jewish Congress, and the United Negro and Allied Veterans Association, and resulted in the governor of New York appointing a special investigator into the shooting and how it was handled by the Freeport police and courts.93

On the heels of this tragic shooting, a race riot erupted in Columbia, Tennessee on the night of February 25, 1946, when James Stephenson, a U.S. Navy veteran, accompanied his mother into a department store to pick up a radio that had been left there for repair. When his mother and the white male clerk began to argue about the repair order, and the clerk threatened Mrs. Stephenson, her son intervened, and the clerk ended up crashing through one of the store’s windows. Stephenson’s arrest, bail, and re-arrest prompted the gathering of a white mob outside the county courthouse and the gathering of Black citizens and veterans in the area where Black businesses were located. Police
officers entering the Black business area were fired upon and wounded, but the 
patrolmen, along with some of the town’s white citizens, then gathered and conducted 
illegal searches of homes and businesses, stole cash and goods, confiscated weapons, 
fired randomly into buildings, and arrested more than one hundred Black citizens who 
were then denied bail or access to legal counsel. The riot made national headlines, and 
was one of Thurgood Marshall’s early cases, as well as a rallying point for Black 
oprganizations gathering strength for the struggle for civil rights in the coming decades.94

In response to these two incidents, the African American artist Charles White 
created a charcoal and ink drawing that appeared in the March 1946 issues of the 
National Negro Congress’ Congress View that reconfigured the iconic pose of the Statue 
of Liberty into an indictment of the injustice of these events. Dominating the drawing is 
an African American in a torn soldier’s uniform, perhaps representing one of the 
Ferguson brothers, but also representative of all the African American soldiers who had 
served in the recent war. The soldier holds up a torch, but with an expression of horror at 
what the light of it reveals. Broken shackles and a broken noose hang from his wrists and 
neck, symbols of slavery and lynching contrasting with the symbolism of his uniform as 
one of the men who had fought to bring “freedom” to the world. Below the soldier, 
figures struggle or lie heaped on the ground in the midst of a burned, ruined cityscape. 
The ground before them is labeled “Freeport” and “Columbia.” In the lower right corner 
of the drawing, a trio consisting of a politician, a policeman, and a Klansman holding a 
noose stand. The politician is handing the policeman a paper that reads, “Permit to Kill 
Negro Vets and Civilians.”95 African Americans on the battlefront and the home front 
had held onto the ideals of the “Double V” campaign—defeating fascist enemies abroad
and racist enemies at home. Returning veterans, unable to tolerate any longer the status quo of racism and segregation, were in the forefront of energizing African American activism for full civil rights. The Statue of Liberty’s promise of freedom to participate fully in the American polity had not been realized for all its citizens with the end of the war, and for the African American community, at times the light of her torch only served to reveal the darkness of racism and discrimination against which they struggled.

At other times, however, the statue was a source of encouragement and inspiration in the struggle to realize the full promise of American liberty it represented. The Statue of Liberty appeared in reference to postwar employment discrimination. In February 1946, a notice published in the New York Age used the monument to advocate fair employment practices. Bearing the heading “Bust Ku Klux Filibuster Against F.E.P.C.,” the notice urged support of the Fair Employment Practice Bill in light of the Klan’s attempts to dismantle it. It showed the statue’s raised fist holding the torch above the faces of African American men and women. Its text read in part, “The right to work is the right to live,” and “The Right to Work is the God-Given Right of Every Human Being—Regardless of Race, Color, Creed or National Origin and it must be Guaranteed by our American Democracy.” Such words echoed the language of “life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness,” and thus the statue highlighted individualistic liberties, especially the right to work. At the same time, the image was used to inspire civic liberty, encouraging African Americans to defend their rights against efforts to obstruct the legislative process.

On August 1, 1946, the Southern Regional Council took issue with a statement by Georgia governor Eugene Talmadge that during his three terms as governor “there was
not a lynching in the State.” The SRC, an organization formed to promote racial justice and harmony, and protect civil rights in the South, challenged the governor’s statement with their own records: 508 lynchings from 1882 to 1930, and 19 from 1931 to 1945. Perhaps in response to this exchange, but also in a statement on the tragic injustice of lynching in the United States, a political cartoon the following day in the liberal newspaper, *The Gazette & Daily*, showed the face of the Statue of Liberty with a black eye; her shiner was labeled “LYNCH LAW.”97 The cartoon makes clear that lynching “wounds” and disfigures both the symbol of liberty and the reality of liberty in the United States.

On May 17, 1954, the Supreme Court handed down its landmark decision in Brown vs. Board of Education of Topeka, Kansas, unanimously ending school segregation. The ruling was the turning point in federal law against legal racial segregation, which had previously been supported by the Court’s 1896 ruling in *Plessy v. Ferguson* that permitted “separate but equal” facilities. It made possible the integration of public schools, enforced with federal power, if necessary. In 1957, that power was brought to bear for the first time since Reconstruction when the military was called in to protect nine African American students integrating Central High School in Little Rock, Arkansas.98 One of the “Little Rock Nine” was Minnijean Brown, and in 1958, *Look* magazine published photos of her new life in New York City, including a visit to the Statue of Liberty.99 She had left Little Rock, Arkansas, to finish out the school year at the New Lincoln School, an integrated private high school in the New York City area, because she had no longer been able to tolerate her brutal treatment at the hands of the white students of the Little Rock high school. While the photos of Ms. Brown visiting
the statue might have been intended to suggest that the promise of freedom for African Americans was at last being fulfilled, the ordeal that Ms. Brown described in the article accompanying the photos brought home how far the country and African American people still had to go. As discussed above, almost twenty years earlier, *Life* magazine had carried a photo of four of the “Scottsboro Boys” looking out the office window of their lawyer, Samuel Liebowitz, at the Statue of Liberty. It was another racially charged legal and moral battle that gained national attention. As with Minnijean Brown, it seems when the mainstream press featured such civil rights figures being “introduced” to the Statue of Liberty, it was more than simply underlining the fact that they were touring the sites of New York City. The photos try to connect their freedom struggles with the statue as an icon of American freedom.

In the early 1960s, lunch counter sit-ins and marches in the name of “Freedom Now” were carrying the civil rights struggle more prominently into the mass media and the broader American consciousness. As it had in the decades of the late 19th and early 20th century discussed above, the statue appeared as a symbol of political and social freedom under attack by ideologies opposed to civil rights. African American cartoonist Oliver Wendell Harrington in the *Daily World* showed hooded Ku Klux Klan members snuffing out the light of Liberty’s torch with a Confederate flag.100 (fig. 21, p. 245) While Harrington’s incisive image identifies the Klan as actively seeking to crush liberty in the United States, Hy Rosen’s 1961 political cartoon in the Albany *Times-Union* expands that threat to both sides of the political spectrum. His cartoon shows two vultures pecking at the statue’s raised arm. One vulture is labeled “Extreme Right Wing, John Birch Society, Neo Nazis, Ku Klux Klan,” and the other vulture is labeled “Extreme
As symbols of death and decay, the vultures are appropriate symbols for the political extremism the cartoonist depicts as threats to “life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.” Both cartoons need only depict the statue’s upraised arm and torch to reference the whole statue and its constellation of symbolic associations with American freedom, and to make the point that liberty is under attack from racist, extremist ideologies in American culture.

In January 1961, after a long battle in the Georgia courts by anti-integrationists, a District Court ruling on January 6th brought two Black students, Hamilton Holmes and Charlayne Hunter, to the University of Georgia in Athens. Like the Little Rock Nine before them, the students were met with hostility, taunts, and threats of violence. A few days after their arrival, a crowd of students and spectators gathered outside the women’s dormitory where Hunter resided, smashing windows and snake-dancing through the campus and the town until they were dispersed by police with tear gas. The governor briefly closed the university to restore order. In response to these events, the Indianapolis Star published a political cartoon of the Statue of Liberty sitting at a table, reading a newspaper with the appropriate masthead, “Free Press,” by the light of her torch, her chin in her hand in a disconsolate pose. The headline on the newspaper reads: “Stone Negro Students. U. of Georgia Coeds....” The caption at the top of the cartoon is in quotations to indicate it is the statement of the statue herself: ‘Can’t Get Georgia Off My Mind!’ The statue here is depicted as a passive but troubled spectator to the events going forward in the South, another newspaper reader shaken and saddened by the violence directed at African Americans trying to claim their rightful place in American society and American institutions. Her sadness is made more poignant by her role as the
symbol of the freedom the Black students sought, and the white students tried to deny them.

The foreign press also took note of the civil rights struggle. The failure of the USA to live up to the statue’s meaning as a symbol of equal political freedom for all its citizens was an ideological tool in the Cold War, and a way for other countries to comment on the American superpower that dominated global politics at that time. A 1963 Soviet poster by V. Koretskii showed an African American man being attacked by white men superimposed on the cheek of the Statue of Liberty with the title (in translation): “The shameful stigma of American ‘democracy.’”¹⁰³ Like the “black eye” of lynch law in the 1946 cartoon described above, the attack is a disfigurement of liberty, in metaphor and in fact. The poster mocks the hypocrisy of America’s professed moral superiority to Communist countries in light of America’s institutionalized racial discrimination and deep-seated, sometimes violent racism. A 1961 cartoon from Cuba showed a Klansman in the statue’s pose, holding aloft her torch. In Mexico in 1962, the cartoonist Rius presented the ideological battle lines in America as he saw them. On one side of the cartoon stood a Klansman holding up a flaming cross with a small figure of Adolf Hitler scowling from behind the Klansman’s robes; on the other side stood the Statue of Liberty, her torch aloft, with an equally angry African American man standing in the shelter of her robes glowering at his enemy.¹⁰⁴

In 1965, Langston Hughes wrote an editorial for the *Pittsburgh New Courier* in the form of a dialogue between himself and a character named “Simple” that illustrated the attitude of indifference that white America, and the statue as its representation, seemed to show to African Americans’ struggle for civil liberties at that time. The
editorial also provided a racially based commentary on world politics and the Cold War. Simple argued that even the groups and ideologies most antithetical to the United States at that time—Soviet, Viet Cong, and East Berlin—ultimately chose their allies or enemies along color lines over ideology. Simple remarked, ‘White integrates only with white…’ and illustrated that fact by noting that none of the white refugees coming to America from Communist regimes settled in Harlem. Hughes said: ‘The Hungarians and the Germans who flee to America come seeking freedom.... If you were fleeing to freedom, would you come to live in Harlem?’ ‘Not if I could help it,’ said Simple. ‘The Statue of Liberty is not even looking my way. Her back is dead turned toward Harlem.’

By 1965, the civil rights movement had spawned radical factions like the Black Panthers and Black Liberation Front, ready to pursue the battle against systemic racism by force when other methods seemed inadequate, too slow, or colluding with white society’s oppression of African Americans. A cartoon in the German newspaper, Extra-Zeitung, represented this movement with a Statue of Liberty that had the head of a young Black man, the spiked crown topping his Afro hairstyle, giving the Black Power salute in lieu of a torch, and holding a machine gun instead of a tablet. For these radical ideologies, the Statue of Liberty was equated with white America, the American political system, and even Black-on-Black oppression by some factions of the African American community who were seen as “sell-outs.” The statue’s equation with white America’s power and white America’s indifference led to a plot in 1965 by members of the Black Liberation Front—aided by a woman who was a follower of the Quebec separatist movement—to blow up the Statue of Liberty with thirty sticks of dynamite. Their goal was to destroy the torch and head of the “damned old bitch.” The foursome had also
targeted the Liberty Bell and Washington Monument, two other internationally recognized symbols of American polity, history, and freedom. The plot was thwarted by an undercover African American police officer who had infiltrated the group.

In 1966, the segregationist Lester Maddox became the governor of Georgia. Maddox had come to national attention in 1964, when he shut down his restaurant rather than serve African American patrons. He claimed that he had nothing against Black people, but he would not serve “integrationists,” even after a court battle and fines. His Democratic campaign for governor was supported by poor whites who saw him as “just plain folks” like themselves, a “hero” who fought federally mandated integration. When he won the election, a political cartoon appeared in the Chicago Daily News that reconfigured the statue into a shouting man in shirtsleeves holding up a burning brand, his chest labeled “Backlash.” On his other arm, instead of the statue’s tablet representing American independence and rule of law, are newspaper-sized sheets, one of which read “South—Segregationist Maddox Victory.” Other sheets blowing away in the wind are labeled “East, West” and “North.” The caption of the cartoon was “Give Me your Wretched...,” a darkly twisted reference to the Emma Lazarus poem. The caption may refer to the people who voted for Maddox and what he stood for, or perhaps it was meant as a threat to the people who will suffer under the leadership of such a man, and who would suffer at the hands of the wider backlash against civil rights in the country.

That backlash took a particularly tragic turn on April 4, 1968, when Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. was assassinated by a sniper’s bullet as he stood on a hotel balcony in Memphis, Tennessee. James Earl Ray was later convicted of the murder. The day following his assassination, the Winnipeg Free Press ran a political cartoon that showed a
weeping Statue of Liberty cradling King’s lifeless body instead of her tablet. The cartoon demonstrates that King’s role was understood even outside American borders as a civil rights leader, and his legacy embodied a peaceful revolution for the fulfillment of the promise of the statue for all Americans.\textsuperscript{109}

In 1969, the symbolism of the Statue of Liberty again made it a target in the propaganda battle between white America and the Black Power movement. Fourteen Black Panthers were arrested for allegedly planning to bomb the statue along with a department store and railway station. The Black Panther Party’s Central Committee denied the plot, and claimed the arrests for the alleged conspiracy were an attempt to discredit the party. The party’s official news release stated: “Every Black Panther Party chapter and leadership knows that we would not waste dynamite on the blowing up of some jive statue...because that would not put any food into our people’s stomachs.”\textsuperscript{110}

However, the inclusive, radical potential of the Statue of Liberty as a symbol of freedom could still be utilized and reconfigured in a positive way during the civil rights movement, even by the most militant factions of the struggle. A poster of the period shows the Statue of Liberty lit up at night with a list of “freedoms”: “Free yourself, free the Panther 21, free the streets, free food, free housing, free medicine, free Bobby Seale, free education...”\textsuperscript{111} A 1971 Oliver Wendell Harrington political cartoon in the \textit{Daily World} is entitled “The Statue seen from ‘Uptown.’”\textsuperscript{112} (fig. 22, p. 246) The cartoon shows an African American woman dressed as the Statue of Liberty, the spikes of the statue’s crown sticking out of her Afro. The woman has one fist raised in the Black Power salute instead of holding up a torch, replacing the traditional symbol of freedom’s light with a gesture of radical freedom specific to the Black community. She stands on a
pedestal labeled “Liberation” and with her other hand she wrestles a gigantic serpent with the head of the FBI’s director at that time, J. Edgar Hoover. Hoover spearheaded the FBI’s pursuit of many members of the civil rights movement, and therefore represented the oppressive, insidious power of white America. Where Langston Hughes had remarked in his editorial discussed above that the Statue of Liberty had her back to Harlem, Harrington’s cartoon reconfigures the statue into a form with more currency for African Americans living “Uptown” during the civil rights movement.

In 1972, the Statue of Liberty was the symbol for a groundbreaking Presidential campaign: the first African American woman to run for the highest office in the land. The campaign buttons for Shirley Chisholm’s Presidential bid showed the head and upraised arm of the Statue of Liberty with the motto: “Liberty and Equality.” Sunburst lines extend the crown’s spikes across the breadth of the button, representing the light of liberty espoused by the campaign.¹¹³ In choosing the statue to represent her political aspirations, Chisholm utilizes the statue’s symbolic weight as a female symbol as well as a symbol of political freedom, aligning herself and her campaign with the Statue of Liberty’s ideals. The button’s motto underlines that freedom (and her campaign) stood for equality for all Americans.

In 1975, during the contentious Congressional debate over the federal tax bill, a cartoon appeared in the Buffalo Evening News showing the Statue of Liberty with a shocked expression, her crown flying off her head because she is so startled by the newspaper headline she holds. It reads: “Tax Break for Racist Private Schools.” In light of the sometimes violent struggles to integrate American public schools, and the importance of education as a means to greater personal and civic liberty—a point that we
see in some of the earliest uses of the Statue of Liberty by and about African Americans—the idea of rewarding segregated private schools with a tax break was contrary to both the gains African Americans had made and, the cartoon suggests, shockingly contrary to the liberty the statue represents.\textsuperscript{114}

In the 1980s, the Statue of Liberty’s message of freedom was dominated by the individualistic, conservative, capitalistic slant of the Reagan presidency. During this decade, the African American community continued to question what meaning the Statue of Liberty held for their collective past and their present experiences in the “land of the free.” Their history challenged the dominant paradigm of the time in favor of a more inclusive definition of liberty that acknowledged liberty was still not a fully accomplished reality for all Americans. Celebrating the anniversary of a pivotal moment in that history, a cartoon in \textit{The Detroit News} with the caption “Rosa Parks Day” marked the twenty-fifth anniversary of the day Rosa Parks refused to give up her seat on a bus to a white man in Montgomery, Alabama, setting in motion the non-violent protest that ultimately broke the color barrier in public transportation in that city and mobilized the civil rights movement under Dr. King’s guidance. The cartoon shows the Statue of Liberty sitting down on her pedestal, massaging one of her feet with a smile. Her tablet leans against the pedestal beside her; the date on it is December 5, 1955 instead of July 4, 1776, enshrining a different declaration of independence.\textsuperscript{115}

In this spirit, Fred Marcellino’s 1983 poster for the twentieth anniversary of the March on Washington D.C. aligns the statue’s symbolism with that historic event and its significance for the civil rights movement as a public demonstration of unity of purpose in the pursuit of freedom for all Americans. The poster shows the silhouetted skyline of
the Mall, with the Washington Monument and Capitol dome at its center, and above the skyline, merging into the stars, is the face of the Statue of Liberty beneath the caption: “March for the Dream: Jobs, Peace, Freedom.” Referencing “the Dream” of Dr. King in the caption, the poster brings together symbols of national power with powerful moments in history—the March on Washington and Dr. King’s “I Have a Dream” speech—and the Statue of Liberty a comforting presence over the scene as that history’s guiding spirit.

Issues of freedom for immigrants of color and for the nations of Africa also engaged national attention and political energy in the 1980s, and the Statue of Liberty’s image and meaning was used to comment on these struggles. In 1981, Haitian refugees in large numbers were fleeing dire political and economic oppression in their own country, risking drowning and possible deportation to reach the United States. A detention camp had been set up at Fort Allen, Puerto Rico, and 778 Haitians had been waiting there since August for final decisions from the U.S. Immigration and Naturalization Service on their disposition. The ordinarily patient detainees created a disturbance on November 9th, and that same day, nineteen of the women drafted an open letter threatening suicide if they were not released by the end of November. Inspired by the plight of the Haitians, a political cartoon appeared in The Louisville Courier-Journal showing the Statue of Liberty holding up a stoplight, the red light lit, her other hand held in a gesture of refusal. Three Haitians stand before her, and the caption reads in quotes: ‘Back in Haiti, I Was Told She Held a Lamp.’ The cartoon ironically recasts the statue’s role from “Mother of Exiles” to a sort of immigration traffic cop, the symbol of welcome to immigrants—her “lamp beside the golden door,” as the Lazarus poem states,
now a traffic light stopping their entry. In a larger sense, the statue’s refusal to allow them entry is also a refusal to permit them to partake of the freedom and opportunity she popularly represents as a symbol of immigration.

In South Africa in the 1980s, another struggle for full citizenship and the end to racist policies was being carried forward by Black South Africans against the oppressive white government. Many people in the United States saw parallels with the civil rights movement in America, and organized protests across the country in solidarity with their cause and in attempts to exert political pressure on the South African government. Daily protests outside the South African Embassy in Washington, D.C., led to many arrests for acts of civil disobedience and drew attention around the world. In July 1985, the number of people arrested outside the embassy had passed 2900, and included “23 members of Congress, several major city mayors, tens of labor, church and arts leaders.” A cartoon in a London periodical commented wryly on these protests. It showed the head and upraised arm of the Statue of Liberty. A police officer dangled by his handcuffed wrist from the statue’s wrist, and with his other hand he holds his walkie-talkie to his ear, saying: “Hello, this is embassy security. We’ve nabbed another anti-apartheid demonstrator.”

While the statue is often used in this period as a symbol of American and American ideas about liberty, the statue retains its potential to represent freedom for all people. Here, the statue simultaneously represents American protestors’ efforts to change an oppressive regime, and taking a stand as a supporter of universal freedom.

The centennial of the Statue of Liberty brought it into even greater public consciousness, and its meaning for African Americans was part of the public debate over the statue’s meaning and relevance as a symbol. The close identification with America’s
European immigrant past so celebrated in the drive to restore and commemorate the statue was not a part of American history that seemed relevant to many African Americans. African American leaders and intellectuals expressed disillusionment with their outright exclusion from the centennial’s dominant historical narrative. Historian John Hope Franklin stated, “It’s a celebration for immigrants and that has nothing to do with me. I’m interested in the event, but I don’t feel involved in it.” Similarly, the president of Paine College noted, “If you can’t communicate to blacks that when you are talking about liberty you are talking about more than just European immigrants but about the entire peopling of America, then there just isn’t much in it for me.” Members of the press also commented on these issues, and one reporter stated that the centennial’s focus on European immigration, “serves as a disquieting reminder of the way in which blacks arrived in America and how they have fared since.” 119

A calendar of Liberty events in New York City in May 1986 included an exhibit at the Schomberg Center for Research in Black Culture called “Give Me Your Tired, Your Poor…? Voluntary Black Migration to the United States.” 120 The exhibit used the prevalent association of the statue with immigration while extending that trope to include African Americans, but left unaddressed the predominant trope of historical, involuntary migration as slave labor that informed much of African American identity. The descendents of slavery did not fit comfortably with the images of coming to America for economic opportunity and individual freedom so prominent in the statue’s definition during the centennial. James Baldwin called the statue’s symbolism “a bitter joke” for the African American community. Atlanta mayor Andrew Young noted: “No one in the black community is really excited about the Statue of Liberty. We came here on slave
ships, not via Ellis Island.”

On the other hand, Jesse Jackson, commenting on the meaning of the centennial for African Americans, said: “This would be an excellent time to redeem and amend the Statue of Liberty just as we redeemed and amended our Constitution to outlaw slavery.”

John E. Jacob, the head of the Urban League, urged African Americans to participate in the centennial ceremonies:

> We must refuse to cede the symbols of liberty, freedom, and equality to ideologues of the right, as happened some years back when they appropriated the flag. The national anthem, the flag, and the Statue of Liberty are symbols of freedom that belong to all of us—rich and poor, White and Black. And I don’t want to see them stolen by right wingers for their own purposes. While it is easy to be cynical about the show-biz atmosphere and events surrounding the centennial, we should not fall into the trap of forgetting that the Statue is a symbol of liberty that symbolizes America and its promises to the entire world. As Americans striving to make our country better for all, it is our symbol, too.

Articles in the *Michigan Citizen* demonstrate that the statue was still active and relevant as a symbol for the African American community in the years following the centennial, even when that relevance as a symbol was something to contend against instead of to align with. Jesse Jackson’s 1988 “Find Common Ground” speech, quoted in full in *The Michigan Citizen*, cites the immigrant symbolism associated with the statue as an example of America’s potential for inclusiveness: “Take New York, the dynamic metropolis. What makes New York so special? It is the invitation of the Statue of Liberty—give me your tired, your poor, your huddled masses yearning to breathe free. Not restricted by English only. Many people, many cultures, many languages—with one thing in common, the yearn [sic] to breathe free. Common ground!”

A year later, demonstrating that negative connotations still existed for some African Americans contemplating the statue’s promise of freedom, Professor William McAdoo lectured on the institutionalized racism in Michigan in the 19th century, and cited the Emma Lazarus
poem: “Give me your tired, your poor, your huddled masses yearning to be free. I lift my lamp beside the golden door.” However, McAdoo added that the “golden door” to America had a “For Whites Only” sign hanging on it. 125 And in 1990, the physical site of the statue proved it was still a lightning rod for African American political demonstrations. On the anniversary of Dr. King’s “I Have a Dream” speech, African American protestors led by the Reverend Al Sharpton and Lenora Fulani, who was running for governor on the New Alliance Party ticket, briefly forced the closing of the Statue of Liberty, setting up a tent city on Liberty Island in a protest to support the homeless, and calling for New York City to be renamed “Martin Luther King City.” 126

In a speech given at Whitman College during Black History Month in 1993, Shirley Chisholm used the Statue of Liberty to critique racism and lawful discrimination against African American and other immigrants, as well as American residents of color, including Asians and Native Americans. She critiqued past treatment of immigrants of color, as well as the historical representation of immigration history. Moreover, she emphasized the statue as a symbol of civic liberty. Referring to “The New Colossus,” and its associations with the statue, she claimed that its message of hope and opportunity did not apply to immigrants of color because racism and discriminatory policies had curtailed their opportunities and impeded their success in comparison to European immigrants. She also criticized narratives of American immigration history for omitting the experiences and struggles of people of color, stating, “Until we understand the history, the fact remains that ignorance is bliss.” She called for recognition of the plight of immigrants of color, and of America’s “multifaceted, multiethnic, multireligious”
character so as to build “strength through unity” and create a pluralistic and just society.\textsuperscript{127}

The Statue of Liberty was not only a continuing presence in the rhetoric of politicians and scholars of the African American experience in the 1980s and 1990s. The image of the statue played a part in African American art and popular culture as well. The statue was raped by rapper Ice Cube in the lyrics of one song on his \textit{Predator} album.\textsuperscript{128} The statue was referred to as “The Ole B\#tch,” representing America in the song, “The Ole B\#tch-U-Worryz,” on Griff’s recording, \textit{Blood}. In an interview, Griff remarked that the Statue of Liberty “slept with every other (race) across the globe. But when it comes to reparations for Black people, she closes her legs. We can’t sleep with the whore.”\textsuperscript{129}

The story that the Statue of Liberty originally was designed to be a Black woman, or originally represented Black soldiers of the Civil War, or originally represented the freedom of slaves by casting the statue’s features as African (depending on the version), became widely disseminated with the growth of the Internet in the 1990s, and it continues to circulate, inspiring both controversy and excitement.\textsuperscript{130} A mid-nineteenth-century drawing entitled “Liberty” does in fact depict an African American woman as Liberty. Drawing on elements of both the Revolutionary-era depictions of Liberty in America and Delacroix’s painting of Liberty, one breast is bare, and she holds an American flag on a pole in one hand. Beneath her bare foot she crushes a crown and scepter, and broken shackles lie on the ground before her. She holds a set of scales in her other hand to represent justice.\textsuperscript{131} (fig. 23, p. 247) However, the Internet sites that offer alleged proofs for the Statue of Liberty’s Black origins rarely point to this image, about which little
provenance exists. The urban legend has become part of the ideological and symbolic understanding of the Statue of Liberty for some African Americans, and as such it serves as a metaphor for their collective experiences and history in the United States. In an editorial in the *New York Amsterdam News* in 1994, a woman referenced the rumor:

> The reason for the title “Bring Back Black Liberty” is that in my opinion that statue which stands in New York harbor illustrates the sick denial of this country’s refusal to acknowledge and treat its filthy heritage of racism against melaninized human beings. Those Caucasian features are a big white lie: the original features, when France donated the statue to this country, were Black features; and until Black features are restored, we will all remain in denial.  

Like many urban legends, the facts of the story are untrue. However, as this woman’s use of the urban legend demonstrates, the ideas behind the story—that the statue represents African Americans, and that white America has co-opted its original meaning—speak to many African American people of the racism, historical silences, and search for identity that they experience in white America.

The image of a Black Statue of Liberty, reminiscent of Harrington’s political cartoon “Liberation” discussed above, also inspires creative reconfigurations of the statue and its meaning. Oliver Harrington’s “The statue seen from ‘Uptown’” discussed above predates the Internet rumor, but is a good example of this creative use of the statue to represent African American experience. Another excellent example of this is the spoken-word poem, “black statue of liberty,” by Jessica Care Moore:

I stand still above an island, fist straight in the air
Scar on my face, thick braids in my hair
Battle boots tied, red blood in the tears I’ve cried.
Tourists fly from all over just to swim near my tide
Or climb up my long flight of stairs.
But they trip on their shoe string lies.
Piece by piece they shipped my body to this country
Now that I’m here, your people don’t want me.
I’m a symbol of freedom, but I’m still not free
I suffer from class, race and gender inequality.  
I wear a crown of knowledge, ‘cause I’m a conscious queen  
My mask is one of happiness, though my history here is full of misery.  
Done deliberately.  
I am America’s true statue of liberty.  
You placed a bible under my arm, after you ripped me of my faith  
And made me pray to a fictional imposter  
So, if you were trying to maintain liberty  
Too late, you just lost her  
‘Cause her torch is about to serve as the night light for truth  
In the slums and the ghettos that you find so uncouth.  
Education will be delivered not from the tree, but the root.  
So, little black girls and boys will check their pockets  
For spirituality rather than loot.  
‘Cause liberty is just old mother nature  
And although you don’t love her, she’ll never hate ya.  
She’s earth, wind, and fire, don’t tempt her to show her power.  
Turning all weeds into flowers.  
Looking into her wise eyes will make a blind man see  
How can you dare name a Eurocentric girl after me?  
Assata Shakur Barbara Jordan Nikki Giovanni and Angela Davis.  
These are the real symbols of liberty  
‘Cause that stone faced French woman ain’t gonna save us.  
The same folks who enslaved us.  

I’m sitting at the back of the bus, ‘cause I feel like it.  
And I play ball  
Not ‘cause you pay me to dunk it, dribble it or hike it.  
I’m taking all my people back home, and breaking them mentally free.  
I am the walking, talking, breathing, beautiful statue of liberty.  
I sweep crack pipes out of the school yards  
I nurture my man when times are hard.  
So, where the hell’s my statue?  
What’s the liberated woman gotta do?  
Place my name in wet cement.  
Every month I pay my rent.  
Put my silhouette on a stamp  
I’m not a ho, slut or tramp.  
My children aren’t on crack, and neither am I.  
I want to see the words, “Go, strong Black woman,”  
When the Goodyear blimp flies by.  
I can bake cookies, bear babies, preside over revolutions  
Get rings out of tubs, wear a suit, sport baggy jeans, slick my hair back  
Or tie it up in braids.  
My aura is unafraid.  
So, no statue in the big apple can mess with me.
I am the walking, talking, surviving, breathing, beautiful
Black Statue of Liberty.\textsuperscript{133}

The poem was written to be performed orally. Its first half reshapes the Statue of Liberty into a Black woman, rejecting the original French image in favor an empowered Black female figure. The second half of the poem turns the “strong Black woman” into a living Statue of Liberty, a source of nurture, strength, and social change for her family and community.

In the new millennium, the Statue of Liberty’s as a conflicted symbol of America and its ideals of freedom continues to be used by the African Americans as a means to comment on racist beliefs and actions, demand fuller representation in the American polity, and agitate for social change. Welfare reform activists marched in Philadelphia in 2000 carrying “symbols of freedom” such as the Liberty Bell and the Statue of Liberty.\textsuperscript{134} In 2003, an exhibition of African American quilts from Alabama included a quilt that showed the Statue of Liberty clutching a Black figure in one hand and a fistful of money in the other.\textsuperscript{135} On the Internet, that new medium where race can be invisible or foregrounded according to the goals of a website’s owners and participants, the meaning of the statue and the schism between its ideals and American reality are still addressed and debated. The \textit{Horizon} website offers visitors a page for “Re-inscribing the Statue of Liberty” by rewriting the Emma Lazarus poem. One version submitted by Garry Mendez reads:

\begin{quote}
Give me your tired, your poor,
Your huddled masses yearning to breathe free\textsuperscript{1},
The wretched refuse of your teeming shore.
Send these, the homeless, tempest-tossed to me.
I lift my lamp beside the golden door\textsuperscript{2}.
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{1} Note: said freedom does not include African slaves, but after all, \textit{somebody} had to provide slave labor to make the American economic system viable.
2. Warning: This offer does not apply to Haitians, or other such “boat people” who, while tired, poor, and huddled in masses yearning to breathe free, they also believe in voodoo and take part in various other African mumbo-jumboesque activities. This incisive revision of the statue’s iconic statement of welcome and hope for immigrants glosses the poem with footnoted, racist disclaimers in “small print,” undercutting the poem’s espoused promise of welcome, at least for people of color. It also indict the historical injustice of American slavery. It ironically makes the statue a symbol of slavery in the name of economic necessity, rather than a symbol of the end of slavery as the Black Statue of Liberty rumor and early associations of the statue interpreted its meaning.

In 1999 Amadou Diallo, a Guinean immigrant to New York City who had come to the United States in search of work, was shot to death in the Bronx by four police officers. As with the case of the Ferguson brothers in 1946, the case garnered national attention and calls for an investigation into the shooting. And as in the Ferguson case, the police were acquitted of any wrongdoing, and received no disciplinary action for the shooting. Just as Charles White had been inspired to create an artistic indictment of the police shooting over fifty years before, in response to the Diallo killing, Harlem-based artist Hulbert Waldroup painted a mural a few doors away from where Diallo was killed as a memorial to him. The mural is entitled “The American Dream,” and those words appear in large letters across the top of the mural. The centerpiece of the mural is a skeletal Statue of Liberty holding aloft a pistol instead of a torch, with a pile of skulls at its feet. Before it stand four police officers in NYPD badges and KKK hoods. A large image of Amadou Diallo’s head and shoulders appears to right of the statue, along with
depictions of his grave marker and the tree he is buried under back in Africa. An editorialist in *The New York Beacon* wrote of the image of Liberty in the mural:

The last time I recall seeing her depicted in such a way was on an album cover of 70’s rock/fusion band Funkadelic called ‘America Eats It’s [sic] Young,’ where the statue is seen on a dollar bill holding babies in her left arm, with a fang-toothed mouth chewing on a bloody ripped infant’s arm. To the right of that cover, the American Eagle grips a needle in one hand, and a rail-thin sickly baby in the other hand. 29 years after the release of that brilliant funk-opera, America is still eating her young. Only she’s become less apologetic, and more arrogant about it.137

The mural was defaced shortly after its 2001 unveiling—someone painted out the images of the four police officers—but it was immediately repaired by Waldroup.138 Such lurid, emotionally charged reconfigurations of the Statue of Liberty demonstrate that the statue continues to be a conflicted symbol for African Americans, but also demonstrate its continuing importance as a sometimes bitter, twisted symbol of America, and as a symbol of a reality of social justice and freedom from racism that is not yet fulfilled.

The failure of Liberty’s torch to enlighten every corner of the United States and the world is a source of pain for those who cannot yet enter that light unshadowed. African Americans continue to struggle with the meaning of the statue, as they have from the time of its dedication, engaging it or rejecting it even as they work to make its promise of freedom a lived reality for all American citizens, and for all the world. The ideals that the Statue of Liberty represents continue to beckon, challenge, and inspire all those who join in the struggle for liberty.

---
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Chapter Six
War and Liberty: WWI to Iraq

Wartime challenged the faith that the Statue of Liberty could stand only for a dream of spreading the ideal of liberty to all mankind. Certainly some argued that when America went to war it did so to preserve that hope but the optimism of the phrase "Liberty Enlightening the World" was only a small part of overall way the statue was understood and used in periods of military crisis from the world wars of the twentieth century to the fight against terrorism in our times. Even more powerful was the tendency to see the monument as a symbol of home during times of conflict. Citizens used the image to assert the need to defend the homeland repeatedly and as a sign of the home they longed to return to once battles were fought on distant shores. Wartime furthered considerably the process of Americanizing the Statue of Liberty and using it as a symbol more for America itself and the need for its survival rather than as an emblem of a transcendent political dream. Wars were fought mostly by men and by the use of force. And like the era of the Civil War, liberty’s central icon took up this masculine, militaristic cause with vigor. At times there seemed to be something of a reasonable balance between the universal and the national—between the need for peace and justice for all and the need for war. At other times, however, liberty was placed squarely in the emotional stream of ties to home and hearth and visions of vanquishing those who threatened it. As the era of the Civil War demonstrated, Lady Liberty could be attached to aggressive militaristic desires as well as humanistic ones. In this chapter, we will examine the statue's roles in the First and Second World War, and in America's defining post-World War II conflicts with world communism and terrorism. Tracing the uses of
the statue along the ideological trajectories of these periods, we can see the ongoing
debate on the nature of that most fundamental American ideal—liberty—and that debate's
impact on the rest of the world. And we can catch a glimpse of the tortured quest for
liberty oscillating between high minded idealism and unrestrained rage.

**Fighting For Democracy: World War I and the Statue of Liberty**

In February 1917, Charles Grasty stated that the world would soon see “…the
Statue of Liberty drawing her sword, not merely to defend New York Harbor but to
obtain peace in the only way by which peace may be obtained—by victory.”¹ His
article “London Rejoices in Our Decision” described ideological reasons that the United
States should enter World War I. Just three months earlier, during the thirty-year
anniversary of the Statue of Liberty in 1916, Americans had represented the statue as a
symbol of peace, and its illumination as a visual cue to all civilizations of the
possibilities of freedom. The celebration in 1916 had cemented the process of
ownership which Americans felt for the statue, as its connection with essential
American ideas of freedom, democracy, and technological innovation was reinforced in
1916, as well as the national sense of responsibility the country felt as it funded its
illumination through donations.

Many of the World War I posters and sentiments regarding the statue built upon
the rhetoric established in 1916 at the thirty-year anniversary of the statue. During the
celebration John Purroy Mitchell, the mayor of New York, claimed that the statue
“…symbolizes the spirit and the soul of America, the origin of our Nation, the best that
America has been and is and all that she hopes to be.”² Expressing an emotion many
had felt, Mitchell laid the groundwork for the national use of the statue during World War I. Ralph Pulitzer, owner of the *New York World*, foreshadowed nationalist and internationalist uses of the Statue of Liberty during the war when he said: “Henceforth in the blackest hour before the dawn the Goddess of Liberty herself will be the beacon to those who would steer out of stormy seas into a peaceful anchorage.”³ Less than five months later, with these comments and images fresh in their minds, the people of the United States prepared for war using the Statue of Liberty as a national rallying point.

Ideologically, World War I led the United States into paradoxical realms. Eric Foner reminds us that the rallying cry of World War I was democracy, yet adds that “the idealistic goals with which the war began…seemingly had been abandoned.”⁴ Elsewhere, Foner refers to the “coercive patriotism of World War I” as an element of the times.⁵ Jonathan Hansen also reminds us that “time and time again between 1895 and 1919, citizens arose to defend America’s honor, elevating national interest over liberal and democratic principles” in clear contrast to the type of ideology he labels “cosmopolitan patriotism” (read pacifism in most cases) proposed by people such as Eugene Debs, Jane Addams, and William James.⁶ For these people “peace required not a balance of Western power but a vision of democracy that balanced the ideal of universal self-government with respect for local government and tradition.”⁷ In this web of ideological complexity, the official use of a statue named “Liberty Enlightening the World” is bound to have evoked a number of ideas and feelings for the people of the time. It was also used to help build feelings of patriotism and love of democracy in the citizens of the nation, at times masking deeper ideological differences in America over the critiques of the war by pacifists or German-American who opposed the idea of
making war on their ancestral homeland. Interestingly, in a way that perhaps reflected the international scope of the Progressive Era, the Statue of Liberty was also used by foreign countries during World War I, both as a symbol of the American nation and of the freedom and democracy to which many nations aspired. 

By the end of the war, the Statue of Liberty had been used by government spokespeople, businesses, and citizens to support a plethora of ideas and images. All strove to connect this symbol to the daily realities of the war they faced, from economic sacrifice—in the guise of the Liberty Loan—to draft posters that reminded families of their fathers, sons, brothers, and friends fighting overseas. The Statue of Liberty was emblazoned on recruiting posters and Liberty Loan posters such as those of the statue in the harbor that reminded immigrants about their debt to their adopted country. During the war, the statue was not just a symbol of a democratic future but increasingly became linked to a whole host of pressing needs that moved away from freedom for all, and often served to maintain ties between the home front and battle front and to rally support for a war that was not supported by all citizens. Thus, the New York Times noted that overseas in the small war-camp auditoriums, when the soldiers painted a back-drop on a stage, they nearly always used depictions of New York Harbor and the statue to remind them of the place they left and to which they hoped to return. The growing fusion between the statue and local attachments to America was also seen in the fact that small Statues of Liberty were erected in Philadelphia, Chicago, and even New York, among other places. Clearly the era of World War I finished cementing the bond forged during the 1916 celebration between the monument and America.
The use of the Statue of Liberty to portray nationalism is one of the major themes of World War I. The statue was often used as a visual shorthand for America to evoke a sense of protection in the citizens of the nation. Many short ads requesting purchase of Liberty bonds displayed the Statue of Liberty in the corner, and many further made the leap to the connection between the Liberty Loan and the protection of the troops fighting the war. An ad run in the *Philadelphia Inquirer* stated: “Lend your money to Uncle Sam! Help him bring the boys home quickly!”\(^{12}\) There is a small Statue of Liberty pictured in the corner. Another argues: “That torch of Liberty is shining over the battlefields of France to-day, where OUR BOYS are fighting side-by-side with THEIR BOYS.” The ad then stated that Liberty Bonds would bring victory to the fighters. A political cartoon in the *Philadelphia Inquirer* advertising Liberty Bonds visually connected these themes by depicting a squat gorilla standing on the Statue of Liberty’s pedestal wearing a German helmet and holding a sword in the air. Nearby, the Statue of Liberty puts her head down and weeps, the word Kultur—a term used during World War I to signify the loss of individual liberty to the needs of the state—written on her back. Behind her, in a symbol of hope, the sun rises, the word Liberty written across it. The cartoon is entitled “The Kaiser’s Dream. Buy Liberty Bonds and Wake him up.”\(^{13}\) (Fig. 24, p. 307)

Perhaps the most dramatic use of the Statue of Liberty to evoke a protective and patriotic response was the 1918 Liberty Loan poster designed by Joseph Pennell, which displayed the Statue of Liberty destroyed in the harbor. Flames light the sky as enemy aircraft fly away, and to the front, Pennell drew a burned wreck of the Statue of Liberty, her head rolled to the base of the island and her torch completely gone. The statue’s blackened figure would have been especially shocking to Americans who had labored to
illuminate it just two years earlier. Whether or not the poster consciously recalled the nationalist and optimistic rhetoric of the celebration of 1916, or the image of the Statue of Liberty as the country itself and the troops abroad, the poster would have had a profoundly disquieting effect upon Americans. Certainly, the poster seemed to resonate with its audience: the Fourth Liberty Loan drive for which the poster was designed was quickly over subscribed.\(^\text{14}\) (fig. 25, p. 308)

The monument became not only a sign of America as home but increasingly acquired martial implications as well. The Statue of Liberty was often associated with the army: in 1917 or 1918, an army unit in Des Moines, Iowa formed an impromptu human Statue of Liberty in a cornfield. It was also adopted as the symbol of New York’s 77th Division of the army in 1918, a company of men later made famous as the “Lost Battalion.”\(^\text{15}\) Grasty’s earlier comment about the statue drawing a sword to defend New York and the world reverses overtly feminized statues portrayed in need of aid, assistance, or salvation, such as in Morgan’s cartoon depicting the gorilla-like Kaiser above a fragile, weeping Liberty. An image displayed in New York a year and a half later encapsulated this sentiment, as the people erected a sculpture of “four soldiers in the attitude of rushing to battle and just behind them the Goddess of Liberty with overspreading wings and sword in hand and the motto: “Allies—United for Liberty,” on the roof of the Flatiron Building. Just as the soldiers stood ready to protect liberty, so the Goddess of Liberty stood ready to protect them in their fight for her ideals.

Continuing the theme established in the 1916 commemoration, many people linked nationalist images of the Statue of Liberty with feminine issues or roles. Morgan’s image of the statue weeping as the German gorilla ended personal liberty relied on ideas
of protection of femininity; in contrast writers and artists drew upon ideas of the strength and protectiveness of motherhood. The Statue of Liberty did not quietly sacrifice her children in many of these posters, but rather showed active courage, such as in the Liberty Loan poster designed by Joseph Leyendecker, which displayed a warlike statue accepting a sword from a kneeling Boy Scout.  

(fig. 26, p. 309)  The poster visually emphasized the help that citizens could give the war effort. The caption at the bottom reads “Weapons for Liberty,” and the sword is marked with the Boy Scout motto “Be Prepared.” As the poster advertised the sale of Liberty and Victory Bonds, “weapons” was multivalent, from the sword pictured, to the money that citizens should donate, to the general preparedness of true patriots displayed in the active stances of the Boy Scout and Liberty; all these could be weapons against the Germans. In the antique colors on the poster and classical posing of the figures, Leyendecker evoked a sense of grandeur and militant sacrifice.

In a second poster by an unidentified designer, the Statue of Liberty pointed at the viewer and says, “You buy a Liberty Bond Lest I Perish!” The emotion demonstrated here is not pleading, but rather an order. At a time when women went out to work in war factories, organized Red Cross drives, and held parades to display their sacrifices as mothers and in consequence demand that others enlist, these images of determined womanhood, ready to fight or to sacrifice for ideals, would have resonated with their audience on personal as well as patriotic levels.

Not all of the wartime uses of the statue were militaristic: some posters recreated immigration, others reminded citizens to support wheat conservation and the Red Cross—in other words, they supported the home front. In a set of famous posters, the
government pictured the Statue of Liberty in the harbor as seen from on board a ship, and in different languages asked immigrants to remember their first view of the Statue of Liberty and everything the country meant to them at that moment. In return, immigrants were asked to donate money to the Liberty Loan drive, and help different civic events during the war. A parade that occurred in New York in July 1918 shows how people took this image and plea to heart: one float displayed a Filipino girl holding her hands out to the Statue of Liberty.\(^{19}\) Perhaps this image was kept fresh by different articles in the newspapers that continually used the idea of the Statue of Liberty as the entry point to the nation. When Marshal Joffre, a commander retired from the duty of defending France from Germany came to New York to help mobilize the war effort, he commented on the sight of statue as he sailed into the harbor.\(^{20}\) In a serviceman’s letter, reprinted in the *New York Times*, the author describes the experience of sailing out of New York Harbor to the war in a backwards rendition of so many immigrant narratives. The unnamed serviceman describes watching the buildings on the harbor recede, noting that it might be for the last time, and then seeing the Statue of Liberty “waving an encouraging goodbye and saying, ‘You’re going to win independence for the world, boys, so it must be for the best!’”\(^{21}\) This moment replicates the quintessential American moment in reverse—immigrants seeing the Statue of Liberty as a world of potential offered to them—as a soldier departs the country to sacrifice time, energy, and possibly his health or his life, in return for democracy and independence for the world.

Perhaps one of the reasons why the immigrant narrative and the Statue of Liberty were so prevalent was that there was still suspicion about immigrants’ loyalty to the country and its goals during World War I. In an article printed in the *New York Times*,
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Hans Bleg, head of the foreign-language branch of the national Liberty Loan organization, almost exactly replicated the words of some of the Liberty Loan posters when he said:

You, or most of you, came to this country because there was something in of you [sic] remember the thrill which you had when you first caught sight of the Statue of Liberty in New York Harbor. You were received in friendship by the people you found in this country…. Now it is your duty to support the institutions of this country, under which you have flourished and which you have learned to love.22

This call for the support of immigrants was far pleasanter than some. Billy Sunday, arguing against those opposed to the draft at a rally in New York suggested that those who did not uphold the draft were anarchists, further that anarchists were immigrants who had not been properly assimilated, and finally that all anarchists should be shipped back to their home countries as patriotic Americans would then “stand on the Statue of Liberty and sing ‘Praise God, from Whom all blessings flow’!”23 Faced with these threats, immigrants responded with intense patriotism during the war to affirm their allegiance to the United States and calm fears that they were a danger.

As Americans looked to the Statue of Liberty, so too did the rest of the world, both as a symbol of America and as an international image of freedom and democracy. Foreign war posters and commentary used the Statue of Liberty to symbolize America as well. A French propaganda card designed by Emil Dupuis after the sinking of the Lusitania in 1915 reveals the hypocrisy Dupuis felt existed in American notions of liberty. In the card, Uncle Sam weighs the 1,152 lives lost (some of which were American) against the profits made in selling war materials to those who sank it. The scales are balanced. In the background, the Statue of Liberty’s torch shines benignly on as the Lusitania sinks. The card is revealingly titled “A l’ombre de la Liberté” or “In the
Shadow of Liberty.” Similarly, a German cartoon shows President Wilson taking the statue’s place, his left arm in his pocket and his upraised right arm holding a gun. He is dressed like Uncle Sam. In the distance, the Statue of Liberty sinks sideways into the waves.  

The Statue of Liberty came into its own over the course of the war, as both Americans and the rest of the world could use the statue to symbolize human liberty or America itself. When the United States entered the war in April 1917, Paris responded with parades and festivities, finally presenting the American ambassador with a plaque “representing ‘Liberty Enlightening the World,’ after the statue by Bartholdi, protected by the American eagle.” In 1918, the New York Times announced that the American consul at Algiers had telegraphed to announce that the country had celebrated American independence on July 3 with all day festivities, including a Statue of Liberty. The people of Prague also used the statue to symbolize America: when protesting against their government and the continuing war in November 1918, they flew American flags and flourished miniature Statues of Liberty to call for peace. 

An interesting cross between nationalism and internationalism can be found in American gifts of the Statue of Liberty during the war itself. When Marshal Joffre came to the United States in 1917 to help promote the war effort, he was presented with a gold reproduction of the Statue of Liberty meant to symbolize the relationship between France and America that the statue originally represented. In 1918 the Mayor of Bordeaux in turn proposed the erection of a Statue of Liberty in the estuary of the Gironde River to remind the world of the American soldiers who died for liberty.
Of all the plans to send the Statue of Liberty abroad, most interesting was a plan Americans conceived to send Russia—recently recovering from a revolution which ended its monarchy, but not yet communist—a reproduction of the Statue of Liberty to remind it of the ideals of liberty. Originally planned as an offering of American Jews to Russian Jews in celebration of their new freedom from the constricted society of old Russia, this attempt was broadened as Americans of all religions across the country expressed an interest in the plan. Secretary of the Interior Franklin K. Lane disparaged Russian efforts to organize a country, but also admitted:

The Statue of Liberty Enlightening the World at the main gateway of our country has been symbolic of our national attitude. We have believed, and we still believe, that liberty contains a magic healing power for many of the woes of man: that if we can turn its rays upon those troubles which have caused bitterness between peoples, the world will be made sweeter, safer, and saner.

A literal interpretation of his words would certainly see a connection between the physical Statue of Liberty and a more organized world; whether or not the movement to send Russia its own statue, which began nine days later, is connected to those words is uncertain. The effort grew rapidly. The Russian Minister of Foreign Affairs notified its director only twelve days after it formed that Russia would be delighted to accept the gift. All plans were dropped, however, when Russia became a communist nation only a few months later. This project perfectly symbolizes the dual role the Statue of Liberty played during World War I. While the statue was to have been a national gift from America to reinforce American ideals of liberty in Russia, it also demonstrated a belief that the liberty symbolized by the statue was available to other countries that desired it.

There was also international use of the statue to symbolize liberty and democracy unconnected to nationalism as well. In another French poster dating from 1917, the
Statue of Liberty is portrayed without any reference to the United States at all. It displays the top half of the Statue of Liberty rising above the water peacefully. In text, the article reads “For the Freedom of the World. Subscribe to the National Loan at the Banque Nationale de Credit.” While in French minds the statue could be associated with the United States, as in Dupuis’ card, it could also represent liberty without reference to country. War posters from other countries used classical female figures that vaguely resemble the statue. In a moment that echoed the statue’s internationalist uses during World War I, representatives from British, French, Italian, and American civic groups met at the Statue of Liberty in 1920 to pay tribute to Florence Nightingale.

When the war ended, the heightened emotions with which the statue had been invested over the course of the war were displayed in jubilation. On November 12, 1918, the New York Times reported that when the end of the war was announced, the Statue of Liberty was illuminated in the harbor once again in celebration, as all the blackouts were cancelled. The most emotional scenes involving the Statue of Liberty that those living in New York were privileged to see were the return of the troops. An emotional New York Times article describes the first troops sailing home after the war had ended. It reads, in part:

The returning soldiers were for the most part silent on the journey up the bay until the Statue of Liberty was abeam. Then they showed how happy they were to reach their native land. A mighty cheer in greeting of the emblem of liberty went up fore and aft. It was echoed across the water and was picked up by hundreds on a passing Staten Island ferryboat. On the Battery there were thousands of persons who had been waiting in the cold wind since 7 o’clock to see the Mauretania pass. They, too, cheered and waved flags frantically.

Among the thousands on the Mauretania were 167 wounded soldiers and men from France and Flanders who were in the hospitals and in the second cabin of the transport. Some of them were unable to move without assistance and their mates brought them up to see and hear the greetings of New York Harbor.
From the Statue of Liberty to the pier the whistling of harbor craft was continuous.\textsuperscript{35}

As the troops celebrated their return home, so did the rest of the city. On Christmas Day 1918, another large event was planned, as several of the ships carrying troops home met at the Statue of Liberty and were escorted into the city at the same time as President Wilson left for France to begin discussing peace settlements. As the ships crossed in the harbor, soldiers cheered Wilson’s ship, and thousands cheered from the Battery.\textsuperscript{36} Once again, the whole city celebrated victory and the end of the war. An officer interviewed in May 1918 in the midst of the war might have described the sentiments of many when he told about his planned return home: “When this war is won and when the transport I am on hauls in sight of the Statue of Liberty I am going to say, ‘Hello there, Old Girl. If you ever want to see me again you’ve got to turn around.’”\textsuperscript{37}

After the celebration of the war victory ended, it remained to the people of the country to resume normal life. The use of the Statue of Liberty did not immediately end with the war. Afterwards, people retained a sense of its symbolic importance to America in terms of both the war and the ideals behind it. A plan that a monument to the war dead be erected in New York Harbor facing the Statue of Liberty was published the day that armistice was declared.\textsuperscript{38} While this plan came to nothing, another was completed. The town of Paragould, Arkansas, erected a replica of the Statue of Liberty as a memorial to the dead of World War I in 1920.\textsuperscript{39} It was rare, however, to symbolize the male sacrifice of the war in the form of transcendent liberty; most memorials recalled fighting men with images of a fighting “doughboy.” The female Statue of Liberty was a strong symbol of universal freedom, but she did not fit comfortably with the need to explicitly acknowledge male sacrifice for the nation. For all of her versatility, her role as a war
memorial did not last beyond the war: she was simply too vulnerable to constant reinterpretation. In fact, New York City itself actually failed to erect any permanent memorial to World War I due to the fact that divisions over the war still haunted the population and citizens could not decide whether to acknowledge the carnage and all that was lost in the war or simply its triumph.40

Whatever the status of the Statue of Liberty as a war memorial, it continued to be used as an ideological weapon after the war, particularly in the emerging quarrel between the United States and the Soviet Union. As early as the 1920s, articles in the New York Times report on the jailing of two managers of The Daily Worker for publishing a “slur on America” in a satirical poem that described the Statue of Liberty as a “symbol of depravity.”41 In contrast, when the United States refused entry to a British Communist Member of Parliament, the Soviet paper Izvestiya responded with a cartoon entitled “Free America.” It depicted “Secretary Kellogg, dressed as a policeman and armed with a spiked club, occupying the place of the Statue of Liberty while Liberty herself has just dropped her torch beside the pedestal.” The caption read “Appropriate Place to Be Dropped Sought by the Statue of Liberty, Forbidden in the United States.”42 Despite the outward appearance of peace in the twenty years between World War I and World War II, the statue was still readily available as a weapon and used as such in a foreshadowing of its Cold War usage.

The Statue of Liberty During World War II
Two decades after World War I’s end, a new generation of Americans looked to the Statue of Liberty in time of war. 1930s theatergoers perused playbills featuring the
monument at performances of Sinclair Lewis’s “It Can’t Happen Here,” a tale of fascism’s rise within the American political system. In 1939, the America First Committee, a group committed to preserving American democracy by preventing entanglement in Europe’s war, issued a poster showing the statue’s torch-bearing arm being sheared off by a missile. That same year, a print titled “Fellow Travelers” depicted the statue and a cross smashed to pieces at the bottom of a cliff. Gorillas bearing a swastika and a hammer and sickle stood atop the cliff, chasing goose-stepping soldiers over its edge, while a white-robed skeleton pointed down into the abyss. Whether locating the threat at home or abroad, whether advocating intervention or isolationism, Americans witnessing Nazism’s and fascism’s rise recognized the growing difficulties of defending American liberty and democracy. A 1940 WPA poster neatly captured the sentiment, juxtaposing the text “Democracy—a Challenge” against the statue’s raised torch. Indeed, as war loomed on the horizon, the statue symbolized the liberty Americans wished to defend. When they entered the conflict, it rallied them to victory and helped sustain them through times of trial.

Early wartime uses of the monument evinced differing notions of the best way to protect liberty and democracy, recalling the ambivalence expressed at World War I’s outbreak. But as in the previous war, emphasis on American national liberty was clear, joining, at times, with broader visions of international freedom. After America’s 1942 entry into World War II, the statue continued to be used to promote national liberty, but the debate about how to preserve it virtually vanished. Indeed, U.S. officials and others used the statue to unite Americans in support of the war. Combined with outrage at the attack on Pearl Harbor, these efforts helped create unprecedented pro-war consensus. As
in World War I, the monument appeared in a variety of propaganda forums in which it resumed the nationalistic, martial, and masculine meanings present in the prior conflict. However, it also retained a variety of feminine associations, ranging from compassionate motherhood to no-nonsense assertiveness. The statue’s significance for soldiers also echoed its World War I importance, and press coverage of troops’ New York Harbor homecomings strengthened the monument’s links to them in the public mind.

In representing international liberty, or at least an American-inspired vision of it, the statue’s dual associations also recalled World War I. Wartime meanings of the monument mingled with immigration narratives, and symbolic exchanges and ceremonies involving the statue and other countries combined nationalism and internationalism. In this context, as in the previous war, the statue remained a potent symbol of French-American cooperation. However, as the United States increasingly set its sights not just on halting Nazism and fascism, but on exporting its vision of liberty to the rest of the post-war world, the monument’s international meaning eventually surpassed that of World War I.

As Americans mobilized for war, a variety of propaganda and other iconography featured the statue as a symbol of national liberty, characterized by democratic ideals, industriousness, frugality, and opposition to foreign tyranny. As in World War I, such images urged patriotism, unity, civic involvement, and commitment of resources to protect liberty at home and troops abroad. An early 1940s poster showed the statue looming over an aircraft carrier with a bi-plane taking off from its deck and urged Americans to “Keep’em Flying” to preserve “Liberty for All.” Thus, it inspired servicemen’s and home front supporters’ hard work by reminding them of the liberty they
were defending.\textsuperscript{47} (fig. 28, p. 311) Bearing the same slogan, a bond poster issued by the North British Mercantile Insurance Company showed the Statue of Liberty illuminated beneath the words, “Worthy Symbols of a Nation and of a Company.”\textsuperscript{48} A 1943 poster titled “Work to Keep Free” offered similar inspiration, juxtaposing the statue’s torch-bearing fist against one clenching a hammer.\textsuperscript{49} More specifically, a 1943 Esso advertisement from the \textit{New York Times} showed a man pointing to a petroleum plant tower, proclaiming, “I call this a Statue of Liberty, too!” The advertisement’s text also called the tower a “working monument to the power of American freedom and progress.”\textsuperscript{50} In urging conservation of energies and resources for troops’ sake, a poster issued for a Civilian Defense “At Home Vacation Program” featured the statue alongside suggestions to “Enjoy your concerts, movies, theaters, beaches, parks, amusements this summer at home.”\textsuperscript{51}

World War II’s promotion of patriotism and consensus to achieve “Liberty for All,” however, could come at the expense of true racial and ethnic inclusiveness. As in World War I, the statue was implicated in efforts to secure national unity through derision of ethnic and racial others, although the focus was less on castigating anti-war immigrants than on defining liberty against racially marked foreign tyranny. Posters urging wartime production or bond purchase evinced anti-foreign bias and the racializing of liberty through juxtaposition of the statue, with its normative European features, against racially stereotyped Germans and Japanese.\textsuperscript{52} One war bond poster titled “Remember Pearl Harbor” showed a caricatured Japanese man giving the monument a phony peace offering. Meanwhile, an arm labeled “Jap treachery” wielded a swastika-inscribed sword marked “Dec. 7,” and approached to stab the statue in the back.\textsuperscript{53} A still
more incendiary poster portrayed a brute, whose two heads represented Hitler and an especially grotesquely rendered Japanese soldier, wresting the helpless statue from its pedestal. Below, a wrench symbolized “Production,” while the caption urged Americans to “Stop this monster which stops at nothing…PRODUCE to the limit! This is Your war!” Thus, the imperiled statue encouraged civic responsibility and starkly represented the choice between American liberty and foreign domination.

The statue also appeared in rhetoric contrasting American liberty to foreign tyranny in less overtly racial forms. It was used in propaganda contrasting the “free world” and the “slave world,” a dichotomy formulated by Vice President Henry Wallace and recapitulated by Frank Capra in the opening sequence of his film series Why We Fight. Capra invoked diverse symbols of liberty, including the statue, to contrast American freedom to Nazi and fascist enslavement, and to urge Americans to fight to save the former. Reminding Americans that they had been fighting for the ideals of liberty—to which he referred as “lighthouses”—since the nation’s birth, Capra invoked the words of Thomas Paine over a montage of familiar symbols of freedom, including the Liberty Bell, the Capitol, and the Washington Monument. As the narrator intoned, “Give me liberty or give me death,” the statue appeared as the final symbol in the montage. Juxtaposed against Paine’s classic call to arms, the statue was thus used to promote civic responsibility in preserving liberty. Moreover, behind this narration the tune from the last line of America the Beautiful, “from sea to shining sea,” was played, offering viewers a highly sentimental and noble portrait of the nation. Overall, the statue became the literal “lighthouse” of freedom in Capra’s sequence and the ultimate symbol of the liberty Americans had to fight to preserve.
As in World War I, the statue’s representation of American national liberty and its use in promoting the war was gendered. Bond advertisers capitalized on the monument’s female identity in rhetoric urging women’s support of the war and in defining appropriate roles for them. But unlike the previous war, bond promoters did not cast the statue in overtly martial, masculine roles. Instead, a 1943 advertisement appearing in the *New York Times* defined women as loyal wives and consumers, locating their uniquely feminine strength within these roles. It urged women to buy bonds instead of pining on the home front or wishing to take up arms, and it concluded with the following pronouncement: “When you reckon with the women of this country…you reckon with something! Remember—the Statue of Liberty is a woman!”

The statue’s representation of and appeal to women’s strength offered them a still-circumscribed but productive role in defending American liberty. Moreover, the monument’s embodiment of female agency contrasted with the powerless figure depicted in the anti-German and anti-Japanese propaganda discussed above.

The Statue of Liberty was also associated with courageous motherhood, especially mothers’ sacrifices, as it had been in World War I. A poem published in the *New York Times* in 1945 portrayed the monument as a “Gold Star Mother,” who looks “beyond the sea of death and hails her sons of Liberty!” Indeed, real Gold Star Mothers could appreciate the statue’s symbolic value. While in New York to dedicate a ship in the name of one of her dead sons, Mrs. Francis Damato asked to be taken past the Statue of Liberty, which she remembered seeing as a young girl coming from Italy. For Gold Star Mothers, real and poetic, the statue represented strength, hope and comfort, and it reminded women of their role in supporting their sons’ defense of liberty.
The posters and other propaganda cited above kept the statue in the national spotlight as a symbol of American liberty, but the monument took on special significance at home in New York City. It was used in connection with local war bond drives, appearing on a poster at a Rockefeller Center rally for the 1945 Victory Loan campaign. The poster joined a picture of the Statue of Liberty with the text “I remember,” and a *New York Times* photograph circulated an image of the rally that showed young female figure skaters posed with the poster.\(^{60}\) Starting in November 1944, New Yorkers did not have to look out into the harbor or rely on iconography to see the statue, but could see it while passing through Times Square. The War Activities Committee of the motion picture industry erected a replica of the monument in the square for the Sixth War Loan Drive, where it remained until January 1946.\(^{61}\) (fig. 29, p. 312) It became the site of weekly Red Cross and Treasury Department fundraising events, as well as celebrations and ceremonies honoring veterans.\(^{62}\) The *New York Times* regularly covered these events and ran advertisements for them, which featured a small image of the statue, on its movie page.\(^{63}\)

While the monument itself was not the setting of many war-related events, probably owing to its relative inaccessibility on Liberty Island, the replica rendered the statue an important symbol for New York’s wartime mobilization. Many events held at the Times Square statue promoted the defense of American national liberty by highlighting the contributions and sacrifices of those who had already risked their lives. \(^{64}\) E Bond rallies urged financial support to honor the “hundreds of thousands of American boys [who] gave their lives on the altar of liberty.” These rallies sometimes featured appearances by soldiers and detailed their heroic exploits in defending the nation’s
freedom. Other rallies honored new recruits for the Women’s Army Corps for the valuable contributions they would make in the future.

Amid emphasis on American liberty, some events at the Times Square statue combined national and international visions of liberty similar to those present in World War I. Some fundraising activities held at the replica recalled the previous war’s early concern for the international community. Seventh War Loan rallies raised funds for specific nations which had fallen to the Nazis, including Poland and Czechoslovakia, as well as for Latin American countries. They featured speeches by foreign and American immigrant officials associated with those nations, performances by foreign-born artists during weekly “United Nations shows,” and shows with celebrities from Betty Grable to Alice Marble. Similarly, Victory Loan and E Bond Rallies for Greece, Hungary, Denmark, Italy, the Netherlands, and the Ukraine, held at the replica during “International Victory Festival Days,” featured ethnic music and dance, along with appearances by foreign soldiers. A clothing drive sponsored by the American Women’s Voluntary Services and the United Nations Clothing Collection Appeal also internationalized the statue’s meaning. A pantomime ceremony accompanying the placing of a large donation box at the Times Square replica’s base featured women dressed in the traditional costumes of the European nations to receive the clothing, and it depicted Uncle Sam giving two ragged children new clothes. Thus, these events used the statue to encourage Americans to extend their efforts on behalf of American national liberty to provide for the needs of the international community.

In New York, the Statue of Liberty and its Times Square replica also symbolized the persistence of American national liberty despite wartime losses, as well as liberty’s
revitalization after the war’s end. V.E. Day was not only marked by a massive
celebration at the replica, but it also occasioned the first lighting of the original statue’s
torch since 1942. Thousands flooded Times Square for V.E. and V.J. celebrations at the
replica, which combined joy at victory with more solemn commemorations of the war’s
casualties. But as in World War I, the statue remained less a symbol of the dead than of the
triumph of American liberty for the living. This association was emphasized at the
re-lighting of the real statue’s torch, which as in the previous war followed an extended
blackout period. The press contrasted the dim lights that had burned in the torch
throughout the war to the new mercury lamps that now illuminated it, and noted that
liberty’s light had never been literally or figuratively extinguished. But at the same time,
they asserted that the statue was now a grander symbol of liberty and democracy than
ever before.

Soon after Americans on the home front looked to the statue’s newly re-lighted
torch to celebrate victory, troops returning through New York Harbor shared their
jubilation and relief as the monument welcomed them home. Indeed, the Statue of
Liberty had held a special meaning for many troops throughout the war. A wartime
photograph shows servicemen and their female companions posed casually in front of the
monument. The image is one of leisure, focused more on the smiling, well-dressed men
and women than on the statue itself. But the links between the monument, homeland,
and one’s own home and family grew especially intense during the war, and the statue
possessed powerful associations for soldiers. It bid them farewell as they sailed past it on
their way to war, and it followed them to European and Asian battlefronts in the form of
replicas and artistic renderings. There, the monument reminded them of home and of the
liberty they were fighting for. Upon return, the first sighting of the Statue of Liberty evoked strong emotional reactions from troops sailing into New York Harbor from distant ports. Such reactions and commentary on them also circulated in public forums, especially the press, where they defined the statue as a symbol for American soldiers and clarified the type of American liberty it represented.

As in World War I, the Statue of Liberty offered hope and inspiration to soldiers sailing into the uncertainties of war. Joseph M. Dennis recalled that “she was in the harbor waving goodbye to me,” as he departed in July 1942 aboard the *Louis Pasteur* for North Africa “to free Europe from the grasping hands of Adolf Hitler.” He further recounted, “There was not a dry eye aboard this fine French ship as we sailed by Bedloe’s Island. Most of us knew that we would have to bring Germany and Japan to their knees before we would see this magnificent Lady again.” An anonymous veteran recalled the statue similarly, contrasting an apprehensive departure with a joyful return:

> I shivered with emotion when the Statue of Liberty seemed to whisper, “So long,” as my infantry regiment sailed out of New York Harbor in WWII, and that great silent lady seemed to smile with us when we returned to jubilant welcome by fireboats and amplified entertainers aboard harbor tugs.

Once stationed abroad, replicas and representations of the statue reminded troops of liberty, homeland, and loved ones at home. Servicemen stationed in Paris visited a replica of the statue on the banks of the Seine that had been donated by French-Americans in 1889. A mural at a Red Cross unit in Burma reminded soldiers of homeland and liberty by depicting the monument alongside other familiar scenes of home. In addition, soldiers frequently requested films showing the statue from the Information and Education Division, which was charged with sending materials to boost morale and provide education to overseas armed forces. Similarly, souvenir booklets
issued to soldiers upon embarkation from New York featured the monument on their covers. For husbands and wives separated by war, the Statue of Liberty could also serve as a more personal symbol of home and the freedom soldiers fought to preserve. Such was true of a Christmas card featuring the statue sent to an American soldier by his wife. Most somberly, the statue marked the final resting place of some of the 77th Division’s 2,000 war dead in Okinawa. The division had continued to use the monument as its symbol since World War I, and a representation of its statue emblem topped the entrance gate to its Japanese cemetery plot.

After inspiring troops’ efforts abroad and symbolizing the homes they fought to protect, the statue bid a warm welcome to soldiers returning to New York Harbor. Homecoming sightings were a pivotal and emotional event for many, just as they had been for the previous generation of soldiers following World War I. Some stayed up all night so as not to miss their first glimpse of the Statue of Liberty, while others woke to special early-morning announcements that they were approaching the monument. Once it came in sight, they cheered loudly or wept for joy. Some servicemen spoke emotionally and generally of the monument’s significance for them, as in the case of a man who remarked, “I could only make out the Statue of Liberty in the heavy murk; but she was very pretty; well, I just choked up.” Air Force pilot Oliver A. Morris similarly recalled his joy at seeing the statue after flying combat missions in Europe: “The grand old lady was a most welcome sight when we sailed past in July 1944.”

Other soldiers’ responses evoked more specific meanings. Pennsylvania native Corporal Attilio Martini explained that the statue helped him acknowledge the reality of his homecoming and return to normalcy:
I think boy, you’re dreaming. I am still dreaming, I think, on the boat and in Paris and I think if it isn’t a dream, I’ll get to see my two sisters and my brother. I think maybe I’ll get to the Bethlehem plant where I used to work. Then we see The Old Girl, the Statue of Liberty, and I said to myself, ‘It’s okay. It’s true, all right.’

For New Yorker Frank Schauer, a former prisoner of the Nazis, the statue acquired new personal relevance: “I’ve lived in New York a long time, and just about every day I’ve seen the Statue of Liberty…but I never realized before what it means, never really appreciated it until I got behind barbed wire.” For him, the monument now literally represented liberty as opposite from Nazi tyranny. In light of his fellow prisoners’ accounts of guards’ stealing and beatings, the statue also embodied Franklin Roosevelt’s Four Freedoms, especially freedom from want and from fear. The statue also held special meaning for those who survived the war with severe injuries. One blinded soldier was guided by a friend to the ship’s rail and said, “When we go by the Statue of Liberty, just tell me.” A Canadian soldier who had lost his legs also asked to be moved to where he could see the monument and sighed, “Ah, there’s the Lady!”

While soldiers’ linking of the statue with protection of liberty and reminders of home were distinct to wartime experience, portrayals of homecomings sometimes echoed immigration narratives, as well. As the press reported in connection with Czechoslovak-descended servicemen’s return from war in the 1940s, the statue combined welcome for newcomers and for returning soldiers who were immigrants or their descendents. A notice for the G.I. Bill of Rights connected immigration and wartime homecoming narratives even more strikingly. It showed a serviceman supporting a comrade who had lost his leg, so that he could view the statue from the deck of their ship. A third veteran stood nearby, also gazing at the monument, and an excerpt from Lazarus’ sonnet was inserted into the frame of the picture. The notice’s text described the statue’s and the G.I.
Bill of Rights’ significance for the men—each identified as belonging to a different ethnic group—with reference to immigration or to Lazarus’ poem. For the maimed man, it read:

Tony Felice, leaning on his crutches, always remembered these words were graven at the base of the statue. Ever since he was old enough to talk, he’d repeated them reverently…especially the last three words: “…the golden door.” Tony lost a leg in Normandy, but the Army docs were going to fix him up almost as good as new. And he’d be back at his old job in another month.

For one of his fellow veterans, it continued:

And Sammy Cohen…he’d remembered the words on the statue as his mother spelled them out to him…one by one…during the first year after the family landed at Ellis Island. He knew that those words stood for America! And now he’d have a chance to finish school. Might even learn a trade…thanks to the G.I. Bill of Rights!

The notice concluded by construing the men’s homecoming voyage past the Statue of Liberty as a new chapter in the story of opportunity that had begun with immigrants’ arrivals:

TONY, MIKE and SAM are just three of the millions of loyal Americans who are coming home…who once more step through the golden door that is America. Decades later, such links between homecoming and immigration resonated for immigrant and non-immigrant veterans, alike. Louis B. Evans, a retired Marine captain and pilot linked emotional World War II homecoming stories with immigration narratives in explaining the monument’s meaning. In a letter accompanying a donation for the statue’s repair in 1986, he recalled,

I brought many a transport ship into New York Harbor with the crippled service men, arms and legs off. When the Army Band came out to greet them it sometimes broke me down and I had to compose myself before docking that ship. But how they cheered coming into that harbor despite their handicaps. My wife cried when she remembered her father telling her how he came over to America from Germany at fifteen years of age in 1894, taking 14 days to arrive, down in the hull of that ship, and the Statue of Liberty was the first thing he saw.
An anonymous woman whose parents immigrated to America in 1881 also joined World War II immigration memories. She emphasized that her five sons had all served in the Pacific theater and asserted her own contributions to the war effort. She somberly reflected on the pain suffered by soldiers and mused that, while her own sons had lived to see the statue upon their return, many others did not. She concluded by recalling her parents’ hard work as farmers, and by asserting the statue’s value as a symbol of equality and freedom of speech and religion.88

Immigrant veterans and their families also linked the statue’s wartime and immigration associations. In a letter sent to the monument to mark its centennial, an anonymous Byelorussian immigrant jointly recalled the statue’s welcome after he escaped revolution in Europe with its importance to him during his Air Force service:

…my parents and I passed within hailing and welcoming distance of The Lady Liberty Statue on our way to Ellis Island and our new United States homeland. Again in early 1944 The Lady Statue wished me luck, I like to think, as I and many others proceeded on a troop ship to England and participation in World War II…

She was there, too, to welcome him home to “this Free Land” when he returned later that same year.89 Also writing at the time of the centennial, Ethel M. Mazyinski, a British immigrant who came to America with her husband in 1955, explained the statue’s significance in light of his wartime service: “My husband was a Polish Air Force officer and a Russian prisoner-of-war during World War II—an experience which considerably intensified his delight at seeing ‘Lady Liberty!’”90

Whether combined with immigration narratives or not, the Statue of Liberty signified homecoming, return to normalcy, and freedom from tyranny for many soldiers, marking closure to wartime experience and the beginning of postwar life on a personal
level. On a public level, the statue acquired similar meanings and served similar functions, thanks to press, civilian, and official discourses. Soldiers’ reactions to the statue described above, as well as commentary on the monument’s meaning for veterans, often appeared in the *New York Times*. They usually appeared in connection with the arrival of Liberty Ships, or in press discussions among citizens and officials about how to honor soldiers back home. Together, these references formed a recurring trope which explained soldiers’ experiences to the public, and defined the statue as relevant symbol for them. One story reported that the statue was so important a landmark for the returning soldier that he “always looks for the ‘Old Lady’ with her flaming torch aloft.”\[^{91}\] Such an assumption was confirmed and reinforced by Major General Groninger’s June 1945 decision to illuminate the statue whenever a Liberty Ship was expected into port.\[^{92}\] Letters to the editor also made the Statue of Liberty into a symbol for soldiers, especially in connection to debates over what type of monument would best commemorate American casualties and participation in the war. Margaret Creeson, who wrote to the editor of the *New York Times* in May 1946, believed that the statue had unique significance to soldiers as a monument. She advocated “lasting memorials,” constructed with “reverence and love” to “remind and inspire,” as opposed to “living memorials” like community centers. She used the statue as an example of a monument capable of “carrying a thought to the people,” asking, “And what home-coming soldier would exchange his first view of the Statue of Liberty for all the community centers in the world?”\[^{93}\] Thus, she highlighted and presumed the statue’s significance for returning soldiers as both the embodiment American ideals and as a monument to the war’s survivors and casualties.
Despite the statue’s obvious significance to soldiers, some of them, along with other writers, noted that the monument did not always serve as an adequate symbol of hopes for homecoming or needs upon return. An American prisoner of war who survived the Bataan Death March said of his dreams of America during Japanese captivity, “America wasn’t the Statue of Liberty or speeches or parades…America was a clean white bathroom…”94 Doctor Howard A. Rusk, referring to the ill effects of rapid demobilization, reported,

It can be seen in the faces of many a GI who has found that the sight of the Statue of Liberty didn’t release the tension of combat fatigue, didn’t prevent the recurrence of the chills and fever of malaria, didn’t relieve the driving restlessness. Nor did it give him needed insight to employment, housing and readjustment problems.95

Reporter Ernie Pyle, while acknowledging that the homecoming sighting of the statue would be one of the few romantic experiences of the war for most soldiers, also noted that servicemen stationed abroad for several years had become more focused on their wartime duties than on dreams of seeing the statue again. For Pyle, perhaps the statue symbolized soldiers’ lost innocence once wartime duties had replaced American civilian life as the norm.96

Along with its significance for soldiers and their home front supporters, images of the Statue of Liberty also circulated around the world with connotations extending well beyond Americans’ needs. Indeed, the monument was an important symbol in promoting Europe’s freedom from fascism, liberty in Palestine, peace with Japan, and post-war recovery efforts around the globe. While war raged, the statue represented hope for nations fallen to the Nazis and was used to contrast freedom and fascism. It also symbolized international unity. Immediately following the war, images and replicas of the statue were sent abroad to symbolize liberty as a hopeful new beginning, and
ceremonies at the monument advocated international cooperation. Throughout, American and international liberty were often conflated.

As in World War I, and as suggested by World War II troops’ and family members’ recollections above, immigrants in America often helped internationalize the statue’s meaning. At a July 1939 celebration of Czecho-Slovak Day at Randall’s Island in New York, 18,000 immigrants and their descendants listened to former Czechoslovak president Eduard Benes’ calls to rescue their former compatriots from Nazi tyranny. Via shortwave radio, Czechoslovaks themselves also heard his appeals to Americans to help liberate them. Celebrants in New York then watched Sokol club members form a tableau representing the rise, fall, and hoped for rebirth of Czechoslovakia. A woman dressed as the statue formed the center of the tableau and was raised high above the crowd as men and women in traditional costume looked on. Thus, the event and its use of the statue urged immigrant Americans to look beyond national liberty and to embrace international cooperation against tyranny.

Propaganda posters and other iconography also used the Statue of Liberty to promote international liberty. Specifically, these images conflated worldwide liberty under attack with American freedom, highlighted America’s leadership in protecting liberty worldwide, and stressed international cooperation in preserving shared ideals of freedom. Many of these images also connected the statue, either implicitly or explicitly, with President Roosevelt’s Four Freedoms, defined as freedom from want, freedom from fear, freedom of religion, and freedom of expression. A poster titled “Freedom of Expression of Religion from Want from Fear 1791-1941 Everywhere in the World” connected the monument explicitly with the Four Freedoms. It showed two books, a
globe showing the western hemisphere, and the statue’s hand holding the torch. More than representing the Four Freedoms generally, the statue specifically symbolized freedom of expression in contrast to Hitler’s book burning.\(^98\) (fig. 30, p. 313)

Emphasizing the American role in preserving and proffering liberty on an international scale, Harry Gottlieb’s early 1940s depiction of “Liberty” employed the statue as a beacon of hope and safety for those fleeing fascism and Nazism. It showed people grasping at beams of light radiating from the monument, while—in stark contrast to the Statue of Liberty raising the torch—a nearby skeleton clutched a stick of dynamite. Here, the monument symbolized international freedom from fear.\(^99\) A poster titled “Safe,” evoked a similar sentiment in reference to the war’s youngest victims. Issued by the United States Committee for the Care of European Children, which helped British and Jewish children to secure asylum in America, the poster showed a boy and a girl debarking from a ship while the monument illuminated their way from behind.\(^100\)

Along with these posters, several poems written for a nationwide contest honoring the statue’s 1936 Golden Jubilee had foreshadowed this use of the monument as a symbol of freedom for those fleeing war. Amateur poets highlighted diverse themes in connection with the statue, but several represented it as a symbol for wartime refugees and the promise of peace. In “The Statue of Liberty Speaks,” Leora Wilber of Colorado conflated such themes with the statue’s growing associations with immigration:

```
For as my torch has beckoned wanderers  
Groping in blind bondage in some war-torn night,  
Or lighted back some traveler to his own land  
That harbors freedom, peace and light.  
So must it ever be a welcomer and guide!

I have grieved for seeking strangers turned away;  
I have felt compassion for those bound by lust;
```
I have wept for millions torn by war;  
But I rejoice that these People still can trust  
And point to Liberty with pride.  

People of America, I who am Liberty and Peace  
Invest you with this solemn charge—  
Keep faith with me! 

Even more presciently, or perhaps recalling World War I, Alabama contributor Eoline Wallace Moore put the following words in the statue’s mouth in “The Light Still Shines:”

Out past my feet  
Massive ships go  
Carrying weapons and agents of woe.

Over my head  
Circle great planes,  
Sounding war’s warning though countless air lanes.

Yearning and sad,  
War’s refugees  
Gaze on my torch as they come from strange seas.

Far through the mists  
Still shines my ray,  
Symbol of faith in a war-darkened day.

Still gleams my light,  
Signalling [sic] peace;  
Telling that strife in the nations will cease.

Finally, Sheila Jane Crooke’s grand prize-winning poem from Illinois, “The Statue of Liberty,” connected the monument directly to potential war victims abroad and invoked it as a symbol of security:

In London I talked to a woman who’d just received a government gas mask.  
“Do you think,” I said, “that you’ll ever use that?” She shook her head.  
“I don’t know,” she answered, “I don’t know—but—I’m afraid.”  
“I’m afraid,” they said, “I’m afraid, I’m afraid.”

When we steamed into New York Harbor the other day I got up very early,  
So as to be sure of getting a good, long look at Liberty, standing there,  
So proud, so peacefully reassuring, so—  
God bless you, old girl! So unafraid!
In addition to its significance for immigrants, international refugees, and their supporters, the statue symbolized universal liberty by encouraging international cooperation to defeat freedom’s foes, and by promoting American leadership towards global egalitarianism. A 1942 poster titled “United Nations Fight For Freedom” signified this sentiment, showing the Allies’ four flags with an image of the statue’s head and torch below. Despite emphasis on cooperation, other uses of the statue just after the war’s end continued to highlight the necessity of American leadership in securing international liberty. Leaflets placed in the pockets of clothing sent to war-torn nations featured pictures of the statue as a symbol of freedom from want. Other leaflets containing pro-American messages played up the nation’s role as a savior and promoter of international health and good will. Such uses of the statue thus emphasized America’s expanded vision of liberty to promote egalitarianism worldwide.

Invocations of the Statue of Liberty to promote international cooperation sometimes involved specific nations. Given its origin and enshrining of French-American friendship, the monument appeared especially in connection with France. Here, references to the statue, images of it, and symbolic exchanges linked French and American liberty and promoted strong relations between the two nations. During the war, the statue symbolized French freedom from “enslavement,” as German occupation was sometimes called in political and press discourse. American Rabbi William F. Rosenbaum figuratively suggested:

...the Statue of Liberty in New York Harbor be draped in crepe and that the light in the upraised hand be dimmed in mourning and become a taper of sorrow until the French people have found somehow new courage and new ingenuity to set themselves free and resume their true position before the bar of world opinion.
Moreover, Rosenbaum’s reference to the statue connoted civic liberty, urging Americans to protect not only national, but also international freedom. “Now, more than ever,” he proclaimed, “it devolves upon the American people to take up the faltering torch and to keep the light of freedom aglow in the Western World.”

Similarly, Florida Senator Claude Pepper invoked the statue as a symbol of freedom for France’s youngest war victims, who “are in slavery today,” recalling that the monument had been funded by a prior generation of French children. Howard E. Kershner, director of relief in Europe for the American Friends Service Committee, noted likewise that French children decorated their cards of thanks for American charity with pictures of the statue.

The monument’s link with France also appeared in wartime iconography produced for the French, and persisted into the immediate postwar period. One 1942 poster, whose text translated as “Liberty…Sweet Liberty…Guide And Support Our Vengeful Arms,” juxtaposed a winged, saber-bearing figure with an image of the statue. A Royal Air Force leaflet dropped that same year over Paris and Lille to inspire hope featured a picture of the statue and the American flag. After the war, American Boy Scouts took soil from Liberty Island to spread around the Arc de Triomphe on their 1947 journey of friendship to France. Also, a large donation of food was sent following a celebration in New York Harbor in front of the Statue of Liberty. It was an especially appropriate gift since, according a New York Times story covering the event, French children’s grandparents might well have helped fund the donation of the statue to Americans. Such commentary echoed links drawn by the press between French generosity in donating the statue to America, and Americans’ clothing donations made during “France Day” at the Times Square statue.
Elsewhere, replicas of the Statue of Liberty symbolized universal or American-sponsored international liberty. The presentation of a small gold replica of the statue to Madame Chiang Kai-shek during her 1943 visit to San Francisco occasioned her reminder to Chinese-Americans that their war bond purchases promoted both American and Chinese liberty. Elsewhere around the globe, statue replicas represented nascent peace and new liberty. 1947 plans to erect a replica of the statue in Hiroshima on the site of a feudal castle destroyed by atomic bombing symbolized new democratic beginnings and the city’s commitment to world peace. That same year, a small gold replica of the statue was presented to Israeli dignitaries to be taken to their new nation. The gift was presented several weeks after a ceremony at which soil from Palestine was buried on Liberty Island in exchange for soil from the island to be brought to Palestine.

As World War II concluded and the Cold War dawned, the statue would continue to represent genuine and ostensive universal liberty sponsored by—and sometimes dictated by—the United States. Indeed, exchanges like those above symbolized the tensions between altruistic universal liberty and the hypocrisy of self-serving American foreign policy. The presentation of the statue replica to Madame Chiang Kai-Shek occurred eight months before the repeal of the Chinese Exclusion Act, which had officially barred Chinese immigration since 1882; thus, her calls for Chinese Americans’ support of America’s war effort must have rung hollow to some. Likewise, Japanese plans to erect the Hiroshima Statue of Liberty must have seemed tragically ironic not only in the wake of the decimation of that city, but in light of the wartime detention of thousands of Japanese Americans. Perhaps, too, the symbolic exchanges involving Israel seemed hypocritical, given the recalcitrant American immigration policy that had
prevented many Jews from escaping the Holocaust. Such ironies and tensions would continue to influence how the Statue of Liberty was used amid American military involvement in Asia and the Middle East in the second half of the twentieth century and into the next.

The Statue of Liberty from the Cold War to Iraq

On the cover of the *Saturday Evening Post* for July 6, 1946, Norman Rockwell portrayed workmen laboring to refurbish the torch of the Statue of Liberty. With buckets and ladders, the men clean the panes of the stained glass flame as pigeons wheel around the spiked crown of the statue. It was not only a 4th of July image of a beloved national symbol. It was also the artist’s optimistic representation of the energy of postwar America—a time for restoring the home fires and refocusing attention on the needs of the nation after the great struggle and triumph of World War II. The “Four Freedoms” espoused by Franklin Roosevelt and represented in another series of famous paintings by Norman Rockwell seemed at last to be in reach for those who had sacrificed and suffered during the Great Depression and the Second World War.

However, that same year Winston Churchill declared: "From Stettin in the Baltic to Trieste in the Adriatic an iron curtain has descended across the Continent." His speech was a defining moment in the Cold War between the competing ideologies of democracy and communism. The following year, a political cartoon by Daniel Fitzpatrick in the *St. Louis Post-Dispatch* portrayed Uncle Sam and the Statue of Liberty sitting on a park bench, with Uncle Sam saying, “Everyone is a little subversive but thee and me, and sometimes I think even thee—.”117 The caption plays upon an old joke, replacing the
word “crazy” with the word “subversive,” commenting ironically on the atmosphere of mistrust and anxiety about communist “subversives” that saw threats even in the most patriotic and trusted figures.

Throughout the Cold War and the “war on terrorism” that followed the 9/11/2001 terrorist attacks on the United States, the statue played an important role in the public dialogue over the nation’s political trajectory and its relationship with other nations, as it had in World War I and World War II. The onset of the Cold War insured that Lady Liberty would continue to serve America’s war aims, and would still privilege noble or sentimental visions of the nation over those that were more critical. However, while the Statue of Liberty continued to serve as a positive symbol of the nation’s values, as it had during the earlier wars, it also began to appear more openly as a tool for critique of national policy or ideology, a use that had been largely unseen during earlier wars. The uses of the statue during the latter half of the 20th century and the beginning of the 21st made visible the dissension and ideological tensions that had been present in earlier wars, but were now more vocal and widespread in the public sphere. The universal dimension of liberty as justice and human rights for all people is all but subsumed by the American political agenda in this period of entrenched ideological camps drawn along national borders during the Cold War and the war on terrorism. And while this period of American history saw the definition of liberty shifting more towards an individual rather than a civic focus, the uses of the Statue of Liberty in the ideological battleground of the post-World War II world examined here addressed the role of the nation-state in relation to its citizens—for example, debating the curtailment of civil rights in the name of “national security”—and the role of America in the world.
In the 1950s, the symbolism of the statue was used as a potent commentary on the competing ideologies of the Cold War. As an internationally recognized symbol of American power and American ideals—a role well established by two World Wars—the statue was easily adapted to this new political conflict. A political cartoon in the *Knickerbocker News* called "Welcome to Moscow!" depicted Joseph Stalin standing on a pedestal labeled "Statue of Tyranny," holding up a ball and chain, with a book by Karl Marx in his other arm. Another Soviet premier was similarly treated in 1958 in a cartoon in the *St. Louis Post-Dispatch*. Nikita Khrushchev stands on a soapbox holding up a hammer and sickle, with the message "Give me your tired, your poor, your huddled masses yearning to breathe free" on the tablet in his other hand. One of the two men looking up at him remarks, "Somehow I think I prefer the original." These cartoons were a way to metaphorically contrast the United States to the Soviet Union. Where America had a feminine, depersonalized symbol of its guiding ideals, an embodiment of liberty with torch upraised to welcome immigrants and greet returning soldiers, the Soviet Union was represented by masculine, tyrannical despots wielding symbols of oppression and communist ideology. The use of the Emma Lazarus poem on the tablet held by the image of Khrushchev is ironic in light of Soviet oppression of its citizens’ freedom.

Within the United States itself, the Red Scare in the 1950s fed Cold War anxieties about a "Communist threat" from “subversives” within American society working to undermine American ideals. The movement drew criticism from liberals who deplored the censorship, hysteria, paranoia, and ruined reputations of McCarthyism as threats to the very freedoms the conservatives were claiming to protect. The statue played a role in
the debate as a symbolic means to critique red-baiting and book banning. In 1953, a cartoon depicted a figure labeled "Self-Righteous Book Burner" holding aloft a torch that has been used to set piles of books on fire. In his other hand he carries a book entitled "Ignorance," and wears an "I Hate Ike" button on his lapel in reaction to President Eisenhower's stand against book burning and censorship. A 1954 cartoon in *Punch* depicted Senator Joseph McCarthy as the Statue of Liberty, holding a tablet labeled "Report of the Senate Investigative Committee" and holding aloft a torch that spews black smoke instead of flame, darkening and obscuring the scene instead of bringing light to it. The cartoonist titled the work, "...that we here highly resolve that this nation, under God, shall have a new birth of freedom...' A. Lincoln, Gettysburg Address." Juxtaposing McCarthy as an obfuscating symbol of liberty with Abraham Lincoln's words contrasts the crisis of national unity that Lincoln faced in the Civil War and the divisive, oppressive tactics and agenda of McCarthyism, underscoring the threat the artist perceived McCarthy to be to the national liberty that Lincoln preserved a century before.

By 1957, a cartoon in the *Montreal Gazette* showed the comic strip character Fearless Fosdick, a hapless parody of Dick Tracy, firing his pistols randomly as he runs, saying, “You never can tell—I might hit a communist.” The smoke clouds from his pistol are labeled “Blasts in all directions,” “Damage to U.S-Canada relations,” “Rumor reports,” and “Hearsay evidence.” In the background, Uncle Sam and a park ranger peer from behind the Statue of Liberty. All three have bullet holes in them, and while the statue still holds up her torch, her other arm is in a sling. The cartoon is captioned, “Time to Curb the Fearless Fosdick Committee.” The cartoon demonstrated that the damage
being done by the witch hunts for Communists were affecting America’s relationship with the world and damaging its own liberty.

In the 1960s, American anxieties about Communism continued, and the Vietnam War was waged to contain the spread of communism in Southeast Asia. In 1960, cartoonist Bill Mauldin commented on America’s militaristic approach to perceived communist threats in the world. His cartoon in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch shows a man labeled “The Realists” strapping a machine gun over the shoulder of the dismayed Statue of Liberty, saying, “It looks great on you, kid. Now why not drop that other junk?” The cartoon showed the artist’s concern that factions of American foreign policy advocating war threatened the ideals of liberty and rule of law that the statue’s torch and tablet represent. Another cartoon in 1961 by Mauldin addresses the state of American perceptions of the Communist threat, depicting a man representing hysteria pointing out a large cat with hammer and sickle for eyes to the Statue of Liberty and indicating her torch by saying, "Maybe it'll go away if we put out the light." (fig. 31, p. 314) Liberty's torch represents the light of freedom, and the cartoon comments on the fear of communism eclipsing the very freedoms that America and the statue represent.

In 1966, as the war in Vietnam raged on, Buddhist priests protesting the American presence in their country and the inhumane violence of the war immolated themselves publicly. On the same day, in the newspapers Le Canard Enchaine in Paris and Vecernje Novosti in Yugoslavia, cartoonists portrayed used the same image to comment on these deaths: the Statue of Liberty with a Buddhist priest sitting in the midst of her torch’s flame. A few days later, the Vecernje Novosti ran both cartoons with the comment: “PEOPLE IN DIFFERENT PARTS OF THE WORLD HAVE THE SAME OPINIONS
AND REACTIONS TO GLOBAL PROBLEMS.” In another dark commentary against the Vietnam War and the war on communism it represented, Tomi Ungerer did two pieces of art in 1967 and 1968 using the statue as a symbol of American democracy being forcibly imposed on the Vietnamese. One, called "Eat," shows the Statue of Liberty being forced down the throat of an Asian man. The other, called "Kiss for Peace," shows a soldier forcing a bound, naked Asian man to lick the bare backside of the statue, who wears an American flag instead of her robes. This visceral, obscene imagery using the statue created a powerful statement about American military power perverting self-determination—and the statue’s representation of freedom as a universal ideal—in the name of fighting Communism.

The use of the statue as a symbol for protesting the Vietnam War went beyond art to public demonstration in 1971, when members of Vietnam Veterans Against the War seized the Statue of Liberty National Monument. The fifteen protesters occupied the statue for three days, eating food from the staff lounge refrigerator, leaving money and a thank you note on the blackboard for the staff. They turned all the American flags upside down—a signal of distress—and hung an upside down flag from the crown. They were in phone communication with the New York VVAW office, and had with them a disc jockey from an underground New York radio station. They shared their statement that they “support anyone who refuses to fight,” hoping to extend the Christmas cease-fire. They voluntarily left the statue after three days, and were not arrested for their protest.

A more positive and humorous commentary on American foreign policy from the artist Choé appeared in September 1973. A frequently used artistic convention in the ideological uses of the statue is to replace the face with that of a political figure, often
replacing the torch and tablet with symbols that comment on the person’s actions or beliefs. Choé represents Henry Kissinger in the robe and crown of the statue, holding up a whip instead of a torch, and a shield instead of a tablet. The shield has the flag’s stars and stripes flanking a handshake, a symbol of friendship and reconciliation. The cartoon is a playful comment on Kissinger’s role as a peace broker for the United States, portraying him as a representative of American liberty to the world.128

The end of the war led to the fall of South Vietnam and the withdrawal of American forces, but also the release of U.S. POWs from Vietnamese prison camps. On February 13, 1973, Draper Hill’s cartoon in the Memphis Commercial Appeal portrayed Uncle Sam holding Liberty’s torch and tablet as she walks forward, arms open to embrace men wearing shirts with POW stamped on their backs. The caption, “Gently, Mother…,” captured the emotion of the nation welcoming home its long-lost sons.129 The cartoon harkens back to feminine, maternal images of the Statue of Liberty used in the First and Second World War to represent the tender (rather than the martial) side of motherhood as the nation’s relationship to its soldiers. The maternal, welcoming image is utilized again in 1976, in a Sacramento Bee cartoon commenting on President Carter’s pardon of the draft resisters who had fled to Canada. The cartoon shows two men labeled “30,000 Vietnam Draft Resisters” at the U.S.-Canada border before a lowered gate with a stop sign on it. On the other side of the border stands the Statue of Liberty holding a tablet reading “Carter Pardon Pledge.” One of the men gestures to her saying, “I just heard her say, ‘Y’all come home!’”130 That the statue is heard speaking in a Southern accent is a nod to the Southern origins of President Carter, and having the statue welcome back the draft resisters is a twist on its symbolic role as “Mother of Exiles.”
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In the 1980s, the Vietnam War had ended, but the Cold War policy of containing communism and supporting anti-communist regimes continued to guide American foreign policy. A 1981 cartoon in the *Detroit News* shows the Statue of Liberty wearing a button labeled “Solidarnosc,” the Polish term for the Solidarity Movement that signaled the beginning of the end of Soviet influence in Eastern Europe, and was the first sign of the impending fall of the Soviet Union.\(^{131}\) In a more controversial and politically contentious gesture of support for anti-Communist movements around the world, the United States supported Contra troops in the civil war in Nicaragua. Oliver Wendell Harrington published an editorial cartoon in the German magazine *Eulenspiegel* in May 1986 commenting on this struggle. His cartoon shows the Statue of Liberty (looking rather like Mick Jagger in drag) leading armed Contra troops out of a ravaged, burning village. The “freedom fighters” are portrayed as a ragtag band, little better than bandits; one is carrying off a pig as villagers lie dead amid their houses. By using an image of the statue as the leader of the Contras, the artist makes clear that his critique is directed at the foreign policy that equates exporting American democracy with support of a bloody civil war that murdered and displaced innocent civilians.\(^{132}\) (fig. 32, p. 315)

Traditionally wartime tended to reinforce highly positive views of the American nation. That pattern was never complete, but its rupture during the era of the Vietnam conflict was mostly ended by the terrorist attacks on American soil on September 11, 2001. Because of the statue’s physical proximity to the destroyed World Trade Center, and the statue’s role as a symbol of New York and the United States, the statue became a focal point for symbolic responses to 9/11 and its aftermath. The National Park Service, recognizing this close relationship of the Statue of Liberty with 9/11, set up a special
online exhibit in remembrance of 9/11, providing opportunities at national parks and online for park visitors and employees to share their personal experiences of the tragedy.\textsuperscript{133} The Internet also plays a part in the statue’s widespread uses in response to 9/11, and to the wars in Afghanistan and Iraq that followed, giving individuals and groups an outlet for their feelings and opinions.

The day after 9/11, editorial cartoons across the country used images of the Statue of Liberty responding to the tragedy. The cartoons were collected by Daryl Cagle’s political cartoonists web site into a section on his site called “Lady Liberty’s Horror.” The cartoons were remarkably consistent in their imagery, a worldwide reiteration of the statue responding to the devastation of the attacks. They either depict the statue weeping, often with the smoke from the burning towers behind her, as in Scott Stantis’s cartoon in \textit{The Birmingham News}, or they depict the statue in a martial pose, with a fist or a sword upraised, as in Larry Wright’s cartoon for \textit{The Detroit News}.\textsuperscript{134} The unity of symbolism in these cartoons from so many different sources demonstrates the shared emotional response the nation—and most of the world—experienced: grief, horror, and rage.

Responses from private citizens featuring the Statue of Liberty were also posted online. A good example drawing by 17-year-old Eliza Gauger, posted to her online diary at “LiveJournal” the day after 9/11, shows the Statue of Liberty brandishing a revolver instead of her torch, holding a baby, wrapped in an American flag, instead of her tablet. The caption reads: “The most dangerous place in the world is between a mother and her children.” The image, drawing once again on the maternal, feminine image of protective motherhood, was copied and shared so widely across the Internet that Gauger allowed CafePress to market the image on mugs, t-shirts, and other items, donating all proceeds to
the Red Cross. Just as this drawing was the spontaneous emotional response to the attack for Eliza Gauger, numerous sites featured poetry by individuals using the statue as a symbol to express their feelings about the tragedy, as in this excerpt from the anonymous poem, “Lady Liberty”:

I wonder what she thought
As she stood there, strong and tall.
She couldn’t turn away.
She was forced to watch it all….
How dignified and beautiful
On a day so many died
I wonder what she thought,
And I know she must have cried.136

As with the editorial cartoons, these images and poems use the statue’s expressions of grief and anger to represent their own feelings about the 9/11 attack.

Another thread of emotional response to 9/11 associated with the statue expresses pride in and commemoration of the “first responders” who died at the World Trade Center, and those who worked in the rescue and recovery efforts after the towers collapsed. Dan Wasserman’s cartoon in the Boston Globe on September 12th showed the firefighters working amid the rubble of the fallen towers with the statue lifting her torch to light their work. One of the firefighters says, “We’ll get through this as long as she’s around.”137 The association of the Statue of Liberty with the first responders as mutual embodiments of American ideals continued well after the event. For example, a large circular embroidered patch suitable for the back of a jacket is an excellent example of this use. It says “Honor the Finest and Bravest—United We Stand—America’s Heroes—NYPD—FDNY—September 11, 2001.” The words encircle a foregrounded image of the Statue of Liberty with the World Trade Center towers and New York skyline in the background.138 Sold on eBay, the patch permitted people to commemorate the event and
demonstrate their support of the firefighters and police officers who had died in the collapse of the WTC towers, and is yet another medium in which the statue is used to memorialize the event.

When the attack was traced to al-Qaeda and its association with the Taliban in Afghanistan, the image of the statue was again brought into play to express people’s responses to the approaching war with Afghanistan. One online image from Hobotraveler.com expressed the widespread anger and determination of many people at the prospect of striking back against those who had attacked the WTC and the Pentagon. It shows a cleverly “photoshopped” Statue of Liberty giving the finger with her upraised arm instead of holding up a torch, with the caption “We’re coming, motherfuckers.” Another online image of the statue shows her wearing a veil covering her face such as Afghan women were required to wear, holding a tablet with an Arabic inscription. The image commented on the Taliban’s oppressive treatment of women, so antithetical to the principles of liberty the statue represents, and rallied support for the invasion of Afghanistan.139

The connection of the World Trade Center’s destruction with the Statue of Liberty was so deeply ingrained in the national consciousness that even the proposed structure of the new World Trade Center site capitalized on this relationship. Architect Daniel Libeskind designed the “Freedom Tower” to evoke elements of the Statue of Liberty, its offset spire replicating the upraised torch of the Statue of Liberty, thereby joining its symbolism of freedom and the United States with the already established symbolic meanings of the statue. Libeskind further joined the new tower’s symbolism with the
history of the United States by making it 1,776 stories tall to refer to the year the United States declared its independence from Great Britain.\textsuperscript{140}

Alongside the affirmative, unifying uses of the statue came criticisms of the policies and actions affecting civil liberties instituted in the wake of 9/11 in the name of “homeland security.” A political cartoon by Kevin Kallaugher, published in the \textit{Baltimore Sun} on September 27, 2001, shows Uncle Sam in a suit of armor. He bends over to pick up his helmet, labeled “security,” representing the country ramping up its security measures in the wake of 9/11. His tip of his sword catches the gown of the Statue of Liberty, lifting her off the ground. The caption reads: “Careful, pal!” Another editorial cartoon, this one by Jeff Danziger, published by Tribune Media Services on June 24, 2002, shows the Statue of Liberty sitting in a jail cell with the Bill of Rights. Vice President Dick Cheney says, “You’ll be completely safe in here,” and President George W. Bush says, “Remember, we love freedom.”\textsuperscript{141} These images express the concern of many people that civil liberties are being threatened more by internal security measures than by the potential threat of terrorist attacks by foreign extremists.

As the “war on terror” shifted its focus from Afghanistan to Iraq, political criticism of the United States’ military policies and lack of international support increased. The Statue of Liberty became a key symbol in the controversy with France over the war in Iraq. Vandals burned a replica of the statue in Bordeaux, France, marking her eyes red paint to symbolize tears of blood, and cracking the pedestal of a 9/11 commemorative plaque near the statue. Responding to French protests against the invasion of Iraq, a number of protests in the United States (most of which seem tongue in
cheek) called for the return of the statue to the French. One online protest site called for replacing the Statue of Liberty with a statue of Ronald Reagan in cowboy garb.\textsuperscript{142}

A cover cartoon on the \textit{Washington Post} entitled “The Cost of Preemptive Politics” showed President George W. Bush dressed as the Statue of Liberty, carrying a tablet labeled “Pax Americana” and blithely crossing a bridge set on fire by the torch he carries. He is passing a sign labeled “Welcome to Iraq.” On the other side of the burning bridge stand representatives of the rest of the world’s nations. The cartoon is a clear summary of the president pursuing a foreign policy against Iraq in the name of spreading American liberty abroad, at the cost of “burning bridges” to the rest of the world.\textsuperscript{143} This cartoon continues the longstanding strategy of replacing the face of the statue with that of a famous politician as a way of commenting on that politician’s actions in light of the ideals of liberty that the statue and America are supposed to represent.

Online, the website \textit{The Propaganda Remix Project} takes posters from wartime propaganda of World War I and II, and reshapes them into acerbic satire on present-day issues. A number of these images use the Statue of Liberty. One poster plays with the famous Liberty Loan poster discussed above that shows the statue pointing at the viewer saying, “You Buy a Liberty Bond Lest I Perish.” The remixed version shows the same image of Liberty with the caption, “You! Stop Asking Questions! You’re Either With US or You’re With the TERRORISTS!” and attributes the message to the Ministry of Homeland Security. Another image of Liberty from a wartime poster is labeled “TRAITOR!” and shows the statue being stabbed in the back by an arm labeled “John Ashcroft.” Below the image is a quote from Ashcroft: “To those who scare peace-loving people with phantoms of lost liberty, my message is this: your tactics only aid
terrorists.”144 (fig. 33, p. 316) Another image shows Liberty standing in the smoke of a burning, bombed out city, its face a mask that has been taken away to show a skull beneath the spiked corona. The images are available for sale on the Cafepress site,145 but on the artist’s own website, there is an option to email feedback, which he then features on a page called “Read the Hate Mail!” By using these posters, the artist cleverly draws upon images that were crafted in the service of national interests in a time of war, makes them a means to critique national policy instead of support it, and does it in a way that exploits their former meanings in new contexts, demonstrating the continued versatility of the statue as an ideological tool.

The Statue of Liberty continues to be used in imagery and demonstrations protesting the war in Iraq, the Bush administration, the curtailment of civil liberties in the United States, and U.S. foreign policy in the war on terrorism. For example, the torture of prisoners in Abu Ghraib prison in Iraq galvanized national and international response to the perceived hypocrisy of the United States bringing freedom and democracy to Iraq while torturing and humiliating its military prisoners. An editorial cartoon in the Calgary Sun shows the Statue of Liberty in the pose of one of the Abu Ghraib prisoners, draped in a black cloth, standing on a box with electrodes attached to her outspread hands, a tear on her face. Another political cartoon, which appeared in Ad-Dabbour in Beirut, Lebanon, depicts Lynndie England, one of the military guards who abused prisoners. She wears the crown and carries the torch of the statue, while her other hand holds the leash attached to a naked George Bush, again replicating one of the images from the prison, skillfully commenting on the president being a “prisoner” of the scandal and of his own policies, as well as underlining the hypocrisy of American policy in light of the torture of
prisoners. In June 2004, protesters in Boston were arrested during a non-violent street protest in which one protestor dressed as one of the Abu Ghraib prison, another wore the orange jumpsuit of a Guantanamo Bay detainee, another dressed as the Statue of Liberty blindfolded with an American flag, and a fourth protestor—holding a rope that bound the others at their wrists—wore a dark suit and a Donald Rumsfeld mask. The “street theater” made the statement through their silent presence that America, represented by the Statue of Liberty, was captured by Bush administration officials and blinded by patriotic rhetoric to the suffering that American policies were inflicting on the people they were supposed to be liberating.

From its early uses in World War I Liberty Loan posters to the present-day members of “Code Pink—Women for Peace” dressing up in pink Statue of Liberty costumes during war protests at the 2004 Republican Convention in New York City, the Statue of Liberty has been a tool in rallying support for or against the wars waged by the United States. The statue performs a vital function in representing the United States in a human form that can fight, mourn, offer comfort, or be identified with well-known (or notorious) political figures and their policies. The debate over the nature of American liberty does not end, and the policies that best secure liberty for American citizens and export liberty to the world continue to inspire protest, support, and incisive commentary featuring the versatile image of the Statue of Liberty.

5 Ibid., 223.
7 Ibid., 132.
11 Historian Wendy Shadwell claims, “It was during World War I that the Statue of Liberty became a national symbol, the female embodiment of freedom, peace, and patriotism, much as Uncle Sam was the male symbol.” We disagree, placing this affection in the context of 1916, as demonstrated in the commemoration chapter and this section of the war chapter, but the fact that a strong national feeling for the Statue strengthened during World War I cannot be denied. See Wendy Shadwell, "The Statue of Liberty: A Century in the Graphic Arts," *Imprint: Journal of the American Historical Print Collectors Society* 20 (Spring 1985): 24.
14 Shadwell, "The Statue of Liberty,” 26; Joseph Pennell, “That liberty shall not perish from the earth,” [1917?], Library of Congress Prints and Photographs Collection, Unprocessed [item] [P&P]
15 “Symbol for Upton Men,” *New York Times*, 14 March 1918, p. 8. The 77th became famous during WWI when their battalion was cut off from Allied support by the German army.
17 Shadwell, "The Statue of Liberty,” 25.,
18 Ibid., 24.
20 "France Fights for the World, Says Viviani; America Heartens Her for New Sacrifices," *New York Times*, 10 May 1917, p. 2. Writer Henry Leach also commented on viewing the statue when he returned to the country in an article that investigated the reasons that America entered the war, in "America and Liberty." *Living Age* 294 (17 July 1917): 48-53.


[Caricature of Woodrow Wilson in pose of demagogue on pedestal of the Statue of Liberty while Miss Liberty sinks beneath water], ca. 1917. Library of Congress Prints and Photographs Online Catalog, print number LC-USZ62-54713.


“Nation Rejoices at War’s End; City is Jubilant,” New York Times, 12 November 1918, p. 1.


It is possible to also read the following images as signs of anti-German-American and Japanese-American sentiment, especially in light of the continued bias against German-Americans and the incarceration of Japanese-Americans that flourished throughout the war. However, the specific images of Germans and Japanese represented here specifically depict military personnel or appear to be directed at remembering military actions.


Frank Capra, “Prelude to War,” in Why We Fight (Special Service Division, Army Service Forces, in cooperation with the U.S. Army Signal Corps, 1942), reissued as Why We Fight (New York: GoodTimes Home Video Corp., 2000).


This emphasis on women as civic-minded consumers matched prevailing views about their roles during the war. For a full discussion, see Lizabeth Cohen, A Consumer’s Republic: The Politics of Mass Consumption in Postwar America (New York: Knopf, 2003).


64 “State, City Meet Loan Drive Quotas,” New York Times, 4 November 1945, p. 42.


72 Untitled photograph of servicemen and sweethearts at the Statue of Liberty, circa 1940-1946. Box 9, Folder 9, Number 8, Statue of Liberty-Ellis Island Library.


74 Ibid., 51.


George Nobbe, “Saga of the 77th,” Sunday News, 5 November 1967, p. 96. Available in “Lost Battalion” Folder, 4th Filing Cabinet Drawer, Reading Room, Statue of Liberty-Ellis Island Library. See also the Liberty Patch representation of the 77th Division’s insignia, as well as the undated, unattributed photograph of four members of the 77th Division holding a placard bearing the Statue emblem. Both available from the Statue of Liberty-Ellis Island Archives.


Bundesen, 54.

Berger, “1,300 Decorated Veterans Back,” 38.

Horne, 16.


Bundesen, 52.

Bundesen, 5.

Bundesen, 39.

Bundesen, 58.


Ibid.


Ernie Pyle, Here is Your War (New York: Henry Holt and Co., 1943), 102, 298.

Fittingly, an image of the statue depicted on the shoulder patch of the Seventy-seventh Infantry Division appeared on a monument erected to Pyle’s memory by that division on the spot on Ie Island where the journalist was killed in April 1945. See “Ernie Pyle Honored in Ryukyus and U.S.,” New York Times, 3 July 1945, p.3.


“Freedom of expression, of religion, from want, from fear everywhere in the world,” [between 1936 and 1941], Library of Congress Prints and Photographs Collection, POS – WPA – PA .01 .F7439, no. 1 (B size) [P&P].
100 Ray Morgan, “Safe” (United States Committee for the Care of European Children: n.d.). Statue of Liberty-Ellis Island Archives.


Dennis Renault, Sacramento Bee, 10 November 1976, in Aguila, 68.


Oliver Wendell Harrington, [Statue of Liberty smoking a cigar and leading Contra troops out of a village], 1986, Library of Congress Prints and Photographs Collection, CD 1 – Harrington, no. 163 (B size) <P&P>[P&P].


Figure 28
Figure 32
Figure 33
Chapter 7
The Statue of Liberty in Popular and Commercial Culture

In July 2004, a conservative advocacy group, the Center for Individual Freedom, mobilized its members for a protest against Subway Restaurants for being “anti-American.” The tray liners that franchisees in Germany were using to advertise the movie *Super Size Me* showed an obese Statue of Liberty holding aloft an order of fries, a burger in her other hand, along with the headline, “Why are Americans so fat?” The ad contained the German word “amis,” which the Center’s complaint claimed was a derogatory nickname for Americans. The Center’s executive director stated: “It is appalling that Subway, a U.S. company, would attack Americans and the Statue of Liberty, our most recognizable symbol of freedom, in a time of war just to gain market share.” The president of Subway responded that the German distributors of the movie who had designed the tray liners may not have been “sensitive” to the ad’s effect. He added that their German franchisees, rather than being un-American, “are about the most pro-American people you can find.” However, Subway pulled the ad in response to public pressure.¹

This incident demonstrates that whenever and wherever the Statue of Liberty appears, even on a tray liner advertisement halfway around the world from the original statue on Liberty Island, people take notice of its use, interpret its meaning in that particular context, and respond to its message. The case of the Subway ad demonstrates how the confluence of symbol, audience, and historical moment shape an instance of the statue’s use. In this case, a corpulent Liberty was employed as an icon of the United States, representing the nation not as the homeland of freedom, but as the homeland of

³¹
fast food and prodigious appetites. Allied in the ad with a movie that indicted the ill effects of a fast food diet, the ad served Subway’s purpose of making their food seem healthier than their competitor’s, and no doubt played upon its German audience’s humorous perceptions of Americans. It might have ended there, but in a time when the United States is at war, post-9/11 patriotic sentiment still runs high, a conservative president is in the White House, and diplomatic relations with European nations are strained, the effect on the ad’s American audience took quite a different turn than was intended, and the reshaping of the statue from her role as freedom’s icon in a way that mocked Americans solely for commercial ends was taken as an affront. It is interesting, too, that the counterattack was led by a conservative advocacy group “for individual freedom,” whose members took it upon themselves to defend both the statue and America’s image abroad against a seemingly too-generous freedom of expression by an American corporation.

The Statue of Liberty is omnipresent and widely diverse in its appearances in popular and commercial culture. So ubiquitous is its use that it may even scarcely register with the viewer except to reinforce one of the meanings that have come to be associated with the monument over time—a meaning which may be far removed from its original intent and lofty role as an international symbol of freedom. In an age dominated by the images of mass culture, the Statue of Liberty appears in many forms and locales. For example, in movie theaters in the summer of 2004, viewers saw the statue inundated by a tidal wave, then frozen in sea ice up to its crown in the movie, *The Day After Tomorrow*. In July of that same summer, the National Park Service announced the reopening of the Statue of Liberty to visitors after security upgrades following the 9/11
terrorist attacks. Colmar, France, commemorated the centennial of Frederic Bartholdi’s
death by erecting a large replica of his most famous creation. On television, a
commercial featuring Travelocity’s “Roaming Gnome” wooed a souvenir Statue of
Liberty while touring the sights in New York City. In Nashville, Tennessee, the Statue of
Liberty stands above the entrance of the “Noshville Deli,” which features New York deli
food and sells statue souvenirs to its patrons, including a Statue of Liberty topped
birdhouse painted the color of the statue’s copper patina. And on the Internet, eBay
shoppers purchase Statue of Liberty-themed merchandise ranging from the high art of
Erté to small statues of Snoopy dressed as Liberty, while web sites by individuals and
groups use images of the statue as fodder for political agendas, social commentaries, or
patriotic paeans.

The multiple incarnations of the Statue of Liberty in popular and commercial
media are part of the cultural fabric of the United States and, indeed, of the world.
Tracing the statue through public and private settings, known and anonymous creators,
and multiple meanings in popular and commercial culture in its almost 120 years reveals
the threads of debate and consensus on the meaning of American national identity and the
meaning of the idea of freedom in the larger culture. The uses of the statue have not
always been overtly political or nationalistic—its appearances can be playful, aesthetic,
even trivial. The associations between liberty and high-minded political ideals that drove
the struggle for freedom in America and France continue to shape its meanings.
However, throughout its history and into the present day, the statue can also be found in a
cultural thicket of signs, ideas, and uses that dilute the statue’s potency for enlightening
the world.
Marvin Trachtenberg writes: “Liberty’s vitality centers on her personification of America, but it also involves her extraordinary fluidity as a symbolic image.”

“Liberty Enlightening the World” continues to serve as a symbol of personal and political freedom and as a marker of economic opportunity—ideas that were certainly evident in the nineteenth century. Over time its meaning has also acquired heavy layers of American national identity and the sense that it can stand for America as a home. To a considerable extent these alter meanings have tempered the universal dreams of human liberation encapsulated in its founding vision. Popular culture has extended its spirit even more widely, and at times actually rendered its significance confusing. It is not clear if this popularization has led to a trivialization of the animating dreams of human liberty, but that is one possible conclusion to draw from viewing it through the lens of popular culture.

As Chapter One of this study noted, the Statue of Liberty entered an already rich and active tradition of representing America in the form of a woman. This tradition actually predated the founding of the United States and originated with the form of an “Indian Princess” that represented the “New World,” which spawned a “Plumed Greek Goddess” in classical robes with feathers in her hair. The feminine symbols had multiplied by the time of the American Revolution. One variant was called “Columbia,” an alternative name for the new continent. Columbia was dressed in white, appearing with the Liberty Cap and pole, and often accompanied by the American flag, a shield, bald eagle, the Declaration of Independence, the thirteen stars of the original colonies. Another variant form called “Liberty,” based on the Roman goddess Libertas, also adopted these trappings, save that she was often portrayed as dressed in or holding the
flag. This form proved to have greater utility for the American cause, perhaps because her name represented not a place, but a state of being, an ideal the new nation could aspire to and rally around. Liberty graced the first coinage of the new Republic.

Alongside this official use, however, both Columbia and Liberty became widespread symbols in popular culture right up to the time of the Statue of Liberty’s arrival in New York Harbor. As Nancy Jo Fox demonstrates, early figures of Liberty were weathervanes and figureheads, sewn into quilts and embroidery samplers, carved into furniture or whale ivory, inscribed on metal, or painted on paper, glass, velvet, or wood. Even early forms of advertising found use for Liberty; Fox’s artifacts include a tavern sign circa 1860, a “Sweet Liberty” cigar-box label circa 1890, and an Art Nouveau style trademark for the “Columbia Carriage Company.” She notes: “Americans of all levels of education, sophistication, and wealth loved their land and venerated the symbols of their nationhood, displaying them everywhere, often in advertising.”

The Statue of Liberty, as another variant of the Goddess of Liberty representing America’s most cherished ideal, found a ready-made place in American iconography. However, “Liberty Enlightening the World” arrived on American shores at a unique time in American history, one that provided the means for its image to disseminated, used, and interpreted in ways never experienced by its already-established sisters. Anne Palumbo and Ann Abrams describe the elements that affected the “proliferation of the image” of the statue, even before its dedication in 1886. Along with the story of its manufacture and the highly publicized fund drive for its pedestal, the image of the statue was widely reproduced in newspapers and magazines. They write:

A half-century earlier, visual information in such profusion would have been unthinkable, but by 1886, when Bartholdi’s statue was installed on its pedestal in
New York harbor, “the explosion of imagery” was well underway, spurred on both by revolutions in the technology of printing and pictorial reproduction and by the adoption of mass-production techniques. Modern technology and mass production made possible the manufacture of inexpensive three-dimensional replicas as well.\(^4\)

Palumbo and Abrams note that the new printing techniques, which made newspaper illustrations and cartoons easier to produce, extended to lithographs, so mass-produced artwork of the statue was widely available. They add that this was also the time when mass-produced advertising was proliferating. Businesses were advertising to expand their customer base and take advantage of more efficient, far-flung rail transportation for their products across the country. Recognizing the widespread popular interest in the new statue, and drawing upon the precedent of using these female symbols of America to represent American products, advertising began to use the Statue of Liberty to hawk their products, sometimes in humorous forms.\(^5\)

Victor Turner argued that the significant elements of any symbol’s meaning are related to what it does, and what is done to it by and for whom.\(^6\) To understand the varied uses of the Statue of Liberty in popular and commercial culture, past or present, it is useful to consider first “what it does.” Therefore, what follows is a taxonomy of the meanings the statue has accrued over time, and some examples of those meanings as they have been applied over time. These meanings come variously from its form, its location, its philosophical roots, or its repeated association with historical or cultural milieus. They can be invoked singly to relay a simple message, or the use of the statue in a particular context can invoke several layers of meaning at once, creating a more complex, nuanced message. To fully understand these meanings, we will also identify “what is done to it by and for whom”—the venues in which the image of the Statue of Liberty has
been used to communicate with audiences. These contexts in popular and commercial culture are art, advertising, leisure (as souvenirs, collectibles, and a tourist site), and the Internet.

**Symbolic Meanings of the Statue of Liberty**

*Statue as Itself:* The simplest meaning of the Statue of Liberty in popular culture is reflexive: the image of the statue represents the statue. For example, a Halloween costume of the Statue of Liberty gives its wearer the chance to be the Statue of Liberty, but does not ask the audience to read any further meaning into the representation. Another example of this category is a “flaming shot” known as the Statue of Liberty, available at a bar called Kilroy’s in Bloomington, Indiana. The drink is a shot of anise liqueur; the drinker dips a finger in the liqueur; the bartender sets fire to the drinker’s finger, who holds the finger aloft like the Statue of Liberty’s torch, downs the shot, and blows out the burning finger.

The latter example demonstrates that the entire statue does not have to be represented to mobilize this meaning. So iconic is the statue that seeing a part of it can be as recognizable as the whole image. The raised arm holding the torch, the spiked crown, even the pose, can be enough to evoke Liberty, and this metonymic familiarity with the statue was established early in its tenure here. Consider the “Statue of Liberty play” in football: a player fakes a pass with an upraised arm while handing off the ball to someone behind him. In the November 26, 1916 *Los Angeles Times*, a reporter wrote:

> Older than the pyramids of Cheops, even so old that it was new, the time honored Statue of Liberty play which was famed in football nearly a quarter of a century ago was responsible for the defeat of the San Bernardino High School football team on the Pomona High School field this afternoon.7
The play had been named for the statue by 1891, if the reporter is correct, which suggests that the Statue of Liberty’s image had already become so much a part of the American consciousness within five years of its dedication that even a similar pose evoked it.

**Statue as Place Marker:** Over time the Statue of Liberty has come to stand for New York City, New York state, and the United States of America. Its more complex ideological and emotional associations with these locales is discussed below. The statue as “place marker” is a simpler form of its symbolic use: it denotes a geographic location, just as the Eiffel Tower represents Paris and France, the Parthenon represents Athens and Greece, and the Taj Mahal represents India. This layer of meaning is present in a Statue of Liberty souvenir to commemorate a visit to the city, or an establishing shot in a film, or as a logo on a New York license plate or a Lower Manhattan street sign. An early use of this meaning is well illustrated in a turn-of-the-century colored lithograph, part of a series meant to be assembled into three-dimensional models. The image shows the Statue of Liberty on its pedestal inside the fort around its base, the Brooklyn Bridge behind it, the words “New York” printed so the statue is centered between them. In the upper left corner of the lithograph is the French flag; in the right corner is the American flag. The original elevation drawing, held by the Metropolitan Museum of Art’s Department of Drawings and Prints, is widely available today on souvenir mugs, plates, t-shirts, and tote bags. It is interesting to note that the perspective is inaccurate; the statue cannot be seen foregrounding the center of the Brooklyn Bridge as it is in the lithograph, but in the interests of having these two New York City landmarks appear together, the artist made the decision to shift them.
A later example of identifying city and national locales by their iconic landmarks is a 1928 French tapestry commemorating Charles A. Lindbergh’s transatlantic flight. Lindbergh and the nose of the *Spirit of St. Louis* are in the center of the tapestry under his name. To the left is a New York skyline labeled “New York” at the bottom, with the statue in the harbor foregrounded, the airplane flying by at the level of her torch. To the right is a view of the plane flying above the Seine and Paris, also labeled, with the Eiffel Tower in the distance. Here, historical accuracy has been shifted in the interests of making the message clear: Lindbergh did not fly over or near the statue in his historic flight. However, the appearance of the statue and the tower at either edge of the tapestry make clear that Lindbergh’s flight linked these two cities and their two nations.

**Statue as Technological Marvel:** When the artist of the turn-of-the-century lithograph cited above changed the geographical perspective to show the Statue of Liberty and the Brooklyn Bridge together, it was not simply an aesthetic choice. It was a conscious decision to feature two great technological masterpieces of the Industrial Age that graced New York Harbor. The Statue of Liberty’s colossal size was a source of wonder to those who visited the island and climbed its interior stairs to the top. The statue was also an engineering challenge to its creator. The problem of how to support the great weight of the statue’s copper skin, and create a structure that would be able to withstand temperature changes, high winds, and storms, was solved by the innovative engineering genius of Gustav Eiffel. He designed the iron armature that supported the thin sheets of beaten copper and provided the stability to withstand the stresses the statue would face in the harbor.
Other technological marvels have overshadowed the statue since its creation, and its use as a symbol of technological innovation and power has been overshadowed by other meanings associated with the statue over time. However, this layer of meaning does help explicate some of the turn-of-the-century advertising images of the Statue of Liberty found on trade cards. It may be a way of touting the product as the latest improvement, linking it with American ingenuity and technological prowess (conveniently glossing over the fact the statue was a French technological marvel). For example, an image of the “New Easy Lawn Mower” shows the Statue of Liberty in the upper right hand corner of the card. Castle Garden is visible on the left, so the image is meant to represent the Battery. Along the shore people stand or sit gazing out at the statue, but in the lower left corner of the ad another technological marvel draws an admiring trio: two stylish women and a young girl stand watching a young man use the New Easy Lawn Mower.¹²

**Statue as Symbol of French-American Relations:** One of the original meanings of the Statue of Liberty when France presented it to the United States was to embody the shared historical and philosophical foundations of the two nations. The connection was one of the major themes of the dedication, discussed in Chapter Three of this study. The relationship was not lost on advertisers of that period. An 1886 trade card for “Parisian Sauce” showed the image of the Statue of Liberty in its center, but she is not the focal point of the ad, for her namesake Liberty stands foregrounded on the left, clad in the stars and stripes, her shield on the ground before her, her eagle perched on top of it, and a large wooden spoon in her hand instead of a Liberty pole. On the right stands a more stylish, corseted Marianne wearing the *bonnet rouge* on her head and the French tricolor draped
about her hips, her own spoon worn at her hip like a sword. Marianne is in the act of handing Liberty an oversized bottle of sauce. The statue, above and behind them, stands for another friendly gift between the two nations. Since its dedication, the Statue of Liberty has been adopted by and inextricably identified with the United States. However, expressions of this transnational relationship still show up in popular culture during the statue’s commemorations, when events such as Lindbergh’s flight reconnect the two countries in the popular imagination, and during times of war, when international alliances need to be reaffirmed.

On the other side of the Atlantic, the French also continue to have a relationship with the Statue of Liberty, as the aforementioned celebration of Bartholdi’s centennial in Colmar demonstrates. The statue’s construction was funded by the efforts of the Committee of the Franco-American Union, which was formed in 1875 to solicit subscriptions for the project, and the center-left and republican newspapers of the French press played their own role in promoting the statue, encouraging donations of any size just as Pulitzer’s campaign in The World did to fund the pedestal. The statue’s head was put on display at the Paris Exposition in 1878, just as the torch was displayed at the Philadelphia Exposition in 1876. Replicas of the statue can be found in Paris at the Pont de Grenelle and the Jardin de Luxembourg, as well as other locations around the country. The statue also finds its way into French popular and commercial culture. For example, France has issued a number of postage stamps using the image of the Statue of Liberty. One was issued in 1939 as a commemorative stamp for the New York World’s Fair, an event that represented international amity as the statue does in this aspect of its symbolism. Another French stamp, issued after World War II, had the caption “Aide aux
Representations by the statue of French-American relations also emerge in popular culture when relations are strained between France and the United States. For example, a 1983 cartoon in the *Gary Post-Tribune* shows French president François Mitterrand with the Statue of Liberty tucked under his arm alongside a flagpole displaying the French flag. Mitterrand is wading through water, presumably on his way back to France. The caption reads: “Protection of war criminal Klaus Barbie deplored by France.” Barbie had been chief of the Gestapo in Lyons, France, and had been sought by France for war crimes since 1950. U.S. Army Intelligence had shielded Barbie because they were using him as a spy in East Germany until 1951, and had assisted in his escape to Bolivia, where he lived until Bolivia extradited him to France for trial in 1983. Twenty years later, the idea behind this cartoon was resurrected in ironic “Send Back the Statue of Liberty” articles and petitions—along with fabricated French demands to return the statue—on Internet sites that sprang up in response to France’s opposition to the U.S. invasion of Iraq.

*Statue as Symbol of New York(ers):* It is one layer of meaning when a license plate uses the Statue of Liberty to represent New York geographically. It is another layer of meaning when a driver on the freeway sees that symbol and mutters, “New York driver.” By representing the state, and particularly the city of New York, the statue as a symbol can reference all the beliefs and images associated with the place and its inhabitants. It can therefore be used to promote, comment upon, or critique New York and New Yorkers. An early example of this use is a cartoon by Thomas Nast.
representing the statue as Death with a skeletal face and skeletal arm. Its torch is held upside down, showering sparks, and the spikes of its crown are beams of light. On its tablet is printed “Role of Death. Its pedestal’s inscription, “Leave All Hope, Ye That Enter,” paraphrases Dante’s Gates of Hell. The cartoon was the artist’s indictment of the unhealthy conditions in the city, and the political corruption that allowed those conditions to continue.  

A more positive portrayal of the city through a redesign of the statue can be found on the cover of the book *The WPA Guide to New York City: the Federal Writers’ Project Guide to 1930s New York*. The cover art foregrounds the head and crown of an Art Deco representation of the statue with a Deco skyline behind it. The statue's presence geographically fixes the book as effectively as the title, but its style of representation is also evocative of a dominant style of public architecture in the city. Rockefeller Center, the Chrysler Building, and the Empire State Building are all Art Deco masterpieces and icons of the city. The statue’s style of representation also suggests the time period and vibrant cultural life of New York City in the 1930s that the WPA writers captured in their guidebook. 

*Statue as Symbol of Woman:* The Statue of Liberty is a gendered image, but its gender is not always referenced or foregrounded in its representations. However, because it is female, the statue’s identity as a woman can be used to stand for, comment upon, or play with female identity from the time of its dedication. As with African Americans, the statue’s espoused role as a symbol of freedom made its image a tool to critique American society as women struggled for full citizenship. As discussed in Chapter Three, the statue’s dedication ceremony was disrupted by women protesting their exclusion from the
formal ceremonies on Bedloe’s Island, and bringing attention to their larger struggle for suffrage. The campaign for women’s suffrage continued into the next century, and a poem by Alice Duer Miller, published in 1917 in her book *Women are People!* imagines “An Unauthorised [sic] Interview Between the Suffragists & the Statue of Liberty.” The suffragists ask the statue that stands for “equal law and right...[w]hy you treat your daughters so?”, the statue replies:

Be not deceived, my daughters, I’m not she—
The winged Goddess, who sets nations free.
I am that Liberty, which when men win
They think that others’ seeking is a sin;
I am that Liberty which men attain
And clip her wings lest she should fly again:
I am that Liberty which all your brothers
Think good for them and very bad for others.
Therefore they made me out of bronze, and hollow,
Immovable, for fear that I might follow
Some fresh rebellion, some new victim’s plea;
And so they set me on a rock at sea,
Welded a torch securely in my hand
Lest I should pass it on, without command.
I am a milestone, not an inspiration;
And if my spirit lingers in this nation,
If it still flickers faintly o’er these waters,
It is your spirit, my rebellious daughters.²⁰

This poem was published in the same year that America entered World War I. At that time, the statue was undergoing a reconfiguration of its message of freedom towards a more nationalistic, even militaristic stance. This poem is another kind of call to arms by the statue, not in defense of the nation, but in revolt against it. The image of Liberty here is one of universal freedom that is not yet attained, an activist figure pinioned by men, but encouraging her “rebellious daughters” to carry forward the statue’s (and their) struggle for liberty.
Other, more recent campaigns by and for women have also used the statue as a symbol. For example, a World War II-era “Son in Service” pin worn by Blue Star Mothers had its blue stars—one for each son in service—superimposed over the torch and arm of the statue, once again mobilizing the wartime tradition of representing the statue as a symbol of both freedom and a mother’s sacrifice. By wearing the pin, the woman identified herself as waiting for her son(s) to come home, just as the statue stood vigil in the harbor waiting for all of America’s returning sons. Campaign buttons for Hillary Rodham Clinton’s potential run for the presidency in 2004 portrayed the Statue of Liberty with Hillary’s face and stated: “I support the New York Lady.” Pro-choice buttons in the collection of the Museum of the City of New York showed the statue with the inscription: “Abortion: A Private Choice,” associating the statue with a woman’s issue as well as an issue of private freedom. Addressing another issue of women’s sexual freedom, a 2001 poster for a forum that protested government interference in the commerce of sex toys, held at a New York City store called "Toys in Babeland," shows the Statue of Liberty holding up a vibrator instead of a torch, with the caption "Life, Liberty, and the Pursuit of Happiness," with "Happiness" crossed out and "Masturbation" written above it. The statue is depicted with a tiny smile.

**Statue as Symbol of the USA and Americans:** Just as the Statue of Liberty can represent New York and New Yorkers, the statue is also used as a national symbol representing beliefs and images associated with the United States and Americans. Its French creators intended the statue to represent the unique heritage of democracy and liberty in the United States. Americans and the rest of the world have adopted that identification of the statue with the nation. As the Subway ad discussed at the beginning
of this chapter demonstrated, uses of the statue as a symbol of the USA can celebrate or
critique American attitudes or political policies. These images can be turned inward, a
way for Americans to explain, explore, and define their national identity. An excellent
early example of this use is the Liberty Loan posters of World War I, discussed in depth
in Chapter Six of this study. These posters illustrate that the need for Americans to
define their nation becomes particularly acute in times of war. Images of the statue
representing the United States can also be turned outward to define America’s
relationship to the world. Lastly, images of the statue can also be used by the popular
and commercial cultures of other nations to describe, praise, or criticize American
policies or citizens.

A playful and incisive example of the use of the statue to represent the USA is the
1979 album cover art for the English band Supertramp's *Breakfast in America.* Seen
through an airplane window, the Statue of Liberty is a plump, grinning diner waitress
holding up a glass on a plate, with a menu in her other arm that says "Breakfast in
America," and the skyline of the city is composed of coffee cups, condiments, and an egg
carton, with silverware representing the piers jutting from Manhattan Island. The artwork
comments on the material abundance of America, but also on its culture of consumption.
One of the themes of the album is a critique of American materialism and its effects, as in
this excerpt from “Child of Vision”:

You're messing up the water.
You're rolling in the wine.
You're poisoning your body.
You're poisoning your mind.
You gave me Coca-Cola.
You said it tasted good.
You watch the television.
It tells you that you should.
How can you live in this way?25

A darker American skyline appears on the September 1984 cover of the magazine *Arabia: The Islamic World Review*. The cover article is entitled "In the shadow of the superpowers." In the center of the page is a skyline of missiles around a Statue of Liberty holding a pistol aloft instead of a torch. At the bottom of the cover is a Russian city skyline dominated by another missile with the Kremlin star on its top. A map of the Middle East lies between the two dark skylines, with the figures of an Arab and an Egyptian standing on the map.26 The image illustrates the ideological and political position that many nations experienced during the Cold War, standing between the USA and the USSR.

The Statue of Liberty as a symbol of the United States has ideological and philosophical aspects as the concomitant symbol of liberty, a concept that transcends national boundaries. That wider meaning is discussed below, but it enters into the meaning of the statue here, because the idea of American liberty involves debates about the appropriate role of the United States in relation to its allies and its enemies as a nation that espouses a special relationship to liberty. The statue’s symbolism of the USA prompts discussion of the right (or wrong) use of American power, its moral imperative as a superpower, and the proper use of its immense resources in its own service as well as in the service of the liberation of people in other nations. A recent example of the use of the Statue of Liberty in this context was photographed in November 2002. Palestinian artists set up an image of the statue to protest American support of the Israeli government. The statue stands on a high wooden platform over the ruins of Yasir Arafat’s compound in Ramallah, which was destroyed by the Israeli army. The statue
holds its torch in its left hand instead of its right, and the flame points down, perhaps to represent the inversion of liberty in the face of the destruction before it, or in the act of snuffing out the flame, or about to set the scene on fire.\textsuperscript{27}

\textbf{Statue as Mother of Exiles:} The Statue of Liberty is a symbol of the American immigrant experience, a role which is discussed in depth in Chapter Four of this study. The immigrant connection is a particular strand of the statue’s larger role as a symbol of America. When used in contexts dealing with immigrants, the statue provides a symbolic means for exploring the nature of—and limits of—freedom, citizenship, and economic opportunity in the United States. Examples of this association in the popular imagination, and the debates around it, can be found early in the statue’s existence. A Thomas Nast cartoon that appeared in an 1889 issue of the \textit{America} magazine shows one of his caricatured Irish immigrants entering New York Harbor, the Statue of Liberty towering in the distance above the masts of the passing ships. The Irishman stands on the prow of his ship, his fist clenched and shillelagh brandished belligerently as he shouts: “I am agin the Government!” The cartoon is entitled “In the Face of Liberty.”\textsuperscript{28} Nast, himself an immigrant to the United States from Germany when he was six years old, illustrates a nativist fear of the time that immigrants, not properly understanding or appreciating American liberty, would use their newfound freedom to promote anarchy or other views antithetical to American law and order.

Ninety years later than the cartoon above, another editorial cartoon demonstrated that the association of the Statue of Liberty with immigration issues was so much a part of public consciousness that it could be used to comment on economic equality and opportunity within America’s own borders. Entitled “America’s Boat People,” a 1979
cartoon in the *Sacramento Bee* showed a boat laden down and overflowing with Black people, some with arms outstretched to the Statue of Liberty as they sail past it, others falling overboard or struggling in the water. One holds up a makeshift flag made from a shirt. The boat looks like images of the Haitian “boat people,” economic refugees whose status and welcome to the United States were under debate at that time. However, the boat is labeled “45% Unemployed Black Youth.” The statue stands with her hand held out in a gesture of refusal, and her tablet reads “No Jobs.”

By depicting American Black youth as economic refugees, cast adrift and drowning only to be turned away by the symbol of freedom and equality—here representing equality of citizenship and equality of opportunity—the cartoon indicts the fact that this economic tragedy within American borders is being overlooked, and perhaps comments as well on the competition for public resources, jobs, and assistance that has always been a source of tension between those coming to America and those who are already here. The issue is made all the more acute by the history of discrimination and racism against African Americans that the statue’s symbolism has both occluded and made painfully visible, a relationship this study examined in Chapter Five.

The Statue of Liberty has also been used in more positive, even poignant ways to represent the immigrant experience. For example, in the Skirball Museum’s collection of Judaica, a 1985 painting by Malcah Zeldis demonstrates the modern connection of the Statue of Liberty with immigration. The oil painting depicts the history of the Jewish people from King David to the founding of Israel. Prominent in the upper right quadrant of the painting is a golden Statue of Liberty, surrounded by ships filled with immigrants. People stand on the docks before a cityscape to the statue’s left to welcome the
newcomers, holding up tiny American flags. Interestingly, there is no image of Ellis Island in the harbor; the artist chose to use the statue as the symbol of entrance to the New World. The positive, welcoming images of the immigration experience contrast with the images to the right of the statue, which depict the concentration camps, fiery crematoria, and the Nazi soldiers of the Holocaust. By making the statue golden rather than green, the artist references the “golden door” and “streets paved with gold” imagery associated with the American immigration experience. The color gold also visually represents America’s material prosperity and economic opportunity.

**Statue as Symbol of Liberty/Freedom:** This is the oldest symbolic valence of the Statue: its continuity as a modern representation of the Roman Goddess of Liberty. This is the original meaning and intent for the statue envisioned by its French creators. *Liberty Enlightening the World* represented not just the United States, but the principle of liberty spreading its light to other cultures. This aspect of the statue’s symbolism is widely exploited by business and government interests in the United States to celebrate and reinforce the status quo. However, this meaning of the statue also has the most radical potential of all its meanings, because freedom is an idea that transcends national boundaries and can be invoked by any group inside or outside the United States.

The transnational potential of the symbol of Liberty can be seen in the 1989 “Goddess of Democracy” built by protesting students demanding greater freedom from the Chinese government in Tiananmen Square echoed the statue with its robed female form and upraised torch. As Barry Moreno insightfully explains in his article on this statue, it is not an exact echo: the students very consciously designed their statue so it did not look like a symbol of support for America, giving their figure Asian features and
windblown hair. While evoking the Statue of Liberty by making their figure female and having it carry a torch, they wanted this symbol to represent their own vision of political and social liberation, their own aspirations to democracy. The statue was destroyed by an army tank and cleared away, but in June 1989, a wreath was laid at the Statue of Liberty “in commemoration of the Goddess and her slain followers of the Tiananmen Square massacre.” 31

Another expression of the Statue of Liberty as a symbol of freedom, in this case a more personal freedom, is a photo from the annual Halloween party on Castro Street in San Francisco, the center of the gay community in that city. Seven men pose in Statue of Liberty costumes, each one robed and painted in a different color of the rainbow—the rainbow flag is a symbol of both diversity and gay liberation. 32 (fig. 34, p. 373) Taken in October 2001, a month after the 9/11 terrorist attack, the group’s costume is not only an expression of freedom for the gay community celebrating in the streets that night, but an expression of patriotic solidarity and celebration of American freedom in the face of the terrorist attack, even though the gay participants' freedom is not universally accepted by American society.

As noted in the section above on the Statue of Liberty as a symbol of America, the ethical role of United States in the promulgation of liberty are inherent in the complexities of this symbolism. The statue was set upon Bedloe’s Island facing out to sea, to the Old World, the wider world beyond American borders, as a symbol of the liberty embodied in the United States being a light to the rest of the world. How that light is to be spread, and what role American policy and power are to play in that dissemination are subjects of ongoing public debate. A recent editorial cartoon of the
Statue of Liberty played upon this debate. The statue is shown striding forward carrying her torch and her tablet, which reads “U.S. Human Rights Image.” The statue is glancing back at a long piece of toilet paper stuck to her heel with the word “Guantanamo” on it, referencing the American military base in Cuba where some Iraqi prisoners of war and alleged terrorists arrested in the United States are held. The cartoon appeared in the wake of charges of human rights abuses in the treatment of the prisoners there. The statue represents her primary role as a symbol of human freedom and human rights, as well as her role as a symbol of America’s moral stance against human rights abuses. The cartoon illustrates how that stance is undermined by alleged incidents at Guantanamo that embarrass the nation, and detract from the moral weight of America’s professed support of the universal ideals of human dignity and freedom.

The Contexts of the Symbol of Liberty

The symbolic meanings described above make up the “toolkit” of the Statue of Liberty in popular and commercial venues. In varying forms, these core meanings have been associated with the statue from its inception. What constantly reshapes and reinvigorates these meanings over time are the historical and social circumstances they address. This ongoing process of revitalizing, debating, and reconfiguring the Statue of Liberty’s meanings is also affected by the settings in which they are used: advertising, art, leisure, and most recently the virtual world of the Internet. These venues keep the statue’s image in the public eye, and provide many opportunities for individuals to affirm or contest the meaning of the statue. These venues each come with their own constraints and goals in using the statue to communicate an idea to their audience. Any one of these
contexts is worthy of a study in its own right. The goal of the discussion here is to briefly introduce how the statue is being used in these contexts.

**The Statue of Liberty in Advertising**

Advertising is a medium that shapes the meanings associated with the statue, because it is mass media representations such as advertising construct and maintain the statue's imagery and symbolism. Grant McCracken notes that consumer goods are a primary instrument of self-definition in American culture, and those who advertise and create goods are important authors of our cultural universe. Advertising as a business and a manifestation of consumer culture has its own aesthetic and its own measure of success in its representations. At its most telling, advertising is a reflection of its time, and at its best it relies on associations with established symbolic resources as referents.

Advertisements reference and manipulate the meanings of the statue, sometimes a single meaning, sometimes multiple layers of meaning at once. For example, a 1981 “Talon” zipper company ad showed a line drawing of the back of the statue with her robes having a zipper. Above the statue was the caption: “We hold America together.” This ad playfully references the statue as a symbol of the USA, the icon that “holds America together” in a figurative, imaginative sense, while at the same time punning on the fact that Talon zippers literally hold together America’s clothes. The ad also references the Statue of Liberty as Woman, because only women have clothes that zip up the back. And because women do the great majority of home sewing, the ad successfully targets their intended audience by representing how women use zippers. In a 1983 example, another iconic symbol of New York City celebrated its centennial: the Brooklyn Bridge. Stroh’s Brewing Company used the statue in an advertisement that
showed the statue holding up a can of Piels Light in the gesture of making a toast with the large caption over its head: “To the Bridge!” The caption at the bottom of the ad read: “It’s Piels 100th Birthday, too. This calls for a small celebration.”36 Having one New York City landmark salute another with their beer playfully connects their product to the celebration surrounding the Brooklyn Bridge centennial, links their product with the idea of celebration in general, and by associating its centennial with these iconic images suggests their beer is an "All-American" beverage.

Advertisers draw upon the Statue of Liberty’s array of shared meanings when they associate their product or mission with the monument. When that association is successful, advertisers increase the chance that their audience will remember what they are selling. At the same time, ads increase the visibility of the statue and reinforce the shared meanings associated with it, even when that meaning is used in a playful or exploitative context. I have identified two principle kinds of ads using the statue: “issue” ads and “product” ads.

“Issue” ads sell an idea, a social movement, or a non-profit organization’s campaign. They are not to be confused with editorial cartoons, which are an art form that comments on current events; issue ads are an outlet for institutions and organizations to make their positions public and recruit members or financial support. The Liberty Loan posters of World War I, discussed in Chapter Six, are an early example of the successful use of the statue in an issue campaign. The Statue of Liberty is used as a "spokes-statue" for various organizations or causes today: the American Civil Liberties Union uses the head of the Statue of Liberty in its logo, as does NARAL-ProChoice America, and Democracy Now! Use as their logo the Statue of Liberty holding up a microphone instead
of a torch to represent their commitment to free speech. An advertisement on the New York subway system for the “15th Annual New York Cares Coat Drive” shows the Statue of Liberty sitting huddled in a snowstorm with her arms wrapped around her legs.37

“Product” ads sell an object, and the product may be an image of the statue itself, or have no relationship to the statue except for whatever connection is drawn between product and statue in the ad. For example, an advertisement on an Internet site has a Statue of Liberty chew toy for dogs. The toy holds up a dog biscuit instead of a torch, with a dog bowl instead of a tablet under its arm, while the text of the advertisement for encourages owners to give their dog "a real taste of freedom."38 A clever ad for Atarax, an itch-relieving medication, shows the Statue of Liberty in New York Harbor. The statue’s image has been manipulated to show her left arm reaching behind her back with the caption: “Freedom from itch with Atarax.”39 Both these advertisements play with the statue’s role as a symbol of freedom, and play with the idea of freedom itself as something that can be purchased.

This commercial interpretation of freedom, and the use of the statue itself to sell products, can be a source of discomfort and dissonance when the audience perceives the Statue of Liberty is being used inappropriately by advertisers. When advertising using the statue occludes the ideals of the statue, or insults an important meaning of the statue, the ad can come under fire from people trying to prevent the statue’s meaning from being diminished or diluted. These kinds of protests seem to focus more often on product ads than issue ads. The use of the statue as a symbol for ideological or social ends such as promoting the Peace Corps or public libraries is more consonant with what the public sees as an appropriate use of the statue. Such ads contribute to the ongoing debate on the
nature of American citizenship and ideals. Product ads, on the other hand, can have people questioning the use of the Statue of Liberty in the same way that some people patrol the use of the American flag and protest when its use seems “sacrilegious.” An early example of this critique of product ads obscuring the noble ideals of the Statue of Liberty is an editorial cartoon that appeared in *Puck* magazine during the funding campaign for the pedestal. The cartoon lampooned the way that advertising exploited any opportunity and symbol to sell its wares. It shows the statue covered in advertisements from her top—wearing a “Silker the Hatter” top hat and holding a “Gamp & Co. Umbrella”—to her bare feet, which were flanked by competing ads for corn cures.\(^{40}\) This ad demonstrates that people of that time were aware of the statue as a valuable symbol worthy of protection, and suggests that advertising would overwhelm anything in its reach unless it was checked.

It is interesting to note that publicly accepted hybrids of the issue ad and the product ad, some of them prominently featuring the Statue of Liberty, occurred during World War II. The United States was locked in combat with enemies across both oceans. The industrial and human might of the nation was bent toward a single goal: victory. Ads of this era illustrated how businesses and organizations helped the war effort. They addressed home front issues caused by the war, such as the 1943 ad from the Association of American Railroads featuring the statue, explaining that the men and materiel for the war effort had to take priority over civilian travelers.\(^{41}\) Such ads also addressed the powerful emotions their customers experienced while living with the war, such as the pain of separation from loved ones or the value of home. Even when advertising a
product, the ads expressed solidarity with their customers and patriotic commitment to the common goal of victory, and the use of the Statue of Liberty supported those aims.

An example of this is a full-page, Christmastime ad for the Hamilton Watch Company from 1942. At the top of the ad, it showed the statue from the waist up against a stormy sky with the caption below: “We shall ride this storm through!” The text below draws parallels between the current Christmas and earlier difficult Christmases endured by the Pilgrims and the soldiers at Valley Forge, but affirms: “These times, too, shall pass away!” The ad continues that Hamilton watches might be difficult to find as gifts, because the company’s priority is making precision instruments for the military, but encourages the shopper: “But when you do find it, it’s doubly precious now. Like the love you give with it, it’s one of the things that endure. Like that love, too, it looks to the future—America’s future—when Hamilton Watches may again mark every shining, golden hour of peace!” An illustration inset in the text shows a woman kissing a man in uniform, a gift-wrapped box for a watch in his hand.\textsuperscript{42} Eric Foner notes that in the 1950s, the Advertising Council took a very conscious role in promoting free enterprise, equating it with freedom, and using the Statue of Liberty and the Liberty Bell in its advertising.\textsuperscript{43} However, it is plain from these World War II-era ads and the earlier success of the Liberty Loan ads during World War I that the conscious service of advertising to national aims—and the statue’s part in it—predated the Cold War.

A more contentious hybrid of product and issue ads occurred during the fundraising drive to restore the Statue of Liberty for its centennial. Corporate sponsorship and advertisements raised money for the Statue of Liberty/Ellis Island Foundation in the 1980s by selling "the Lady" herself.\textsuperscript{44} These ads inundated the
American audience, which in itself generated negative feedback towards turning the statue into a “high-priced corporate tart.” These ads conflated the symbolism of the statue and the worthy goal of its restoration with purchasing Statue of Liberty-inscribed products like Coca-Cola, Oscar Mayer wiener’s, and Kellogg’s cereals. The debate generated by the restoration ads gave Americans an opportunity to publicly reflect on how liberty and capitalism coexist.

**The Statue of Liberty in Leisure**

Victor Turner argues: “Some form of deliberate travel to a far place intimately associated with the deepest, most cherished, axiomatic values of the traveler seems to be a ‘cultural universal.’ If it is not religiously sanctioned, counseled, or encouraged, it will take other forms.” Tourism requires a population with money and leisure, adequate transportation, conditions of reasonable safety and comfort at sites, and a body of images and narratives to induce travel. The United States has had these attributes since the 1820s, and tourism has played an important role in America’s invention of itself as a culture, providing physical sites for national imagining of a shared identity.

Since its dedication in 1886, the Statue of Liberty has played its part in that national imagining for tourists. Because the statue’s meaning as a symbol of freedom transcends national boundaries, international visitors can also find something significant in the tourist experience to the Statue of Liberty. Indeed, the many layers of meaning available in the statue increase the likelihood that individuals visiting the statue will find something memorable and personally significant in the act. A ferry ride across New York Harbor to the Statue of Liberty is considered a "must see" in a tourist’s experience of New York City. Over three million people from all over the world visited the Statue
of Liberty National Monument in 2003. Climbing to the top used to be an important part of that visit. After the September 11th terrorist attacks, the statue itself closed to visitors. The pedestal reopened in 2004 after renovations to improve security. A “Remembrance Journal” was set up at a number of National Parks, including the Statue of Liberty, to allow visitors to record their impressions of visiting the site in the wake of the terrorist attacks. The excerpts provide a telling snapshot of the feelings and thoughts a visit to the statue inspired at that time:

Ohio:
I believe that as citizens of the United States of America we are blessed with being a part of the greatest country mankind has ever known. Therefore, it is our duty to love, cherish, and protect it; but also to reach out to the rest of the world so that freedom and democracy may reign throughout all countries. God Bless America and the world.

California:
This is my first time to New York and first time to see the statue as well. The statue is really kind of shocking and I’m unsure of my feelings upon seeing this legendary symbol of America. The words of Emma Lazarus are indeed inspiring, though sometimes I feel our country doesn’t quite live up to the dream. Here’s to always working towards that dream. Though, I feel that places such as this are some of the best sources of inspiration and power to achieve these...that we may find today.

New York:
Much more meaning—more solemn. Reinvents the meaning of Liberty. My father told a story that when he returned to NYC after WWII he threw his weapons in the water when he saw her (the Statue).

Taiwan:
What does the Statue of Liberty mean to me? EVERYTHING!!

The climb to the top is still missed by visitors, who used it both as a test of their own limits and a way to interact with the statue physically. The loss of that experience is even seen as a loss of liberty—literal and figurative—by a New York Times article describing the new security at the reopened statue: “Obviously, security will have to come first, but
visitors to the Statue of Liberty, the symbol of American freedom, shouldn’t be constrained forever.”

The tourist experience is an essential part of the appeal of souvenirs of the Statue of Liberty. A photo of the Statue of Liberty’s own gift shop shows a sample of the wide range of objects available as souvenirs: crowns, Liberty Torch flashlights, teddy bears with Liberty’s image on their chests, picture frames, rubber masks, crystal paperweights, and plush Snoopy dolls in Liberty’s crown, gown, and pose. (fig. 36, p. 375)

Purchasing souvenir images of the statue—objects, postcards, or the tourists’ own photos to commemorate the visit complete the experience. Souvenirs concretize and preserve in a compact form the ephemeral experience of the tour for the visitor. Susan Stewart notes that both souvenirs and collections are generated by means of narratives. Their power comes from the stories their owners associate with these artifacts. The twofold nature of any successful tourist site is that it communicates a shared meaning accessible to a wide range of visitors, but also has “space” for individual meanings to accrue to it. The souvenir, as an emblem of that site, can carry both these levels of meaning.

Art critics generally denigrate the souvenir as soulless dreck, also described as “tasteless kitsch, manufactured in a totally unharnessed commercial spirit…show how the indiscriminate use of political symbols and monuments as decoration without iconographic content robs them of dignity and power.” However, these representations are not devoid of meaning or insignificant to this study. They are yet another form by which the Statue of Liberty enters popular culture and popular consciousness. Generally, souvenirs of the statue are not symbolically dense in themselves. Most of the souvenir’s meaning comes from the tourists who buy them as mementos of their visit to the statue or
to the city. It may even be vital to their success as souvenirs that their symbolic weight is relatively light, leaving more room for private significance and memories to be attached to them.

Souvenirs are as old as the Statue of Liberty itself. Images of the statue were available at the dedication, much to the chagrin of Auguste Bartholdi, who had planned to collect royalties from the exclusive right to sell the statue’s image. Souvenirs are mass-produced, and their artists are generally anonymous. They take a multitude of forms. Some souvenirs are not designed to easily or permanently integrate into the lives of their owners, so not all souvenirs are intended to be permanent mnemonic devices for tourists to remember and share their associated narratives with others. A foam crown, for example, is a playful item to wear as a memento of a visit to the Statue of Liberty during one’s time in New York—a way to let others know one had visited the site—but would be out of place as day-to-day wear, and would be an unlikely object to display in the home. Clothing with the image of the statue upon it—hats or t-shirts, for example—can more easily be worn outside the tourist experience as a sign of the visit to the statue. Photographs and other small objects like paperweights, spoons, and figurines are the most durable forms of souvenirs, the ones most likely to be displayed in the home and kept over a long period of time. They can also form the core of a collection.

Collecting may or may not involve items created as souvenirs. It is similar to visiting the statue in that the act of collecting, like the act of visiting the site, is a way for individuals to commune with the statue, and affirm an emotional connection to the symbol. Collectibles are similar to souvenirs; in fact, souvenirs can be collectibles, but not all collectibles are souvenirs. Collectibles take a staggering variety of forms. What
makes the item desirable to its collector is the unifying element the collector seeks. That can be a shape or function, such as a cigarette lighter, thimble, or beer can; an image, such as the Statue of Liberty; the work of an individual or company, such as the art of Thomas Kinkade or Jewel Tea china; or the product of a particular era, event, popular culture product, or stylistic movement, such as World War II memorabilia, World’s Fair souvenirs, Star Wars figurines, or Art Deco jewelry and furniture.

Statue of Liberty collectibles take us into the private passions of collectors and the communities they form around the objects they pursue. One such collector, Brenda Gale Beasley, posted an online exhibit of a selection of her Statue of Liberty objects. She introduced the site by explaining her passion for the statue and the scope of her collection:

Since early in life I have been inspired by Liberty's image of strength, justice, and equality for all... a universal symbol of hope.

My collection development policy for "Lady L" is very broad and very liberal (size withstanding, as I am running out of space!). I collect, admittedly somewhat compulsively, all manner of Liberties: key chains, magnets, statuettes, plates, cups, prints, jewelry, postcards, cards, wine bottles, a World's Fair telescope (traded for it with a collector of barf bags), a dancing dashboard ornament, matchbook covers--you name it!54

It is interesting to note that she does not trace the origin of her collecting passion to a visit to the statue, but to what the statue stands for: “a universal symbol of hope.” One section of her website included “roadside Liberties” she photographed while traveling around the country. Part of the appeal of collecting is the hunt for the object, and part of the appeal of collecting images of the statue is its widespread, varied presence in American culture and public spaces.
The Statue of Liberty Club has its own website where collectors display items for sale and share their interest in all the representations of the statue. The website demonstrates that collecting objects is only one activity of club members. For example, there are annual meetings of the club members held in locations like New York City, Colmar, France (Bartholdi’s birthplace), or Las Vegas, where the “New York, New York Hotel and Casino” features a replica of the Statue of Liberty. The club also took an interest in petitioning the Department of the Interior to reopen the statue’s crown, and reported on repairs to the Liberty Island seawall. The club’s webmaster even proposed marriage on a trip to Liberty Island. Collecting is a passion that extends far beyond a display case of objects in the collector’s home. It can also provide social contacts and stimulate political activism where it is relevant to the passion, as in the club’s petition to reopen the statue to visitors. Collecting creates intensely personal meanings about the Statue of Liberty for the collector.

In fact, multiple strands of meaning and use can be found in a seemingly simple artifact that uses the image of the Statue of Liberty. For example, a token the size of a silver dollar was created for gay members of Alcoholics Anonymous. On one side the Statue of Liberty stands in front of a rainbow flag, holding a tablet with an upside down triangle, “Gay Pride” printed around the circumference of the image. On the other side is the “Serenity Prayer” used in AA meetings. The token is part of the history of the movement to create AA meetings specifically for gay alcoholics. Carrying it was a way to express pride in both the gay community and the AA community. The statue is used here to represent dual freedoms: the freedom to be openly gay, and the freedom from addiction. Neither a souvenir, nor something created to appeal to collectors, it
demonstrates that the statue is an active symbol for many communities, its image providing a source of solidarity and strength for individuals facing adversity. 56

The Statue of Liberty in Art

Art is generally the work of an individual, usually but not always identifiable as its creator. It is arguably the most complex and varied of the contexts in which the Statue of Liberty is used. The changing aesthetic dimensions of art, the cultural and historical circumstances in which it was created, the intent of the artist, the medium used to create it, and the audience’s reception of the work—all these factors shape the meaning of any work of art. Erté sculptures, Peter Max paintings, commemorative quilts, magazine cover art, murals, comic books, and performing arts like plays, parades, and movies are some of artistic media that have employed the image of the Statue of Liberty. To explore all the art forms in which the Statue of Liberty appears is beyond the scope of this chapter. The focus here is on art as a communicative event between creator and audience using the symbolic meanings available for the statue. This model can be applied to all varieties of art, and it is for the purpose of communicating with an audience that the Statue of Liberty—and its layers of symbolic meaning—enter the artistic realm. By using the statue, the artist can be fairly confident that his or her message will be received by the audience, because the meanings of the statue are so widely shared. Artistic use can be celebratory of the statue and what it represents, as in the 1886 painting by Edward Moran of the Unveiling of the Statue of Liberty. It depicts the statue towering heroically above the ships circling it at the dedication, smoke swirling about it from the cannonades, and flags of the United States, France, and other countries fluttering in the wind. Artists can also use the statue and its meanings in a more critical vein. For example, Johanna
Vogelsang’s 1984 pen-and-ink drawing lampoons the materialism of her time with *New Immigrants (or Eurotrash)*. She depicts the statue wearing haute couture and diamonds studding her crown, a champagne glass held aloft instead of a torch, her tablet replaced by issues of *Town and Country* and *Paris Match*, while a horde of identical wealthy couples pour off a ship. The statue is flanked by the poem, “The Nouveau Colossus,” by Dick Kagan:

```
Give me your rich,
Your jaded,
Your coddled classes
Seeking the final frisson,
The arrogant egos
Of your dimming shores,
Send these, the restless,
Disco-driven to me.
I lift my strobe
Behind the condo door.57
```

In 1986, the Great American Quilt Contest and Festival was one of the activities surrounding Liberty’s centennial, and these quilts provide a good cross-section of artistic uses of the statue. The theme of the contest was “Liberty, Freedom, and the Heritage of America in honor of the Statue of Liberty Centennial.” Displayed at the Museum of American Folk Art and compiled in a book by Robert Bishop and Carter Houck, the quilts are not only beautiful works of folk art, but expressions of the creators’ patriotism, passion for quilting, and affection for the Statue of Liberty. The quilts fit in with the general celebratory tone of the centennial; no quilts critical of America or of any other meanings associated with the statue were included in this collection. A perusal of the quilts reveals the “Mother of Exiles” symbol dominated the popular image of the statue. Many quilts featured the faces of immigrants, excerpts of the Lazarus poem, and other images suggestive of the prosperous and free New World to which immigrants came.
Another prominent theme in the quilts was American patriotism, often pairing the Statue of Liberty with the American flag, the bald eagle, the Liberty Bell, fruited plains, and in one case the first lines of patriotic songs like “This Land is Your Land” and “You’re a Grand Old Flag.” In this latter example, the quilter remarked: “When I was making this piece, it was the first time in a long time that I had thought in depth about my own pride in being an American.” Her remark is suggestive of the fact that while patriotic symbols and sentiments were not foremost in her day-to-day life, she was able to organize and express both in the creative act of making the quilt. These quilts also demonstrate a technique often seen in patriotic uses of the statue: clarifying the Statue of Liberty’s use by having it appear with other symbols of similar meaning such as songs, flags, and other patriotic symbols. Just as the Revolutionary-era Liberty traveled with her Liberty pole, eagle, shield, and gown of stars and stripes to make clear her identity and meaning, so artistic renderings of the Statue of Liberty will draw on other symbols in the culture to amplify the artist’s intent.

A third recurring theme in the quilts is the symbolic representation of the “Statue as Woman.” One such quilt shows the Statue of Liberty standing with Anne Hutchinson, Betsy Ross, Harriet Tubman, Susan B. Anthony, Emma Lazarus, and Eleanor Roosevelt, all of them posed with arm upraised like the statue. Another shows the statue from the back, sitting on the ground with her torchlight creating the words, “Freedom to Dream, to be me.” The names of famous women in history are quilted into the white background. The artist of this quilt writes: “The women represented in my quilting stitches personify the opportunities for the freedom and liberty offered by our American heritage. While
The other half of the communicative event that makes art a powerful form of self-expression is the audience’s reception of the message. Artistic conventions as well as surprises come into play in the statue’s appearances in film, for example. In addition to its ubiquitous use in movies to show the audience that the film is set in New York City, the Statue of Liberty is a popular icon to climb, destroy, or show destroyed in Hollywood films. The statue represents America and the ideals of liberty that maintain the nation; when the statue falls, it is symbolic shorthand for America's fall, and the loss or failure of those ideals in the world. It was used in this fashion in Planet of the Apes in 1967, a shocking twist that proved to be an enduring image with moviegoers. It is destroyed again in 2004 in the movie The Day After Tomorrow, where global warming is the enemy that unravels American civilization. By the same token, when a villain climbs up and falls from the statue, it is seen as a kind of poetic justice, a reaffirmation of the continuity of the statue’s ideals of liberty and democracy in the face of a threat. It was used in this fashion in Saboteur in 1942, and it was on top of the Statue of Liberty that the villain Magneto’s plan to destroy humankind was thwarted in The X-Men in 2000. The statue became a more active heroine in the face of a threat to New York, America, and humankind in Ghostbusters II in 1989, saving the day after being animated by the heroes. The statue may also be modeled by a movie heroine to associate its meaning with her own, as in 1968’s Funny Girl, when Fanny Brice (played by Barbra Streisand) is on the prow of a tugboat in New York Harbor, on her way to the ship carrying away her lover. She is singing “Don’t Rain on My Parade,” and she strikes a pose like the statue as she
passes the Statue of Liberty with a bouquet of flowers upraised as her torch. The song is
a declaration of freedom, her determination to live her own life despite obstacles, so the
pose underscores her courageous act of individual liberation.

*The Statue of Liberty Online*

The Internet is a fascinating and complex medium in which people work, play,
socialize, and debate. Its unique combination of accessibility and anonymity has created
a venue for individual and group representations of fact, opinion, and creativity that make
abundant use of symbols to communicate with an audience. The Internet is a distinct
medium for many representations of the statue apart from the ones above, although art,
ads, collectibles, and souvenirs relating to the statue can all be found on the Internet.
There are representations of the Statue of Liberty unique to this medium; even those uses
that are not unique are different because they appear on the Internet.

The Internet emerged in the 1970s from a Department of Defense project called
ARPANET. In 2004, 12.5% of the world’s population used the Internet, with usage
growth of 121.6% between 2000 and 2004. In the United States, 69% of its citizens are
Internet users. The Internet is unique among modern media for its accessibility to
individuals, groups, business, government, and organizations with information or
opinions to share. That accessibility creates a tremendous variety of sites, from the
serious to the playful. The one element all Internet sites have in common is
interactivity—Internet users expect to be able to interact with a site in some form, even if
that interaction is limited to clicking through its pages or sending a comment to the
website designer, and designers create websites with interactivity in mind, whatever the
ultimate goal of the site may be.
One important way of reaching out to a diverse audience such as the world-wide community of Internet users is to employ symbols that will be instantly recognizable and carry shared meanings for the visitors to a website. The Statue of Liberty is such a symbol, so it is no surprise that it can be found all across the Internet. Tracking a single symbol’s use across the Internet can tell us a great deal about that symbol’s meanings and uses. It is no easy task to exhaustively explore a symbol’s appearances in cyberspace. A Google search on the term “Statue of Liberty” in 2004 returned 826,000 hits; a Yahoo search returned 1,400,000 hits. The nature of search engines means that not every site listed in such a search has the statue as its subject; all that is necessary for a hit to occur is that the term be somewhere in the website. However, the high number of hits does prove that the Statue of Liberty is as widely represented in the virtual world as it is in the “real” world. And while visiting every site returned by the search engine is not practical within the scope of this study, visiting the first hundred or so captures the sites most involved with the statue, reveals patterns in the ways that the statue is used on the Internet, and provides the basis for analyzing that use.

A word here may be helpful regarding how the Internet itself is understood as the context for this analysis. Maria Bakardjieva concurs with Barry Wellman that all communities are socially constructed, and the products and uses of the Internet must be considered in the full context of social life, not as isolated phenomena divorced from the culture(s) from which they emerge.61 The Internet joins other forms of mass communication where consumers and shapers of culture can participate in imagining a shared vision of the nation, although the Internet can also allow individuals to participate only in those groups and viewpoints in sympathy with their own, creating a “hyper-
individualism” that can contract rather than expand a person’s experience of the world.\textsuperscript{62}

The interactivity of web sites allows both the history of the Statue of Liberty and its symbolism to be explored in ways that complement more traditional media representations of the statue, but also in ways that are highly personal. Political interpretations of the Lady in the Harbor are suddenly subject to a bewildering array of meanings and uses. In addition, some websites using the statue are constructed only for play and recreation.

The Internet has become a resource for planning and booking vacation travel, so websites can be found that encourage tourism to the Statue of Liberty. The National Park Service maintains an excellent website on the Statue of Liberty National Monument that includes fee information, visiting schedules, current press releases about the statue, its historical and cultural background, education programs, and a special section for kids that features a “Junior Ranger Program” booklet with activities for children to complete while visiting the statue. This site by the keepers of the monument provides an authoritative, informative baseline for Internet users planning a trip to the statue, but is only one place where prospective travelers can find online information about a statue visit. Sites also offer travel tips, commentary, even virtual reality tours, such as the statue tour on NewYork.com that can either prepare the visitor for a visit, or serve in place of an actual visit.\textsuperscript{63} Kurt Mills notes that visiting national sites provides “visceral reification of our nationalism,” and while virtual visits are not the same, interaction with such sites can realign or reinforce identification with the site’s meanings.\textsuperscript{64}

The Cultured Traveler features a monthly World Heritage Site, and offered a brief article on the Statue of Liberty’s history that opened with the Emma Lazarus poem and
concluded with an imagined scenario of what immigrants at the turn of the century
experienced when they came through Ellis Island to New York City:

Only hours after seeing her, the vast majority of the immigrants in that era will
experience first-hand what Lazarus’s poem described. After passing tests for
disease, moral turpitude, political radicalism and feeblemindedness, those
immigrants that pass are fed a simple meal of cold milk, fresh bread, and apples.
For many of them it is the finest meal they have ever eaten. Then they are led to
boats that will take them the 1.3 miles to lower Manhattan. There,
unceremoniously, with no words of welcome or encouragement, they are urged
down the gangplank and onto the streets of New York. Only a few hours after
their first—and probably last—view of Liberty Enlightening the World, they are
now free to make of their lives what they will. Goodbye, King; goodbye, Kaiser;
goodbye, Tsar; goodbye Old World.65

The essay is an online example of presenting the statue’s symbolism as “mother of
exiles” to an audience probably already familiar with this particular construct of the
statue’s meanings. Underpinning this meaning is the statue’s symbolism of an
individualistic view of freedom, where the newcomers “are now free to make of their
lives what they will,” presumably unfettered by the imperial, Old World political systems
they bid goodbye to, but also unassisted by the political system of the New World beyond
a “simple meal” at Ellis Island as they are dumped on the streets of the city “with no
words of welcome or encouragement.”

A unique sport called “geocaching” blends the Internet, global positioning
systems (GPS), and the appeal of a scavenger hunt with travel to sites like the Statue of
Liberty. As described at Geocaching.com, individuals and organizations set up caches all
over the world and post the locations of the caches on the Internet. GPS users find the
caches by its coordinates, add and leave something at the cache, or simply sign into the
logbook stored in the cache. “Konradzuse,” who created the Statue of Liberty cache,
explains the task as follows (note: the grammar is not standard, which is sometimes the case with Internet postings):

These cache is dedicated to the famous Statue of Liberty in New York. From this island in the upper bay, the message of freedom is send around the world. The task of this cache is to find out, where over the world are locations to receive and transmit this messages. You have to look for sisters of the Statue of Liberty all over our blue planet. Post your photos with the coordinates of the sign’s location. Only the first at the spot gets to log it. …Please only log locations where you can find a real statue—no murals, etc.

The logged visits and photos are posted on the website, reporting statues in a restaurant in Amsterdam; in Möglingen, Germany, accompanied by a sign protesting a through road coming into their village; a post office in downtown Louisville, Kentucky; and outside the Sticky Fingers restaurant in Little Rock, Arkansas, among other sites. As with other tourist experiences, the paramount meaning of these representations of the statue comes from the individual experience of the sightings of the statue, the act of journeying to the sites, and sharing the experience with others—in this case as a brief statement and photo on a website.

Art specific to the Internet using the Statue of Liberty takes a variety of forms, and the meanings of the statue range from simple to multilayered symbolic imagery. The common thread of all Internet art using the statue, both pictures and literary representations, is that these uses provide a creative outlet for individuals to download on their own computers or share with other individuals. Both creators and users of Internet Statue of Liberty images thereby express their feelings about the statue, the United States, and their own sense of patriotism, both in cyberspace and on their personal computer.

Wallpaper, screensavers, and clip art are the most basic forms of computer art that are made available on the Internet. These images allow a user to decorate their personal
computer or their web site with images of the statue. Images can be found both for sale and free. Statue of Liberty clip art can be found on sites like *Founding Fathers.info*, *HistoryImages.com*, or *Interesting.com*. Liberty’s torch, bust, full figure, and stylized figure in GIF format can be downloaded for use at no charge, though the website’s owners request that users include a link back to their site in recompense for use of the clip art. Sites like *bearclover.net* or *aaascreensavers.com* offer high resolution, full-color images of the Statue of Liberty for use as screensavers or wallpaper for a personal computer’s desktop. The *bearclover* site designed by J. R. Dunster has “patriotic wallpaper” available featuring the statue with a waving American flag in the background. Two other variants include the words “God Bless America” with an accompanying midi file of the song. One of these also features the Capitol dome, creating very dense imagery associated with patriotism. Among the twelve Liberty images on *aaascreensavers* is also a Liberty-and-flag motif, this time with “Proud to be an American” in script along the bottom of the screen and a midi (music) file of the song “America” by Neil Diamond. Computers permit this mix of visual and audio media to carry meanings, as do films, parades, and other dramatic performance forms. The advantage of computers is that these multimedia presentations can be created by an individual and shared with a large audience.

The Internet can also be a site for posting art made in non-computer generated media. In a way, the Internet becomes a “virtual refrigerator” for posting individual artistic expressions for other people to enjoy, share, and use. For example, in 2001 the Chenango Forks High School in New York posted student artwork from “The Human Spirit” exhibition, a memorial to 9/11, which included a drawing of the Statue of Liberty
in a militant pose: in her right hand she holds the staff of an American flag, and in her left hand is her torch, its flame shaped like an eagle with wings outstretched. Her hair and gown are windblown. Behind her stand the twin towers of the World Trade Center. One of the options on the webpage is to send the image as a postcard. Another site, this one posting artwork by younger children, includes a painting entitled “Statue of liberty with a Piece of Pizza,” where the torch is replaced by a slice of pizza. The statue is foregrounded in the painting, with an American flag in the background. The painting demonstrates how early in life patriotic images like the statue and the flag are linked, which suggests how widespread and clear that linkage is in American culture. 69

Adult artistic efforts, both visual and literary, also find their way onto the Internet. Some of these representations of the Statue of Liberty are simply for other people to enjoy. For example, at The Paper Cutter website where Stephen Kinsey displays his best work, he included “Lady Liberty,” a paper sculpture. The artist described how he created the piece, and explained the work was inspired by his son, “a big fan of the Statue of Liberty.” 70 More often, however, Internet examples of the statue in art created by adults for posting on the Internet have an ideological, rhetorical edge to them. Software programs give Internet artists the opportunity to manipulate sophisticated images of the statue into new contexts and forms. These images depict the artist’s point of view on current issues, and the Internet provides the opportunity to display, sell, and receive feedback on their work. A clever example of this kind of art, entitled “No Escape,” redesigned the movie poster for Escape from New York, which includes the head of the Statue of Liberty lying in the street, and retooled its title to read “No Escape from New York,” with Osama Bin Laden squatting on his heels in the foreground with a rifle.
propped on his thigh and flames swirling around him. The image is meant to suggest that Bin Laden will not escape from American retribution for the destruction he orchestrated on New York City; the destroyed statue and flames evoke the destroyed buildings and damage to America’s sense of peace and safety. The image has a link to “Mail This to a Friend,” and the page has a link for another site, greatamericangifts.com, which sells “patriotic gifts, FBI caps, and CIA tshirts.”

Poetry about “Miss Liberty” is another popular art form the Statue of Liberty inspires on the Internet. As with the visual art on the Internet, some of the poetry is celebratory of the statue and what it stands for: the United States, civil liberties, and individual freedom. For example, a poem entitled “Lady Liberty” portrays the statue as an icon of freedom: “Looking to the future/standing on the past/God bless our lady freedom/till we are free at last.” Other poems use the statue as a symbol of an ideal America unrealized (or failed) in the present. For example, one poem opens: “Oh Miss Liberty/Look what we’ve done/Our Children are going to School/Toting School books and a Gun.” Another poem titled “Erasing Miss Liberty” charges: “The fascists are trashing Miss Liberty!” A number of poems address the poet’s feelings about 9/11: the grief, the affirmation of hope, and solidarity in the face of tragedy. The poem “Lady Liberty’s Still Standing,” quoted in full below as it appears on a September 11th memorial website, is an excellent example of the range of emotions and responses many people shared about 9/11:

She’s still standing in the harbor as she has for all these years
But if you look more closely, you might see the tears.
She cries for all her loved ones, which were killed, behind her back,
By evil men who used her people in their diabolical attack.
As blood ran down the towers and mingled with the dust,
America grew stronger, we believe in God We Trust.
We have not been defeated, our resolve is stronger still,  
Lady Liberty is not bowing, and she never will.  
Her torch lights the path to freedom, as Americans resolve,  
We are one nation, indivisible, united under God.  
Our nation is in mourning but she’s not dressed in black,  
The colors of Old Glory cover the wounds of the attack.  
These towers reached to Heaven for the many who were lost,  
Let us vow to route [sic] this evil, no matter what the cost.  
The eagle’s poised for take off, her wings spread across our land,  
Her talons hold the weapons for the battle that’s at hand.  
With hearts that have been broken, we have become more strong.  
As people come together and vow to right this wrong.  
We pray to God for guidance as he watches from above,  
Please God, Bless America, the land that we love. 

As with many representations of the Statue of Liberty that invoke the statue’s meanings as an icon of America and freedom, the poet uses the statue in concert with other images and phrases associated with that meaning: Old Glory, the eagle, “one nation, indivisible,” and because it is a 9/11 poem, the World Trade Center towers, which in their destruction have taken on the symbolic representation of America and freedom in ways they did not when they were standing.

Ideological uses of the Statue of Liberty on the Internet are not limited to artistic forms. The Internet is a “virtual town hall,” a site where individuals and groups have equal access to a forum where they can express their views, debate those who disagree with them, and find like-minded people. The Statue of Liberty generally enters into these online debates in two ways: as a source of controversy itself, or as a symbol in a larger controversy over American history, policies, or ideals.

As a public monument and internationally recognized symbol, the Statue of Liberty is a target for debate on its historical and ideological role. The Internet provides a ready forum for any and all opinions about the statue, no matter how idiosyncratic. So while a site like the Phoenixmasonry Masonic Museum can celebrate the connection
between the Statue of Liberty and the Freemasons (Bartholdi was a Freemason, and the cornerstone of the pedestal was laid with a Masonic ceremony), a site called *Freemasonry Watch* can argue that the statue is a sign of the interconnection of Freemasons, the Illuminati, the Knights Templar, Kabbalists, the worship of Astoreth, and a worldwide, occult conspiracy. Other sites about the statue celebrate or protest its meanings in present-day American life compared to the past. A site such as Skyangel’s paean to “Lady Liberty” focuses on the statue as a symbol of America’s history of immigration—summarized by the Emma Lazarus poem—as the best example of America’s commitment to freedom. The text tries to recreate the cadences of oratory by using ellipses, capital letters, and italics:

> Throughout the history of our great country…we have stood for Freedom and Liberty. ‘Lady Liberty’…has shown the WAY! She does…“LIFT HER LAMP BESIDE THE GOLDEN DOOR!” We are…that Golden Door. Long may she continue to be a Great symbol, not only to us in America, but to all who desperately yearn to come here. This is STILL…the only Nation in the WORLD…where people are “Knocking down the doors to get IN!”

Meanwhile, the “Free Lady Liberty” site petitions to remove the Emma Lazarus poem “The New Colossus” from the statue: “The Statue of Liberty is a monument dedicated to freedom and liberty and never meant that foreigners have the unconditional right to violate America’s immigration laws. …Lady Liberty was never designed as a welcome mat for immigrants.”

Other ideological websites include the Statue of Liberty in their campaigns, but are not interested in the physical statue as much as they are in utilizing its visibility and power as a symbol. One such site is *The CyberNation of Freedom*, which bills itself as “The Free and Independent Internet-Based Nation of the New Millennium.” It is a “virtual nation,” stressing individual freedom and arguing that physical boundaries and
their governments are impediments to true freedom. The CyberNation claims the statue as its central symbol, “not as an emblem of the United States, but as the predominant global symbol of freedom.” On other sites, essays decry the expansion of the federal government at the expense of personal freedom contrary to the founding principles of the United States, proclaiming that “Lady Liberty Dropped Her Torch,” or asking “Is Lady Liberty a Terrorist?”

Closely related to ideological sites, but far less variable in the meanings assigned to the Statue of Liberty, are educational sites featuring the statue. These sites are designed for teachers to use the Internet to train students in the history and meaning of the Statue of Liberty. Such sites are an excellent way to see the basic shared meanings assigned to the statue that the designers considered crucial to pass on to children to make them informed citizens. Education sites associate the Statue of Liberty with the U.S. government, citizenship, and freedom. The statue is generally contextualized on these sites with other symbols of America, and is identified as one of a core group of symbols representing the United States. For example, a site created by the Utah Education network called Themepark addresses the theme “liberty” and provides resources for students and teachers on “United States Symbols of Liberty.” The list of websites to visit for further information includes not only information on the statue, but the American Flag, the Pledge of Allegiance, “The Star-Spangled Banner,” the Liberty Bell, and the American bald eagle. At Ben’s Guide to U.S. Government for Kids (K-2), a site created by the U.S. Government Printing Office, a page entitled “Symbols of U.S. Government—the Statue of Liberty” offers an elementary history and meaning for the statue:

The Statue of Liberty is located in New York. The Statue of Liberty symbolizes freedom throughout the world. The Statue was actually a gift from the people of
France. The Statue represents a woman escaping the chains of tyranny. She holds a torch, which represents liberty. The Statue’s full name is Liberty Enlightening the World. For more information, check out the National Park Service.

This summary acknowledges the universality of the statue as a symbol of freedom, but by identifying the statue as a primary symbol of the U.S. government, even this short introduction subtly makes the argument that for the world, freedom and the American government are inextricably linked. On PBS Kids, a multi-episodic educational site called “Learning Adventures in Citizenship” includes an episode on the Statue of Liberty. It provides a brief history of the statue’s meaning as initially a symbol of “France and America’s love of liberty,” and then a symbol for immigrants to the New World, and proposes that students create a symbol for the new century’s ideals.  

The Internet is not only a site for working, debating, shopping, and learning—it is also a site for play, and some of the websites created for play feature the Statue of Liberty. For example, one site features a nighttime, full-color photo of the lighted Statue of Liberty. By clicking the computer’s mouse, the visitor to this site can create fireworks around the statue, complete with sound effects—the more clicks, the more fireworks. It has no other purpose except to provide users the chance to interact with the statue in an entertaining, individual celebration. On a site called Surfing the Net with Kids, the statue is featured in a “Concentration” puzzle, where players click on “cards” to find matching pictures. As with other kinds of sites on the Internet, interactivity and the ability to communicate with others are built into this site. The puzzle allows players to scramble its images for a new challenge, scores the number of attempts, and allows a player to send the game to a friend with a personal message. The same site also features a “Scrambler,” where an image of the Statue of Liberty with a quotation from the Emma Lazarus poem
can be disarranged and reassembled, and a virtual jigsaw puzzle of the statue to put together. Another “toy” representing the statue can be found at PaperToys.com, which features paper cutouts to print and assemble. Their Statue of Liberty includes a three-dimensional base, folding instructions, and a flat statue with front and back views represented. This site includes a paragraph on the history of the statue as well as the ability to send this cutout to multiple friends. Interestingly, this site provides the same kind of toy made available in the pages of The Washington Post in 1903. These sites do not have any deep rhetorical significance behind them; however, they demonstrate the ubiquity of the statue in popular culture, and reinforce its image and meanings through playful forms of interaction with the image. While playful sites might seem the most frivolous uses of the statue on the Internet, play itself is a basic human need and a potent tool for teaching the elements of a culture in a memorable, enjoyable form. It is no surprise that a symbol as versatile and influential as the statue would appear on such sites.

**Conclusion**

The meanings of the Statue of Liberty are located in both public and private realms. Its meanings draw upon both those realms for their continued vitality. The monument can still serve as a beloved sign of America’s highest political ideals, but it can also be transformed into countless private uses which have nothing to do with these ideals. It can stand for an aggressive defense of the American homeland, and have little to do with the idea of America or the universal rights of man at all. The protean nature of this symbol and the generic, cultural, and historical matrices that inform the statue’s representations ensure its place as a key symbol in the United States’ collective
imagining of itself. But even the power of the United States cannot stem the unsettling drive to circulate images of Lady Liberty in all kinds of ways.
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“We shall ride this storm through!,” advertisement, 1942. This full-page ad was purchased on eBay, ran at Christmastime 1942, and came from either *Life* or *Look* magazine.
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Figure 34
The Statue of Liberty has served many masters and many dreams. How could it be otherwise in a political culture shaped by widespread debates over the meaning of freedom and the unfolding events of the modern historical era? At the birth of liberty itself, the significance of the idea was open to some debate. That discussion only expanded with time. The Statue of Liberty was inevitably caught up in claims and counter-claims for the end of despotism, the need for personal freedom, the dream of human equality, the quest for property and wealth, the need to empower the American nation, the desire to protect one’s home, and the commercialization of nearly everything. It could be at once reflective of noble sentiments and petty dreams.

Despite the centrality of the statue to American national identity, it does not stand alone. The Statue of Liberty shares cultural space with other monuments and images. The very need to create and invoke various images and monuments over time suggests that the project to sustain the idea of the nation and its political ideals is continuous. As it emerged in the early republic, the effort to represent America in ways that were wholesome and unblemished was often embodied in the female form. In this way the nation and the idea of freedom—and its universal dream of leaving behind the pollution of monarchy and enslavement—were expressed in highly romantic terms. These feminine images conveyed a sense of optimism that America was virtuous, freedom could be shared around the world, and material progress would mark the future. The new nation itself was seen primarily as the guardian of personal rights. There were counter-images to the virtuous side of national identity such as the eagle, which affirmed more the
sense of power that citizens could derive from the creation of a new nation and its standing in the world. In time the hopefulness of the dream of liberty had to accommodate the growing celebration of the nation itself and the authority it represented, as well as countless other meanings.

The growing sense of power and authority in the idea of the nation meant that alternative ways of imagining the nation more attuned to its masculine and warlike capacities began to challenge the purely feminine form. At times these two sides of national consciousness merged nicely. This merger was implicit in symbols and tales of a powerful nation fighting for freedom in the world that was also seen as virtuous and honorable. In some instances, however, the universal dream of equality and justice for all was overwhelmed by the celebration of national power and powerful men. In the revolutionary era, more hope was expressed in the universal dream than the more masculine national dream. That era shared Jefferson’s optimism that men could be both moral and self-interested at the same time. Later, after the experience of mass war in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, such optimism was harder to sustain. Mass warfare showed that freedom could not be sustained simply by the exercise of human desire, for such desire either had to be defended brutally from time to time. It was also clear that the liberty of some could be ruined by the aggressive pursuit of liberty on the part of others. Human nature could not always be trusted to be fair and just. Jefferson’s faith was misplaced. War showed that the future may not always be about progress and happiness but about death. The dream of liberty enlightening the world would have to be shared with the ideal of a powerful nation and the nightmare of mass killing. Some of this desire for a powerful nation (France) among nations actually lurked in the minds of Laboulaye,
Bartholdi, and the men who dedicated the statue in 1886. But the experience of modern war would take the idea of a strong nation further than they ever imagined. By the end of the twentieth century, national identity in America could not be just about human freedom or the dream of blending the republican-civic dream and liberal values in a workable mix. It would also have to embrace visions of national grandeur and power. And power would require icons as well.

Dedicated in 1922, the Lincoln Memorial was the first of several American memorials that grew out of the experience of total war. Resembling a Greek temple, it drew inspiration from classical models, as did the Statue of Liberty. The men who promoted the building of this shrine—much as with the Statue of Liberty—were mostly influential elites. In the aftermath of the Civil War and Reconstruction, these men were fixated on the idea of national reunification, and the monument we see today was very much an attempt to transform Lincoln into a timeless symbol of national unity and virtue. Christopher Thomas, who has studied the monument’s history, concluded that in antiquity the Greek temple served as a dwelling place for a god or goddess. In the modern liberal nation, however, it was the morally perfect and patriotic president that was celebrated. He was god-like while still retaining the citizen’s commitment to public order and national political ideals. The monument drew upon civic republicanism in its aspirations for a vital national society, but it backed away from a full-fledged faith in mass political action—just like the Statue of Liberty—by affirming the need (more explicitly than the statue) for strong male leadership. There are democratic sentiments in the memorial to be sure—the Gettysburg Address is reproduced. But there is a limit placed on the idea of freedom for all, because the text of the Emancipation Proclamation
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is nowhere to be found, despite the fact that there is one mural of slaves being freed. The memorial also omitted direct reference to the military action of the Civil War itself in order not to offend the South for the sake of national unity. As with all iconic images and sites, meanings would be remade. The racial bias of the original design would be overturned by African American activism later in the twentieth century, and the Lincoln Memorial became a key site for the advancement of civil rights for all in America, especially after the performance of Marian Anderson at the site in 1939. But in its original design this memorial elevated the idea of a powerful nation and strong men willing to fight for it to a cultural level that rivaled the simple endorsement of the idea of liberty enlightening the world.¹

The leaders of the American Revolution had faith that human nature could handle the dual responsibilities of liberty and civic republicanism. From that attainment, political liberty and progress would flow. The experience of mass warfare altered that faith. It did not disappear, but now advancements in political freedom and material progress were often seen as contingent upon the existence of a powerful nation able to use violent means to solve problems. Such an entity could defend freedom—but it also had the capacity to threaten it. The proliferation of war memorials in America after the Civil War spoke to that changing realization, and to the fact that national identity now had to honor—and visualize—not only human rights but valiant men. In our time, the debates and public activities surrounding the Vietnam Veterans Memorial and the new World War II Memorial illustrate this point. Public attention to the Statue of Liberty has by no means gone away. Yet, these other icons have diverted civic celebrations and the proclamation of national identity in directions that speak to the need for patriotic sacrifice
and the defense of home more than to the basic ideal of liberty enlightening the world. James Mayo has written that the “highest purpose” that can be expressed in monuments and memorials is humanitarianism—a dream of universal rights for all mankind without regards to nation or race. He admits that such an ideal is rare in war memorials, however, which tend to speak more directly to the tragedy or value of national service and sacrifice. To the extent that these values have been honored, we can conclude that some of the confidence expressed in 1886 that liberty was sufficient to ensure progress has faded. Our contemporary array of iconic figures suggest that a better future—and the dream of the American and French Revolutions—cannot be assumed.²

The statue inherited the legacy of romantic ideals. These ideals were very much a dream about a perfect world in which private desires and public good could be realized together. They were grounded in a deep faith that human nature could serve not only as a foundation for political sovereignty, but be trusted to fashion a fair and prosperous future for all. However, ideals are difficult to sustain, and liberty proved no exception. The tensions in the dream were evident from the start. The private desires excited by liberalism often threatened to weaken the goals of republicanism to create and preserve an egalitarian society. The broad quest for liberty for men and women everywhere could only proceed slowly in the face of constant attempts to proclaim the power of some entities and groups over others: capitalists over workers, men over women, whites over blacks, virtuous nations over evil nations. In theory all men were equal; in the reality of time and place some men were always trying to attain dominance over others.

In the end the Statue of Liberty became the heir not only to a political ideal, but to the realities of struggles for dominance—and the quest for profits. Lady Liberty proved
to be powerful and enduring, not simply because of her attachment to the human dream of freedom, but also because of her capacity to serve so many interests, both personal and national. Over time, it became an important symbol used to express all kinds of views—humanitarian, national, commercial, and trivial. Its ties to the nation seem to make the strongest claims on meaning in modern times, but whether any meaning will ultimately predominate in the age of mass culture remains to be seen.
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