

## AFTERNOON SESSION

(12:37 p.m.)

(Reconvened at Cash Room, Treasury Department Building, 15th and Pennsylvania Avenue, N. W.)

CHAIRMAN BROWN: The meeting will come to order. We are reconvening the stated mission of the Commission of Fine Arts, the first part of which took place in the Fine Arts Commission headquarters across from the White House on Jackson Place, and we have completed our agenda now except for one outstanding item, consideration of some new proposals for additions to the design of the Vietnam Veterans Memorial, which was approved by this Commission at various meetings heretofore.

We will start off with the proponents of these design changes, and I understand that John Wheeler, President of the Board of Vietnam Veterans Fund, would like to be the first speaker.

MR. WHEELER: Mr. Chairman, members of the Commission, good afternoon. I am John Wheeler, Chairman of the Board of the Vietnam Veterans Memorial Fund.

"Life, to be sure, is nothing much to lose, but young men think it is, and we were young."

When I saw the statue which we are presenting to you,  
*I thought of those words.*

A. E. Housman wrote them.

We Vietnam veterans were young men together in the cauldron of war.

There were bonds born in our military service that are never broken. I think that they are not even broken by death. They are bonds of friendship and creativity. We have worked together to create this statue as part of a beautiful national memorial.

It takes courage to grieve, and our country has only begun the process of grief after the Vietnam War.

Grieving is work. Grief means looking at the truth and brings a time of anger at the loss, and the anger takes different forms for each person. The hardest part of the job of building Vietnam Veterans Memorial is to face the anger involved as our country does this work.

This statue is part of the beginning of the process. I think the statue is a hopeful sign that our country in time can work together more creatively and in greater friendship after the Vietnam War.

As you consider the statue and hear the men who have made it possible, please see if your own thoughts are as hopeful as mine.

The statue, flag and placement we present to you

today are the wholehearted recommendation of myself and the Board of Directors of the Vietnam Veterans Memorial Fund.

We make the recommendation for two reasons:

First, the statue and flag gracefully honor living Vietnam veterans, by incorporating a tangible human presence.

Second, the recommended placement makes an integrated unity of the whole Memorial.

May I ask, if possible, that a decision be made today so that our work can go forward.

By your approval today, the Fine Arts Commission can take a major step for the whole Nation in healing the wounds of the Vietnam War and honoring the Vietnam veteran.

With your permission, our order of presentation this afternoon is in four parts. First, James Webb, who has served as a member and spokesman of the Sculpture Panel of the Memorial Fund, will speak to the guidelines which were used, which were used in developing the sculpture.

Second, Rick Hart, the sculptor, will speak about his creation.

Third, architect and landscape architect, Kent Cooper and Joe Brown, will discuss sitings of the sculpture and the mast for the flag.

Finally, Jan Scruggs, President of the Memorial

Fund, will close.

I, sir, I thank you for your attention.

CHAIRMAN BROWN: Thank you very much.

MR. WHEELER: May I introduce James Webb.

MR. WEBB: Mr. Chairman and members of the Fine Arts Commission, I would first like to introduce the members of the Sculpture Panel other than myself who participated with me in this creative process. First, Milt Copulos, who is an energy expert with the Heritage Foundation. He has his own syndicated energy column. He was a two-tour Vietnam veteran. I understand that Milt will also testify in his individual capacity later today.

Second, Ray James, who is the associate sculptor. He was an enlisted Marine, rifleman, during the siege of Tsisungh (phonetic). Thirdly, Art Mosely who holds a degree from West Point and one from Harvard, who is in the construction business. He has 10 years of extensive design experience, both here and in Miami, Florida. Art.

Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this memorial is not to remember the Vietnam War dead. It is not meant to be a memorial specifically to the Vietnam War dead; it is intended to honor and recognize all those who served in Vietnam.

I became involved with this project at its

inception. I was an initial member of the sponsoring committee, I was before the House Veterans Committee when this legislation was working its way through the Congress. In that capacity, I drafted the speeches, press releases, dear colleague letters and, most importantly, I gave my personal guarantee to dozens of Members of Congress as to what this memorial would do to the position of the Vietnam veterans. This all was wrapped up through hearings and everything else into what is called Congressional intent.

Thirdly, my novel, which is a combat novel, was supposedly mandatory reading for the jury in the design competition and was recommended reading for all of the competitors.

When the initial design was announced, I immediately contacted the Memorial Fund and discussed with them and began a process which, unfortunately over a period of four months, led to my resigning from the National Sponsoring Committee in order to disassociate myself from the project which I believe was incomplete. I testified in writing before this Commission last year when Mr. Tom <sup>Carhart</sup> ~~Star~~ testified orally, outlining some of my recommendations, and I am pleased today to be here as a spokesman for the compromise that has been reached through a very long process in which will be outlined in greater detail to you by our representatives from the architectural community.

The issue as I foresee it is one between a design solution, which is imminently compatible with the site, which <sup>where</sup> it was supposed to go, but at the same time it was not a statement of honor to the constituent group, the Vietnam veterans.

I think there are clear indications that this is a correct assessment. This is not, as has been indicated in some press accounts, a few individuals who have created havoc with the process. The two clearly demonstrable indications of this are, first of all, the Gallup Poll of the prisoners of war, in which 67 percent of our former Vietnam prisoners stated that they disliked the wall; 70 percent stated that they wanted the walls to be white; 82 percent stated that they should be above ground; 96 percent stated that the flag should be in a prominent place; and only 18 percent believe that the initial design would appeal to those who fought.

Secondly, the entire Ohio delegation of Vietnam Veterans of America, which is 3,000 members, overwhelmingly rejected the initial design as something that did not bring them honor.

Again this is a clear indication that something needed to be done, and we are very pleased with what we have come up with. We believe that we have placed the initial

design into a context that will allow all those who served in Vietnam to feel that they are honored when they visit the site. We began with the mandate from the compromise meetings and working off of that mandate, we believe we have done two things. First of all, we have honored the principals involved in the compromise but, at the same time, we have, through a series of meetings of four individuals who had completely divergent viewpoints on what the memorial meant to them, actually enhanced the original design while, at the same time, showing the utmost respect for it. Our original mandate, as you might recall, was to place a sculpture, essentially a sculpture of the traditional Army infantry pose, leading individuals into the attack, directly in front of the juncture of the two walls. The American flag would be on top of the walls actually in the juncture. That was where we began.

We now have a solution after many months and many trips to the site which will incorporate three figures, three eight-foot figures, 170 feet away from the wall in the most appropriate place on that site where they will blend with the site and in a state of artistic tension with the existing design but in no way infringing on it.

The flag has been moved to a place 40 feet away from the juncture of the walls in its own area where it can

be visited but, at the same time, in a way that is integral to the design. I believe this does two things. For those who have supported the concept of a wall design as a memorial, it does not intrude on their ability to appreciate that design. It creates figures 170 feet away from a 400-foot wall, hardly overwhelming. For those who were unsatisfied with the original design, we believe that it has done a very important thing; that is, it has placed their design into an artistic concept. My view of this is it tells a story. You have three individuals, two white and one black, who are bounded by their war experience. They are strong individuals and, at the same time, they are young and they are sensitive. Purity across this gash in the earth, which represents the tragedy of Vietnam to the American flag which represents the reasons for military service. In that way, you have the unified one single memorial concept. And, in a way, that does not interfere with the original design.

We chose Frederick Hart as a sculptor for this project for a number of reasons. First, he was the highest placing sculptor in the original design competition and, as a result, we believe we have done justice to the original design competition.

Secondly, and most importantly, he is a nationally



renowned sculptor, he has demonstrated his buildings. We interviewed him extensively before we contracted with him. There has been some report that this is a sculpture that was designed by a committee. I can tell you emphatically that that is not true and anyone who knows Rick Hart's credentials will know that on its face. This is his design. We are simply amazed by it.

And with that, I will introduce Mr. Frederick Hart.

(6)

MR. HART: I have some historical -- a conceived list with three things in mind. First, to preserve the simplicity and austerity of the design.

Second, to create a work which interacts with the wall to form a unified totality.

And, finally, to create a sculpture which is in itself a moving experience of the Vietnam veteran.

I have attempted to do this by means of understatement. The sculpture is removed from the area of the wall; it does not intrude or obstruct compared to the scale of wall; that is, the sculpture is quite small. It does not attempt to compete or to dominate. The figures are turned to the wall to create an image in metaphor. The tension between the elements echoes from one to the other. The figures are treated in a realistic manner. They are close to life size

and they stand on a low base which is incorporated into the landscape. One senses the figures as passing by the tree line and caught by the presence of the gaze upon it almost as a vision. The portrayal of the figures is consistent with history. They wear the uniform and carry the equipment of the war. They are young. The contrast between the innocence of their youth and the weapons of wars underscores the poignancy of their sacrifice. This is developed in the contrast and sense of unity that speaks of the bounds of love and sacrifice that is the nature of man and war. Yet, they are each alone. Their strength and their vulnerability are both evident.

I see the wall as the kind of ocean, a sea of sacrifice that is overwhelming and nearly incomprehensible in its <sup>SWEEP</sup> streak of names. I place these figures upon the shore of that sea, gazing upon it, standing in <sup>vigil</sup> visual before it, reflecting the human face of it, the human <sup>heart</sup> art.

Thank you.

Mr. Kent Cooper and Mr. Joseph Brown.

MR. COOPER: My name is Kent Cooper. We have appeared before you on prior occasions as project architects for the Vietnam Veterans Memorial.

In March 1982, when you concurred with Secretary

Watt's request that was forwarded through VVMF that a flag and statue be relocated on the site, the task fell to us to work with the designated parties, the Sculptor Selection Committee and our own consultants, to ensure a proper location of these added symbolic elements be found, without damaging the basic memorial design.

Our task has been an unusually difficult one, for many individuals who have been involved in this project feel that aesthetics can be separated from such MESSAGE issues as "appropriate patriotic content" and "political message." We have taken a consistent stand that aesthetics in itself is an important component message and cannot be separated out. So, therefore, in approaching these changes, we have therefore designed to ensure that the basic nonpolitical message of the memorial is preserved and the inherent aesthetic attributes of the basic concept are preserved.

In this process, we have been served well by the fact that Miss Lin's concept is grand enough to overcome any but the most blatant intrusion.

Frederick Hart's concept, three close to life-size realistic figures placed carefully along the perimeter tree line facing the walls, seems to us to be an acceptable resolution that is placed before us.

Joe Brown from <sup>EDAW</sup> Utah who has been landscape consultant to the Sculpture Committee, will explain the process by which the location for the sculpture was determined.

MR. BROWN: Mr. Chairman, it is a pleasure to be at your usual low key roll up your sleeves meeting here.

I need to use the model and I need to use some boards so I am going to have to leave the podium.

CHAIRMAN BROWN: Please feel free.

MR. BROWN: I would like to start with this analysis plan and then we will place the sculpture and the flag on the model.

CHAIRMAN BROWN: If there are people who would like to hear this, is one of the microphones detachable perhaps?

MR. BROWN: Thank you.

There are several natures at work here and, as Kent said, we have all worked together to try to deal with all of these.

He must have liked the first line (indicating microphone).

CHAIRMAN BROWN: Some of the microphone work, too.

MR. BROWN: This is in the nature of the site and way back several years ago, we were hired by the Fund to

select a site, and we did that. There is the nature of the wall, very implicitly involved with the site at this point, and there is the nature of the sculpture which I believe Rick has eloquently described. The sculpture was underway as the site selection process began. An important aspect of the nature of the site and the wall is the vertex and that is the crucial design aspect and the angles that come from that and the great change that comes from that.

With that in mind, we began -- and this drawing tries to sum up, and I hope you can all see it, tries to sum up the issues that we went through. From the very beginning, we were fascinated with the tree line because it, other than the wall, is a major feature of this site. The trees present a kind of growth and living opportunity to work with lights, filtered lights, shade and shadow. The approach that you can have through the trees to the site, as well as the approach from various angles of the wall along the trees. We like the spatial edge of the trees and we like the fact that the tree line was sufficiently distant from the wall that we felt the immediate area of the wall would not be violated in any way. The wall could be experienced acceptably.

We like the fact that the tree line and just outside the tree line presented a plateau that was not

8  
—  
integrated into the slope so you were off the slope. We liked the way the sweep of the slope suggested an area for inner activity in several ways. First, a closeup, the sculpture could be interactive with the trees in a literal way, the lights, the position and the approach. In a distant activity much as Rick has talked about, the relationship of the sculpture and the wall in a distant way could have an inner active quality. So we began focusing in on this area.

We immediately eliminated before that several other areas. Certainly nothing could go here and block that angle and view to the Washington Monument because, as we all know, the wall creates this beautifully simple directional connection a mile down the Mall. It does the similar thing in this direction. So those areas had to be avoided.

Obviously, we felt the vertex had to be avoided. We then began to try to draw a zone. We had a lot of people involved and we wanted to meet a diverse sense of values for this memorial in siting the sculpture.

We initially, in working with the tree line, came on this area right here. This is <sup>an</sup> red maples that <sup>were</sup> planted around the Constitutional Gardens renovation. We like the quality of that, almost architectural, and there were several options. There were two locations thought of initially in

— this zone, one at 150 feet and one at 170. It provided certain opportunities as you approached from really the basic entry direction. We have said we defer to this as the entry direction mostly because it is probably closer to a greater number of parking spaces. The information pylon is also sited here. There is opportunity for access here as well and through the trees as well. You can see we have diagrammed what those access areas are through the trees. So the views along the tree line from this direction along the tree line to this direction, we like that area.

We then went to the site several times. We placed some models in real scale on the site, and we are all prepared to do that with you today at your leisure. And we felt that this tree edge was getting too tight when you projected the growth of these trees, and that is what we have done. We have projected the growth of the red maples to maturity to be realistic and factual. Then we found another area which was a little bit more open, a pass-through space, and as you walk the site a great deal, you find this major path through the trees, and we liked that approach area. This really appeared to be a more minor path through the trees. So we selected this area, this is 180 feet from the vertex, and this is give or take five feet.

CHAIRMAN BROWN: One hundred seventy?

MR. BROWN: It is really 180, and the back of this square is 185, but that is for your consideration.

We projected the growth of the <sup>liquidambar (sweet gum)</sup> liquid ambers which grow a little bit bigger than the red maples, and you can see when you go to the site, and that is important to go to the site, the nature of how this fits in the opening of these trees. It has some space around it for its own character and this is 180-foot distance from the wall. Usually at your meetings we put these drawings at your table. We won't do it.

CHAIRMAN BROWN: You are welcome to do it. We can see it rather well.

However, one point of information while you have got it up there.

When you refer to the site, could you point out for the benefit of the Commission what the boundaries of the congressionally mandated site actually are?

MR. BROWN: That is a tough question.

MR. COOPER: They are generally what you see on the model here. The perimeter is the circulation path around the immediate area, and here is the lowland right where the land is. There is an arbitrary line that the land is cut off on.



CHAIRMAN BROWN: So it would go all the way to the encompassing path?

MR. COOPER: That is correct.

CHAIRMAN BROWN: Could you point that out on the design?

MR. BROWN: Here it is (indicating).

MR. COOPER: Where the X is.

CHAIRMAN BROWN: And it goes down to the curves to the north as well.

MR. COOPER: All the way here where it necks down, you have a cutoff and that is the end of the site.

MR. BROWN: We drew the line in of the tree angle and we thought that was an important line for your consideration.

We also drew the radius of the wall dimensions and we thought that was an important dimension. Our zones are located between those two lines.

Mr. Chairman, something you know far better than I do, we did look at the distance factor on the statue as far as body gesture, head position and eye contact, and at what dimensions from certain entry to circulation paths these were visible and weren't visible, and that was another reason for coming to this 180 plus minus five location beyond 200 from

the walkway, we felt body position was less visible than acceptable and head vision becomes visible as you approach it, 180, 150 feet to -- you see position. Eye contact we thought was something to be discovered as you move closer to the subject.

● As we looked into these questions, we could see what needs to be debated and what these dimensions are. With that, we prepared this drawing.

I believe that you will recall from the exhibit that opened several weeks ago the sculpture was located over here and there had been constant discussion, I think creative discussion, among everyone for the best solution, for the site in question, and we feel that is the location right now.

And with that, we can place these objects in the area. You may want to stand up.

I would offer several points of advice in viewing the model. The tree positions on the model are not entirely accurate. They are on the analysis drawing and the site plan. You can see the growth patterns also of the trees on the analysis plan, and that concludes what I have to say.

CHAIRMAN BROWN: All right. Fine.

I would like to say that at the appropriate moment, which is presumably after we have heard the testimony, the

Commission plans to go over to the site so that they can take one more look at it, the way it looks today, although it may be a little damp, and then we will return for the final determination here. So that we would adjourn the meeting at a certain point just for a quick site inspection, which we want to do with the benefit of all the testimony in our heads as we go over there, and then we will come back here. And that will be later on in the afternoon.

At this moment, if there are members of the Commission who would like to --

MR. COOPER: Mr. Chairman, we were not quite done with our presentation. We have another issue.

MR. BROWN: Also have the styrofoam in the trailer waiting for your arrival. They will be in place when you get there.

CHAIRMAN BROWN: It won't be for awhile, looking at the number of people that want to testify.

MR. COOPER: Secondly, the issue of the flag.

We have long held the opinion that our Nation's flag should not be included in any composition without extreme care. It is a powerful symbolic element, demanding a precise locational concept. In consideration of this, we would like to share with you the fact that multiple locations,

each one having some pros and cons to it, were reviewed. I would like to use a little bit gross -- a little bit over-scale a model of a flag, but it is large enough so that I think you can see it to discuss these locations with you.

First, we would like you to see the -- the point of the departure that James Webb talked about, which is the placement of a flag literally at the apex.

The positive aspects of this location would obviously be that the entire horizontal thrust of the walls would be resolved upward into this element. The negative aspects of it, of this location, would be that the basic unresolved contemplative geometry of the ground would be resolved into a single vertical element and this, of course, was not the intent of the basic design. There are a variety of locations which are behind the apex, here, here, here, which also have been considered.

The positive aspects of such a location would be that any viewer facing the walls, would not be able to view the walls without viewing our flag simultaneously. The discrete separation from the apex would be interpreted, perhaps, by the viewer as an attempt to separate the flag far enough so that the upward thrust issue is taken care of, and yet the flag would have a separate identity. If placed slightly east

of the apex, which is the location I have placed it in here, a dynamic tension across the apex with the sculpture would be established. The negative aspects of this location will inevitably be that the flag staff, given the foot foot plus length of the walls, may have a scale problem somewhat reminiscent of a golf course. In addition, the flag would not be properly viewed by those persons who are walking along the path below near the apex. From that location, when visible, the flag staff would then appear truncated.

A third possibility, of course, would be the location of the flag with the sculptures. The positive aspects of such a location would be to concentrate the added elements so that they might gain symbolic power. The negative aspect is that the proposed sculptural concept, unlike Iwo Jima in many ways, does not use the flag as an integral symbolic element. This sculpture and that location do not seem to coalesce.

Finally, the fourth possible location of the study was a location of the flag near the west entry to the site. The positive aspects of this location are that it places the flag at a "western destination" opposing the ring of flags at the base of the Washington Monument, allowing the face view of the memorial walls to remain unencumbered and making the

"flag experience" essentially one of pedestrian circulation, both on top of and "inside the walls." The negative aspects of this location are that it may be considered too remote.

This problem of flag location has indeed been difficult. A clear consensus has not emerged. The Sculpture Selection Committee has recommended to you location for a flag staff that is generally opposite, across the apex, in the location that I have indicated here.

There is a broader consideration that is also of importance, that is the design of Constitution Gardens, and the whole Mall park itself. Any location which places the flag on or near the apex will make the flag not only a Vietnam Memorial event, but will also make it the long view "identification element" for the entire Constitution Gardens area. A direct view exists from Monument Hill directly into this site. We ask you also to consider this aspect of flag placement in your deliberations.

If you would like, we have additional information with respect to the design of the base of the flagpole which seems to be consistent with any one of the numerous locations. The height of the flagpole, which I would assume, which has been nominally forwarded to you is 50 feet, would be adjusted somewhat when the exact location is known. It could be 45,

it could be 55.

Finally, if you would like to see a little sketch of the locator device which is essentially a three-foot high <sup>round</sup> ground cylinder that has the directory of names built into it, in a weather protected way, we would be happy to give you one.

CHAIRMAN BROWN: Yes, we would like to see one.

MR. COOPER: I see nodding of heads so I will do that.

CHAIRMAN BROWN: Where would be locator be put and why?

MR. COOPER: The locator device would be placed along the path, essentially at the west end. This has been designated as a handicapped entrance to the site. The reinforcement has been extended outward from the walls in this direction. It is felt that ~~that~~ seems to be a visible and sensible location for such a device to be placed. It is possible to do more than one of the -- if this turns out to be the case, we are proposing to use a standard, really an off-the-shelf element. The locator itself being in the form of a book, not unlike a telephone book, except the larger type than the locating device system.

CHAIRMAN BROWN: Waterproof.

MR. COOPER: When the book is not in use, it falls back, as you can see, into a waterproof case. And this is a telephone company approved system for the preservation of a document of this sort.

CHAIRMAN BROWN: And would you replace the book then if pages became torn out?

MR. COOPER: That is correct.

Are there any questions regarding the issue of placement?

MR. NETSCH: Could that be pointed out on the drawing, please?

MR. COOPER: It sure could (indicating).

MR. NOVAK: If I could have the placing of the flag, the west end flag, the comparison?

MR. COOPER: West end flag, if that were ultimately your recommendation, would be placed approximately in there and the locator device would be outside that.

MR. NOVAK: What was the last consideration you mentioned with the effect to the monument --

MR. COOPER: That because of the opening in the trees, there is the one leak in the site, it is entirely tree surrounded all the way around, that this view, of course, that this points straight to the Washington Monument, anything that



is in that area in terms of a flagpole is what you are going to see from Monument Hill is the Vietnam Memorial. A 50-foot high pole will become the visual distinction of the whole Constitution Gardens experience. Because that is the only thing that sticks up.

CHAIRMAN BROWN: How about from the Lincoln Memorial? If it were done western site, would it be visible from the steps of the Lincoln Memorial?

MR. COOPER: It would be visible from the Lincoln steps only in winter because the foliage is so dense you could hardly see through.

When we were trying to locate the memorial walls, which was done during the season of foliation, we had a dickens of a time getting a site really on that. So it is really dense. It is quite bare in the winter.

CHAIRMAN BROWN: All right.

Any further questions?

MR. NOVAK: Would you consider the entrance on the west end as a handicapped?

MR. COOPER: We have taken the position from the start that the memorial could be accessed from any side equally and with success. We know that the tourist path is basically from -- this is the point of arrival, from the

Lincoln Memorial, right around in here. And by virtue of not taking the path on out and allowing this thing to float, this grass, we try to say come as you want. The trees are all trimmed up, it is a series of stalks with free pedestrian circulation all around them, and we don't really care. We did feel that it was quite important, given the idea of having this float to take care of the wheelchair. We have done this with the reinforced turf system, by means by anchor mats, which is the same thing put under pro football playing fields.

CHAIRMAN BROWN: You remember that we pointed out access for the handicapped in the previous meeting.

What is the tourmobile route?

MR. COOPER: Mr. Brown, I don't think that this has been finally settled as to where the stop is going to be. I heard a couple of different things. One is obviously along Bacon Drive, right at this end. Another one would be a single stop for both the signers memorial and the Vietnam Memorial. I don't know which that is going to come out. This is the closest -- this end is the closest of automotive access to the site. Henry Bacon Drive. This is right up here.

CHAIRMAN BROWN: All right. Thank you.

Any further questions by the members of the Commission?

Then Mr. Scruggs.

MR. SCRUGGS: Mr. Chairman, members of the Commission, I am James Scruggs, President and founder of the Vietnam Veterans Memorial Fund.

I am very much honored to be here today speaking before you once again, and I would like also to express my personal appreciation to your beginning work on the long overdue Veterans Memorial.

Just to clear up any confusion regarding our recommendation for the location of the flag, we do recommend that it be behind the apex where it's presently sited.

I would now like to read a letter from a former member of the Commission of Fine Arts who was a juror in our design competition and a very prominent internationally known landscape architect, Mr. Sasaki <sup>Correct</sup> (phonetic). He writes:

"Dear Jan: I unfortunately shall not be able to attend the Fine Arts Commission meeting held to review the sculpture and flagpole. Obviously because I have not seen the proposed sculpture nor its relationship to the memorial wall, I cannot express an opinion as to its design or its artistic merit. Moreover, it is properly the province of the Fine Arts Commission members to decide this question rather than mine. I would like to note, however, that in any competition, a jury

—

may select a winning design, not because it is so perfect that it cannot be improved, but because it is the best of the lot. I remember at least several jury members in evaluating the winning selection, expressing views on how the design should be modified to be more suitable for public use. The matter of public safety is one approach to all, from the upper side is one question. Matters not only technical but aesthetic were also discussed. Thus, it is not certain that the design by Maya Ying Lin need be irrevocably compromised by the changes which require technical, visual or, indeed, programmatic needs. As I understand it from verbal descriptions given to me, the proposed sculptural group by Mr. Hart is not part of the visual mass of the wall but is placed at some distance and in opposition to it. Other works of other artists, if sensitively done, enhance the totality of the design. I hope the latter is true." We certainly appreciate the letter from Mr. Sasaki,

In closing, I do wish to state that I formed the Vietnam Veterans Memorial Fund a little over three years ago to create a national memorial honoring my fellow Vietnam veterans and, of course, I served there as an enlisted man with the United States Army. I was wounded, decorated for gallantry, and I am proud that the names of all who fell in

Vietnam will be forever on the Mall. It was certainly never my intention of this project to become the object of so much disagreement and so much controversy. Yet, it was never my intention for this project to be viewed as a textbook example of how to select a public work of art.

The statue is a great tribute to those who served in Vietnam who are very, very highly praised among Vietnam veterans and among those who once again want to be united behind building this national memorial.

Thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN BROWN: Thank you very much.

This, I take it, completes the leadoff presentation and we now open the floor to the people who have registered their support of the proposal. The first being the Under Secretary of the Department of Interior, Honorable Donald Hodel.

MR. HODEL: Mr. Chairman, members of the Commission, I appreciate this opportunity to appear before you on behalf of Secretary of the Interior James Watt to outline our position on a very important matter, the Vietnam Veterans Memorial. For too long, our Nation largely ignored the veterans of Vietnam; very few were welcomed home with public appreciation for their commitment to duty and service to their