

CHAIRMAN BROWN: Thank you very much.

And finally, Leroy J. Manor.

A VOICE: He had to leave.

CHAIRMAN BROWN: All right.

We will move on to those ~~in opposition of the pro-~~
~~posal~~, and we start with Maya Ying Lin, the Architect/Designer,
who won the original competition.

MS. LIN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Today the Commission has before it a proposed addi-
tion to the previously approved design for the Vietnam
Veterans memorial.

Over one year ago the Vietnam Veterans Memorial Fund
and I appeared before you seeking approval of the original
design, a design supported by many of the groups you have
heard testify today. You approved that design.

Since you granted that approval some people have
voiced an opposition to the appropriate nature of the original
design and have sought to amend or alter it by making it, in
their words, more "realistic." The product of that effort is
the proposal that is before you today.

As the artistic conscience of the Nation, I appealed
to the Commission to protect the artistic integrity of the
original design.

What is realistic? Is any one man's interpretation better able to convey an idea than any other's? Should it not be left to the observer? The original design gives each individual the freedom to reflect upon the heroism and sacrifice of those who served. It is symbolic of individual freedom, which this country stands for.

The original design is not just an object to be looked at: it is a moving composition to be understood as the individual moves through it. It is a journey to the awareness of the service and supreme sacrifice of the Vietnam Veteran. It is a living park, symbolic of life -- the life of the returning Veteran, who sees himself reflected within the time, within the names. It is not a memorial to politics or war or controversy, but to those men and women who served. It leaves the individual with the freedom of reflection and contemplation at a place where he is at once part of the Vietnam Veterans Memorial and a part of our memorialized history. The Vietnam Memorial takes its shape from and reflects two great symbols of our country, the Lincoln Memorial and the Washington Monument.

The experience or visual perception of the Vietnam Veterans Memorial should not be interrupted visually by the abrupt verticality of a flag pole, or conceptually by a

sculpture that forces a specific interpretation.

To attempt to make a "unified totality" out of two different works of art fails. These "intrusions" which treat the original work of art as no more than an architectural backdrop reflect an insensitivity to the original design's subtle spatial eloquence. Its use as a retaining wall in the presence of sculpture and flag desecrates the design's artistic integrity. It violates basic principle of design in trying to juxtapose incongruous elements.

The scale and verticality of the flag pole (which from any angle will appear to rise out of the wall) is totally out of character with the sweeping horizontality of the memorial. Paradoxically, the scale of the flag pole is too great for the memorial and too small for the site and the statues -- merely eight feet tall -- are taller than the wall for most of its length. These intrusions as placed rip apart the meeting of names, beginning and end, destroying the meaning of the design. Accordingly, the proposed sculpture and flag pole should not be in visual contact with the original design.

I am not approving or disapproving of the sculpture per se. I only disapprove of the forced melding of these two different memorials into one memorial.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BROWN: Thank you very much.

Robert Lawrence?

MR. LAWRENCE: Mr. Chairman, members of the Fine Arts Commission, my name is Robert N. Lawrence, and I am President of the American Institute of Architects, and am representing this Nation's group of architects, in addition, I am also representing a number of Veterans who have written in to me, expressing their concerns about the addition and compromise to the memorial.

Also, many of the Veterans' parents who lost persons in the conflict have written.

I have been impressed this afternoon by the compassionate elements of those men and women who have spoken in support of the compromise design. They have spoken sincerely and movingly, and it is precisely that the AIA support our Vietnam Veterans, that we are here before you today, to ask that you preserve what we are convinced is a unique, moving tribute to all of the men and women who have served their country.

From inception, the AIA has been supportive of the Vietnam Veterans Memorial Fund. We have made a contribution very early in the Fund, we have a display at the AIA Building

to honor the finalists in the design competition.

I have to admit, and I am somewhat surprised to even be here today, because i feel we are starting over, when in fact we should be concluding the process to construct the memorial, in fitting tribute to those who served in the Vietnam War.

On November 10, 1981, this Commission approved a final design that had been selected through an open competition process.

On March 26, 1982, a groundbreaking was held, and construction was begun, looking forward to the dedication in November, on Veterans Day. And in fact, there should be a dedication, because the original winning design is near completion. This design was the result of a legitimate, tested, open competition process, a process clearly in the public interest.

The Commission is now being asked to approve a new design, a design whose origins are confused, and closed to public scrutiny.

In 1910, Congress recognized that the city needed a coordinated body to look after the appearance of our Capital. The city needed some expert advice on art and design questions, so there would be a planned, cohesive and public

appearance befitting the dignity of our Nation's Capital.

To the Commission's credit, this is a beautiful city of monuments, museums, parks and memorials, all belonging to our citizens.

Once again, this Commission is challenged, and has the opportunity to act on behalf of the best interest of the American public by supporting a unique design which was won in open competition, with rules agreed on by all participants, judged by our professional jury, and acclaimed by its sponsors.

A brief chronology seems in order to set the record straight as just what the issues are in this matter. The Vietnam Veterans Memorial Fund chose to utilize an open competition to select a design for the memorial. In doing so, the Fund accepted a long tradition for public landmarks that began in 1792 with the design of the United States Capitol.

By the time registration for the design closed on December 29, 1980, there were 2,573 registrants, of which one-third were teams, averaging three designers each. Thus, approximately 3,800 designers from around the country dredged through in this competition.

On March 31, 1981, the entries for the memorial

design closed, 1,421 designs were submitted, an American record for such a competition, and a record for international competition as well.

On May 1st, the jury reported to the Vietnam Veterans Fund with unanimous recommendation that Maya Lin's design be built on the proposed site.

On May 6, the Fund announced the winning entry. Its President, James C. Scruggs, founder of the Fund, was quoted in the press release as saying, "Maya's design best projects our thoughts about the memorial, which is to honor those Americans who had served in the Vietnam War."

And I certainly concur in his remarks. For the remainder of the year, the necessary approvals were obtained from the Department of the Interior, the National Planning Commission and this Commission as well, as stipulated by the legislation authorizing the memorial.

However, sometime in early 1982, a concerted effort was launched by a few individuals unhappy with the design, to overturn the decision recommended by the jury. Accepted by the Vietnam Veterans Memorial Fund, applauded by almost unanimous press, and approved by various public agencies involved.

At some point, and through some unknown process,

the original design was to be embellished through the dedication of a sculpture and a flag pole. The Secretary of the Interior's decision to accept these decisions then required another round of approval from your Commission and the National Planning Commission. Let us be considering a matter already decided by you.

The Vietnam Veterans Memorial Fund decided it when they accepted it. The competition jury and critical opinions have already accepted the design that is nearly constructed. The question of whether this memorial should have a statue or flag pole, in my opinion, has already been laid to rest.

The Fine Arts Commission has before it, not a compromise, but two different design solutions, commemorating the Vietnam Veterans. It also has before us two processes by which the designs were brought forward.

The original design, striking in its simplicity and power, is being used against a new design which uses the original design as a background for a statue and a flag pole. The new design is not a modification or an addition to the original winning design.

As I mentioned it is a design altogether. The original designer was a product of national open competition. The competition process itself is organized worldwide as a

method to seek excellence in design for significant projects that have symbolic value, such as monuments and major public buildings. Design competitions have been the subject of interest to members of the American Institute of Architects since its founding.

In 1870 the AIA issued its Schedule of Terms, regulating architectural competition. Over the years, a series of documents were developed to promote fair conduct for competition. Our commitment to fair, open competition is a matter of longstanding.

The Vietnam Veterans Memorial Fund wisely decided to use the national competition process, whose rules are recommended not only by the AIA, but also by the Union of International Architects. Proper competition is based on strict rules. A competent advisor, a program establishing the philosophical and practical considerations for the design is approved by the sponsor. A high, qualified jury of experts judges the entries, and then the competitors are openly requested, and the best design is then submitted to the sponsors for adaptation, or its recommendation.

Let us compare how the so-called compromise design was arrived at. The new design, which is before you today, was not produced by recognized public process. There was no

program that was given to the public, no qualified jury that was appointed from the public, no openness to qualified designers.

What served us so well over the centuries of design solutions for landmark structures was subverted. Narrow political pressures produced a totally new design.

Let me make it clear that before you today is not an embellishment of the winning design, it is, as I mentioned before, a new scheme altogether, in which the statue does become the axiom and the wall a backdrop. The statue would be the biggest memorial, seemingly anxious to make a statement about the war, but uncertain about what that statement should be.

This is precisely the kind of thing that the competition program sought to avoid, in what the winning design, in its quiet power and dignity totally avoided. Like the proverbial camel, this compromised memorial was designed by a committee, a committee that did not consult the designer, which would not only have been courtesy, but also accepted standard of professional practice, a committee willing to delay the dedication of this national memorial to those who served in the Vietnam War.

One of the criteria was a design that best honored

memory of those Americans who died by serving our country in Vietnam, the memory of those who were wounded, and the memory of those who served.

We believe that a memorial to honor those individuals who died, who were wounded, and who served, should be the best we as a Nation are capable of planning. When the Congress, in the name of the American people, set aside land for this monument, it certainly was not its intent to sanction compromise.

Congress surely expected design excellence. The American people surely demanded excellence, and our Veterans surely deserve design excellence. This was the objective of the original competition process, and this was the objective achieved by that process.

As I mentioned earlier, I have heard from Veterans who are affronted by the original design. We have also heard, just as forcefully, from participants in the competition, as well as relatives of Veterans killed in the war.

I would just like to give you a sense of the comments that we have been receiving. From Tennessee: I participated in the design competition, and feel the jury selected the best design. I lost my brother in Vietnam, and feel that the award winning design is an appropriate memorial.

From California: we feel the changes to a well conceived and properly run public design competition would set a dangerous precedent.

From Delaware: The simple walls of Ms. Lin's design pointing to the Washington Monument and the Lincoln Memorial will include the name of our older son. He was born three days before the Hiroshima bomb went off, and 23 years later he was dead. Please let the names stand for the prayers of the living who visit that spot of a hallowed grave.

From California: as an infantryman veteran of the Vietnam War, I was appalled to read last week that Ms. Lin's sensitive memorial to all Americans who died there is being compromised. I fully support your efforts to block this compromise.

Again, from California: in the final analysis, if the proposed modification is allowed to be executed, Maya Lin no longer wins, and we all lose.

To conclude, Mr. Chairman, we do all lose. The AIA is not against statues, flag poles or the American flag. We are for the integrity of the original design. The integrity of the process that has created that design, and the integrity of the public interest which the design serves. We are for the completion of this monument now as originally scheduled.

The Fine Arts Commission must insure the public interest is protected, and the design excellence in the Federal City is preserved. Including the integrity of the Mall. This is the challenge you face, as we look to each of you for leadership. Expedience should not allow compromise of a process built on integrity and consensus among participants from beginning to end. We should not allow a patched up modified compromise memorial to be built.

The best design was selected, that is the design that should be commissioned. Our Vietnam Veterans fought, and many died for our democratic process. This same democratic process led to design excellence in the selection of the original design. Our Veterans deserve nothing less than excellence, and the public trust demands nothing more.

Thank you for the opportunity to be here.

CHAIRMAN BROWN: Thank you very much.

The next speaker will be Paul Spreiregen, Professional Advisor for the Original Competition.

MR. SPREIREGEN: My name is Paul Spreiregen. I am an architect here in Washington. I was also the Professional Advisor to the Nationwide Competition which resulted in the original design for the Vietnam Veterans Memorial, the work of Maya Ying Lin.

The Fine Arts Commission must insure the public interest is protected, and the design excellence in the Federal City is preserved. Including the integrity of the Mall. This is the challenge you face, as we look to each of you for leadership. Expedience should not allow compromise of a process built on integrity and consensus among participants from beginning to end. We should not allow a patched up modified compromise memorial to be built.

The best design was selected, that is the design that should be commissioned. Our Vietnam Veterans fought, and many died for our democratic process. This same democratic process led to design excellence in the selection of the original design. Our Veterans deserve nothing less than excellence, and the public trust demands nothing more.

Thank you for the opportunity to be here.

CHAIRMAN BROWN: Thank you very much.

The next speaker will be Paul Spreiregen, Professional Advisor for the Original Competition.

MR. SPREIREGEN: My name is Paul Spreiregen. I am an architect here in Washington. I was also the Professional Advisor to the Nationwide Competition which resulted in the original design for the Vietnam Veterans Memorial, the work of Maya Ying Lin.

As for other credentials, really, except to the present matter, I have been a member of the Regional Planning and Design Competitions. I chaired the latter two. I initiated and developed the AIA National Program of Design in the sixties. I have had a deep interest in the planning of Washington, having come here originally as a designer for a downtown planning effort of 20 years ago.

I have taught as a visitor in schools of architecture, planning and landscape architect^{ure} across the country, and I was an editor, a former member of this Commission. ^(not of the Commission of Fine Arts) My professional involvement with the competition ended in 1981, by which time the National Park Service, the National Capital Planning Commission and the Commission of Fine Arts approved the original design concept with considerable enthusiasm, as I recall, of deep gratification.

Since then I have been an observer, at a distance, to the memorial design development. While removed, I have been quite concerned over the events leading to this meeting.

I have come now to address the aesthetics and urban design merits of the proposed additions, the statue and the flag pole. In so doing, I will try to be precise and specific.

To address the merits of the proposed additions, without equivocation, it must be said that they are not at a

level of quality equal to the occasion. They are a distracting appendix to a design which operates fully only if it is unencumbered. They are a misunderstanding at least of reputation, at most.

The principles of design compromise the wall. They are incorrect. They are a diminution of the intending legislation. They are impractical in several aspects, and they are, as a result, an insult to the aesthetic spiritual sensitivity of Americans.

I will concentrate on the aesthetic aspects of honoring the memory of those who served and died. I do not speak lightly.

Equally, I do not enjoy attacking the work of any architect, or any group of people, particularly those who are here today, but in this case it is regretful.

Last spring, when the Vietnam Fund announced that a flag pole and sculpture would be added to the original design, I became quite alarmed. I knew that the background of that announcement, of the whole memorial design was in serious jeopardy, but I was also alarmed because even if construction of the original design might not be allowed to begin, which fortunately it was, the idea of a statue and flag pole addition was totally incorrect.

Only two weeks ago did I see the proposed statue at the Pension Building. A proposed statue design, incorrect in basic concept, serves only to prove that it is neither wanted or needed. Taken by itself, in model form, in uniform, in tiny scale, set in a pedestal indoors, the skill of the sculptor has powerful attraction, but the attraction is deceptive. Imagined in full size, or larger than life size, in real metal in its proposed location, opposite the two granite walls, and judge with real knowledge how the Mall operates, and how people experience it, and what they experience, the statue and flag pole proposal should be dismissed.

Just imagine visiting Arlington Cemetery, the uniform headstones by this Commission, establish this sense of purpose to the soldiers buried there. This establishes the sense to all our Nation's soldiers. It has an equal aesthetic partner, that is the breathtaking panorama of the Mall, the Washington Monument, the Lincoln Memorial and all the rest together.

What we have in visiting Arlington Cemetery is the individual soldier bound up in comradeship into a hard purpose, and all of them together are bound into the glorious symbols of our Nation, the symbols so clearly arranged on the Mall.

We have the essence and spirit of the L'Enfant plan carried beyond its original design, the essence and spirit of that plan is to establish clear, visual relationships between the component parts of the city and nature, between its natural features, its symbolic features, its every day structures and its commemorative memorials. The visual relationships were designed to be comprehensible, to normal human beings, with normal human sensibilities and faculties.

The component features themselves are assigned, ranged in an easy progression of importance. Democracy and its sustained citizens are put into a clear and whole relationship working together visually all to achieve a higher sense of purpose.

The Lincoln Memorial is thus the better of things to the Washington Monument and vice versa. Both of these are better seen in relationship to the Capitol, and again vice versa. Yet all this works because there is no distracting clutter to interfere.

So with all the buildings and memorials on the Mall, each claim a degree of supporting role, each in a hierarchy, and each with different courses of success, of course. Each soldier's grave in Arlington gives special poignancy to the dearer cost of democracy. In one place ~~the~~ circling the base

of the Washington Monument, a bouquet of American flags serves as a special focus, not flags here and there and everywhere across the Mall, but in one unified ring.

But, come back to Arlington Cemetery for a moment. Suppose now what it would be like if we were to install here and there, in Arlington Cemetery, groups of larger than life soldier statues, in various historical combat outfits, winding their ways through the trees, coming upon the headstones. Suppose some well intentioned citizens proposed such a sculpture for Arlington Cemetery?

And, if not for Arlington, why for the Washington Monument? What would be wrong with having the fife player and the drummer boy marching up, larger than life, and how about some brigades fighting their way through the Lincoln Memorial?

The most you could say about such an idea is that it is a mediocre joke. In the hands of Saturday Night Live it might work up more of a laugh, because that is its practical intellectual level. This is precisely what is proposed.

Is this how you are supposed to honor the memory, with a parody? If you try to examine the President's program seriously, the statue and flag pole becomes serious mischief. The destructive effects are threefold.

First of all, both proposed additions, statue and flag pole, would serve to distract from the superb and essential visual relationships between the original Lin design and its two primary references, the Washington Monument and the Lincoln Memorial. The statue and flag pole would shortcircuit that essential linking relationship. We would honor the memory and service less.

Secondly, the statue group, with vertical massing, placed near a horizontal wall element would become the composition of focus, even placed a distance from the wall. Likewise, the flag pole near the apex of the wall would contend with the apex as the point of focus of the names.

In short, the statue and flag pole, at -- can neither support lead roles, nor do they contribute any compositional harmony. They only serve to throw the composition awry. You can take the statue and flag pole out of the composition, leaving the walls, but you can't take the walls away leaving the statue and flag pole. We would honor the memory and service less.

Third, and even more distressing, perhaps most distressing, a figure of representation of specific symbols will serve the limited and so reduce the vast array of patriotism on the part of Americans who visit the site. We would again

ws40

honor the memory and service less.

That week in April, a year and a half ago, during which the selection jury deliberated, was a high point in exercising artistic judgment for the Nation, and so of discharging patriotic disability. The eight person jury included former members of this Commission, they included combat veterans of two world wars. Neither, however, are the reasons that they served as jurors. They were asked to be the jurors because they were found to be the most able in exercising the most discerning judgment.

Vietnam Veterans made the decision to utilize the selection of these jurors. The jurors' names were made to the two approving agencies, lest there be objection to anyone. Similarly, the jurors' names were made known to the competitors prior to the commencement of the competition, and they were published in all the relevant competition documents.

In evaluating the some 1,420 or 30, I don't quite remember, designs, the jurors gave the most thoughtful consideration to all design possibilities, without bias, including designs that proposed the sculptural elements. There were numerous designs with figurative abstracts, intended sort of one figure or another. The jurors' contention was that no symbols were appropriate for the reason that they

would arrest a visitor's thoughts, rather than enlarge it.

The jurors reasoned that it should stimulate them in many areas. It should not tell you what to think, and feel, but make you think and feel.

The jury was concerned with thoughts and feelings, and not restrictions. How much more is an open-ended expansive design in any figure of a flag?

Starting from the Lincoln Memorial, then the Capitol Dome, and all the rest, it achieves that full power, only if it is unfettered. That is a way of honoring memory and service.

By adding anything, by, worse, a flag pole and statue, the vast array of possibilities are arrested in flight. Without these additions, I can well imagine present and future visitors to this memorial reflecting on so many aspects of patriotism, and the Veterans themselves will have their own memories to bring out. They don't need a statue.

I can imagine many aspects of patriotism being reflected upon the service of our citizens to our Nation, the bond our Nation has to its allies, our better intentions sometimes realized and sometimes thwarted, and yes, as we must, all those tragic aspects of Vietnam, in the lives given. Because all of that, and much more, has become

unavoidably avoided in the single work of Vietnam.

To attempt to unbalance that range in a memorial through a statue is to reduce the larger benefits which this memorial and recollection of Vietnam and our heroes of Vietnam stand to offer us.

In this, there is no question of right or wrong, but rather of problems, and that I think is a way of honoring memory and service.

To repeat a great work of art doesn't tell you what to think, it makes you think. A great work of art, and not a parody of one, honors the memory and service.

On a more practical level, the proposed statue and flag pole poses a number of problems. I suppose the cost of a Park Service person raising and lowering it isn't that great, but it will be something. The statue, in metal, will not protect itself against the foliage. Bronze would serve it better.

The statue group also has lots of protrusions, fingers, rifle butts and barrels, which are easily broken or bent. Particularly if they are reachable. The Ulysses S. Grant statue at the foot of the Capitol, is worth examining in that respect. Even though mounted on pedestals, its protrusions are broken. The Burghers of ^{Colais} Caillaux, designed

3

for placement at ground level is also a lesson in detailing. Its details are not prone to damage. The rifles in the statue furthermore, are prone to be vertical, while the rest of the statue group is level, this will distort the statue.

As to placement of the statue and the flag pole, it is not at all difficult to try to relocate it, either, one, 10 or 50 or 100 feet, and it would not make any difference. That they are arbitrary in their locations, shows that they are not necessary.

I would urge anyone to move the flag poles and the statue on the model, and see if it makes any difference. Time does not allow, but in the context of this examination, it could be helpful to examine the monument in Helsinki, the Hiroshima Memorial, the Memorial to the Departed in Milan, of course, the Washington Memorial, the Jefferson and the Lincoln Memorials.

The lesson was learned well by a flier who died in World War II, once wrote, if anything at all, perfection is achieved not when there is no longer anything which can be added, but when there is no longer anything which can be taken away.

One last point to you, the members of this Commission, if I may. It is a misconception, occasionally voiced, that

14

democracies are incapable of planning and building beautiful cities. Edinburg and New Amsterdam refute that, but no city is greater testimony than the one in which we now live. No democracy has created as expensive and artful a capital as has the United States. The roots of its plan are the gifts of Western Civilization, as are the plans' embellishment. It is predominantly classical architecture.

History and the present are able to stand comfortably together here. The credit for this lives in the magnanimity in the original plan and the stewardship of three agencies, the National Park Service, the National Planning Commission and you, the Commission of Fine Arts.

Through you, the Nation chooses its most important art, its most important art. Through you our Nation shifts its embodying symbols. Through a great plan, those symbols enlarge each other and us. Those democratic Nations which have made their capital cities as whole designs, one thinks of ^{Camberra} Candia and ^{Camberra} Brazilia, Candia was still under British authority. Little else comes to mind.

Even in part, where is there to compare? How much does London have, or Paris? A single building in most of those cases, tucked aside. No democratic capital expresses so much of its Nation as does ours. A great Nation is honored

only by great works of art. Great art, and only great art should honor great memory and great service.

Our Capital and our law are such great works of art, so can be the Vietnam Veterans Memorial in the original.

Thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN BROWN: Our next is Henry F. Arnold, the Designer of Constitutional Gardens.

MR. ARNOLD: Mr. Chairman and members of the Fine Arts Commission, when all the furor over the present controversy is forgotten, there are issues that are forgotten today, that will assert themselves in ever growing consistency. These issues deal with specific design context, and the aesthetic purposes of the park in relationship to this memory.

The civic design context of the Federal Mall has certain criteria which must be respected if we are to respect the Nation's front yard. The intrinsic suitability for art in the Nation's Capital must be judged by the highest standards of art. Appropriate relationships to elements of the place, how does it fit, is it complimentary to the surroundings?

Finally, the question of precedents. Do we want more of the same caliber of work that we are approving today to be built tomorrow? That is a challenge that must be

only by great works of art. Great art, and only great art should honor great memory and great service.

Our Capital and our law are such great works of art, so can be the Vietnam Veterans Memorial in the original.

Thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN BROWN: Our next is Henry F. Arnold, the Designer of Constitutional Gardens.

MR. ARNOLD: Mr. Chairman and members of the Fine Arts Commission, when all the furor over the present controversy is forgotten, there are issues that are forgotten today, that will assert themselves in ever growing consistency. These issues deal with specific design context, and the aesthetic purposes of the park in relationship to this memory.

The civic design context of the Federal Mall has certain criteria which must be respected if we are to respect the Nation's front yard. The intrinsic suitability for art in the Nation's Capital must be judged by the highest standards of art. Appropriate relationships to elements of the place, how does it fit, is it complimentary to the surroundings?

Finally, the question of precedents. Do we want more of the same caliber of work that we are approving today to be built tomorrow? That is a challenge that must be

answered.

Secondly, there are the aesthetic purposes of the park. These, incidentally, were affirmed by your approval of the plan of Constitution Gardens in 1975. The park was to be a place of dignified beauty, with broad open meadows surrounded by wooded edges. It was to be viewed uncluttered under the canopy of trees. There were to be no interruptions in the ground plane, except the tree trunks and the low ground cover. There were to be no vertical objects in the open meadow. Because the meadows were within view of the Washington Monument. There were to be no flags.

The Washington Monument is provided with this eloquently. How does the proposed addition meet these criteria? The proximity of the new proposal to the Lincoln Memorial diminishes the simplicity of the design by its incongruity.

What about the intrinsic suitability as art? The proposed, undistinguished, made to order statue is a sentimental response to a difference of opinion. The result is more likely to serve as a memorial to pettiness and corruptive endeavor.

Finally, the park design. By itself, the proposed statue is just a small, square on the visual integrity of the

17

park. The flag pole is a jar and intrusion. By their precedent, the park is more likely to become a repository for heroic statues and clashing symbols to detract from the aesthetic purposes.

Considering the importance of this issue, it might be prudent and appropriate for the Commission to delay their decision until each member of the Fine Arts Commission and the Memorial detractors have had the chance to visit the Memorial, after it is completed, and experience the mysterious power of this unprecedented work of art. Such a course might and the controversy, and become one more case in history where great art has become its own protector.

CHAIRMAN BROWN: Thank you very much.

Next on my list is Wolf Von Eckardt.

MR. VON ECKARDT: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, members of the Commission.

I read Tom Wolf this morning, and reflected on Maya Lin's wall, and looked, and I couldn't see Jane Fonda in there at all.

More seriously, Tom Wolf does point up a calamity of our time which I have very often long discussed, and that calamity is the enormous gap between what some call elite art and popular art. Between avant-garde and traditions.

17 — park. The flag pole is a jar and intrusion. By their precedent, the park is more likely to become a repository for heroic statues and clashing symbols to detract from the aesthetic purposes.

Considering the importance of this issue, it might be prudent and appropriate for the Commission to delay their decision until each member of the Fine Arts Commission and the Memorial detractors have had the chance to visit the Memorial, after it is completed, and experience the mysterious power of this unprecedented work of art. Such a course might end the controversy, and become one more case in history where great art has become its own protector.

CHAIRMAN BROWN: Thank you very much.

Next on my list is Wolf Von Eckardt.

MR. VON ECKARDT: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, members of the Commission.

I read Tom Wolf this morning, and reflected on Maya Lin's wall, and looked, and I couldn't see Jane Fonda in there at all.

More seriously, Tom Wolf does point up a calamity of our time which I have very often long discussed, and that calamity is the enormous gap between what some call elite art and popular art. Between avant-garde and traditions.

Between representational and abstract. Similar arguments were heard about the Washington Monument, which is, of course, also an abstract monument, and nobody has proposed a figure, an image of George Washington on there, and the problem that we have, which I tried to deal as a survivor, is a difficult one, but I think in time it is going to be resolved. It is, in fact, being resolved through what we all call the cultural explosion, the enormous number of people who visit museums, and the wonderful effort the American museums particularly are making through the proliferation, if I may say so, of critics of the newspapers, even on television, through discussions, and through a wonderful instrument which is peculiarly American, citizen participation in design.

I am very much in favor of all of this, and I think that in the end, maybe in our lifetime, our culture will find the common hiatus found in which we will not have this kind of argument.

I am glad we are having it, I am glad so many people are interested in memorials, and in urban design, and in park design. But we are not going to resolve the gap in our culture through subverting the established procedures. I do not need to repeat the established procedures.

Mr. Lawrence and Ms. Lin have very eloquently, and

very, with great detail, outlined them. But most of all, if the democracy is going to work also in the field of erecting great monuments, we need law and order, and I think the Veterans of the Vietnam War, and any other way, will agree that that is, first of all, if we want to oppose the flag, and if we want to oppose the motivation that all people of goodwill have, we cannot have law and order if the Federal Government of the United States is meddling in issues that concern art and the public. It is not a Federal issue. It is not for the Secretary of the Interior to conclude what kind of monument we have.

I think the Vietnam Memorial Fund and the Fine Arts Commission should not allow themselves to be intimidated by the threat of their withholding building permits. The Veterans of America come to the Mall without Secretary Watts' permission.

We don't -- if you don't oppose the rules, and if you don't keep hope with our art, we will have ugliness and not art. We cannot compromise on this.

Thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN BROWN: Thank you very much.

Next I have Michael Straight.

MR. STRAIGHT: Mr. Chairman, what I have to say is purely extemporaneous.

very, with great detail, outlined them. But most of all, if the democracy is going to work also in the field of erecting great monuments, we need law and order, and I think the Veterans of the Vietnam War, and any other way, will agree that that is, first of all, if we want to oppose the flag, and if we want to oppose the motivation that all people of goodwill have, we cannot have law and order if the Federal Government of the United States is meddling in issues that concern art and the public. It is not a Federal issue. It is not for the Secretary of the Interior to conclude what kind of monument we have.

I think the Vietnam Memorial Fund and the Fine Arts Commission should not allow themselves to be intimidated by the threat of their withholding building permits. The Veterans of America come to the Mall without Secretary Watts' permission.

We don't -- if you don't oppose the rules, and if you don't keep hope with our art, we will have ugliness and not art. We cannot compromise on this.

Thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN BROWN: Thank you very much.

Next I have Michael Straight.

MR. STRAIGHT: Mr. Chairman, what I have to say is purely extemporaneous.

I am a former B-17 pilot, a former B-29 pilot, a former chairman of the American Veterans Committee and a former deputy chairman of the National Endowment of the Arts.

I listened this morning with respect, and at times, awe, to my fellow Veterans. The Post this morning carried an inflammatory article designed to rub raw an open wound, by saying that this, Ms. Lin's extraordinary design was there to honor Jane Fonda.

I thank my fellow Americans for not falling for this kind of cheap debate today, and for exercising restraint, and betterment of art, and everything that was said.

When the Congressman spoke of near ^{mere} aesthetics, in urging the additions to Ms. Lin's design, I would suggest on the contrary, that aesthetics alone matter here today. If we are talking about non-aesthetics, in relation to the deserving Veterans of Vietnam, then we are talking about hospitals, libraries, schools, not designs in this part of the Nation's Capital. It is solely an aesthetic statement which you are asked to consider as such. It is the final truth.

James Webb, in his impressive opening statements here, defended that concept by saying that there was agreement between all of us, that what was needed was integrated unity

of the whole memorial.

From then on, we have heard only of the word compromise. Mr. Webb himself pointed out that the new integrated unity which he sought, if these additions are made, was one in which the three figures here would look across the wall with its moving names to the flag itself. It would tell a story, as he said, that it is a concept, but it is not Ms. Lin's concept. She spoke of it melding one into another, and thought that even the process of melding would make it impure. But that is not even melding. The two cannot be melded.

I do not mean by this that there was no place for a flag at a Veterans Memorial, or even that there is no place for some precise imagery.

If additions are to be made, then I am begging you, only in the name of art itself, to consult the voice which was heard here only briefly today, the voice of the artist. It may be that in time these additions can be worked in. They cannot be worked in.

The only statement today which jogged between those who came here in a sense of respect to this amendment, and yet urged the additions, and those who like myself speak against those particular additions, the only voice here in assault on that spirit, I am sorry to say, was the voice of the

Undersecretary of the Interior, who in fact said, in a bald-faced threat, either you take what I give you today or else it will not be dedicated in November. Two days in November are a very short period.

But you remember the words of the Romans, life is short, the heart is long. These monuments will be here, good or bad, for centuries, and it is in the interest of centuries, and with love and veneration for those Veterans, we urge you to think only in terms of the very fineness which you can offer them.

CHAIRMAN BROWN: Thank you.

Next is Peter Masters.

A VOICE: He had to leave.

CHAIRMAN BROWN: He had to leave.

Former President of the Design Council, Jim Brodniak.

MR. BRODNIAK: Mr. Chairman, I am Jim Brodniak, Local Coordinator of the Vietnam Veterans Against the War. Not all Veterans groups approve of the additional elements.

I also find that the Undersecretary of the Interior, his statement, if you don't accept it, you don't get it dedicated, as absurd.

I am a playwright. I would not have someone take a play that I have written and make additions to it, add

Undersecretary of the Interior, who in fact said, in a bald-faced threat, either you take what I give you today or else it will not be dedicated in November. Two days in November are a very short period.

But you remember the words of the Romans, life is short, the heart is long. These monuments will be here, good or bad, for centuries, and it is in the interest of centuries, and with love and veneration for those Veterans, we urge you to think only in terms of the very fineness which you can offer them.

CHAIRMAN BROWN: Thank you.

Next is Peter Masters.

A VOICE: He had to leave.

CHAIRMAN BROWN: He had to leave.

Former President of the Design Council, Jim Brodniak.

MR. BRODNIAK: Mr. Chairman, I am Jim Brodniak, Local Coordinator of the Vietnam Veterans Against the War. Not all Veterans groups approve of the additional elements.

I also find that the Undersecretary of the Interior, his statement, if you don't accept it, you don't get it dedicated, as absurd.

I am a playwright. I would not have someone take a play that I have written and make additions to it, add

3 —
characters, or take away.

The design is such that I can go in, and I can remember, and that is the only thing that has to be done.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BROWN: Janice Connally.

MS. CONNALLY: Mr. Chairman and members of the Commission, I speak as an individual member of the general public.

I wish to speak for Maya Lin's design, and as originally submitted. The figures have a kind of photographic realism that we associate with the Marine Memorial here in Washington.

Those of us who lived through the Second World War were thrilled by the photographs which inspired this work, raising the flag spoke eloquently to the emotions at that time.

But what are the memorable images from the war in Vietnam? A guerrilla shot at pointblank range, a naked girl afire, running screaming down a dusty road, American college students slain by their countrymen on the grassy slopes.

I think Maya Lin was right in going beyond these kinds of images. She gave us not realism, but abstraction. She resolved all the pain and conflict of that unhappy time in a simple message of sacrifice and quiet heroism.

I think additions to her design, in another style, from another time, would be inappropriate, and detract from the solemnity and grandeur of her design.

Thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN BROWN: Thank you.

James J. Butera.

MR. BUTERA: I am not sure if you called me, but I have been waiting all afternoon, so I will take the opportunity.

CHAIRMAN BROWN: Do you want to give your name for the record?

MR. BUTERA: James J. Butera.

I certainly appreciate the opportunity to discuss the Vietnam Veterans Memorial. It is appropriate that the unresolved issues be debated and deliberated in an open forum such as this. It well exemplifies the basic concept that this country stands for, defending these democratic principles, and why the United States has involved itself in most of these foreign wars, and I believe this includes Vietnam.

By way of background, I should state that I am a lawyer by trade, not an architect, and thus I hope to contribute to this hearing simply as one who was involved in this war, who was involved in the efforts of the Vietnam Veterans Fund to raise the money necessary to complete this worthy project.

I think additions to her design, in another style, from another time, would be inappropriate, and detract from the solemnity and grandeur of her design.

Thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN BROWN: Thank you.

James J. Butera.

MR. BUTERA: I am not sure if you called me, but I have been waiting all afternoon, so I will take the opportunity.

CHAIRMAN BROWN: Do you want to give your name for the record?

MR. BUTERA: James J. Butera.

I certainly appreciate the opportunity to discuss the Vietnam Veterans Memorial. It is appropriate that the unresolved issues be debated and deliberated in an open forum such as this. It well exemplifies the basic concept that this country stands for, defending these democratic principles, and why the United States has involved itself in most of these foreign wars, and I believe this includes Vietnam.

By way of background, i should state that I am a lawyer by trade, not an architect, and thus I hope to contribute to this hearing simply as one who was involved in this war, who was involved in the efforts of the Vietnam Veterans Fund to raise the money necessary to complete this worthy project.

My legal specialization is in banking, so I have no client who is interested here.

To put it as clearly as possibly can be stated, I am staunchly opposed to the modifications to the original design submitted by Maya Lin. I am not going to argue this on the standpoint of aesthetics or artistic integrity, because you, after all, are the experts in that field.

However, from the standpoint of law, logic and elementary fairness, it strikes me as indefensible that anyone should now have a design that is based on free and open competition, available to anyone, and all entries.

Earlier I referred to the concept of open debate as embodying the essence of our system of government. Another fundamental concept is what we lawyers refer to as due process of law. Basically what this means is that no individual should be deprived of rights and privileges, except in accordance with the clearly established, and fairly administered rules.

As applied, the subject matter under discussion here, one could only conclude that this ex parte tampering with the winning design, after the fact, violates everyone's reasonable expectation of how the competition was restructured.

I am very sensitive to the views of the individuals

who have been directly involved in the Vietnam Veterans Memorial Fund. They worked hard, and accomplished a great deal to bring this project this far along. But sometimes we become so fixated by a goal that we lose sight of the larger purpose, and I would just like to talk about that larger purpose for a moment.

The larger purpose, as best I can perceive it, is nothing more than basic fairness, the fairness that we owe the Vietnam Veterans, because the burden of that war lasts, or rather, the role is not evenly distributed. The Vietnam War was unique.

The Post pointed that out well, but little else, in the article today. It was unique in that we reversed the time honored tradition of this country, that the ones in this society are the ones to do the most when the country is in need.

In my professional field, and I suspect it is true in medicine, the arts, politics and business, one rarely encounters Vietnam ^{veterans} ~~benefits~~. Because deferments and outs are too readily available for those who wish to take advantage of the situation. Let us not compound this unfairness by violating the rules that were established for selecting a memorial to those who made the ultimate sacrifice.

7

I believe that when called upon we all have the responsibility to give something back to this country, which provides us with the opportunity to succeed on the basis of our abilities, the opportunity is one of the reasons that my grandparents came to this country, they came from Italy, about the turn of the century. Through these opportunities my parents were able to pass on the living conditions to me, as I hope to do for my children.

The design competition for the Vietnam Memorial signifies the opportunities that still exist in this country. Why should this Commission, a government agency, or any person, whomsoever, now seek to deny Ms. Lin the fruits of her creative talents and her abilities?

Reflecting back to 1966, I recall, in vivid detail, the ideals and enthusiasm instilled in all the graduates of the Marine Corps Officer Training right here at Quantico, Virginia. Six of us took a brief holiday before shipping out to Vietnam. Of those six, two died in Vietnam, three of us got back with wounds of varying degrees. One got back unscratched, but I can attest that he attempted suicide on more than one occasion.

When you join the Marines, you know the rules, so there ^{are} is no complaints. But all of us should complain when

someone tries to change the groundrules, when they don't like the end result. Fairness is not one person or another. It is a concept of patriotism at today's hearing. Patriotism in my view is nothing more than doing the duty when the occasion arises.

Heroism, on the other hand, takes many forms, and it is not to be equated with Bronze Stars, Purple Hearts and medals accumulated in jungle warfare by individuals such as myself.

I am not -- I don't think it is appropriate here, although I would certainly be prepared to match medals and war stories with some of the speakers that preceded me. I just don't think that is the point today.

Most of the men and women who served in Vietnam, and surely all those who died, fall into the category of heroism, doing the unpopular, doing the difficult.

In light of their memory, I urge and plead to the members of this Commission not to take the easy course, but to do the heroic, reject the concept of architecture by consensus. Artistic endeavor by compromise, you have heard that word a lot today, and most of all, reject the political manipulation of an award won in free competition. Nowhere is it written that there can only be one Vietnam Memorial.

And so to those individuals who, for reasons sincere, I am sure, they may be dissatisfied with Ms. Lin's winning design, I say go back to work and create another award. This one should have been settled a long time ago, and we are now witnessing just another disservice to the individuals who should be honored.

CHAIRMAN BROWN: Thank you very much.

Peggy Robin.

MS. ROBIN: My name is Peggy Robin, I am on the Landmarks Committee ANC-3c. I came here as a citizen and resident of the city.

Most of the points I wanted to make about incongruity of the statue have been made.

But I would like to add my voice to someone who is neither an architectural expert nor a Vietnam Veteran, but one who will be visiting the Memorial as friends, who are preserved in Vietnam.

I would like to be able to walk through this beautiful and moving park, and look at the monument in quiet reflection and pride, without the fact that three enormous giants are looking over my shoulder. The statue may serve a need of the Vietnam Veteran, if that is so, couldn't it be placed on its own spot, and not left to intrude on the complete

serenity of the design?

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BROWN: Thank you.

And finally, Darrell J. Gaebel. If he is still with us, private citizen and Vietnam Veteran.

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN BROWN: Okay.

That concludes this part of the meeting. We are going to go over to the site now, briefly, and then come back.

MR. NETSCH: Mr. Chairman, would you be assuming that we will be convening in approximately half an hour?

CHAIRMAN BROWN: That is right.

MR. NETSCH: So we will be reconvening about five o'clock?

CHAIRMAN BROWN: Right.

Thank you very much.

(Short recess.)

(Balance of transcript, consisting of 13 pages, del'd 10-14-82)