

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

TRANSCRIPT

708 Jackson Place, N. W.,
Washington, D. C.

Tuesday, October 13, 1981

The Commission convened at 9:45 a.m., J. Carter Brown, Chairman, presiding.

COMMISSION MEMBERS PRESENT:

J. CARTER BROWN, Chairman
EDWARD D. STONE, JR.
WALTER A. NETSCH
SONDRA G. MYERS
ALAN R. NOVAK
HAROLD BURSON

ALSO PRESENT:

CHARLES H. ATHERTON, Secretary
DONALD B. MYER, Assistant Secretary
JEFFREY R. CARSON
RICHARD RYAN
SUE KOHLER

COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS
TRANSCRIPT

2

A G E N D A

MEETING OF 10/13/81

ITEM	PAGE
I. Administration	
A. Dates of next meetings: November 10, 1981 December 15, 1981	3
B. Approval of September 16, 1981, minutes of the Commission of Fine Arts	3
C. Design mock-up of Renwick Gates at Smithsonian Castle-report	3
D. Modification to Monkey Island design, National Zoo-report	6
E. Georgetown Waterfront, Harbour Place Associates proposal-hearing status-report	8
II. Submissions and Reviews	
A. Pennsylvania Avenue Development Corporation	
1. CFA 13/OCT/81-1, John Marshall Park, John Marshall Place and Pennsylvania Avenue, N. W., final drawings	8
2. CFA 13/OCT/81-2, Waste receptacle designs for the avenue, and related parks	22
3. CFA 13/OCT/81-3, Great Seal of the United States, proposal for Western Plaza, 14th Street and Pennsylvania Avenue, N. W.	24
B. National Park Service, National Capital Region	
4. CFA 13/OCT/81-4, Vietnam Veterans Memorial, granite samples	28
C. District of Columbia Government, Office of Planning and Development	
5. CFA 13/OCT/81-5, National Theater, proposed design; and second floor enclosed balcony	56

MR. NETCH: Let me thank the Chairman for being so aware. I think we should recommend it.

CHAIRMAN BROWN: What is the sense of the Commission?

MS. MYERS: The original.

CHAIRMAN BROWN: Okay. Thank you.

Let's move on to the Park Service's mission which is the Vietnam Veterans Memorial, granite samples.

MR. ATHERTON: We have some slides.

The Park Service is submitting a sample of the granite which, in its conceptual state, is presented to the Commission as black granite.

We have representatives from the Vietnam Veterans Memorial Association as well as representatives from the Park Service. The architect is also present with us today to discuss material samples. We have also had several requests from people who would like to make a statement on the design itself, and they are all with us today. I think it would be appropriate to lead off, however, with the Park Service.

Mr. Ron Cefella, do you want to state anything?

MR. CEFELLA: You covered it all.

MR. ATHERTON: We have a sample here. Would anybody like -- the architect -- Mr. Dubek is here.

MR. DUBEK: Mr. Chairman, members of the Commission,

I appeared before you in July. I am Robert Dubek. I am Project Director. The design competition was won by Maya Ying Lin, an undergraduate architectural student at Yale University.

Since we have been before you, we have structured a professional design team to work with Ms. Ling in the actual development and realization of the memorial. The senior member of the team is Ken Cooper. Ms. Ling is working in Mr. Cooper's office as an independent consultant. We are proceeding with the design development process. We are here, as you know, today to present several samples of stone in order to most expedite the construction and design process which is moving along very well at this point.

I would like to introduce Mr. Cooper.

MR. COOPER: We have estimated -- first of all, let me say it is with reluctance that we are here making a partial submission. The memorial was approved by the Commission earlier this year. We are in the process of meeting the requirement that has been set out for the design development phase. We will be back in November with a complete submission at which time I think we will be able to answer all of the questions that have been raised with regard to safety, drainage, inscription, one thing and another.

In the meantime, in order to meet the schedule, we

really have to get the quarrying operation on the black granite underway. We are headed for a deadline of next November. It appears to us it is quite feasible to have the memorial in place at that time. We have selected, with Ms. Lin's full concurrence, two alternate samples of granite which are represented by the one you see here. One is quarried in Sweden. The other is quarried in India. They have the same physical attributes. They are identical. Without the labor, you can't tell them apart. They are fine crystal in structure. They are all polished in the same way. They are the same color. The veining is quite similar, the lack of veining is similar. It is proposed that competitive bids be taken on them from the two different sources and, depending on cost and availability, a decision will be made which way to go. I think that -- have all of you had a chance to see it? This is a sample used in other memorials in Washington. It is largely without veining and it seemed to meet the criteria of Ms. Lin's design completely, and we have no technical problem with it at all.

MR. STONE: Is this the proposed finish?

MR. COOPER: Yes. It would be a highly polished finish and also ultimately the inscription will be sandblasted in with light gray. We are prepared to come back to you with

a complete proposal on the inscription which is developing, we think, awfully well. We think you will be pleased. We are particularly desirous of having a granite of this quality because of the need for precision in the sandblasting process. Without this kind of fine texture, we can't get it.

MR. NETSCH: There is none available in this country? It seems geologically peculiar. We went through this problem on the Air Force Academy, and I was finally required to select materials from the United States.

CHAIRMAN BROWN: Hopefully, this country has grown up a little bit since then.

MR. COOPER: We have completely explored American sources. The West Coast source in particular, which was probably what you used. The Canadian sources. There is also South Africa, Uruguay, and we have settled in on the Indian and the Sweden.

MR. NETSCH: The issue is the fine graining?

MR. COOPER: It is the uniform quality, lack of veining.

MR. NETSCH: That is what the problem is about. I think we ought to define what the issue is.

MR. COOPER: The issue is density, uniform color.

MR. NETSCH: Let me ask the question. If it were

another color, and the goals were the same, say it were white or a green granite, would those materials be available locally?

MR. COOPER: You know, I can't honestly answer you.

MR. NETSCH: I mean geologically within the United States, Canada, Mexico.

MR. COOPER: I can't answer you because we have not searched all the way for that.

MR. NETSCH: The only reason I mention this, you know the Lincoln Memorial is white and the Jefferson Memorial is white and the Washington Monument is white, and I just wondered why, all of a sudden, is the Vietnam Veterans Memorial black?

MR. COOPER: I would say because that is the design proposed that won the competition which has been approved conceptually by the Commission.

MR. NETSCH: We approve things conceptually. There is the opportunity to refine and detail as the concept goes along. If you have been to this meeting, you see how at the zoo we had a long and continuous process on the refinement of a design which was conceptually agreed upon at the first meeting. So I am not trying to change the concept of the memorial. I am simply asking a question.

MR. COOPER: We feel very satisfied with this particular color in this location with the inscription, to be really straightforward with you.

CHAIRMAN BROWN: Do we have any comment from members of the community or anyone who would like to speak to this?

MR. CARHART: Yes. I spoke to Mr. Atherton earlier and he told me I could speak for 10 minutes.

MR. ATHERTON: I think we said five.

MR. CARHART: I have a statement I would like to make in objection.

One man in truth makes a majority. My name is Tom Carhart. I graduated from West Point in 1966. I received a law degree from the University of Michigan in 1972. I am employed as a Government bureaucrat, but I speak to you today as an individual.

In 1969, while serving as an infantry platoon leader in Vietnam, I was awarded two Purple Hearts for wounds suffered in combat. I am proud to have so served my country, and I am proud of all who served with me in Vietnam. I am very proud especially of those who died in Vietnam.

When I came to Washington in March of 1980, I immediately joined the Vietnam Veterans Memorial Sons, wanting, as I did, to support the memorialization of our experiences in

Vietnam.

President Reagan has called out Vietnam experience a noble cause, and I believe that perception is shared by virtually all Vietnam veterans.

When I went to Vietnam, I was a young man. I didn't know much. I believed that we were fighting to protect the freedom of the South Vietnamese people. I still believe that today. However, I realize there are differences that still exist in this society over that war, and so I applauded the apolitical stance of the VVMF when I joined their ranks.

One of the immediate problems that the organization faced in March 1980 was a lack of funds to support or pay for the first campaign mailing. Within a few weeks, I was able to arrange an unsecured loan of \$45,000 to VVMF from a local bank. Over the next year and more, I contributed heavily in areas that ranged from hard physical labor to tedious administrative matters.

I mention these things only to show that I have been both active and strongly dedicated to the goals of VVMF. When the design competition opened, I submitted a design myself. I am not an artist. It was the first I have ever done, with the first statue I have ever sculpted as the centerpiece. I didn't expect to win and I didn't. But that's okay because I

participated. I wanted the fullest participation possible. When I saw the entries at Andrews Air Force Base, I was very impressed by the level of thought and effort that had gone into most of the designs that were submitted.

But when I saw the winning design, I was truly stunned. I thought it the most insulting and demeaning memorial to our experience that was possible. Initially, I thought it better to keep my opinions to myself, realizing that any objection I might make could be quickly and easily dismissed as sour grapes. But, since that time, I have realized that it is too important an issue to our entire Nation, especially all Vietnam veterans, that the fear of someone misconstruing my ambitions or reasons for speaking are insignificant.

The jury which selected the winning design was made up exclusively of non-Vietnam veterans. They were architects, sculptors and so on. They didn't even include a layman to give a man on the street opinion. They never served in the military in any way. I don't know how the members of the jury were selected, but I do know that when a friend of mine asked the Chairman of the Board of VVMF why there were no Vietnam veterans on the jury, he was told none were qualified. That is an astounding thing to say for any knowledgeable Vietnam

veteran.

Part of VVMF's official statement on the selection of the jury reads, and I quote, "The purpose of the memorial is not to literally depict the experience and motivation of Vietnam veterans, but to express America's honor and recognition of them. We realized that the important skill of a drawer was not so much having an experience or feeling, but the ability to interpret how well a particular design expressed that experience or feeling."

In order to interpret how well a particular design expresses an experience or feeling, all other things being equal, when possible, it would seem an important qualification would have to be to have had that feeling. Many Vietnam veterans are undeniably fine artists, architects and sculptors. Why didn't they get appointed judges? What went wrong?

Some 500 years before the time of Christ, a Chinese philosopher named Sun Tzu wrote that fighting was the crudest form of warfare. He advised instead that warfare be differently pursued, particularly against a stronger enemy. He wrote, "Break the will of the enemy to fight and you accomplish the true objective of war. Cover with ridicule the enemy's traditions. Exploit and aggravate the inherent frictions within the enemy country. Agitate the young against the old. Prevail

if possible without armed conflict."

It is self-evident that North Vietnam adopted Sun Tzu's policies in fighting against the United States. The result was two wholly distinct and totally different wars. The first war was a military war. It was fought in the rice paddies and the jungles of South Vietnam. That is the war we seek to memorialize. That is the war that Congress licensed VVMP to build a memorial on the mall to commemorate. The second war was a political war fought in this country on the TV screens and radio and on the college campuses. The adversaries were the Americans and the South Vietnamese on one side against the Viet Cong and the North Vietnamese on the other. The adversaries in the second war were the older more conservative citizens of this country, as well as the formal American governmental structure against the younger citizens, mostly students and artists, writers, newspaper and television people and the generally more liberal segment of our society.

Because of the open nature of our society, the North Vietnamese were able to implement the precept of Sun Tzu in this country. We who wore the uniforms often became the enemy to the people on one side of this second political war.

When I came home from Vietnam in December 1968, I was literally spat upon as I walked through the Chicago airport in

my uniform by some girl in a band of hippies. That spit hurt. It went through me like a spear. Welcome home. I hadn't said anything but I was a target. I was the enemy. Needless to say, I buried my Vietnam experience for a long time. That was many years ago, of course, and now, at least, Americans seems ready to honor her fallen American soldiers, as well as those who served in Vietnam. It is no surprise that no one wants to talk about Vietnam or Cambodia any more. Their new Communist governments have not exactly shown themselves to be the bands of angels they proclaimed themselves to be. Now, both sides of that political war here in America are confused and frustrated and embittered.

A few lines from Kipling say it all, "And the end of the fight is a tombstone white, with the name of the late deceased, and the epitaph drear, 'a fool lies here who tried to hustle the east.'"

That is the important lesson of Vietnam, that both sides in the political war as well as the military got out-hustled by the East.

I never really felt good about my Vietnam experiences until I joined VVMF. We got the quick approval of Congress and the White House, and the money started rolling in and sudden bands of brotherhood were sprung up or were reawakened.

I don't blame the individuals at the VVMP for the decisions they make. After all, I think they simply got outhustled. As committed as they are to the formal structure of professional judging by non-Vietnam veterans of the design of the memorial, I think it unlikely that they will agree with differing views.

When we Vietnam veterans sought to actually build the memorial to our experience, we needed some professional artistic assistance. I don't know how it was done, but somehow we got talked into a Board of non-vietnam veterans. Can there be any doubt that the interpretation of the war they selected was the interpretation of the war they saw at home since it is the only one they knew? But that is not our military war. That is not the war we are here licensed to memorialize. That is another war. I don't care about artistic perceptions. I don't care about the rationalizations that abound. One needs no artistic education to see this memorial for what it is, a black scar. Black, the universal color of sorrow and shame and degradation in all races, all societies worldwide. In a hole, hidden as if out of shame so that no Vietnam veteran who is condemned to spend the rest of their life in a wheelchair can ever visit it. Perhaps that is an appropriate design for those who would still spit upon

us. But for me that is not appropriate. Can America truly mean that we are to be honored by a black pit?

In a city filled with white monuments, this is our reward for faithful service.

There are presently three monuments that could be called black in Washington and they are all on the other side of the river, on the edge of Arlington Cemetery. The first is the Seabee Memorial, a statue of a man on top of a pedestal cast in black metal and looking out over the horizon. The second is the 101st Airborne Division Memorial, and it is again a black pedestal some 10 feet high, on top which is a bronze eagle with wings spread, soaring in flight. The third is the Marine Corps Iwo Jima Memorial, a cluster of marines cast in now green bronze, raising Old Glory. They are atop a 10-foot bronze stand. But those are all heroic images. They are nothing like this. And then we come to the shameful, degrading ditch that Vietnam veterans are given as their memorial, a black gash of shame and sorrow.

It is important that this matter be considered carefully and rationally for we are here making history. If a design were chosen from among the thousands of entries by a jury of Vietnam veterans, I assure you that they would choose something white, above ground, and low key that would neither

obstruct nor detract from the other monuments. We seek only to be accepted in our society. We do not want to divide. We are still waiting to be welcomed home.

The other option is to allow the design that won the competition that was selected by a jury of non-Vietnam veterans stand. If you do this, you only add fuel to the fire we want to put out. One hundred years from now, long after we are all dead and gone, visitors to the mall will see only one thing, a black wall in a trench with a random scattering of names on it such that neither brother nor father nor lover nor friend could ever be found. No flag, no insignia. They will see this as the memorial established long ago by America to those who served in Vietnam. And they can only see that as some ugly dirty experience of which we are all ashamed. I am not ashamed. We are not ashamed.

Over the past weekend, people in VVMF got wind of my intention to speak to you today, and I got several phone calls from intermediary friends. What would it take, I was asked, to call you off? What is it that you want that will keep you from criticizing this memorial? You want an inscription? Okay. We can get that inscription. You say you want a flag? We can talk to you about that. But do not attack this design.

My answer to them is the statement I make here to you today. Cosmetic changes are not enough. I am tired of the inference that we should feel apologetic for our service to America. I am tired of being made to feel that all of us who served in Vietnam are losers. The only thing we lost over there was the support of our countrymen back here. I am proud that I fought for my country. I am proud that I bled for my country. I am prouder still of the men and women who died for their country. I will not stand idly by while we are memorialized by a black shaft of shame thrust into the earth. I do not regret my actions and I will not apologize.

Are we Vietnam veterans so blind? Are we so dumb? Will we be outthrustled once again? Are we going to take this, a black pit of shame? Is that what you want for your grandchildren to see? Is that how you want to be remembered?

Please extend to us the grace and dignity to choose our own memorial that will fairly represent our Vietnam experiences to posterity. None of us want to be memorialized as a black spot in American history. Let our own artists and sculptors and architects select the most appropriate design. As a Vietnam veteran who feels dishonored by the design that was declared the winner of the competition, I call on the United States Fine Arts Commission to reopen the selection

process of the design competition and to require that the winning design be chosen by a jury composed exclusively of Vietnam veterans, for only they are truly qualified to judge. I hope that you will allow us this chance to recapture our rightful position of honor in our Nation's history.

Thank you;

There is one more person that would like to make a comment, Tony Norton, who was with the walking dead, 109, in Vietnam. It will take him one minute. He would like to make a statement that is separate from my own.

MR. NORTON: I have prepared a statement that I would like to read.

In addition to the expressed discontent with the design's appearance and its suitability as the memorial to the Vietnam veterans, I would like to express my concern over the originality of Ms. Lin's winning submission.

Recently, looking at a book entitled "Unbuilt America," I was struck by the remarkable similarity between the winning design and the summer music shell designed by Jean Summers of CFM. I have a Xerox copy of that for your review. While I applaud VVMF for sponsoring the competition, I feel it is also the ethical responsibility of the VVMF to ensure that the winning design is an original complying with

all rules as set forth in the guidelines.

Out of deference to the 1,400 competitors who devoted so much time and effort to the creation of unique quality designs, it would be a heinous injustice for this memorial not to represent the culmination of such an endeavor. Moreover, as a veteran of Vietnam, I feel very strongly that in order for this memorial to truly honor those who were killed and honor the veterans, the memorial itself must also be honorable. It would be defeating and inexcusable for this memorial to be the subject of future public controversy and ridicule due to questions about the competition's integrity.

I have written to the VVMF stating these concerns and am awaiting their response. I will demand verification of the originality of Ms. Lin's winning design as well as compliance with specified contest regulations.

CHAIRMAN BROWN: Thank you very much.

MR. NORTON: If you cover up the top of it, you can see.

MR. NETSCH: Mr. Chairman, I think what has been given today is an important statement by a group of people who disagree with the results of a competition. However, I think the issue is not with this Commission. I think that the procedure of discussion has to be with -- between the Vietnam

groups themselves first and with their representatives, whom-
ever they might be, second. We are following a policy that
has been preestablished and I believe that the people present-
ing today have to acknowledge that there are differences of
opinion, and the only one in which I do not want to get into
any political discussion is the fact that a drawer must always
be those involved with the process. I think it would be
impossible in history -- we would never have had the Lincoln
Memorial if it had to be someone there at the event. We never
would have had the Washington Monument. I think we have to
accept the fact that there are Americans who are sincere and
can be members of juries. I think that is the only thing about
this statement that I wish to comment on at this moment.

MR. CARHART: May I respond to that or am I out of
order?

MR. NETSCH: I think the rest of the Commission
should speak first.

CHAIRMAN BROWN: Well, we have procedurally here a
piece of advice to render on something which has been submitted
to us now as a further action following up a consideration
that we gave at a previous meeting. At that time, we had a
chance to weigh varying points of view. There was a repre-
sentative of Vietnam veterans that found, from his point of

view, that the memorial was unsuitable. But the feeling of the Commission at that time was that there is an extraordinary sense of dignity and nobility that comes out of this design precisely because of its great simplicity and not because it goes through a lot of corny specific references which may seem briefly to go to the heart of the matter but can be seen to be really rather superficial, and that this solution which had to do with nature, the ground, the modulation of the ground plain, the openness of the sky and the view of the other great historical monuments around on our National Mall, but it would be within, with that extraordinary litany of names, would be ones which would call up in the visitor's heart a tremendous admiration and gratitude for the extraordinary sacrifice made on behalf of all of us.

So we found a noble cause here well expressed and the concept of it being this very beautiful material, highly finished, highly polished, that you wouldn't expect to stumble across, gave contrast to the natural forms that showed that man had been here. We found the sight of it rather extraordinary. There is no group of veterans in the history of our country that have been proposed to be memorialized in such a conspicuous place. It is right next to the Lincoln Memorial and on the major axis that leads up to the Capitol of the

United States and I think will draw many, many visitors and bring into their hearts and minds a sense of contemplation and appreciation which I think will move all of them.

Now, we can't tell before it is built whether it will have this effect, but a lot of people whose profession it is to visualize plans have been involved in this, and all of them seem to feel that this has every earmark of extraordinary success. That is not always true of memorials. It is very difficult to find a great solution to our great President Roosevelt, and yet the whole trend in memorial design has been away from the approach of bits of whipped cream that are put on to fancy pedestals and to go at the emotions in a more serious way and feel the element of nature and to get into a landscape solution for the memorial as the proposed Roosevelt memorial does rather than try to sum up all in a single statue or a single temple building.

We recognize that symbols are inadequate to express the enormous impact of some of these national experiences of ours. So, more recently, people have responded to a different approach. I think that is what is involved here.

I was interested in the presentation that there was the word "inference" used rather than "implication," and I think that is the nub of it. People will always react to

these things subjectively according to what they read into it, and we can't avoid that. But at least for this Commission, when it was presented, we voted unanimously that we felt that this was the kind of memorial that would do honor to the people it memorialized. That was really our intention.

There may be other comments.

MR. NETSCH: I think you are speaking very eloquently for us.

CHAIRMAN BROWN: I suppose we should have a vote on the material sample which is before us.

MR. CARHART: May I make one one-second statement? It may be that you are correct, that this new direction in artistic monuments is correct, rather than bits of whipped cream we will have solemn low-key monuments. There is a tradition made by Washington monuments, the Washington Monument and the Lincoln Memorial. They both rise in white splendor. These are our national heroes. The Vietnam memorial goes down into the ground in black, the color of shame. It may be that you are right, that this is the new wave and things will change. But the problem is you are wrong. There is too much political baggage associated with Vietnam to take a chance on it. There are too many people whose hearts are torn apart, both veterans and those here in this world. I think it a much

safer path to take for the future because a hundred years from now, we will be remembered by the memorial we put in the ground, if we made it low-key, low-profile, white, discreet, solemn memorial. I don't know what it is. I don't want a black trench.

Excuse me. I will never take my children to the black hole. I will go across the river to Arlington Cemetery where there are monuments of heroes that I can be proud of, not spat upon.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BROWN: I suppose we should take a vote.

MR. DUBEK: We feel it would be appropriate to enter a statement by the Vietnam Veterans Memorial Fund on issues raised here. I would like to introduce John C. Scruggs, who is President and founder of the Fund.

MR. SCRUGGS: Mr. Chairman, Mr. Commissioners, I would like to thank all of you for allowing us this opportunity. My name is John Scruggs. I am President and founder of the Vietnam Veterans Memorial Fund.

In 1969, I reported to the 109 Light Infantry Brigade as a private. During my year there, half of the people in my infantry were either killed or wounded. I was personally very seriously wounded and was also decorated for gallantry.

This was under enemy fire. I am essentially alive today because a young private gave his life during an ambush.

But in 1976 I became involved in a project and became the youngest man to ever give professional testimony before the United States Senate on a psychological matter, the readjustment difficulties of Vietnam veterans and the effect the war had on the veterans. In this regard, I have a couple of key points to mention that seem to relate to the research that I was so honored to give to the United States Senate.

One of the key points is that any design chosen would be the object of a few people's misplaced anger. There is a lot of anger certainly about the Vietnam War from a lot of people and a lot of time, in this case at least, there is a shortage of things to vent your anger upon. However, I think that anger is essentially about the Vietnam War itself and the treatment of its veterans. In 1979, I had a dream. My dream was that regardless of the controversy of the Vietnam War, that the people of the country could come together, both pro-war and people against the war, to honor the sacrifices of the Vietnam veterans through a national memorial. And I formed the Vietnam Veterans Memorial Fund, and that dream is a reality today because the purpose of the meeting is to discuss the

stone.

My final key point is there is a lot of unfinished business left for our country because of Vietnam, and this memorial is just a part of that unfinished business. But it remains for the country to absorb and resolve the many other difficulties that remain and, of course, I and everyone else who has any sense certainly wishes that a memorial could magically erase these lingering problems for our society and certainly for veterans. But it can only be a beginning.

This year the Memorial Fund held the largest architectural competition in history, in the history of the United States or Europe, I believe, and the winning design is a very beautiful and extraordinary work of art and one that all of us are very proud to have. I agree with the architect who compared this memorial's brilliance to that of the Eiffel Tower, and recently columnist James Kilpatrick wrote up its very eloquent qualities and then ended by saying that the memorial truly packed a wallop and honors the veterans very well.

I recently spoke to the American Legion and Veterans of Foreign Wars convention in Philadelphia and Hawaii to discuss this memorial. And I discussed it as one that is 10 feet and one that will make veterans feel 10 feet tall. And probably 10,000 people came to see the artist's conception

of the memorial that we had on a panel. Out of the 10,000 people, that is my sincere estimate, that stopped to look at the artist's conception, to get pamphlets, two of them came up to me and said I don't like the design. So that is not a bad batting average. But both supported the project regardless of their perception of its artistic merit.

From May 8th to May 10th, after that design was released to the public, there was a radiothon in Washington. We raised \$10 million. That is far in excess of what the entire defense industry has donated to the memorial. But we are working on that. We are certainly working on that.

But across the country right now individuals, veterans groups, the unions, just people call us up literally every day that want to take part in this very noble effort to get this memorial built, to honor the veterans of Vietnam.

With respect to the remarks about the jury, I might remark that the jury was about the most prominent that has ever been assembled to judge a work of art in this country, and all were interviewed by Vietnam combat veterans. The senior member of the jury was a combat veteran himself of World War I. I believe someone mentioned that there were no veterans on the jury. The foreman of the jury, Mr. Grady Clay, won the Purple Heart at Anzio during the invasion of Italy.

I recently lunched with Mr. Grady Clay, who told me of his amazement at the reaction of the 1,420 competitors that took part in the design competition, the 1,420 that lost. He said that in European design competitions, they have them more in Europe, often there is an ugly aftermath insofar as the competitors make public statements about how bad the winning design is and theirs should have been selected, and try to engineer things to make people feel bad. Yet, by and large, our competitors have said their reward in the competition was being able to compete. One competitor even contributed the prize money that he was given for -- he was one of the people who received prize money. He contributed it to help build the winning design. Also one of the jurors donated the expenses we gave him to the memorial fund. We wanted as many qualified veterans as we could to compete in the competition. The jury, when we saw the winning design that Ms. Maya Ying Lin came up with from Yale University, we unanimously approved it, and of those unanimously approving it include people with much more better credentials than myself as far as being a combat veteran who was wounded.

We had one man who lost a leg and who volunteered many of his services to our organization.

I might add that someone also mentioned that we were

authorized by Congress to memorialize the Vietnam War. That is incorrect. The legislation clearly reads that we have been authorized to honor and recognize through a national memorial the sacrifices and services of Vietnam veterans, not the war itself, but the veterans. And that is what we are doing.

So all competitors, all 1,400, had some preconceived notions of what this monument should be, but only one or two of the competitors have presently expressed such an opinion, and certainly we have just heard from one of the most bitter of the competitors. But I somehow put this in perspective. What we are building is a memorial, not an average memorial. I truly believe it will be one of the world's greatest memorials and probably the greatest work of art that this city has seen.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BROWN: Thank you very much.

We have a long agenda ahead of us. Perhaps the time has come that we should vote on this.

MR. BURSON: It seems to me that we as a Fine Arts Commission have been brought into a process of which we had no initiative in bringing about. We did not establish a competition. We had no part in judging it whatsoever, and I think this part has been used as a forum to air some intragural

differences of which we really have no part except our review process for what goes on in the part of the Federal district that we have some responsibility for.

CHAIRMAN BROWN: I think that is an important point to make.

MR. NETSCH: I think it is important, but I also think it is important that we reaffirm our position that we took in July. If it is required -- I don't think it is required or even necessary, and I think we should go on with the issues that are facing us, which is the selection of the detail. I think the only issue that comes up is do we want to do this sequentially or do we want to look at the procedure when we have more things before us? I understand the problem of the quarrying relative to the time, and it is that understanding -- with that understanding, I understand why the material has been brought to our attention, in a sense, out of sequence.

CHAIRMAN BROWN: I think in an ideal world we would like to see all elements together. But we have been asked specifically to help them with the lead time problem and that is fair, given the inflation costs and so forth. We would not want to be responsible for holding up unduly.

Do we have a motion to approve?

MR. NOVAK: So moved.

CHAIRMAN BROWN: A second?

MS. MYERS: Second.

CHAIRMAN BROWN: All those in favor signify by saying
aye.

(Chorus of ayes.)

CHAIRMAN BROWN: Unanimous.

Thank you very much.

Let's move on.

MR. DUBEK: Thank you very much.

MR. ATHERTON: We have a request from the Office of Planning and Development of the District Government regarding a proposal to extend the second floor balcony space in an enclosed pavilion on the sidewalk of E Street at the National Theater. We have Dr. Murphy with us, Morris Tobin, and also the architect, Al Hireeri.

MR. MURPHY: We value your advice. It is a pleasure to be here.

The National Theater began operation in 1835 and, since that time, has continuously presented legitimate theater in Washington. For many of us that came here prior to 1970, it was probably virtually the only place in Washington in which we could see theater performed. About seven years ago,