

architecture institutions and change

Proceedings of the Society of Architectural Historians Australia and New Zealand Vol. 32

Edited by Paul Hogben and Judith O'Callaghan

Published in Sydney, Australia, by SAHANZ, 2015
ISBN: 978 0 646 94298 8

The bibliographic citation for this paper is:

Sully, Nicole. "Washington Monument Syndrome: The Monument as Political Hostage in the United States of America." In *Proceedings of the Society of Architectural Historians, Australia and New Zealand: 32, Architecture, Institutions and Change*, edited by Paul Hogben and Judith O'Callaghan, 663-674. Sydney: SAHANZ, 2015.

‘Washington Monument Syndrome’: The Monument as Political Hostage in the United States of America

In 1968, following cuts to the national park service budget, George Hartzog (then Director of the National Parks Service) famously closed parks and monuments including the Grand Canyon and the Washington Monument two days each week. The subsequent public outcry resulted in funding – originally cut in response to Vietnam War-related belt-tightening – being restored to facilitate the reopening of these popular sites. This action was colloquially dubbed the ‘Washington Monument Strategy’ or ‘Washington Monument Syndrome’, terms that while in popular usage (particularly by newspaper journalists) have largely remain untheorised.

While Hartzog’s original actions related specifically to services experiencing funding pressures as a result of government austerity measures, the Washington Monument Strategy has increasingly been instituted by higher levels of government and as a means to resolve largely unrelated financial or political disputes. For example, in February 2013 national parks were threatened with closure as a consequence of sequestration measures, in the October of the same year they were closed for 16 days during the government shutdown that resulted from the Republican Party’s attempts to delay the passing of the Affordable Healthcare Act – a bill entirely unrelated to parks and monuments.

This latter incident resulted in memorials, and in particular the World War II Memorial in Washington DC, being used by the media and both the Republicans and Democratic parties as symbolic of the effects on bipartisan conflicts on the most valued and vulnerable members of society, being veterans. The World War II Memorial thus became a popular emblem of the shutdown. This paper explores the role of the national monument, and particularly memorials, as ‘political hostages’ in the institutional conflicts in the United States of America, with particular reference to the 2013 Government shutdown.

On the last day of July in 1892, the *New York Times* reported: “The Washington Monument will be closed on Monday if [Congressman] Cummings and [Congressman] Bailey do not allow for its opening”.¹ Only six years after the memorial honouring the country’s first president had opened, the Washington Monument was threatened with temporary closure as a result of political manoeuvring taking place within sight of the monument itself, in the United States Congress situated in the Capitol building. In this instance, the threatened closure was the result of a funding gap related to the impending expiration of an appropriation bill related to the Chicago World’s Fair that had been repeatedly blocked by the two Democratic congressmen.² The anticipated closure of the monument was listed among other injustices and inconveniences that would also occur, including delays in the burials of “indigent soldiers” and the issuing of “artificial limbs to crippled veterans”.³

This event, reported with a sense of exasperation by the *New York Times*, was perhaps the earliest instance of the newly completed Washington Monument becoming inadvertently embroiled in unrelated political issues, however it was by no means to be the last.⁴ In the following 120 years the Washington Monument has repeatedly either temporarily closed or been threatened with temporary closure as a result of political manoeuvring. The Washington Monument has often been used symbolically, and arguably, as a political hostage in matters of American government. The frequency and visibility of these instances has given rise to the term ‘Washington Monument Syndrome’.

This paper examines the interplay between publicly operated monuments and the institution of government in recent American politics. It will situate political conflicts, exemplified by the 2013 government shutdown, amongst what has become known as Washington Monument Syndrome – a term that while in popular usage in America, particular among politicians and journalists, has largely remained untheorised. It is not within the scope of this paper to discuss the history or design of the monuments themselves, or to consider the politics and institutions that led to the construction of these monuments. Such discussions have, in recent years, been covered by the likes of Kirk Savage in his excellent monograph *Monument Wars* or Erika Doss’s *Memorial Mania*, or most recently the 2012 special issue of *CLOG* titled ‘National Mall’.⁵ Rather, this paper focuses on the specific case of Washington Monument Syndrome, to consider how existing monuments are used and exploited for political purposes. As such, the paper draws from a diverse cross-section of non-architectural sources to chart the historical emergence of Washington Monument Syndrome and consider the symbolic role played by key public monuments, such as the Washington Monument, and the National World War II Memorial (both situated on the National Mall in Washington DC), in institutional conflicts in recent American history.

Washington Monument Syndrome

In December 1968, following a four per cent cut to the National Park Service (NPS) budget, as a result of Vietnam War-related belt-tightening, George Hartzog – then director of the NPS – famously closed approximately 200 parks and monuments on Mondays and Tuesdays, including the service’s most popular and high-profile attractions such as the Grand Canyon,

Yosemite National Park and the Washington Monument, as well as the Jefferson Memorial and Arlington National Cemetery.⁶ Unsurprisingly these closures were met by public outcry, which by the end of March the following year had resulted in the restoration of \$17 million in funding to facilitate the reopening of these sites.⁷ Explaining these events in his 1988 autobiography, Hartzog wrote that the cuts posed "some very difficult choices" for the NPS, writing "so I decided to spread the pain, inflicting as little as possible at any one area. I recommended ... cutting hours, closing seasonal facilities out of season, and closing some areas altogether."⁸ These measures, while certainly an effort to manage significant funding cuts were, arguably, an attempt to match the political manoeuvring he had so frequently witnessed between Congress and the president. Hartzog wrote:

There is always a cat and mouse game between the president and Congress about budgets. The administration invariably cuts where it has strong reason to suspect the Congress will increase and the Congress reciprocates by cutting the president's favourite programs that it believes are excessively funded and increasing the ones he cut ... As a general rule, the whole process levels itself out.⁹

While Hartzog's cuts to park services were undoubtedly an attempt to engage in such a game of cat and mouse, in action they were read more as an act of protest, and indeed articulated by some as a form of strike.¹⁰ The defiant imagery of Washington's commemorative obelisk was at this time, and in subsequent years, to become symbolic of Hartzog's own defiant actions.

Later reflecting on the closures, Hartzog acknowledged, "Even my own staff thought I was crazy."¹¹ While Hartzog's actions were successful in terms of his attempt to see the restoration of funding, they were less successful personally and politically, and resulted in condemnation from various members of Congress. When this esteemed director was fired by President Nixon only a few years later, his bold and high profile budget protest was seen as the primary contributing factor.

Hartzog's actions – being, specifically, to reduce services to the most popular and prominent attractions in order to create a public reaction that would force the restoration of government funding – were subsequently dubbed the 'Washington Monument Strategy' or, more commonly, 'Washington Monument Syndrome'.¹² While little information exists on the precise emergence of these phrases or their numerous variants, other than general affirmation of their links to Hartzog's actions at the NPS, the term has enjoyed growing and widespread informal usage, sometimes as a kind of political in-joke, and more frequently, in recent years, by journalists and politicians endeavouring to dismiss or expose the mechanics of political strategy.¹³ As Barry Popik notes, there is little evidence to suggest that the term was in usage at the time of Hartzog's initial implementation of the strategy, rather the phrases seem to have emerged in the mid-1970s.¹⁴

The earliest documented usage of the phrase implies that it had been in informal use for

some time. Among the earliest published references to Washington Monument Syndrome were those made in relation to the Carter Administration's Zero Based Budgeting program during the 1970s. The first of these was in 1976, when James T. Lynn, then director of the Office of Management and Budget (OMB), invoked the phrase as a means to demonstrate possible flaws in Zero Based Budget Reviews.¹⁵ Addressing the US Senate subcommittee on Intergovernmental Relations of the Committee on Government Operations, he stated:

One of the problems is something we in OMB call the 'Washington Monument Syndrome.' It is a historic term used to describe what used to go on in the Interior Department. I won't say in what time frame, so we leave that alone and get politics out of it. When anyone went to the Interior Department and said we want you to slow down on rate of expenditures or cut back on rate of expenditures, the response was always: "The first thing we will have to do is cut down the number of hours that the Washington Monument is Open."¹⁶

At this point the transcripts register laughter. Despite Lynn's discretion in withholding names and time periods, if there was any doubt as to what circumstances he referred, this might perhaps be cleared by noting that the NPS not only oversees the Washington Monument, but is administratively situated within the Interior Department. Lynn continued: "And that is repeated day after day after day ... [I]t takes people in a separate unit, many times within that same Department, to sift out the 'Washington Monuments', from the real soft spots of where cuts would not hurt the program involved."¹⁷

Lynn's major objection with the strategy evidently lay with bureaucratic time wasting.¹⁸ His reference to the syndrome as historic is interesting given that its origins are generally acknowledged to be with Hartzog's actions less than a decade earlier. While in all likelihood this was a rhetorical distinction as a means to separate such political manoeuvring from the current administration, it is possible that he was also referring to earlier threats for closure of government buildings and services, including the Washington Monument, such as those of 1892. Lynn's comments also indicate that the strategy was used repeatedly, presumably by the NPS. The phrasing of these comments thus raise questions as to, firstly whether Hartzog's 1968-69 closures were in fact the first instance of this strategy, or simply the first time that the strategy was *implemented*, resulting in actual closures (and hence made public), and secondly, whether the success of the strategy saw its reuse on subsequent and less public occasions.

In an article authored by Art Pine in the *Washington Post* the following year Washington Monument Syndrome is again mentioned in reference to Zero Based Budgeting, making this perhaps its first reference in the media, and thus marking its introduction to the general public. In a comment attributed somewhat anonymously to "a top budget maker" – who could well have been Lynn or one of his close colleagues – Pine described that under the old system departments were sometimes inclined to "'pad' their budgets requests to allow a cushion for cutbacks", with Zero Based Budgeting crafty public servants were more likely to invoke "the Washington Monument Strategy", being, as he wrote, the situation when:

lower level officials cleverly tried to get around the ranking process by giving the lowest priorities to items they know won't get cut – in hopes of forcing OMB to approve the less-important items. "It's what we call the Washington Monument syndrome," one top budget maker said. The budget agency is taking steps to deal with the problem.¹⁹

While it is not clear what steps the budget agency in fact took to deal with the issue, it is clear that Washington Monument Syndrome was by no means "cured". Rather a number of legislative changes that had been introduced only a few years earlier would pave the way for the syndrome to develop, and expand in its application well beyond the Interior Department. By 1976, Washington Monument Syndrome had already expanded from a strategy that literally involved the Washington Monument, to one that invoked the monument symbolically. In these circumstances, the symbolic role of this monument shifted from the commemoration of George Washington, a symbol of democracy and a marker of the "heart" of the city of Washington DC, to become emblematic of a defiant act of political and economic protest.

In 1984, Mike Causey, reporting in *The Washington Post*, invokes what he terms the Washington Monument "Cut" as a means to expose the ludicrousness of a plan to deal with funding cuts by making allergy sufferers in the Commerce Department provide their own syringes for injections. Causey colourfully defines the "Cut" as "the way some federal agencies get even when Congress cuts their budgets". Elaborating, he explains:

It works like this: Suppose the Interior Department, which runs the monument, gets a budget cut. It could economise anywhere. But what it does is shut down the elevator at the monument. Protesting tourists are told they can walk (now that is impossible because the stairs are shut too) up and down or go back to Bakersfield with one less tourist attraction under their belts. They can't ride, they are told because cheap old Congress didn't pay the elevator's electric bill.irate tourists – who vote in other places – are then expected to hood it to Capitol Hill, raise heck with their senators or representatives who, in turn, will give the department more money.²⁰

Inherent in this description was the expectation of the role that the public played in the strategy, which was less clear in earlier descriptions. In the eight years since Lynn's first citation, the Syndrome had begun to be interpreted more cynically and used rhetorically as a way of exposing political manoeuvring. In Causey's eyes it was as an act of revenge rather than simply a budgetary bluff.

While Hartzog's first invocation of what was later to become known as Washington Monument Syndrome related specifically to services experiencing funding pressures as a result of the Johnson administration's austerity measures, Washington Monument Syndrome has increasingly been instituted by higher levels of American government as a means to resolve financial or political disputes. More often than not, these disputes are largely unrelated to the

resources that are threatened. Causey's cynicism was perhaps warranted given the events of recent years which had seen closures of the Washington Monument, as well as other federally funded buildings, parks and services as a result of the newly emerged condition of the government shutdown, which had first occurred in its current form in 1981.

Shutting down the Government

In American politics, a government shutdown refers to the collective closures of services that are normally financed by the federal government.²¹ These closures occur as a direct result of funding gaps when political impasses see the president and Congress fail to reach budgetary agreements.²² Government shutdowns are in fact a relatively recent phenomenon in American history.²³ Consequently, while there were, in effect, funding gaps in the past (such as the 1892 gap discussed earlier) the first gaps on the scale of modern shutdowns were not experienced until the late 1970s and, in these instances, while funding was discontinued the everyday business of government remained largely unaffected. It was not until 1981 that the country experienced its first actual shutdown, being one that had a visible impact on the functioning of government activities, and resulted in closures and furloughs. With the exception of the shutdowns of 1996 (which lasted five and then a further 21 days) and 2013 (which lasted 16 days), the majority of post-1981 shutdowns have lasted only a few days. While many have resulted in furloughs and closures, these shorter events frequently have had relatively little impact on the public. In the majority of the cases, however, parks and monuments have consistently been affected and reported prominently in the media. Under such circumstances, the closure of monuments as well as the broader effects of such shutdowns (and the political disputes that lead to them), are effectively a large scale implementation of Washington Monument Syndrome, and are frequently identified by the media, politicians and the public as such.

Shutting down the monuments

Media coverage of government shutdowns has frequently dwelled upon visible symbols of freedom and democracy to demonstrate the inconvenience to the American public. For example, on October 18, 1986, the *New York Times* published a photograph of the Washington Monument with a closed sign in front of it, and a group of visitors leaving the site after the attraction had reportedly shut early. The article noted that tourists "were turned away from the Washington Monument but were free to stroll around other open-air monuments", and noted the closure of the Statue of Liberty in New York and the Gateway Arch in St Louis.²⁴

The opening sentence of a front page article in *The Washington Post*, the day of the commencement of the October 1990 shutdown, listed the closure of the Washington Monument, the Smithsonian Museums and the animal houses at the National Zoo, citing a National Park spokesman who had stated "Anything that can be closed or locked will be closed or locked."²⁵ Again, the closure of the Washington Monument was reported prominently. Invariably the closure of the monument, during these events, referred to the closure of access to the interior space of the monument by elevator or stair, and not the land surrounding the obelisk. A notice in *The Washington Post* two days later, with the title

“the Impact” clinically listed local closures as well as partial and full openings. The article included a neutral image of the obelisk of the Washington Monument, this time without people or signage. Among the long list of closures were the Washington Monument, Arlington House at the Arlington National Cemetery and a number of National Parks. Listed as open with limited services were the grounds of the National Zoo and the Jefferson, Lincoln and Vietnam memorials. Among those attractions that remained open were the Arlington National Cemetery, the Iwo Jima Memorial and a number of prominent sites that were identified as not being operated by the government.

In the midst of the same shutdown, Edwin Chen also drew attention to sites that were particularly symbolic of cherished American values. Recalling the 1981 shutdown, he wrote in *The Los Angeles Times*:

The lights began going out in government offices across America. The Statue of Liberty and the Washington Monument were closed. At the National Archives, workers lowered the Constitution and the Declaration of Independence into a deep vault until the crisis passed. That was nine years ago – the first time that the most powerful government in the Western world came to a virtual standstill because it ran out of operating funds during a budget stalemate between Congress and the President.²⁶

By 2011, as the threat of yet another closure loomed, the imagery of the government shutdown had been well established. References to Washington Monument Syndrome also spiked, as they had done during the shutdowns of the 1990s. The prevalence of this imagery was made evident when the president himself made reference in an eleventh hour speech that announced that a shutdown had been narrowly avoided. At 11:04pm in Washington on April 8, 2011, President Obama read a statement that began:

Good evening. Behind me, through the window, you can see the Washington Monument, visited each year by hundreds of thousands from around the world. The people who travel here come to learn about our history and to be inspired by the example of our democracy – a place where citizens of different backgrounds and beliefs can still come together as one nation.

Tomorrow, I'm pleased to announce that the Washington Monument, as well as the entire federal government, will be open for business. And that's because today Americans of different beliefs came together again.²⁷

The president's naming of the Washington Monument in the opening remarks of this statement was not only a reference to the narrow avoidance of a shutdown, it was invoked symbolically for its associations with democracy, and with little doubt the associations the monument itself had developed through reference to the syndrome that bears its name.

At the commencement of 2013, as yet another budgetary crisis faced America, consideration of the Washington Monument and its syndrome again rose to prominence. In March

that year Andrew Siddons published a piece in the *New York Times* titled “A Symbol of Liberty, Strength and Budget Fights” that pondered the ongoing association between the Washington Monument and budgetary showdowns. Beginning with a fragment from Obama’s 2011 speech, Siddons observed that the Syndrome had been effectively disarmed as a tool in the present budgetary crisis, given that the monument was currently closed after sustaining damage in a 2011 earthquake.²⁸

Siddons’ prediction was more prophetic than he could have imagined. In October 2013, six months after the publication of his article, attempts by the Republican Party to defund the Obama administration’s signature policy – The Affordable Healthcare Act – resulted in a funding gap that led to the second longest shutdown in the country’s history. At this time the Washington Monument was still closed for repairs. Evidently the threat of repairs on the Washington Monument halting was not a seductive enough headline for the media, and instead attention was fixed on the unprecedented closure of the Mall, as well as all of the spatial memorials (whether they required staff to facilitate their opening or not), with particular attention being given to the very next monument on the National Mall: the National World War II Memorial. Completed in 2004, the World War II Memorial had not been in existence the last time the Government had shutdown, yet representing the nation’s oldest and frailest surviving veterans – a demographic that had also been singled out as among those most affected by the 1892 closures – and situated at a junction between the axis of the White House and that of the Capitol, it became a convenient and powerful symbol of those who had been disenfranchised as a result of the latest political impasse.

Alongside the shutdown of the Pandacam at the National Zoo, the World War II Memorial became a de facto symbol of the shutdown – particularly as it was not obvious why the operation of either of these ‘services’ would be affected by the furloughing of government workers. As such, they seemed to be clear examples of political strategy, and indeed Washington Monument Syndrome. The controversy associated with the closure of the World War II Memorial was in part because of the special interest group it represented, as well as its geographical location, but largely because Honor Flight (a charitable organisation that brings groups of veterans to Washington to visit the memorials) had scheduled a trip to the memorial that coincided with the beginning of government closures. Unlike in the preceding shutdowns of the 1980s and 1990s, where access was maintained to a number of the memorials, in 2013 the mall was barricaded off, seeing not only individual memorials become inaccessible, but the mall itself. The imagery of frail, wheelchair-bound veterans storming the barricades to see their memorial was too powerful for either the media or the politicians of either major party to overlook. The fact that Arlington cemetery remained open and accessible as it had in previous shutdowns was entirely ignored.

In retrospect, the closure of the Washington memorials represented a hazy and at times confusing turning point for the assigning of blame in shutdown politics. Democrats blamed the Republicans (and in particular the Tea Party caucus) for the shutdown of the government, yet the Republicans seized the “storming of the monuments” as a powerful

political opportunity – blaming the president for what they regarded as the unnecessary closures. In reality, the closure of these monuments was likely to have been undertaken, firstly, for reasons of public liability, maintenance and security, and secondly, to ensure that the shutdown was made visible to the public – and it was for this latter reason that it was widely questioned by the public and the media. The veterans were subsequently allowed to visit the memorials as a concession to their first amendment rights. The World War II Memorial, as the Washington Monument had been in the past, became a powerful symbol of political impasse, public resistance, and a critical turning point in the public perception of the shutdown.

Conclusion: metonymy and the monuments

Inherent in much of the media coverage of the various shutdowns discussed in this paper has been the close association between institutions and their architectural presence, and in particular the metonymic function of architecture in relation to institutions, national identity and collective values in American culture. This metonymy can perhaps be exemplified by the way in which 'Washington' – in terms of both language and imagery – has come to be used almost interchangeably with references to 'government', just as "The White House" has for the president, and "The Capitol Building" for the United States Congress. Evidently absent within such conventions have been buildings that obviously represent the American public. In the face of such absences, particular emphasis has been historically placed by the American media, various arms of government, and special interest groups on the public parks, monuments and memorials that are federally administered by the NPS, and that have during past shutdowns become the most prominent and visible closures – particularly those located adjacent to the seat of Government itself in Washington DC. The publicly operated monument has in these times become an important symbol of "the people". This has in part occurred because of the visibility, and the symbolic potential of the public monument – whether a war memorial or a monument to America's first president – but also because of the emotional attachments that the public frequently maintain to these places and structures.

The emphasis on parks and monuments as representing the impact of politics on the people has, as this discussion of Washington Monument Syndrome has shown, become an established pattern whereby particular emphasis has been generally given to the visible symbols of democracy and liberty, such as the Washington Monument. These instances of Washington Monument Syndrome, in its various forms over the last 50 years, demonstrate the way in which architecture can be involved, and arguably invoked as a political hostage, in institutional conflicts. In view of the traditional emphasis on the Washington Monument, even if frequently rhetorical, the repair-related closure of this monument during the 2013 shutdown represented an interesting development in this historical pattern, that in turn played a key role in the unfolding of the shutdown itself.

Metonymically associated with veterans, regarded as some of the most valued and vulnerable members of American society, the World War II Memorial subsequently became a contested and politically volatile space. This memorial, like the Washington Monument, is located on the National Mall, on axis with the Capitol Building and lying in direct sightlines

of both the Capitol Building and the White House – or Congress and the president. As the tensions between the various arms of government were played out spatially within Washington, particularly through the locations of these sites within the city’s plan, the World War II Memorial became entangled in a spatial, political and emotional triangle with the Capitol and the White House. While a complicated image that lacked the bold symbolic presence of the Washington Monument, the spatial qualities of the World War II Memorial, capable of being both closed off by officials and later stormed by defiant veterans, facilitated a new vocabulary of symbolic imagery for the 2013 shutdown, and possibly for any further shutdown that may eventuate in the near future.

-
- 1 “Two Great Objectors: They Succeed in Embarrassing Many National Bureaus,” *New York Times*, July 31, 1892, 1. Mention of this threatened closure in 1892 is also made by Andrew Siddons in his discussion of Washington Monument Syndrome, see Andrew Siddon, “A Symbol of Liberty, Strength and Budget Fights,” *New York Times*, March 1, 2013, www.nytimes.com/2013/03/02/us/politics/a-monument-to-a-long-tradition-of-budget-brinkmanship.html.
 - 2 “Two Great Objectors,” 1.
 - 3 “Two Great Objectors,” 1.
 - 4 While perhaps the earliest example of the completed monument being subjected to politics, the design and construction was not without controversy. Construction of the Washington Monument had already been subjected to a hiatus of more than two decades as a result of funding shortages. The politics involved in this delay was hinted at in the newspaper article that announced its opening, which stated: “Begun in 1848, and allowed by an indifferent nation to stand an unfinished mockery for many years, the Washington Monument was yesterday completed.” See “Washington Monument: The Highest Structure of Human Hands Completed Yesterday,” *Washington Post*, December 7, 1884, 1. See also Kirk Savage, *Monument Wars: Washington, D.C., the National Mall, and the Transformation of the Memorial Landscape* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2009).
 - 5 See, for example, Savage, *Monument Wars*; Erika Doss, *Memorial Mania: Public Feeling in America* (Chicago, Ill.: University of Chicago Press, 2010); *CLOG: National Mall* (2012).
 - 6 “Agency Would End Cut in Park Hours,” *Washington Post, Times Herald*, February 27, 1969, H1. Many secondary sources proclaim that this action took place in 1969, however an announcement that the closures would begin the following week was published in the *New York Times* in mid-December 1968, and as such this paper uses 1968 as the date of these closures. See “Monuments Close 2 Days,” *New York Times*, December 15, 1968, 82. For a background discussion of Hartzog and the political circumstances that led to this action as well as the political fallout, see Kathy Mengak and Robert M. Utley, *Reshaping Our National Parks and their Guardians* (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 2012), 227-8; Mike Thomas, “The Guardian,” *National Parks* 85, no. 3 (2011): 227.
 - 7 “Historic Washington Sites to be Open 7 Days a Week,” *New York Times*, March 29, 1969, 33; Mengak and Utley, *Reshaping Our National Parks and their Guardians*, 228. This figure of \$17 million is cited by Mengak and Utley, however an article predicting the possible reopening of the parks speculated that less than \$10 million would be necessary to facilitate the reopening of these attractions, see “Agency Would End Cut in Park Hours,” H1.
 - 8 George B. Hartzog, Jr., *Battling for the National Parks* (Mt. Kisco, NY: Moyer Bell, 1988), 155.
 - 9 Hartzog, *Battling for the National Parks*, 154.
 - 10 Hartzog cites in his autobiography an extended quotation from an article written by P. J. Ryan that appeared in *Thunderbear*, that describes this as a strike. See Hartzog, *Battling for the National Parks*, 156-7. Furthermore, Hartzog’s awareness of the public’s likely intolerance for park closures is evident in a 1965 interview where he discussed the conflict between conservation and public visitation of the national parks. Here Hartzog stated “I do not believe that you are going to be able to lock the gates on national parks. You can close the campground when it is full, but just to tell the American public, who own these parks, that they can’t come in – I don’t think that this is something that is in the realm of

- possibility at this time.” Thus we can assume that this anticipated public resistance to park closures is likely to have informed his tactics in 1968. See George B. Hartzog, interview by Amelia R. Fry, April 4, 1965, for the Regional Oral History Office Series on Parks and Recreation, transcript, Bancroft Library, University of California Berkley, p. 25, <https://archive.org/details/nationalparks00hartrich>.
- 11 Thomas, “The Guardian,” 27.
 - 12 This is also known by a number of other names. Wikipedia cites variants to include ‘Mount Rushmore Syndrome’ and ‘Firemen First Principle’. Other variants include ‘the Washington Monument Cut’ and ‘the Washington Monument Ploy’. Hartzog himself retrospectively used the term ‘the Washington Monument Syndrome’ in his autobiography. In reference to his strategy to deal with the cuts, he wrote “This program, also, was assigned a name – a newspaper man in Washington dubbed it the Washington Monument Syndrome. The popular memorial was one of the areas put on a reduced operating schedule.” See Hartzog, *Battling for the National Parks*, 155.
 - 13 Frustratingly, the most comprehensive discussion of the term is perhaps its Wikipedia entry, which is sourced primarily from twenty-first century, and largely online sources which themselves rarely acknowledge their sources. See Wikipedia contributors, “Washington Monument Syndrome,” *Wikipedia, The Free Encyclopedia*, http://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Washington_Monument_Syndrome&oldid=625873073 (accessed February 25, 2015). In 2009, Shirley Duglin Kennedy attributed the coining of this phrase to the *Washington Post* – as did Hartzog himself in 1988, however without either having cited any sources for this claim, it is likely they both are referring to the first publication of the term in the *Washington Post*, where it was attributed to an unnamed high-ranking budgetary official. See Shirley Duglin Kennedy, “The Washington Monument Syndrome: Finding the Connection,” *Information Today*, April 2009, 13, 15; Hartzog, *Battling for the National Parks*, 155; Art Pine “Zero-Base Budgeting Gets Mixed Reviews,” *Washington Post*, November 13, 1977, F1.
 - 14 Barry Popik, “Washington Monument Syndrome (Washington Monument Strategy),” The Big Apple [website], August 18, 2011, www.barrypopik.com/index.php/new_york_city/entry/washington_monument_syndrome_washington_monument_strategy (accessed February 22, 2015). Popik is a contributor to the Oxford English Dictionary – although as of February 2015, no entry for “Washington Monument Syndrome” or “Washington Monument Strategy” exists on the OED online. Popik’s website is a regional American etymological dictionary.
 - 15 The Office of Management and Budget in the US Government is the department that, according to the current website, “assists the president in overseeing the preparation of the Federal budget and in supervising its administration in Federal agencies.” See www.whitehouse.gov/omb/gils_gil-home (accessed February 22, 2015).
 - 16 United States Congress, Senate, Committee on Government Operations, Subcommittee on Intergovernmental Relations (1976), *Government economy and spending reform act of 1976: hearings before the Subcommittee on Intergovernmental Relations of the Committee on Government Operations, United States Senate, Ninety-fourth Congress, second session, on S. 2925 ... S. 2067 ...* (Washington: U.S. Govt. Print. Off.), 405-406.
 - 17 US Congress, Senate, Committee on Government Operations, Subcommittee on Intergovernmental Relations, *Government economy and spending reform act of 1976*, 405-406.
 - 18 US Congress, Senate, Committee on Government Operations, Subcommittee on Intergovernmental Relations, *Government economy and spending reform act of 1976*, 406.
 - 19 Pine, “Zero-Base Budgeting Gets Mixed Reviews,” F2.
 - 20 Mike Causey, “The Federal Diary: Commerce Suffers ‘Washington Monument Cut’,” *Washington Post*, March 26, 1984, B2. While Causey’s primary example is, symbolically, that of the Washington Monument, he continues to cite circumstances where this strategy was invoked in Mammoth Cave, Kentucky, and the closures of both exhibits and bathrooms at the Smithsonian Institution.
 - 21 Kevin R. Kosar, “Shutdown of the Federal Government: Causes Effects, and Process,” CRS Report for Congress 98-844 (September 2004), 1-2; Jessica Tollestrup, “Federal Funding Gaps: A Brief Overview,” CRS Report for Congress RS20348 (October 11, 2013), 1.
 - 22 Kosar, ‘Shutdown of the Federal Government,’ 1-2. As Clinton T. Brass notes, the framework for a government shutdown is provided by number of sources, including the constitution, various statutory provisions, and the opinions of both the courts and the Department of Justice. See Clinton T. Brass, *Shutdown of the Federal Government: Causes, Processes, and Effects*, CRS Report for Congress RL38640 (February 18, 2011), 2.

- 23 While the structure imbedded within the constitution laid the groundwork for the budgetary gridlock that is now commonplace in American government, the key catalysts for their emergence were changes instituted in 1976 as a result of the Budget Act of 1974, and enactments in response to the opinions of the Attorney-General regarding the enforcement of the Antideficiency Act of 1870 which related to the cessation of government funded activities during funding gaps. See Wikipedia contributors, "Government shutdown in the United States," *Wikipedia, The Free Encyclopedia*, http://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Government_shutdown_in_the_United_States&oldid=642189596 (accessed February 23, 2015); Tollestrup, "Federal Funding Gaps," 1; Connie Cass, "Closed for Business? Government Shutdown History," *Associated Press*, September 29, 2013, <http://bigstory.ap.org/article/closed-business-government-shutdown-history-0> (accessed January 22, 15). Felicity Barringer notes that The Antideficiency Act, which mandates that the government is unable to spend money during funding gaps, was passed in 1870 however was unenforced until the Reagan administration. This enforcement thus effectively led to the advent of the government shutdown. See Felicity Barringer, "Behind the Shutdown, a Long-Dormant Law," *Washington Post*, November 24, 1981, A15.
- 24 See Kenneth B. Noble, "Federal Workers Get Unexpected Holiday," *New York Times*, October 18, 1986, 33.
- 25 Dana Priest, "Columbus Day Cushions Shutdowns Initial Blow," *Washington Post*, October 6, 1990, A1.
- 26 Edwin Chen, "As Office Lights Go Out, Its *Déjà vu*," *Los Angeles Times*, October 7, 1990, A19A.
- 27 President Barack Obama, "Remarks by the President on the Budget," The White House Office of the Press Secretary, Statement Released April 8, 2011, www.whitehouse.gov/the-press-office/2011/04/08/remarks-president-budget.
- 28 Siddons, "A Symbol of Liberty, Strength and Budget Fights."