

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

country. This, of course, was a marked contrast to the welcome accorded to veterans of previous conflicts.

Fortunately, there were those with the requisite courage, foresight, and compassion to act to ensure that this wrong was corrected. Hence, efforts were started to authorize, build and dedicate a fitting memorial to the thousands who served our country in Vietnam. The effort bore fruit in 1980, when Congress enacted PL 96-297, which authorized the Vietnam Veterans Memorial Fund, VVMF, to design and construct a memorial to our Vietnam veterans.

Of course, we are all familiar with the controversy that has engulfed this project since the initial design was accepted by the VVMF. Many argued that the initial design was appropriate; others maintained it honored only those who died in the war, and some contended it made an unacceptable political statement about our Nation's role in Vietnam. It was particularly distressing that much of the criticism came from the veterans themselves who are, after all, the group we are seeking to honor.

Since the Secretary is required to approve the memorial pursuant to the terms of the Congressional authorization, we were subjected to considerable pressure to totally disapprove VVMF's initial submission, radically modify it, or

insist that the design process be started all over again. Simultaneously, many Members of Congress with a deep and abiding interest in the memorial were also seeing and feeling the results of the controversy. Fortunately, a group of Senators and Representatives under the leadership of Senator John Warner intervened to determine if an appropriate solution could be devised. Following consultation with interested Members of Congress and veterans, Secretary Watt committed himself and the Department to working with the Congressional group and the veterans organizations to achieve a resolution.

Others can provide more explicit details of the long and often difficult sessions that Senator Warner chaired. The result of these efforts was a basic agreement among the veterans that the initial design would be augmented by the addition of a flagpole to fly the American flag and a sculpture depicting a serviceman or men. This became known as the "compromise." This compromise was accepted by the veterans. It was accepted by the interested Members of Congress. Based on this consensus, the Secretary then communicated with this Commission and the National Capital Planning Commission regarding the compromise and received assurances that led him to believe that both would act favorably to approve the design refinements. Following such general

acceptance and the receipt of assurances, the Secretary issued the required construction permits to VVMF. Let me repeat that the Secretary of the Interior has acted in good faith to carry out this compromise, with assurances from this Commission that a flag and sculpture would be approved.

VVMF acted quickly to make the refined design a reality by commissioning a noted sculptor and taking steps to determine a suitable location for the sculpture and the flag. On September 23rd, VVMF submitted the sculpture design and siting and the location of the flag to the Secretary for his review and approval. In keeping with our commitment to the compromise and our desire to support the veterans, the Secretary quickly and enthusiastically approved the refinements and submitted them to this Commission for your consideration today.

We have, however, made one change from the previous arrangement in March to accommodate the concerns of the veterans organizations. Originally, it was agreed that the memorial would not be dedicated until it was complete, including the flag and the sculpture. It was brought to the Secretary's attention that a National Salute to Vietnam Veterans has been scheduled for the period of November 11 through the 13th, 1982. Veterans groups led by the American

Legion, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, AmVets, and the Disabled Veterans requested that the memorial be dedicated during this salute when thousands of veterans, especially including those of the Vietnam conflict, will be in Washington. Since it would be fitting and appropriate to dedicate this memorial during this salute, the Secretary indicated that he is prepared to issue the requisite permits for a dedication to occur. However, we remain totally committed to ensuring execution of the compromise.

Accordingly, we will issue the dedication permits if the compromise design refinements are approved by this Commission and the National Capital Planning Commission even though the sculpture cannot be completed in time for the salute. To permit dedication of the memorial to proceed if the flag and sculpture have not yet been approved would be to break faith with all those who negotiated in good faith to reach a compromise last March.

Consequently, we urge the Commission to approve immediately the design refinements submitted to us by the Vietnam Veterans Memorial Fund and transmitted to you by the Secretary. The Secretary has personally viewed the model of the sculpture, seen the site model indicating the location of our flag, and walked the site of the memorial. He believes

that the addition of these items will create a powerful monument to those who served out country in Vietnam and to those who made the ultimate sacrifice. We find it incomprehensible that adding a sculpture of three servicemen and our Nation's flag constitutes an affront to anyone or diminishes this memorial. We also believe that we must remember the purpose of this memorial: it commemorates and honors the service that thousands rendered to their country. We would do well to listen to those who we are honoring and ensure that the memorial meets with their approval.

Thank you.

MR. NETSCH: Mr. Secretary, I am curious. No one in this room is opposed to having the American flag at the memorial. I am just curious as to whether a policy is being established that all memorials have flags? I am just trying to understand. You use the word "compromise."

I don't think a flag is a compromise. Does that mean that there will be a flag flying at every memorial in Washington?

MR. HODEL: I do not believe that issue is before the Commission. It appears to me that this is the result of earnest efforts by people of good will and good faith attempting to work out a very specific and difficult issue.

CHAIRMAN BROWN: Thank you very much, Mr. Secretary.

I understand that the Honorable Don Bailey, Member of Congress, would also like to speak at this point.

MR. BAILEY: Mr. Chairman, members of the Commission. I have found it necessary to preface my remarks on this subject by making a request that you bear with me because it is a very emotional issue for me. I want to speak to you not as a Member of Congress who has worked on this issue as much as I speak to you from the viewpoint of a Vietnam veteran who has spent many, many months in very heavy combat in Vietnam, as someone who has been deeply affected by the return to a country I love very much and has been involved in trying to bring together something that no mere issue of aesthetics can take away from this issue, and that is the context of feelings, emotions, history and purpose in which the memorial is going to be built and is going to exist.

One thing that I would like to do away with at the outset was something which is very, very sad. There has never been involved by the people who work on this memorial, on either side, on any side, the multitude of issues that we have faced, any issue of racism. I know that you have a very important decision to make, all of you, and it is very important that you make it in light of a number of ideas, and

I know that you are sensitive to that. It is very unfortunate that the CBS report on this issue conveyed that impression. I had never heard it raised. I made a number of speeches on the floor of the House, I have heard over a thousand, and I reviewed them just this morning, correspondence that never had a single objection to the ethnicity to the design. Anyone who fought in Vietnam knows that we fought along Thai soldiers, Orientals, Koreans, Orientals, both of those groups were terrific fighters. We fought alongside South Vietnamese, some of which were just outstanding. That is not an issue. Please don't believe that. It never has been. It has been created and thrown into this, and it never should have been.

When the whole effort got underway, I had initially objected because of the desire not to invoke any sort of political message or avoid that as a message in itself, that was an objection that I had originally raised.

I think the issue that you are being drawn into, and that is why this room is full today and why you have so much media attention, is not the issue of aesthetics. The issue still remains for the United States of America why the war was fought. As that memorial is built in that clash of ideas, the memorial is being built at a time when the legacy of the war itself turns to the sufferings of the veterans who



sacrificed their lives, and the legacy in this country, and now what exists in Vietnam are all converging, and it is a legacy of someone who is proud of their service, someone who believes strongly in the reasons why that war was fought and still does. But the difficult legacy that is being faced now does not reflect poorly on those who fought there. Out of that strong belief, and it is shared by a great many, there were meetings held. I daresay that the individuals who I think jealously guarded and properly so their initial involvement are good people, well intentioned people who, in a spirit of compromise, compromise agreed with those who objected, but the fair thing to do was to make some alterations in designs. Those alterations cannot and do not violate the aesthetic purity of what has been done. At least not in the opinion of those that care about the message that it conveys. Fundamentally, that message is political whether anyone in this room likes it or not; whether our country likes it or not. It is an issue that you as a Commission are going to have to face if you remove, for example, in a meaningful way the American flag from the recommendation that has been made, it is going to raise a question of the value and message of that memorial.

If you do away with the statue, if you place it too far away or do something with it, I notice the question you

ask, the reason I say this, you asked a question on site, my mind began to work obviously in terms of will it work, that is available to you in that definition. I only ask, and I beg all of you in the most humble way that I can, not as a Member of Congress or not as a legislator with authority to write law, but as a veteran of that war, that you please consider and understand that -- and this is my personal opinion, for the vast majority of American soldiers who fought in Vietnam, who are still tortured, deeply and painfully tortured by the one question that still clouds the entire issue, that question whether or not they fought for a proper reason. Because that is what baits at the pride. That is what carries the message of an insult, that in light of recent history of the boat people, of the incredibly large number of refugees from that country, the greatest political outmigration in recent history -- you see it nowhere in this country in terms of population in this country -- virtual genocide in Cambodia, that you allow us please to carry a message of honor and respect and recognition of the reasons why that war was fought, by allowing us to add in the compromise fashion that has been suggested to you these very basic and surely, from an aesthetic point of view, hopefully minor design changes. But they represent a huge world of difference to us.

Personally I had felt that the most important thing that could be done was the inscription, and I basically lost that battle. Although it would be one that basically the flag policy will make references to at least one issue of ultimate political value. A simple thing called freedom that maybe doesn't mean much in a free and wealthy society. But when your face is dirty and a friend is dead and you haven't bathed in a long time and you are hungry, and you are surrounded, and you don't know if you are going to live or die, there is an issue of pride that keeps you pursuing what you believe in. And when you see newspapers and magazines and letters from home, and you pick up pieces of paper alongside a trail credit- ing North Vietnam, telling you to repatriate yourself and jump President Johnson's dirty imperialistic war, you have to look inside yourself for a degree of persistence that carries you through. As a leader, something that you can reach for that enables you to put your hands on a fellow citizen, there were black citizens, I had superior officers that were black that were fantastic leaders, I had Japanese-Americans, Filipinos, Hispanics from the United States, Hispanic ethnicity, you had to have a reason why you tell a kid something that is going to take his life. That is what that statue is and that is what that flag represents to us.

I really plead with you to give us that. It is not much to ask. I am not a judge of the aesthetic of that wall. I think it is pretty standing by itself, I guess. I just question whether or not the purpose and the intent standing by itself are the reason for the memorial to stand. I hope that in the evaluation of that those things there that you are much better schooled in appreciation of art, I don't know, because I don't have that expertise, that you will consider the message. There is a political message. No matter what is done, I will not change it.

Thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN BROWN: Thank you very much.

We now proceed with those who have requested to speak in support of these modifications.

I would remind you that, as published in the Federal Register, our guidelines ask that testimony be limited to a maximum recommended by the Chairman in the circumstances which we would hope would be three to five minutes, and that each speaker try to limit himself as much as possible to new material, new thoughts or arguments that have not already been established in the record. You can understand the reasons for this. There are limits in the number of hours in the day and one could go on ad infinitum, and the case has

been put most eloquently, but we are particularly interested in hearing from representatives of the veterans' community, and we would like to give them priority in this testimony. So that the first would be Cooper T. Holt.

MR. HOLT; Mr. Chairman, members of the Fine Arts Commission, I am Cooper T. Holt, and I am the Director of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, Washington office.

I appear before you today representing the views of the Veterans of Foreign Wars regarding the proposed sculpture and flag staff for the Vietnam Veterans Memorial.

The Veterans of Foreign Wars represent 1.9 million war veterans and 9,500 posts throughout our great Nation. Among its membership, the VFW has over 530,000 veterans who served in the country of Vietnam.

We thank you for the opportunity of presenting our views. In June 1981, our National Commander in Chief asked all of our Post Commanders for 100 percent participation in raising money for this long overdue tribute to those Americans who served in the Vietnam War. At the same time, we ran a photograph of the basic memorial design in an article describing the project in our VFW National Magazine. This article also asked all posts and auxiliaries to sponsor the

been put most eloquently, but we are particularly interested in hearing from representatives of the veterans' community, and we would like to give them priority in this testimony. So that the first would be Cooper T. Holt.

MR. HOLT; Mr. Chairman, members of the Fine Arts Commission, I am Cooper T. Holt, and I am the Director of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, Washington office.

I appear before you today representing the views of the Veterans of Foreign Wars regarding the proposed sculpture and flag staff for the Vietnam Veterans Memorial.

The Veterans of Foreign Wars represent 1.9 million war veterans and 9,500 posts throughout our great Nation. Among its membership, the VFW has over 530,000 veterans who served in the country of Vietnam.

We thank you for the opportunity of presenting our views. In June 1981, our National Commander in Chief asked all of our Post Commanders for 100 percent participation in raising money for this long overdue tribute to those Americans who served in the Vietnam War. At the same time, we ran a photograph of the basic memorial design in an article describing the project in our VFW National Magazine. This article also asked all posts and auxiliaries to sponsor the

project. The response in the magazine article was extremely gratifying.

In December of 1981, we presented a check of \$180,000 to the Vietnam Veterans Memorial Fund and an additional \$40,000 was sent directly to the Fund by our individual posts. Our support for the Vietnam Veterans Memorial continues undiminished, and we urge you to approve today the basic proposal for the sculpture and the flag staff.

The VFW finds the basic design of the memorial to be eloquent, novel and ideally suited to the environment of Constitution Gardens designed, as you know, <sup>BY</sup> ~~by~~ <sup>Bi-</sup> <sub>A</sub> the Centennial. Our members contributed to have this concept built and we observed the gratification that this basic design was completed. We are equally enthusiastic about the proposed sculpture and the flag staff.

While the memorial walls are a magnificent expression of this Nation's belated honor for its Vietnam veterans, the sculpture magnificently presents their courage, their sacrifices and, of course, their youth. It captures one of the perhaps intimate number of moments in war when young men, when in difficult circumstances, far from home, are sustained by their comradeship and sense of mutual protection.

For me personally, a glance at this beautiful work

takes my thoughts to a time when I was many years younger, afraid, but willing and proud to serve my country. The addition of this sculpture to the memorial site will commemorate for every veteran of Vietnam, as they were during what was most expected of them during time of war. The human touch of the sculpture is a significant enhancement, we feel, of the memorial itself. It goes without saying, ladies and gentlemen, for which Vietnam veterans fought should fly proudly above the memorial in their honor. We support its addition to the site. We urge this Commission to ensure that the proposed elements are placed on the memorial site at the most appropriate and artistic location with relation to the walls, yet in such a way that all elements, the walls, the flag staff and sculpture, are integrated units.

Opinions may differ, but one point is certain, ladies and gentlemen. Men and women who serve their country in foreign wars deserve our honor, and this memorial is for them above all else. This November, up to 250,000 veterans of Vietnam will come to Washington for the four-day national salute in their honor. The dedication of the memorial during the salute can be the culmination of this historic event, depending, of course, on your action.

In conclusion, the VFW thanks you again for this

INC.  
N.E.  
1977



opportunity to express our views and to urge you to approve today the proposal presented.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN BROWN: Thank you very much.

Next Mr. Joseph E. Miller representing the American Legion.

MR. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, members of the Commission of Fine Arts, I am Joseph E. Miller. I am Assistant Legislative Director of the National American Legion.

Our comments, like many comments referred to here today, are positive.

We would like to thank you for the opportunity to present our views concerning the proposed statue design and the flagpole for the Vietnam Veterans Memorial.

For two years, the Legion has been firmly committed to the memorial and opposed to efforts which would seek to delay its construction and dedication. To achieve this, \$1 million was donated by members of the American Legion and American Legion Auxiliaries from all across the Nation. This \$1 million did not come from a few individuals but rather from small donations averaging less than \$9.

Today, the American Legion's support for this worthwhile project continues undiminished and extends to the

opportunity to express our views and to urge you to approve today the proposal presented.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN BROWN: Thank you very much.

Next Mr. Joseph E. Miller representing the American Legion.

MR. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, members of the Commission of Fine Arts, I am Joseph E. Miller. I am Assistant Legislative Director of the National American Legion.

Our comments, like many comments referred to here today, are positive.

We would like to thank you for the opportunity to present our views concerning the proposed statue design and the flagpole for the Vietnam Veterans Memorial.

For two years, the Legion has been firmly committed to the memorial and opposed to efforts which would seek to delay its construction and dedication. To achieve this, \$1 million was donated by members of the American Legion and American Legion Auxiliaries from all across the Nation. This \$1 million did not come from a few individuals but rather from small donations averaging less than \$9.

Today, the American Legion's support for this worthwhile project continues undiminished and extends to the

sculpture designed by Mr. Hart. We recognize that there are those who oppose the statue's design and its inclusion as a part of the memorial. But memorials and controversy are not new to Washington. Eight months ago, in order to bring an end to the debate, supporters and opponents of the basic design met to determine whether certain modifications could be agreed upon which would satisfy the opponents while protecting the basic design and integrity.

Agreement was reached and the modification package was subsequently approved in concept by this Commission. With these actions already taken, we believe that the only question remaining is whether the statue submitted for consideration meets the design modification criteria. In our opinion, the answer is yes. Others, of course, may choose to evaluate the artistic qualities of Mr. Hart's sculpture, but their arguments will always be debatable. We are not critics, we are veterans, and can only express our support for the process in which the basic design and modifications were selected.

We believe it important to reemphasize the American Legion's commitment to the memorial project. That commitment goes beyond our financial contribution. As an organization with 700,000 Vietnam veterans, we are emotionally committed to

the completion of this project at the earliest possible time.

We have participated actively in this endeavor during the past two years. We attended the marathon sessions held earlier this year to resolve the conundrum created by those who saw the basic design as a symbol which depersonalized the war and failed to recognize those who served in the war. We listened to all the arguments, and our support for the memorial remained steadfast. However, in an effort to accommodate the opinions of several recognized spokesmen of the Vietnam experience, we agreed to the modifications which addressed their concerns.

We expressed our commitment to the process by which those modifications would be selected. That commitment remains firm and we are here to advise the Commission that we support the selection of Mr. Hart's submittal, as well as the flagpole. It does provide a human element to the basic contemplative design, the combination of which creates a dignified and eloquent tribute to those who served in Vietnam. We have heard and will hear many opinions regarding how best to honor Vietnam veterans and how best to select designs for public art and public monuments. Yet, we are convinced that no matter how sincere the effort, perfection in method and design will continue to be elusive. The crucial fact is that

this memorial is for and about Vietnam veterans.

Therefore, the American Legion urges this Commission to approve the design modifications which have been submitted for its consideration. We further urge that an approval decision be rendered today.

Mr. Chairman, the preceding statement has been wholeheartedly endorsed by the Amvets, NCO Association, National Association for Uniformed Services and the Reserve Officers Association of the United States, representatives of which are in the audience now. The endorsers represent over 575,000 members, 175,000 of which are Vietnam veterans. When combined with the membership of the American Legion, these organizations represent the views of 3.2 million war-time veterans, 925,000 of which served during the Vietnam era.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BROWN: Thank you very much.

Next will be Mr. Morgan S. Ruph, Amvets.

MR. RUPH: Mr. Chairman, I am Morgan S. Ruph of Amvets.

On behalf of our 200,000 member organization, we express to you our appreciation for the opportunity to come before you today to present our views on the proposed

this memorial is for and about Vietnam veterans.

Therefore, the American Legion urges this Commission to approve the design modifications which have been submitted for its consideration. We further urge that an approval decision be rendered today.

Mr. Chairman, the preceding statement has been wholeheartedly endorsed by the Amvets, NCO Association, National Association for Uniformed Services and the Reserve Officers Association of the United States, representatives of which are in the audience now. The endorsers represent over 575,000 members, 175,000 of which are Vietnam veterans. When combined with the membership of the American Legion, these organizations represent the views of 3.2 million war-time veterans, 925,000 of which served during the Vietnam era.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BROWN: Thank you very much.

Next will be Mr. Morgan S. Ruph, Amvets.

MR. RUPH: Mr. Chairman, I am Morgan S. Ruph of Amvets.

On behalf of our 200,000 member organization, we express to you our appreciation for the opportunity to come before you today to present our views on the proposed

additions of the Vietnam Veterans Memorial.

Amvets has supported the Vietnam memorial since its inception and have contributed a substantial sum to its construction. We feel that we have been actively involved in the process over the past several years, and our membership is extremely interested in having this memorial dedicated as soon as possible.

We agree with the positions presented by our fellow organizations, the American Legion and the Veterans of Foreign Wars, and we believe that the time has come to put aside controversy and debate over this memorial. We feel that the additions of Mr. Hart's statue and the American flag will offer a positive enhancement of the basic memorial design.

Further, we believe that the additions to the existing design will provide an eloquent tribute to the two and a half million men and women who served their Nation so well in the Vietnam War.

On behalf of the entire membership of Amvets, I am proud to say that we thoroughly concur with the presentations made by the Vietnam Veterans Memorial Fund and its supporters and we urge this Commission to grant final approval to this project, and we look forward to your favorable decision and hopefully a dedication at the conclusion of the national

salute to Vietnam veterans in November.

Thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN BROWN: Thank you very much.

Next will be Admiral Mark Hill, Naval Aviation Association.

MR. HILL: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for the opportunity to testify, and I will do it briefly.

I represent the organization of Naval Aviation Association, the Chairman of which, Admiral Thomas Moore, the former Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, was able to get Senator Warner to set up the meeting from which we developed this compromise.

I represent an organization of people who made the greatest contribution in the Vietnam conflict in one service, the U. S. Navy, and that is our Naval Angels. We are all professionals. Whether or not we spend a lifetime in the service or just do obligated service, we are volunteers and professionals. We must be to survive on and off those ships. Everyone of our men, almost without exception, to our pilots was involved in the conflict because of the limitation of the numbers, and easily those who sacrificed as much as those who lived in the prison camps of North Vietnam were largely Naval aviators.



salute to Vietnam veterans in November.

Thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN BROWN: Thank you very much.

Next will be Admiral Mark Hill, Naval Aviation Association.

MR. HILL: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for the opportunity to testify, and I will do it briefly.

I represent the organization of Naval Aviation Association, the Chairman of which, Admiral Thomas Moore, the former Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, was able to get Senator Warner to set up the meeting from which we developed this compromise.

I represent an organization of people who made the greatest contribution in the Vietnam conflict in one service, the U. S. Navy, and that is our Naval Angels. We are all professionals. Whether or not we spend a lifetime in the service or just do obligated service, we are volunteers and professionals. We must be to survive on and off those ships. Everyone of our men, almost without exception, to our pilots was involved in the conflict because of the limitation of the numbers, and easily those who sacrificed as much as those who lived in the prison camps of North Vietnam were largely Naval aviators..

Our initial objection to the memorial was that it indeed was a memorial only to the dead, in between the two greatest living memorials in the world, the Washington Monument and the Lincoln Memorial.

So the compromise which is represented here by the very moving statue of the combat soldiers and the flag was important to us. Every Naval aviator is going to leave that ship with one thing in mind, returning and victory. He is dedicated to his country, to his service and to his own Army. Not one living or dead, not one who gave his life or one who sacrificed his life or risked his life did it for the purpose of getting his name on a memorial. He did it for the purpose of keeping that flag flying. And for that purpose, if none other, I can't think of any more important reason than to accept this compromise with the combat soldiers and the flag.

Thank you, sir.

CHAIRMAN BROWN: Thank you very much.

Next is Major General J. Milnor Roberts, Executive Director of the Reserve Officers Association.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman and members of the Commission, on previous occasions I testified before you in support of the original concept which, of course, we would like to see presented.

Our initial objection to the memorial was that it indeed was a memorial only to the dead, in between the two greatest living memorials in the world, the Washington Monument and the Lincoln Memorial.

So the compromise which is represented here by the very moving statue of the combat soldiers and the flag was important to us. Every Naval aviator is going to leave that ship with one thing in mind, returning and victory. He is dedicated to his country, to his service and to his own Army. Not one living or dead, not one who gave his life or one who sacrificed his life or risked his life did it for the purpose of getting his name on a memorial. He did it for the purpose of keeping that flag flying. And for that purpose, if none other, I can't think of any more important reason than to accept this compromise with the combat soldiers and the flag.

Thank you, sir.

CHAIRMAN BROWN: Thank you very much.

Next is Major General J. Milnor Roberts, Executive Director of the Reserve Officers Association.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman and members of the Commission, on previous occasions I testified before you in support of the original concept which, of course, we would like to see presented.

At this time, I am representing 125,000 commissioned and warrant officers of all the services, more than half of whom were on duty in the Armed Forces during the Vietnam period. I would like to add our support for the proposed compromise which has been presented so eloquently.

Thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN BROWN: Thank you.

Next is Emogene Cupp, American Gold Star Mothers.

Is Ms. Cupp with us? Someone else representing them?

MS. WILK: Mr. Chairman, members of the Commission, my name is Regina Wilk from Silver Spring, Maryland. I am the mother of three Marines who fought in Vietnam. One came home safe and is presently a Captain in the Marine Corps; one came home wounded and is disabled. My third son was killed, thus making me a Gold Star Mother.

I am a past National President of the American Gold Star Mothers, an organization of mothers whose sons and daughters died in line of duty in the Armed Forces. My credentials speak for themselves.

This past July, I spoke to many mothers at our national convention about the memorial, the memory of all who served in Vietnam. There was general praise, both for the

At this time, I am representing 125,000 commissioned and warrant officers of all the services, more than half of whom were on duty in the Armed Forces during the Vietnam period. I would like to add our support for the proposed compromise which has been presented so eloquently.

Thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN BROWN: Thank you.

Next is Emogene Cupp, American Gold Star Mothers.

Is Ms. Cupp with us? Someone else representing them?

MS. WILK: Ms. Chairman, members of the Commission, my name is Regina Wilk from Silver Spring, Maryland. I am the mother of three Marines who fought in Vietnam. One came home safe and is presently a Captain in the Marine Corps; one came home wounded and is disabled. My third son was killed, thus making me a Gold Star Mother.

I am a past National President of the American Gold Star Mothers, an organization of mothers whose sons and daughters died in line of duty in the Armed Forces. My credentials speak for themselves.

This past July, I spoke to many mothers at our national convention about the memorial, the memory of all who served in Vietnam. There was general praise, both for the

basic design and for the sculpture depicting our sons and the flag of our country under which they fought. Many mothers are coming to Washington to attend the National Salute to Vietnam Veterans and the dedication of the memorial. Yet there may not be a dedication unless you act today to approve these proposals. You, the members of the Commission of Fine Arts, have the experience and knowledge as to where the sculpture and flag will be best located.

Please ensure, however, that we who have most recently visited will seek our memorial, one memorial. I looked forward to the dedication for so long. So many lives will be touched so many different ways during this week.

So on behalf of the Gold Star Mothers, I urge you to approve the sculpture and flag. I am deeply moved by the beauty and dignity of the walls. I am deeply touched for I see my sons in these figures. It is a beautiful enhancement to a fine memorial. Many parents and Vietnam veterans have planned to come to Washington for the dedication this November. Many could not afford to come back to Washington for the dedication if it occurs at some future date.

I appreciate the opportunity to speak to you. Thank you for letting me present this and perpetuating the memory of our sons.

CHAIRMAN BROWN: Thank you very much.

Next is Frank McCarthy, President of the Vietnam Veterans Relief Foundation.

MR. McCARTHY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and members of the Commission.

My name is Frank McCarthy. I am President of the Vietnam Veterans Relief Foundation. We deal with the health problems of Vietnam veterans and their families.

I first would like to commend Ms. Maya Lin for her design. I have seen the design constructed and I must say that it caused great emotional feelings to be raised seeing those names.

However, the Vietnam veterans were suffering ill health problems, are committing suicide, as we all know, and these factors must be considered. They have seen these sculptures, they have been moved by them. They relate to them. This is a factor that we all must really consider.

I urge you, please, to approve those sculptures, approve those flag for those men as well as the men who died.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BROWN: Thank you very much..

Next is Andy Messing, Vietnam veteran in the Constitutional Caucus.

1  
-  
MR. MESSING: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I am a twice wounded infantry veteran of Vietnam, under Vietnam Veterans for Reagan, a member of the Reserve right now, along with the Reserve Officers Association.

I would just like to quickly pose a couple of things that have been said. I see my son in that statue. That was very poignant. It means a lot to me. Congressman Don Bailey said there is a political message to the memorial, referring to it. These concepts bring tremendous amount of thought in my head that based on time I would just cover one thing. Compromise. Compromise that many of us fought for is being disregarded. It was a five point compromise. One, it talked about the flag; two, it talked about the heroic statue; three, it talked about the location; four, it talked about a dedication date; and, five, talked about the appropriate inscription.

The site's architect, as he did during the compromise meeting, totally ignored what the people in the meeting were saying. I would like to take one opportunity to point out where we feel in the compromise, the majority of the compromise, the people in that meeting feel that that statue should be placed to negate the political statements.

Mr. Chairman, for the benefit of the audience, we



felt that it should be either on the hypotenuse or inside the hypotenuse. Right there. The flag should be at the apex. Anything else would not negate the political statement.

Mr. Chairman, I request that you consider this. I would also like to enter into the record comments by Mr. Paul Gapp, one of the leading architectural critics of the Chicago Tribune, and I would like to distribute it at your table.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN BROWN: Thank you very much.

While he is doing that, we might call on David DeChant -- please correct me if I mispronounce these names -- speaking as an individual Vietnam veteran.

MR. DeCHANT: You did it very well, sir.

Good morning, ladies and gentlemen. I want to thank you for the energies and expertise in guaranteeing that the men and women who served honorably in our Nation's longest war are recognized and honored in a tradition that began with a Revolutionary War, continued through the Civil War, through two World Wars, the Korean War and now, 10 years later, the Vietnam War.

To celebrate the peace, to consecrate this place, softly call the names of those we love, those we sadly and

felt that it should be either on the hypotenuse or inside the hypotenuse. Right there. The flag should be at the apex. Anything else would not negate the political statement.

Mr. Chairman, I request that you consider this. I would also like to enter into the record comments by Mr. Paul Gapp, one of the leading architectural critics of the Chicago Tribune, and I would like to distribute it at your table.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN BROWN: Thank you very much.

While he is doing that, we might call on David DeChant -- please correct me if I mispronounce these names -- speaking as an individual Vietnam veteran.

MR. DeCHANT: You did it very well, sir.

Good morning, ladies and gentlemen. I want to thank you for the energies and expertise in guaranteeing that the men and women who served honorably in our Nation's longest war are recognized and honored in a tradition that began with a Revolutionary War, continued through the Civil War, through two World Wars, the Korean War and now, 10 years later, the Vietnam War.

To celebrate the peace, to consecrate this place, softly call the names of those we love, those we sadly and

INC.  
N.E.

fearlessly missed, those who died, these words from an anonymous poem written for the Vietnam Veterans Memorial, in my opinion, clearly and with lean force describe the philosophies and the goals of the Vietnam Memorial Fund to recognize and honor those who served and those who died; and, secondly, to begin a healing process, a reconciliation of a grievous beginning brought by the war.

I am a Vietnam veteran who spent 31 months in Vietnam. I was not decorated. I have not written a book although I would like to, and I have not been elected to office. But I served my country. I am dedicated to the honesty of the Memorial Fund and their friends who have taken an idea and have created history. I am highly honored by the winning design of Ms. Maya Lin. Over the last several years, I have observed the process that has left me with some anger and sadness; anger because the individuals who speak out against the memorial design allegedly in the name of all their Vietnam brothers, anger because of the individuals who are not veterans who threaten and attempt to dictate their wills through their power and money for spite and their own ego satisfaction, anger for those who still wish to make a political statement about the war through the memorial which is not permitted by law, is not the intent of Congress nor the

Vietnam Veterans Memorial Fund.

The memorial transcends the debate of the war. It is time for political debates about the war and its policies, but the memorial is simply not the place to do it. It must be remembered that the American people sanctioned and donated over \$7 million for a memorial to the men and women who served and not to a war memorial.

Finally, sadness because these self-centered interests and political debates seem to have been given a priority over the Vietnam veterans, both living and dead, and their families as a Nation. What is most important is we have a most powerful memorial, a truly magnificent and heroic sculpture and Old Glory in her beauty to honor the men who served, sacrificed, suffered, died and survived. It is my opinion that the placement of the sculpture and Old Glory is placed in your hands as professionals.

I disagree with Mr. Watt's statement that design and aesthetics are the primary concern. They are a latter concern and the philosophy that you have is the philosophy of the Vietnam Memorial to date.

Several weeks ago, I had the pleasure to see the stonecutter put the final task on it. As we watched, a Gold Star mother and father watched us and asked if we could help

find the name Robert S. Shuddig (phonetic). After several minutes of looking, we found it. We backed up and observed the father and mother touching their son's name. They began to cry. The father most profusely in his wife's arms. As we approached in an awkward attempt to comfort them, the father apologized for crying. It was suggested to him there is no reason to apologize for being human and feeling the pain of the loss of their son. It is in this vein, ladies and gentlemen, I strongly urge you to approve the sculpture and the flag staff for many reasons but, most importantly, for the Vietnam veterans and their families who are still waiting for recognition and honor, and in order to complete the necessary requirements for the dedication of this truly historical memorial in November of this year.

I would like to close with the following words of a very humble man who knew well the honor of war. With malice towards none, with charity towards all, to bind up the Nation's wounds, to care for him who shall have borne the battle, to do all which may achieve and cherish a just and lasting peace among ourselves -- Mr. Lincoln.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BROWN: Thank you very much.

Next will be Michael Milne, Director of the Veterans

of the Vietnam War, Inc.

MR. MILNE: Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen, my name is Robert Milne, and I am the National Director of the Veterans of the Vietnam War.

I would like to say we finally have a memorial to the service of the Vietnam veterans in our Nation's Capital, something long awaited, and long needed, and still we find ourselves divided. It seems even in peace we cannot decide on a good thing. But people will differ and that is what makes them people.

So I believe we have to look at our disagreements with both logic and emotion.

What is the point of this memorial? Is it a monument to war? No, because we are a people who do not want war. Rather the memorial is a dedication to the memory of those who have unfortunately served in a war; it is something of design to help us keep in mind the value and unselfish service of those living and dead, who did what was required of them. It is something also which tells a story to those who did not have to serve. It tells a story of these veterans and will keep telling it for a long time to come.

Therefore, the appearance of the memorial and all the individual parts and aspects of it must be just right in

order to tell that story the way we feel it should be told.  
It must be a reality.

With that in mind, I cannot see why we are arguing over the inclusion of the statue and the flag. The statue has its own statement to make and I feel it is very much a part of the overall realities. The monument itself is a most beautiful one. It is beautiful in its appearance and it is beautiful in that it pays honor and tribute to those who gave their lives. It is very fitting. But so ~~it~~ is a statue for this statue provides part of the reality. It enables people to see the Vietnam veteran as he was when he fought this war. It is not intended to be obscenely glorious in character. It is a honorable creation of reality. I believe that it does not detract from the meaning or the beauty of our memorial. Rather it should enhance both. This is why. First, it does not obstruct one's view of the monument. It is more out of the way. It is part of the story. It preserves its part of the memory for the veteran and the non-veteran alike. Without actually standing directly before and becoming a physical part of the large monument, the monument can be viewed and the roll call of the fallen can be seen. Any argument that the statue is in the way is invalid. It is only there to be an additional truth or part of the truth. It is not a

counterstatement. It is more in the nature of punctuation.

For those who would claim that the vision of three soldiers, who know what they did, looking as they did, is aesthetically wrong, I have this suggestion. We should, if we believe that, tear down the monument to the courageous flag raising of Iwo Jima. When photographer Joe Rosenthal took that picture, he did not know that the proud nation would transform that image into one of the proudest monuments. We of the grand Vietnam War will never see such, but without a picture of a Vietnam trooper, we will at least have something a little like it. If it is issued that that also be taken away, why don't we take away the Iwo Jima monument? Then we can go to work and take away the statue of the Minuteman as well as General Lee atop his horse, and so on. Let us not depict any soldiers of any war in metal or stone. Let us just offer the school children and the veterans and the people in general just walls with names and only the names of the fallen. Better yet, dispense with the names. Let us just put down the date of the war on each.

I am saying to you such things have meaning and sense in this case. Our small statue is not in the way of a large monument. There can be no harm in its being there. Perhaps there is some harm in its not being there.



Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BROWN: Thank you very much.

Next is R. Jack Powell, Executive Director of the Paralyzed Veterans of America.

MR. POWELL: Mr. Chairman, members of the Commission, it is a pleasure to be here this afternoon.

I noticed as I came in that 15 years ago today I started my first tour in Vietnam and as a young man at that time, I had not expected 15 years later I would still be involved in fighting about the same war.

I would imagine that if I was in your chairs right now, however, the perspective of going to Vietnam might be enticing compared to the decision that you are going to have to make later on.

The PVA is a chartered service organization. All of its members have spinal cord injury or disease. We have been designed in the efforts to create a memorial for those who died in Vietnam for a long time. These funds have enabled PVA to start its fund campaign. PVA has also been involved in certain aspects of the design of the Vietnam memorial. The original design caused us fears about access to the memorial. It would be a blatant injustice to create a memorial and have those who were fighting in Vietnam

unable to approach it. PVA worked with the project director, Mr. Dubick, to reach a compromise to the original design. The result is the hard surface stone walkway that traverses the panels. Another change is the use of implements for landscaping to reinforce the entryway from the west wall of the memorial.

By the way, the handicapped parking area which you asked about earlier are the location of what we call the handicapped entrance, and the locator is done in part to be somewhat close to where the handicapped parking has been designated.

PVA also continued our involvement in the controversy erupted over the basic design of the proposed memorial. We did participate in the discussion led by Senator John Warner which would preserve the original design concept while adding those further elements to the whole which would overtly recognize those who faced their country's call. We understand there are those who oppose these modifications. As an organization of Vietnam veterans, we believe that the proposed statue by Mr. Hart and the other accommodations should be approved as this Commission previously adopted in concept.

Mr. Chairman, I wish to reiterate that PVA has put

an extensive effort into a memorial to those who served in Vietnam. We believe that changes incorporated ensuring accessibility to all those who wish to come and visit a memorial will prove effective. PVA has supported the compromise agreement which adds the statue, the American flag and the inscription. As my brother and I served in Vietnam, we were aware of the ranging debate taking place back home in America. As we returned in ones and twos to this, our homeland, we were reminded in often less conflicting way about our service to the country. Time has passed, and with the passage of time we are told that the American people have reconsidered the sentence that they passed on Vietnam veterans. The Vietnam Veterans Memorial seems symbolic of that long called for reprieve.

Now we find that Vietnam veterans involved in a debate and the irony does not escape us. The beauty of it has been said is in the eye of the beholder. If such is so there, then never will we be able to satisfy every beholder with this or any other. It might be in part to mark closed a dramatic chapter, someone's sensibilities might not be satisfied. If that be the case, I ask you to let it not be Vietnam veterans. I think they have sacrificed enough already. We urge support of the plan and compromise, and we

hope that you will do it very quickly.

Thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN BROWN: Thank you very much.

We go now to Richard J. Gallant, Service Director,  
Military Order of the Purple Heart.

Please begin.

MR. GALLANT: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, members of  
the Commission, distinguished guests. I am Richard Gallant  
for the Military Order of the Purple Heart.

By way of information, we are the only veterans  
organization virtually chartered composed of combat wounded  
veterans who are recipients of the Purple Heart medal. As  
such, it would probably go without saying that we carry our  
own memorial of Vietnam with us every day of the week. As  
such, we have watched over the years the sundry comments or  
controversies that have gone on over the Vietnam conflict  
and also those which have addressed itself to a memorial to  
recognize the valued benefits. And I would like to say now  
on the Vietnam veterans that when you look at all of our  
veterans from all of the wars, we have perhaps the finest  
soldiers that ever served this Nation during the war in  
Vietnam and, as such, we should do all that we can to show  
them our respect, to give them a memorial that truly reflects

hope that you will do it very quickly.

Thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN BROWN: Thank you very much.

We go now to Richard J. Gallant, Service Director,  
Military Order of the Purple Heart.

Please begin.

MR. GALLANT: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, members of  
the Commission, distinguished guests. I am Richard Gallant  
for the Military Order of the Purple Heart.

By way of information, we are the only veterans  
organization virtually chartered composed of combat wounded  
veterans who are recipients of the Purple Heart medal. As  
such, it would probably go without saying that we carry our  
own memorial of Vietnam with us every day of the week. As  
such, we have watched over the years the sundry comments or  
controversies that have gone on over the Vietnam conflict  
and also those which have addressed itself to a memorial to  
recognize the valued benefits. And I would like to say now  
on the Vietnam veterans that when you look at all of our  
veterans from all of the wars, we have perhaps the finest  
soldiers that ever served this Nation during the war in  
Vietnam and, as such, we should do all that we can to show  
them our respect, to give them a memorial that truly reflects

the total Vietnam veteran. And I think you will see that the Vietnam veteran is almost like a microcosm. There are many of them, many shapes, forms, ideas, ideologies and so forth, but they all have one common goal, one common vision, and that was to follow that flag when this country called them. They went there and they did their job, and when it was over, they returned here under the cover of that flag for the freedom and liberties and, as such, we feel strong consideration that we support the American flag as part of this memorial. It is truly an integral part of the Vietnam veterans.

And as we walk through and look at the recommendations and the submissions that have come forward, and we looked and we dreamed and we saw the names we had carved in marble, we recognized that here for posterity are the names of our heroes of this Nation that went forth under the direction of this Nation and who followed their flag and made the supreme sacrifice. And as such, we felt that that was a very acceptable rewarding way to remember our fallen comrades. But then I thought, and we discussed it with others, what about that veteran that returned home? What about that veteran who is making his way through life now? What about the children, the grandchildren? What about posterity for this Nation to recognize what occurred during that particular

traumatic history that we had during the Vietnam conflict?

Then I saw this statue here. And, gentlemen, it really depicts what the Vietnam veteran looked like. I could see myself, only I wasn't quite that young and didn't have that black hair. But I think that what we have before us today is something that the Vietnam veteran fought for. The right for individuals to have their own ideas but also the ability to recognize others and their ideas and to come to a compromise, and a compromise that would not destroy any of their own principles.

I feel, and the Military Order of Purple Heart feels that by having the American flag, the marble walls etched with the names of our fallen comrades, and this beautiful statue here depicting the veteran as he looked in combat, as something to remind us that the Nation must survive only when it recognizes the value of its youth.

We also wish to go on record that we support our fellow veterans organizations and their statements supporting this recommendation.

I thank you very much, Mr. Chairman, for this opportunity to speak to you.

CHAIRMAN BROWN: Thank you very much.

We now go to Donald J. Swartz, Director of

Veterans Affairs, Veterans of the Vietnam War.

MR. SWARTZ: Mr. Chairman, members of the Commission, I was going to speak basically about our organization, the Veterans of the Vietnam War and what we've done with regard to the Memorial. However, I'm really just going to stop here and let a Vietnam veteran for the members of our organization and the pro rights mainly of Vietnam veterans.

When this Memorial Fund came about, we supported it. We raised money for your organization. The Vietnam veterans within our organization supported it heavily. We didn't necessarily agree with the memorial as it was originally designed. However, it was a memorial to us and we went along with it. When these proposed changes came about, many of the veterans within our organization had a ray of hope that this would depict all Vietnam veterans.

I cannot see that the putting of the American flag at a monument honoring Vietnam veterans would detract in any way, in my opinion, not to have the flag which we fought for and basically that was the only reason we fought over there, because many of us had mixed feelings on the political issues that were involved, not to have the American flag at our monument would be an insult to us.



The three men in the statue standing before you depict exactly what the American fighting man in Vietnam looked like, what he was. He was black, he was white, he was Hispanic, he was everything. For others in Vietnam, that is what we call ourselves. We are all brothers who served in Vietnam. Our unity is, I think that is, borne out by people who spoke to you today. All of the Vietnam veterans are speaking in favor of their statue. I cannot see how this would detract from the overall memorial.

As a Vietnam veteran, I am proud to see this, proud to be able to put our support, my personal support to the memorial, and I definitely hope that in your voting you approve these. It is essential to the Vietnam veterans, in my opinion, that this be dealt with.

Thank you very much for your time.

CHAIRMAN BROWN: Thank you very much.

I think this concludes the group of veterans. We have others who have asked to speak as individuals -- I am sorry. Please.

MR. PRICE: I would like to introduce myself. I am Brigadier General (Retired) George B. Price, and I guess in the arena of performing arts and the fine arts, I am better known as Leontyne Price's brother. However, if Ms. Price was

rts

MS. HUGHES: Mr. Brown and members of the Commission, I won't take any more time. I am the Editor of the U. S. edition which represents the editors who have spoken so eloquently today.

I would like to tell you that our President and the majority of our organization lend their support to the memorial.

Thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN BROWN: Tom Pauken, appearing as an individual for the Vietnam Veterans.

MR. PAUKEN: I am Tom Pauken, Director of ACTION, but today I am appearing as a Vietnam Veteran.

I know the time is very tight this afternoon, so I will try not to repeat that what has been said, other than to endorse the general consensus which I think is emerging today. I would only add a few points.

I think that which is incomplete, a feeling on the part of many Vietnam Veterans, now is complete. I think the words of the Sculptor Panel, this powerful enhancement will really add a living tribute to the Vietnam Veterans, those who returned, and those who did not return. I think what is remarkable is the leadership of the Vietnam Veterans who put this together, and even though there has been tremendous

disagreement as those of us in this room are well aware of, it is remarkable that people were able to come to a room, come to a consensus and resolve it in a sensible manner.

I think the failure to ratify that decision would result in reopening some wounds that do not need to be reopened today, this year, or in the future.

I think this memorial is for those who served, and I would like to end by quoting from the Sculptor Panel itself, because I think it is so accurate in terms of how this adds to the completeness of the full world. The three figures appear to be walking along a tree wall approximately a distance of 150 feet. The figures are approximately eight feet tall, which is appropriate to retain the message of peace. Caught in a moment of time, they look beyond to the American flag.

Thus a creative tension is established between the human figures and the abstract figures of the flag and wall, all three figures, into a harmonious mode.

I would ask the Commission to consider that eloquent statement in terms of the meaning of this war, and what the design ought to be.

I would only note a personal note, when I first saw the sculpture, I was not only remarkably impressed, but looking at the face of one of the three soldiers, it came to mind, I

have seen that man before, and I have seen him in Vietnam, and I think so many Vietnam Veterans who will come to Washington will come away with that same feeling. That feeling, yes, that is one of us, one of the young men who served his country at a time of hope.

CHAIRMAN BROWN: Thank you very much.

Next is Rick Abell, Peace Corps.

MR. ABELL: I will make this brief.

As one who was the volunteer for the Peace Corps, and in fact is currently employed by the Peace Corps, as one who was a volunteer for the Army Infantry in the Republic of South Vietnam, and as one who has received an 80 percent disability from the Veterans Commission, one who humbly feels that he loves his country and its principles, it would be a travesty on the souls of the dead, who gave their lives in the defense of a world's Nation, not to approve this sculpture and flag pole. Let us not misconstrue our mission.

We come to honor those who fought for freedom in a noble cause.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BROWN: Thank you very much.

Milt Copulos, the Heritage Foundation.

MR. COPULOS: Thank you, good afternoon.

have seen that man before, and I have seen him in Vietnam, and I think so many Vietnam Veterans who will come to Washington will come away with that same feeling. That feeling, yes, that is one of us, one of the young men who served his country at a time of hope.

CHAIRMAN BROWN: Thank you very much.

Next is Rick Abell, Peace Corps.

MR. ABELL: I will make this brief.

As one who was the volunteer for the Peace Corps, and in fact is currently employed by the Peace Corps, as one who was a volunteer for the Army Infantry in the Republic of South Vietnam, and as one who has received an 80 percent disability from the Veterans Commission, one who humbly feels that he loves his country and its principles, it would be a travesty on the souls of the dead, who gave their lives in the defense of a world's Nation, not to approve this sculpture and flag pole. Let us not misconstrue our mission.

We come to honor those who fought for freedom in a noble cause.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BROWN: Thank you very much.

Milt Copulos, the Heritage Foundation.

MR. COPULOS: Thank you, good afternoon.

My name is Milt Copulos, and many of you may know I was a member of the Sculpture Panel, but I am testifying on my own behalf, because I felt it might be of some value to have the view of a combat soldier.

In many ways I am typical of 2.7 million men and women who served in Vietnam. I enlisted in 1966, I was 19 years old at the time, felt I had a duty as a citizen to serve my country. By the time I was 22, I had completed two voluntary tours of duty in Vietnam, seen 45 of my comrades killed on a mountain top that none of you ever heard of, had Last Rights four times, was retired out of the Army on disability, still, like the overwhelming majority of those who served in Vietnam, I am glad that I served, I am proud of my service, and I would be willing to serve again if asked.

I am sure that my feelings are a little difficult for you to understand. You had to be there, they say. Yet somehow Rick Hart has managed to transcend the barriers to overcome the limitations of language with the sculpture. Somehow he has truly managed to capture the essence of the Vietnam experience.

It has been said that one of the attributes of great artists is the universal ability to communicate. Whether it is a play by Shakespeare, or a painting by DaVinci, a great

work of art must have universal appeal. Rick Hart's statue does this. It reaches out and touches the soul.

During the process of developing the design, we would periodically, we Vietnam Veterans, look for the progress. I was struck by the fact that each one reacted in an identical fashion.

First, they would stop and stare, overwhelmed by the figures. You could almost see the memories. They would then approach it almost reverently, always commenting on how a canteen hung. Then, without exception, they would begin to describe the action taking place. Each was able to project themselves into those figures, and to draw upon his own experience, because each of them saw themselves there. No two stories was alike. That is perhaps the greatest test of testimony to the sculptor's merit, the statue's ability to communicate was not limited to those who served, although time and time again it was.

One could see the beginnings of a glimmer of understanding in their eyes, how they perceived the incongruous innocence, the courage, the essential vulnerability of these boys in war years.

How, at long last, they began to comprehend the enormity of the task that they were asked to perform. I would

also like to address one other question, that of flag placement.

Earlier you heard Kent Cooper suggest a variety of places. I know that has been viewed many times in your meetings. I would like to emphatically disagree, it has always been the position of those who participated in the compromise that the American flag should be placed properly. The flag, we must remember as a tangible system of the principles for which we fought.

The Americans who went to Vietnam went there for principles. The principles that the strong should help the weak, the principle that to the extent any man's freedom is diminished, every man's is.

Therefore, to fail to give the flag a prominent place could be the great faith of nearly 58,000 names inscribed on Maya Ying Lin's wall. We made an effort to place it so that it would be sensitive to the design already in place, that the flag could be placed prominently, without conflicting to the goal, and continues to be my personal belief.

It has been nearly a decade since the Vietnam War ended, a decade during which most of that concept languished in a no-man's land. For that decade they have seen their service, their sacrifices questioned, their notions of duty



questioned. They were portrayed as misfit suckers, and worse. Yet their homecoming was not complete. It will not be until their service is recognized.

Rick Hart's statue recognizes and honors their service. It can help to make that homecoming finally take place.

I urge you to approve it.

CHAIRMAN BROWN: Thank you.

Next is Tom Carhart.

MR. CARHART: Good afternoon. My name is Tom Carhart. I represent only myself. I think it is fair to say that I started this controversy a year ago.

I would first like to agree with Don Bailey, in emphasizing, in spite of CBS' derogatory comment to the contrary, no one has ever uttered racism to the contrary; that is a low and vicious slur. I don't care if the Pope submitted this design, or Atilla the Hun, you criticize the art and not the artist.

A lot of people misunderstood what this memorial is about, and you will have to bear with me. This is something that rips at my guts. It is very emotional.

Let me read briefly of something written by Paul Goldenberg<sup>er</sup> of the New York Times, Thursday, October 7. "By

questioned. They were portrayed as misfit suckers, and worse. Yet their homecoming was not complete. It will not be until their service is recognized.

Rick Hart's statue recognizes and honors their service. It can help to make that homecoming finally take place.

I urge you to approve it.

CHAIRMAN BROWN: Thank you.

Next is Tom Carhart.

MR. CARHART: Good afternoon. My name is Tom Carhart. I represent only myself. I think it is fair to say that I started this controversy a year ago.

I would first like to agree with Don Bailey, in emphasizing, in spite of CBS' derogatory comment to the contrary, no one has ever uttered racism to the contrary; that is a low and vicious slur. I don't care if the Pope submitted this design, or Atilla the Hun, you criticize the art and not the artist.

A lot of people misunderstood what this memorial is about, and you will have to bear with me. This is something that rips at my guts. It is very emotional.

Let me read briefly of something written by Paul Goldenberg of the New York Times, Thursday, October 7. "By

questioning the Hart sculpture and the flag pole, the Vietnam Veterans Memorial Fund seems intent on something that speaks of heroism and absolute moral certainty. But there can be no such liberalism where Vietnam is concerned. To try to reflect the pain and anguish is to misunderstand all that has happened and to suggest that, no less has been learned from the lessons of Vietnam. The Vietnam Memorial could be one of the most important works in Washington -- the insertion of the flag pole not only destroys the abstract principal, inside and outside space that Maya Lin has created, it tries to shift this memorial away from its focus and towards a literal interpretation of heroism and patriotism that ultimately treats the war dead in simplistic terms."

Well, Mr. Goldenberg <sup>a memorial</sup> hit the nail on the head.

This is not immoral to the dead. We respect the dead. There were 2.6 million of us who served. Congress authorized, and the President signed into law, permission for the Vietnam Veterans Fund to build a memorial, "in honor and recognition of the men and women of the Armed Forces of the United States who served in the Vietnam War."

That is it. No separate designation of the dead from those who returned. The listing of the names of the dead was an aspect of the design, competition brought in for

unknown reasons. You have heard people comment here today about it is hard to die, about when we were young, you must learn to mourn, it is hard to grieve.

Sure, it is hard to grieve or mourn, but this is not a memorial to mourn or grieve. This is a memorial to honor those who served.

You are going to hear from architects and artists later who will say that this is a violation of the competition, this is a confusion of artistic schools. I don't care. I don't think that many of us care. We care, Maya Lin has said in the first place that this was for the dead.

Well, you can come here and feel whatever you want. It is an open black wall, you provide your emotions. That is not good enough. This memorial must, "honor and recognize those who served."

And ambiguous feelings are not good enough from someone from Iowa, or Texas, who comes for their one trip in the life of the Nation, and says look down there at that black wall, that is the Vietnam Memorial that honors the 2.7 million who served.

I am not an artist. I may be wrong. I may be an extremist, but I am not alone. There aren't many who are as moved as I am. We feel wronged by this. This compromise is

literally a compromise, this is not something that was gagged down our throats by anyone else. This is something where Vietnam Veterans went into a room and hammered it out, and we came out with this, and yes, I was an extremist, and no, I still don't like that wall, but the compromise means a whole minute piece, we will accept a statue and the flag, the statue was a blunt appraisal of the way we were. I am moved by it. I am pleased that this emotional feeling could be caught up by a man who was never there, and yet it has been. That is a work of artistic genius.

I would humbly request that you consider the purpose of this memorial, and the background of this compromise, and allow us to have a memorial that would be truly honest.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BROWN: Thank you very much.

Michael S. Davidson.

MR. DAVIDSON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for asking me to speak at this hearing.

I am a member of the Vietnam Veterans Advisory Council. I am also a Veteran. I have 36 years service in the United States Army, including service in Vietnam.

I find that the statements of those who preceded me to this podium in support of the addition of the statue,

literally a compromise, this is not something that was gagged down our throats by anyone else. This is something where Vietnam Veterans went into a room and hammered it out, and we came out with this, and yes, I was an extremist, and no, I still don't like that wall, but the compromise means a whole minute piece, we will accept a statue and the flag, the statue was a blunt appraisal of the way we were. I am moved by it. I am pleased that this emotional feeling could be caught up by a man who was never there, and yet it has been. That is a work of artistic genius.

I would humbly request that you consider the purpose of this memorial, and the background of this compromise, and allow us to have a memorial that would be truly honest.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BROWN: Thank you very much.

Michael S. Davidson.

MR. DAVIDSON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for asking me to speak at this hearing.

I am a member of the Vietnam Veterans Advisory Council. I am also a Veteran. I have 36 years service in the United States Army, including service in Vietnam.

I find that the statements of those who preceded me to this podium in support of the addition of the statue,

and of the flag, eloquent indeed. I am overwhelmed, and I, in particular, wish to associate myself with the remarks of my colleague, General George Price.

I would like to direct your attention to the statue which has been often repeated here this afternoon, to tell you that someone who knows soldiers are soldiers, someone who understands the excruciating trials of combat, this statue is breathtaking, because Frederick Hart, out of his genius, has captured that unique bond that ties men together in the face of danger, and gives them sustenance, indeed, ties them together in the face of constant danger.

As a bond of love, the bond that causes the soldier to sacrifice his life for his comrades, and therefore, is properly placed on the site of this memorial. It does not intrude, it compliments what man and nature had brought together.

With respect to the flag, I would remind you that these men who served in Vietnam, both the living and the dead, were called by their country. When called, they responded, and this flag symbolizes that noble act of citizenship.

Thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN BROWN: Thank you.

Scott C. <sup>Breuer</sup>~~Breder~~.

MR. BREDER: Mr. Chairman, members of the Commission, my name is Scott Breder, a Vietnam Veteran. I enlisted. I served as a translator-interpreter.

My reaction to the initial design was immediate and negative. This occurred upon the winning entry, along with the 1,400 other entries at Andrews Air Force Base in May of 1981.

I spoke before the Commission to express my disapproval early. I prefaced my comments by adding my reluctance to the chapter of the country's history that has been full of controversy. There has been controversy surrounding the design selected.

While some progress has been made to resolving that controversy, all issues have not been resolved.

If I may digress briefly, but to emphasize my strong support for the admissions before us, I would like to restate the opening testimony of that initial meeting of Mr. Paul Spreiregen, the advisor to the jury which selected the winning entry, and which I feel expresses the prevalent thoughts of the jury in this design. These comments may be verified in written testimony of that design.

There has never been a precedent of the design for a war memorial such as this, there has never been such a war



in the country that may forever remain controversial.

I submit that the memorial is not to speak of the war, or the controversy surrounding it, but only to honor the service and the memory of the war's dead, its missing and its veterans. To give those who served, those missing and those who died, something less than honor is a disservice, and a potential tragic error to the Americans.

I personally feel it is a tragedy of the initial design, that it denies those Veterans, the missing and the war's dead, the honor which the memorial was intended.

Hence, I strongly feel that the addition of the American flag and a statue should be an integral part of the monument, and without them the memorial will not fulfill the intent of Congressional legislation that a memorial be built to honor the Vietnam Veterans, the missing and the dead.

I would like to restate the comments of Andy Messing, that the compromise agreed to on March 11th, 1982, and the meeting chaired by Senator Warner was that the flag be placed at the very apex of the two walls, and that the statue be located approximately 10 feet from the apex, centered between the two walls. That was the compromise agreed to by a majority for submission to the Commission on Fine Arts.

I strongly urge the Commission to approve the

addition of the American flag and statue as an integral part of the memorial, and not removed from the memorial.

Specifics of the compromise included not only the addition of the flag and the statue, but the specific location as well. That was the single proposal agreed to for submission to the Commission on Fine Arts for their approval.

I strongly urge that the Commission approve the additions, and the specific locations.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BROWN: Thank you very much.

Fred Downs?

If he is not here, we will move to Paul Haaga.

A VOICE: He had to leave, also.

CHAIRMAN BROWN: Understood.

Edward Lyle?

MR. LYLE: Mr. Chairman, members of the Commission, my name is Edward Lyle. I am an attorney in Washington, D. C., and also a resident of this city.

During the Vietnam War I served in the United States Army as a junior officer in Thailand, basically along the border between Thailand and Laos, and Thailand and Cambodia.

I am a member of the George Washington Chapter of the United States Army. I am testifying, however, in a

addition of the American flag and statue as an integral part of the memorial, and not removed from the memorial.

Specifics of the compromise included not only the addition of the flag and the statue, but the specific location as well. That was the single proposal agreed to for submission to the Commission on Fine Arts for their approval.

I strongly urge that the Commission approve the additions, and the specific locations.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BROWN: Thank you very much.

Fred Downs?

If he is not here, we will move to Paul Haaga.

A VOICE: He had to leave, also.

CHAIRMAN BROWN: Understood.

Edward Lyle?

MR. LYLE: Mr. Chairman, members of the Commission, my name is Edward Lyle. I am an attorney in Washington, D. C., and also a resident of this city.

During the Vietnam War I served in the United States Army as a junior officer in Thailand, basically along the border between Thailand and Laos, and Thailand and Cambodia.

I am a member of the George Washington Chapter of the United States Army. I am testifying, however, in a

5 private capacity, representing only myself. I am a Veteran, who in the past has opposed the addition of the statue and flag to the original design. I continue to oppose it.

Whether those two items should be added, however, is a question which has been debated in my mind, with ample opportunity for input from all quarters.

Finally, after a good bit of deliberation and negotiation, a compromise was finally reached. I oppose, at this point, any attempt to reopen that question, whether there should be the addition of these two items or not. To do so, I think, might easily create further polarization, and unravel that which has already been done.

I think also, it might delay the dedication to the monument, and thereby do a disservice to Veterans, many of whom will be coming to Washington for that event.

I therefore urge this Commission to consider the question of whether the flag pole and the statue will be added, is a closed question, a settled question. I urge the Commission to consider in its deliberations the artistic merits of those two items, and their integration to the overall monument.

In regard to those questions, I think those two items and their integration have been appropriately conceived

and designed, and I urge the Commission to approve their addition.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BROWN: Thank you very much.

John D. Pitney?

If he had to leave, we will go to John T. Williams.

MR. WILLIAMS: I am John T. Williams, and I am from Berwick, Louisiana.

I got interested in this thing about a year ago, and gave some money. There was a statement made in 1960 as to why we went. This statue here, and that flag, tells why we went. That wall is nothing but something that came between, and that statement is this, let every Nation know whether it wishes us will or ill, that we shall pay any price, bear any burden, meet any hardship, support any friend, oppose any foe, to assure the survival and success of liberty.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BROWN: Thank you very much.

Mary Louise Dowling?

MS. DOWLING: My name is Mary Louise Dowling. I am a Volunteer for the Vietnam Memorial Fund. A volunteer because I served in Vietnam with the American Red Cross, and I saw many servicemen there, and as I returned, I also worked

and designed, and I urge the Commission to approve their addition.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BROWN: Thank you very much.

John D. Pitney?

If he had to leave, we will go to John T. Williams.

MR. WILLIAMS: I am John T. Williams, and I am from Berwick, Louisiana.

I got interested in this thing about a year ago, and gave some money. There was a statement made in 1960 as to why we went. This statue here, and that flag, tells why we went. That wall is nothing but something that came between, and that statement is this, let every Nation know whether it wishes us will or ill, that we shall pay any price, bear any burden, meet any hardship, support any friend, oppose any foe, to assure the survival and success of liberty.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BROWN: Thank you very much.

Mary Louise Dowling?

MS. DOWLING: My name is Mary Louise Dowling. I am a Volunteer for the Vietnam Memorial Fund. A volunteer because I served in Vietnam with the American Red Cross, and I saw many servicemen there, and as I returned, I also worked

... INC.  
... N.E.  
... 002

on the POW and MIA, as they returned.

As a volunteer, I have been able to see many of the letters coming in from families, mothers, fathers, relatives. These letters spoke very eloquently about the need for this memorial.

I think the time is now to do this memorial. We have waited too long, and I would urge that the memorial be done just as it is depicted here, together with this very fine addition.

CHAIRMAN BROWN: Thank you very much.

~~Michael Detmold?~~

MR. DETMOLD: Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen, I appreciate the opportunity to speak.

I am a Vietnam Veteran from New York State, and I would just like to say, very simply and briefly, that I think the statue is beautiful, and should be included, and I can't imagine any of my fellow Vietnam Veterans who wouldn't feel the same.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BROWN: And finally, Al Santoli.

MR. SANTOLI: Mr. Chairman, as the author of the best selling book on the Vietnam War, and as a Vietnam Veteran, I would like to make a simple statement that art is

on the POW and MIA, as they returned.

As a volunteer, I have been able to see many of the letters coming in from families, mothers, fathers, relatives. These letters spoke very eloquently about the need for this memorial.

I think the time is now to do this memorial. We have waited too long, and I would urge that the memorial be done just as it is depicted here, together with this very fine addition.

CHAIRMAN BROWN: Thank you very much.

Michael Detmold?

MR. DETMOLD: Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen, I appreciate the opportunity to speak.

I am a Vietnam Veteran from New York State, and I would just like to say, very simply and briefly, that I think the statue is beautiful, and should be included, and I can't imagine any of my fellow Vietnam Veterans who wouldn't feel the same.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BROWN: And finally, Al Santoli.

MR. SANTOLI: Mr. Chairman, as the author of the best selling book on the Vietnam War, and as a Vietnam Veteran, I would like to make a simple statement that art is



not detached from society in which it serves.

As a soldier, I served with many people from various parts of the country, I was in a unit that was half American and half Vietnamese, I saw both Americans and Vietnamese give their lives for what they believed in, which was that flag, the flag of their country. I saw people from various lifestyles, from various ages, from the senior officers, who were older people, and the Red Cross people who were in their sixties and seventies, and young people like myself, who were 18 years old, and I won't call it a compromise, I will call it a collaboration, that it brings out the intentions of many people, and I pray to God that we are able to come to an agreement of the combination of the statue and the flag and the wall.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BROWN: Thank you very much.

All right, we will declare the meeting temporarily adjourned for a five minute break.

Thank you very much.

(Short recess.)

CHAIRMAN BROWN: If we could bring the meeting to order, please.

We have discovered two people who had signed up to

speaking in support who were not recognized, so if you will bear with us, just to complete that part of the meeting, we will call on Richard F. Weidman.

MR. WEIDMAN: Mr. Chairman, members of the Commission, thank you for the opportunity to address this Commission today, and I will try to be brief.

I speak on behalf of Vietnam Veterans of America, a national membership organization of men and women who served in the U. S. military during the Vietnam War. Vietnam Veterans of America as an organization, and I personally, urge you to clear the way for the Vietnam Veterans Memorial to be dedicated in November of this year.

The impetus that has brought us this far began with a resolution introduced by the Vietnam Veterans in Congress Caucus, cosponsored by 235 members, and passed by the Congress in October of 1978. That Congressional resolution called upon the President to declare a national Vietnam Veterans Week at the end of May 1979, for the Nation to finally begin to pay due respect for service rendered to country in difficult circumstances. As you undoubtedly know, Vietnam Veterans Week took on a "life of its own" and became a watershed event for Vietnam Veterans. The Vietnam Veterans Memorial Fund grew out of the energy and spirit of that week, as many

people, Veterans and nonveterans alike, agreed that it was time for all Americans to honor those members of the Armed Forces who gave their lives in service to their country in Vietnam. The motivation was clear, decent and pure: to honor our dead and missing fellow citizens who were lost in service to country.

Much has happened since mid-1979. As has been the case in the history of many of our national monuments (i.e., the Washington Monument, among many others), there has been much sound and fury over the plans and design. In all of the tumult of arguments, debates and whatever over designs, proper procedures, or personal and professional prerogatives, only three things remain absolutely clear:

First, that it is right to honor those whom we lost;

Second, that the overwhelming majority of Vietnam Veterans and all Americans support the Vietnam Veterans Memorial; and

Third, the means is at hand to consummate the memorial that is so fitting and so long overdue. I urge you to bear in mind that simple, pure and right goal; honoring our dead ; ; and to ignore and/or see through the nonsense to let us get on with our primary purpose. Now is the time.

Thank you.