

LANDMARKS OF WASHINGTON, D.C.

Visitors to AEI's Wohlstetter Conference Center are often struck by the vivid pictures of the U.S. Capitol, White House, and Supreme Court that hang in the reception room. They were created by New York artist Elliott Banfield and installed on September 11, 2002. Following are remarks at the installation by AEI president Christopher DeMuth, Mr. Banfield, and Daniel P. Moynihan. Senator Moynihan led many successful efforts to improve the public architecture of Washington and was a member of AEI's Council of Academic Advisers following his retirement from the Senate in January 2001. The remarks are followed by reproductions of the pictures and the artist's notes on their conception and preparation.

Remarks at the installation of Elliott Banfield's
Landmarks of Washington, D.C.
American Enterprise Institute for Public Policy Research
September 11, 2002

CHRISTOPHER DEMUTH:

The terrorist attacks of one year ago were directed not only at people but at famous architectural symbols—one of American commerce, one of American might, and one of American democracy. The World Trade Center was not distinguished architecture but was thrilling to behold—an icon of the great skyline of our greatest city and also of the audacious ambitions of global capitalism. The Pentagon was and is the opposite: not lofty and flamboyant but hunkered down and preparing for the worst—stolid, methodical, premonitory. The Capitol, spared by civilian heroics on 9/11, is the architectural union of the other two: at once hugely horizontal and hugely vertical, a man-made mountain of perfect proportions. Like the Constitution it embodies, the Capitol is at once intricate and balanced, separated and combining, grounded and aspiring. A thing of beauty with no message of its own, it indiscriminately accommodates the highest and lowest avatars of our democracy, furnishing their relentlessly practical and often ungainly pursuits with a setting of dignity, nobility, and awe. To paraphrase Frost: *never stooping from its sphere, it asks of us a certain height.*

Washington's commercial architecture lacks these forms of public-spiritedness. It is neither towering nor brooding nor ennobling. It is a sprawling expanse of squat utilitarian boxes that exemplify rather than modulate the work of the

lawyers, lobbyists, and publicists than inhabit them. Its domes are the HVAC units that Jefferson did not anticipate when he sited the capital in a malarial swamp to keep the central government small and lethargic. But we downtowners have got the views if we crane our necks and we have business and visitors that take us regularly to the magnificent places; and most of us are engaged in work that we conceive of as part of the affairs of government. We, too, are part of what Washington's magnificence was designed for.

Policy research institutes such as AEI aim to amend the defects of our political institutions. We mimic and try to improve on every congressional function short of actual law-making—fact-finding, evaluation, and deliberation. We try to provide worn-down officials with intellectual spark and freshness, and judges with relief from their crabbed inbred doctrines. We like to say that we “frame the debates,” and we try to focus those debates on the public interest rather than the cacophony of private interests. In all these respects our work is akin to that of the public architect. So we thought it would be appropriate to decorate our plain headquarters with grand illustrations of Washington's three constitutional landmarks, portrayed on important public or political occasions. We are deeply grateful to Elliott Banfield for executing this commission with such seriousness, originality, and verve.

Elliott is well known for his brilliant and often wonderfully satirical illustrations for the *New York Times*, *Wall Street Journal*, *American Spectator*, *Claremont Review of Books*, and other publications. I am particularly fond of his original illustrations for the *Spectator*—for the Politics column, a donkey and an elephant tugging furiously over a ribbon of patriotic bunting, thereby strangling an American bald eagle caught in the tussle; for the Public Policy column, a legislator portrayed as a portly French farmer, whetting his knife as the geese look on apprehensively.

Several years ago, Elliott prepared a splendid series of drawings of architectural landmarks of New York City, which were the inspiration and the artistic precursors of his new Washington series. His works perfectly capture and celebrate the spirit of our great public buildings and spaces—the spirit that makes them inspiring to us and targets to those who hate and envy us.

When Elliott first suggested that the buildings would be presented as settings for important political moments, I naturally assumed that, for AEI, he would portray the Capitol at the inauguration of Ronald Reagan, the White House at an Easter Egg Roll during the administration of Calvin Coolidge, and the Supreme Court on that glorious day in 1905 when the Court handed down *Lochner v. New York*—announcing that the Fourteenth Amendment had enacted Mr. Herbert Spencer's Social Statics and therefore forbade all forms of government regulation.

Elliott has instead chosen his occasions apolitically, with an eye only to the artistic integrity of his project. It is probably better that these pictures were designed by the artist rather than the patron. Some may recall Ada Louise Huxtable's review of the Rayburn House Office Building, which she said looked as if Mussolini had ordered it over the telephone. Moreover the pictures, being true to life, are an inducement to realism and a caution against think-tank introspection. A colleague who is a thoroughgoing conservative told me lightheartedly that he gets a little bit angry every time he walks past Eleanor Roosevelt; I replied that that is just the way I want him—a little bit angry, and thereby inspired to work a little harder and a little better.

These pictures inspire in many ways. They reward inspection both from a distance and up close. They have grown on everyone at AEI every day we have lived with them, and they are objects of fascination and edification to our visitors. It is immensely gratifying to contemplate the pleasure and inspiration they will provide to many generations to come.

ELLIOTT BANFIELD:

I know that many scholars and writers and artists are here tonight, and they know what it's like to hear applause for the efforts and the sacrifices they've made.

Sometimes I ask myself: How long will the applause last? How long before the work is forgotten? As a rule I'm very pessimistic about the pictures I have made.

But in the present case I have a bit of optimism regarding their longevity. That's because the pictures in my Landmark series, however badly they were made, express an idea. They have a point and a purpose that excuses their aesthetic weakness and will give them a lasting value.

The idea of the series was not mine. It was suggested by Chris DeMuth, and may have originated with Martin Meyerson. More generally, I suppose, one might say the idea was generated within a certain community. And I am very lucky to be a part of that community and to share in its knowledge and spirit.

Thank you.

CHRISTOPHER DEMUTH:

Daniel Patrick Moynihan gave several people at AEI their first Washington jobs—including Karl Zinsmeister, Nick Eberstadt, and me—and he continues to give us work to do as a member of AEI's Council of Academic Advisers. Pat

served for thirty years in two of these three landmarks, and throughout his long and accomplished public career he devoted constant attention to the restoration of Pennsylvania Avenue. If Washington were my kind of town—Chicago—we would have long since renamed Pennsylvania Avenue *Moynihan Avenue*, for he more than any other man is the architect of its current happy state.

DANIEL P. MOYNIHAN:

Jefferson decreed that “design activity and political thought are indivisible.” Elliott Banfield has presented us a luminous tableau of just that. Let us look into his work for the ideas to be found there.

— THE WHITE HOUSE —

In 1791 in Manhattan, Jefferson and Madison reached what could be thought of as the last great compromise of the Constitution-making era, or the first of the political age that followed. The Federal government would assume the debt acquired by the States during the Revolutionary War; the capital would move to a swamp on the banks of the Potomac. New York would become the financial and cultural capital of the nation; Washington, the political capital. The separation, if you like, of powers.

There was “energy in the executive.” The very next year, 1792, James Hoban, an Irish immigrant, won the prize of \$500 offered by the Commissioners of the District for the best design of the “President’s House” or the “President’s Palace” as Pierre L’Enfant variously described it. A tension which remains.

As the 1937 WPA’s *Washington, City and Capital*, far the finest guide to Washington ever compiled, records, it was “a perfect type of late eighteenth century . . . mansion popular in Ireland and England when our Republic was young.” Great rooms on the first floor, open to the public at almost all times. The living quarters on the second floor, typically secluded.

Here we see Eleanor Roosevelt at an Easter egg roll on the South Lawn. These are things one did for the folk. She was the last aristo to live, reign if you like, in the White House. It is said that Queen Victoria never looked behind her when she sat down, knowing a chair would be there. I can attest that Eleanor, on the approach of photographers, would instantly set her martini glass down behind her, confident a side table would be there. In 1934, on the occasion of the Gridiron dinner, she gave the first costume ball in the White House. An exclusively feminine gathering; the wives of the Gridiron’s guests that evening. The First Lady appeared as a Romanian peasant. That celebrated shepherdess Marie Antoinette would have felt very much at home.

– THE CAPITOL –

Where the White House was finished within the decade, the Capitol was slow in starting up and seems never to be quite finished. In 1793, President George Washington chose a design submitted by William Thornton, the first Architect of the Capitol, like Hamilton a native of the West Indies. Benjamin Latrobe followed, Charles Bulfinch, Thomas Walter, in that order. The dome, modeled in part after St. Peter's in Rome, was finished during the Civil War, but additions and renovations have never ceased.

Our artist presents us with the East Front of the Capitol at its most splendid, on the occasion of President McKinley's inauguration in 1901. Alas, the grand Corinthian columns we see towering above the platform are no longer there. They were quarried from the sandstone near Aquia Creek in Virginia, as was much else of Palladian Washington. However, in time it was thought necessary to extend the East Front to give more aesthetic balance to the dome. Unhappily, by now the fine post of Architect of the Capitol had passed to one J. George Stewart, whose only architectural skills consisted of finding hideaways for senior members. In 1958 the East Front was demolished, then rebuilt.

Now to one of the few secrets Washington has somehow contrived to keep. By 1990 the original columns had risen again as a splendid assembly on a knoll in the Ellipse Meadow of the National Arboretum in far-off Northeast Washington. You reach it through the National Herb Garden. Once seen, it is never to be forgot. But painfully few have done so.

Another little known fact is that the Architect of the Capitol, in those days, was chosen by the President. Given the pillage on the East Front, Chris DeMuth and I, in our brief authority in the White House, resolved to find a pretty rare flora, a Republican architect. Which we did in the person of George M. White, who served with great distinction for the next quarter-century.

Another secret of sorts, perhaps less well kept. Visitors to Capitol Hill can hardly miss the great Statue of Freedom atop the Capitol dome. Architect Walter drew an outline of a statue representing Liberty, turned out, of course, with the Phrygian cap, worn by freed slaves in Rome and, since the French Revolution, a universal symbol of liberty (to be found, for example, on the Great Seal of the State of New York). But Secretary of War Jefferson Davis was not about to have a freed slave atop the United States Capitol. And so at his studio in Rome, Crawford replaced the liberty cap with a crested Roman helmet. Next time take a closer look.

– THE SUPREME COURT –

Some while ago, in one of his seminal studies of bureaucracy, James Q. Wilson laid down that organizations in conflict become like one another. We find this in the architectural history of the three branches of the Federal government, which the framers designed for conflict. Early in the twentieth century, Theodore Roosevelt built the West Wing of the White House. The President now had an office, much like an oil baron or a steel magnate, or a member of the Board of the American Enterprise Institute. In short order the Senate built the Russell Senate Office Building, the House built the Cannon Building. FDR built the East Wing; the Senate built Dirksen, the House built Longworth. When JFK moved out into Lafayette Square, the Senate built Hart, the House built Rayburn.

Now where was the Supreme Court amidst this building boom? I espy a pattern: one building behind. As if not to seem assertive, which is of course the subtlest form of aggression. Again, our artist shows us the Court in 1974 having just decreed that a President must resign. For a century and a half, the Court had lived happily enough in a chamber on the ground floor of the Senate wing of the Capitol when inevitably, by the Iron Law of Emulation, as I phrased it following Wilson, the Justices decided they must have a building of their own.

Chief Justice Taft ordered up “a building of dignity and importance.” (Interestingly, perhaps, in 1962 I wrote the “Guiding Principles for Federal Architecture,” requiring that our buildings “provide visual testimony to the dignity, enterprise, vigor and stability of the American Government.”) Cass Gilbert did just that with a great marble temple, a profusion of Roman scrolls, mosaic tablets, and an English crown on the exterior, a recessed temple deep within. Decrees issue forth, and they must be obeyed, if not necessarily understood. In the now lost past, the Justices would join Senators for a morning eye-opener and general chat. No more; they are now never seen. Certainly not in the company of politicians.

In due course, the Executive and Legislative branches had three office buildings each, the Court by the Iron Law required a second. A bill was enacted, I became chairman of the Building Commission, and in 1992 Edward Larabee Barnes served up a fine, luminous, transparent building, now named for Thurgood Marshall. It is set alongside Union Station, the third of the three-building complex Daniel Burnham designed to keep the Pennsylvania Railroad off the Mall. That at least worked out.

Landmarks of Washington, D.C.

By Elliott Banfield

Artists Notes on the Pictures

September 2002

1. *The Capitol (88" x 44")*

The picture of the Capitol is the keystone of the Landmarks series. That's because the Capitol represents the central branch (in fact, the trunk) of the government. The centrality of the Congress is, I suppose, a subject of debate among experts; but for the tourist in Washington who compares the buildings that house the branches, there's little doubt. The magnificence of the Capitol is far greater than that of any other building in the United States.

But it's precisely the magnificence that makes the building hard to draw: the Capitol consists of four main parts, a central section (the original building, completed c. 1830), a north wing, a south wing, and a gigantic dome. To show all these parts in one image, and to recreate an historical scene, is very hard. There's no place where a photographer might stand to get it all in. To overcome this problem I photographed each element of the building separately and then knitted the photos together in a way that seemed about right, although I probably broke some fundamental rules of perspective in the process.

I chose to animate the picture by presenting the inauguration of William McKinley. I show him taking the oath of office on the steps of the Capitol's east front on the cold and rainy day, March 4, 1901. Theodore Roosevelt stood next to him. The event was pretty well documented by at least one good photo, which I downloaded from the Library of Congress's website.

The crowd that witnessed the inauguration was very large: many people (all men it would seem) were jammed together before the covered platform from which McKinley and other notables spoke. It would appear that there was no fear of violence or assassination. There was, rather, an amazing trust and faith in the benevolence of the political order. It was precisely the sense of benevolence that I tried to convey in the picture. Some of the figures in the foreground are dressed in the styles of the day, which were very intricate and opulent in some cases. Wealth and privilege

were not ashamed to show themselves. But there was poverty also: the newsboys, for example, might have been orphans. But it would seem that no one was complaining or begrudging another person his superior status.

In the course of making the picture I read a bit about the history of the Capitol. In 1850 it became evident that the existing building required enlargement to accommodate the congressmen from newly admitted states. The alteration of the building might have been accomplished, I suppose, in a very modest way, but the Congress decided instead to build two huge new wings and a central dome. I've not researched the matter, but it would seem likely that the grand plan was adopted as a way of cementing the Compromise of 1850. That agreement between the Northern and Southern states was an attempt to bury the problem of slavery and to prevent civil war. My teacher, Norris K. Smith, proposed as a general rule that architectural monuments are the result of political crises: here would seem to be a case in point.

When I visited the Capitol in preparation for this work I noted that although the building is well preserved and kept in very good shape, the area that was filled with spectators back in 1901 is now a parking lot. The shiny SUVs of our congressmen seem to be a rather supercilious presence, and I wished them gone. The area was designed as a ceremonial space, rather like a church. The cars are reminders that while the space remains, the piety has vanished.

2. The White House (45.5" x 38")

In order to obtain information necessary for the making of this picture I went, quite naturally, to Washington. The White House is off limits, but I saw it from the usual distant vantage points. There's not much doubt that the south facade of the building presents the most appealing view. The rounded portico is a strong feature, and it makes up for the otherwise poor quality of the building's architectural details. Although I'm not qualified to discuss these matters authoritatively, I'm of the opinion that the moldings are too thin. They don't project enough to create the shadows that are needed to define the shape of the building. The capitals are really bad. The dentils are tiny; they should stand out much more. And since the building is painted in a blinding white, all the shadows wash out anyway. And so forth.

When the building was designed the United States had no professional architects, and the task of creating a Palladian villa was a bit beyond us. The alterations that have taken place over the years have not helped very much: the balcony inserted by Harry Truman into the portico, all the stuff on the roof. If someone wanted to tear the place down and start over again I would not object.

In view of the building's defects I found it necessary by way of compensation to spend a lot of time drawing and painting the park that graciously surrounds the building. I really struggled with that because I'm not a landscape artist; most of my work has to do with figures. I felt (after much experimentation) that a very painterly approach is necessary to render grass and foliage. In order to create that effect I had to create "brushes" in Photoshop, which allowed me to imitate to some extent the texture of impasto paint.

My beloved computer (G4 Macintosh with 8.6 OS) allowed me to experiment with a great variety of color and lighting effects: I tested literally hundreds of possibilities. I'm not a colorist, but I certainly produced a better looking picture than my unaided faculties would allow. The computer is, in my view, a huge gift to the artist.

I needed a good photo of the building, an item that proved very hard to find. In recent times the White House has been shrouded by foliage: possibly for security reasons. By a lucky accident I noticed during a visit to the Heurich mansion (where the Washington Historical Association is housed) a picture of the White House that was taken in the 1840s by a photographer named Plumbe. It is probably the first picture ever taken of the building. It was perfect for my purpose. It shows the building from precisely the best viewpoint, and the details are all very clearly displayed. (It's ironic that of the millions of photos taken since, this one is the best.) The photo, which belongs to the Library of Congress, provided a sort of skeletal image that needed to be reconfigured and changed in many respects; but as a start it was ideal.

I also had to figure out how to draw the people in the foreground. I decided early on to show the annual Easter Egg Roll "event", because it was an occasion that would be well documented with photos. The management of *The Washington Post* gave me the rare privilege of visiting their picture collection, where I was able to find excellent material. The

Library of Congress also has a collection of nice photos that are available online. The Easter Egg thing was started in Benjamin Harrison's time, and it was photographed pretty regularly ever since. It's an obvious subject: Women, Children, the White House, and Easter. All neatly scheduled, ready for the photographer. How perfectly delightful it all is to be sure. Well, okay, maybe too delightful. I'd have preferred a picture showing the White House in the Andrew Jackson period, when unruly crowds overran the building. But there was no photo documentation for that. At the *Post*, however, I discovered excellent pictures taken in the 1930s. People dressed very neatly and formally back then. They really tried to meet the expectations of what was still an aristocratic social setup. And Eleanor Roosevelt was there, on the scene, getting tons of good publicity. The *Post* also had lots of photos from the Eisenhower era, but in those pics the people somehow looked sloppy and they flopped around the lawn as if they were on the beach.

My picture is an idealization: it shows the building and the setting in a way that never was. In the great divide between realist and classical artists I side with the classical. In that respect I am at one with the architects who created the Landmarks: the classical forms are derived from nature, but they are molded by the idealizing mind of the artist.

3. The Supreme Court (45.5" x 38")

I went down to Washington to do the necessary research for this image as for the others in the Landmark series. The Supreme Court sits on an intersection near the Capitol, and there are no particular difficulties in taking photos of its main entrance, by which it is well known to anyone who reads the newspapers. At first glance there doesn't seem to be anything very special about the building. It's a very straightforward rendition of a Roman temple, a form that was becoming boringly familiar in the late 1930s, when the building was erected. There is a slight sense that the architect had run out of ideas, that the great tradition had run its course. My problem was to overcome the sense of conventionality, of the lack of any surprising element.

In truth, the building is quite dramatic: particularly as one mounts its steps and approaches its bronze doors, one is impressed by its grand scale and the great craftsmanship with which it was put together. Unfortunately it's very hard to capture this excitement in a photo. I took

many pictures, all of which were nice, but they were no different from the pictures that are taken every day by every bozo with a camera.

But in one set of photos I was lucky: I shot the building as it was in transition from a backlighted to a frontlighted moment. The light from the sun struck the vast expanse of white marble in front of the building and bounced it upward to the facade, which was still in shadow. In that way the light came not from the sky, but unexpectedly it radiated from the ground. This was the key element. I added some fluttering flags, a few birds, a wispy cloud, and bit-by-bit the picture took its final form. The sense of majestic scale is a very important: I tried to emphasize that aspect of the building by having it fill as much of the picture as I could, and by having human figures diminish in size as they get further from the picture plane. Depictions of human figures are essential in architectural rendering: without them there's no way to tell how big the building is.

The final dramatic touch comes from the crowd that animates the scene. I got the idea of rendering the historic moment of the Watergate period from a photo that I found in the collection of *The Washington Post*. The paper's photog had shot Leon Jaworski in his moment of triumph as he left the Court: he is shown in the photo just as I render him here. Head down, holding all the cards. Surrounded by eager reporters and gleeful Democrats. In order to draw the crowd I asked some friends to walk up and down the steps at Columbia University while I shot them with a camcorder. Freeze frames from the video were very useful.

I think it's notable that I used a lot of technical resources that were not readily available until recently, thanks to the development of digital technology. Without these resources I suppose that the work would have required a much greater investment of manpower and cost. This fact might explain why I was (to the best of my knowledge) the first artist to attempt a serious rendering of any of the landmarks.

Information about Elliott Banfield and his work is posted at
www.elliottbanfield.com

LANDMARKS OF WASHINGTON, D.C.

1. THE CAPITOL

ITS CORNERSTONE WAS LAID BY GEORGE WASHINGTON IN 1793. CONGRESS AND THE SUPREME COURT MOVED FROM PHILADELPHIA IN 1800 TO OCCUPY THE BUILDING. IT WAS PARTLY DESTROYED BY BRITISH TROOPS IN 1814. RESTORATION AND EXPANSION WERE COMPLETED DURING THE PRESIDENCY OF JOHN QUINCY ADAMS, AT WHICH TIME THE CAPITOL WAS AMERICA'S MOST RESPECTABLE BUILDING, HAVING COST \$1,000,000. BY 1850, CONGRESSMEN FROM THE NEW STATES HAD OVERCROWDED THE BUILDING. ARCHITECT THOMAS U. WALTER DESIGNED NEW WINGS FOR THE HOUSE AND SENATE AND AN ENLARGED CAPITOL DOME. WORK CONTINUED DURING THE CIVIL WAR AND, IN 1865, THE STATUE OF FREEDOM WAS LIFTED TO ITS PLACE ATOP THE CUPOLA TO A 35-GUN SALUTE—ONE FOR EACH STATE IN THE NORTH AND SOUTH.

THE ARTIST'S SKETCHING SHOWS THE EAST FRONT OF THE CAPITOL AS IT MIGHT HAVE APPEARED AT THE SECOND INAUGURATION OF WILLIAM MCKINLEY ON MONDAY, MARCH 4, 1901. CHIEF JUSTICE MELVILLE FULLER ADMINISTERS THE OATH OF OFFICE ON A COVERED PLATFORM IN FRONT OF THE CENTRAL PORTICO. VICE PRESIDENT THEODORE ROOSEVELT STANDS NEARBY. IN HIS INAUGURAL ADDRESS, THE PRESIDENT STATED HIS INTENTION TO ESTABLISH AN INDEPENDENT GOVERNMENT IN CUBA AND TO MAINTAIN U.S. AUTHORITY IN THE PHILIPPINES, AND HE ANNOUNCED THAT THE GOVERNMENT HAD A SURPLUS AND THAT THE CONGRESS IN ITS PREVIOUS SESSION HAD REDUCED TAXATION IN THE SUM OF \$41,000,000.

© 1901 AMERICAN ENGRAVERS SOCIETY AND PHOTO PLATE COMPANY





GEORGE WASHINGTON, ACCOMPANIED BY CITY PLANNER PIERRE L'ENFANT, CHOSE THE SITE FOR "THE PRESIDENT'S HOUSE" IN 1791; IN 1800, JOHN ADAMS BECAME THE FIRST PRESIDENT TO RESIDE THERE. TORCHED BY BRITISH TROOPS IN 1814, RECONSTRUCTED AND EMBELLISHED THROUGH MANY ADMINISTRATIONS, IT WAS OFFICIALLY NAMED "THE WHITE HOUSE" BY THEODORE ROOSEVELT IN 1901.

Landmarks of Washington, D.C.
 2. *The White House*

THE ARTIST'S RENDERING SHOWS THE WHITE HOUSE AS IT MIGHT HAVE APPEARED IN 1934; ELEANOR ROOSEVELT LEADS A GROUP OF CHILDREN ACROSS THE SOUTH LAWN DURING THE EASTER EGG ROLL, AN ANNUAL WHITE HOUSE TRADITION BEGUN BY RUTHERFORD B. HAYES IN 1878.
© 2008 AMERICAN ENTERPRISE INSTITUTE FOR PUBLIC POLICY RESEARCH



OFFICIAL PROCEEDINGS OF THE U.S. SUPREME COURT TOOK PLACE IN THE CAPITOL FROM 1801 UNTIL 1935, WHEN THE PRESENT BUILDING WAS COMPLETED FOR ITS USE. CHIEF JUSTICE AND FORMER PRESIDENT WILLIAM HOWARD TAFT PERSUADED THE CONGRESS TO AUTHORIZE CONSTRUCTION OF A PERMANENT HOME FOR THE COURT AND CHARGED ARCHITECT CASS GILBERT WITH DESIGNING "A BUILDING OF DIGNITY AND IMPORTANCE."

Landmarks of Washington, D.C.
 3. *The Supreme Court*

THE ARTIST'S RENDERING SHOWS THE BUILDING AS IT MIGHT HAVE APPEARED ON JULY 24, 1974, AFTER THE COURT RULED THAT PRESIDENT RICHARD NIXON MUST SURRENDER THE TAPES OF HIS CONVERSATIONS IN THE OVAL OFFICE TO WATERGATE SPECIAL PROSECUTOR LEON JAWORSKI REPRESENTING THE UNITED STATES; JAWORSKI DEPARTS FROM THE MAIN ENTRANCE AMID A CROWD OF SPECTATORS AND REPORTERS.

© 2004 AMERICAN ENTERPRISE INSTITUTE FOR PUBLIC POLICY RESEARCH