

The CHAIRMAN. You fail to differentiate between the way we felt about the Japanese military and the way we felt about the Japanese people. That is an unfair interpretation of the history of my generation. We did not hate the Japanese. We do not hate the Japanese. We did hate the people who were conducting that war in such a brutal way. There is a distinction, I think, that veterans still feel today, in the way we feel about the former Japanese military and the way we feel about the Japanese people. And that poll reflected the way we felt about the Japanese military.

Mr. LINENTHAL. Well, all I can say, Senator, every Pacific war veteran that I have interviewed said to me that they understood this war as fundamentally different from the war in Europe. Edwin C. Bearss, a very respected historian, a Pacific war combat veteran who was a member of our advisory committee and someone I am proud to claim as a friend, for whom I worked at the 50th anniversary of Pearl Harbor, said to me you know, for all of us in the Pacific war, the war was to the knife, and the knife was to the hilt.

So what I am saying to you is that that phrase was meant to suggest that the war in the Pacific had a particular kind of anger and vengeance of the racist policies of the Japanese toward other Asians and toward Americans, with American views of the Japanese.

And the second part of that, that this was a war for the Japanese to defend themselves against American imperialism was a very clumsy way of the curators trying to say this is why the Japanese were fighting so ferociously and almost senselessly at the end of the war. Now put together in the way that it was, it could in fact have been read as an indictment. And everybody recognized that and said look, this is going to be misinterpreted, this is going to be read wrong. You have got to take it out. The curators understood it themselves.

That phrase went out after the first script and 6, 7, 8 months later that phrase was still being used by people to pillory the museum and the curators. That, I think, is unfair.

Yes, of course, you have a responsibility and an obligation to be involved. I would have hoped that the involvement of the public would have first have been to think perhaps about the volatility of these issues, these different narratives that the Smithsonian was trying to balance, the heroic and the tragic, and not immediately jump to accusing the curators as being anti-American. I think that was unfortunate.

The CHAIRMAN. Professor, that is what this hearing is about. The question has to be why is the Smithsonian, the pre-eminent depository of our history and the artifacts thereof, hiring someone who writes that first draft? You do not see it the way we do.

Mr. LINENTHAL. No, I do not.

The CHAIRMAN. The first draft was not scholarly, it was revisionist and did not belong in the Smithsonian to start with. And that has been admitted by the changes.

We will go on to the next witness. Thank you very much, sir.

Mr. LINENTHAL. Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN. Now we are going to turn to Secretary Heyman, Dr. Crouch, and Ms. Newman, please. Do you swear the testimony you are about to give is the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

Mr. HEYMAN. Yes, sir.

Mr. CROUCH. Yes, sir.

Ms. NEWMAN. Yes, sir.

TESTIMONY OF I. MICHAEL HEYMAN, SECRETARY, SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION, WASHINGTON, DC, ACCOMPANIED BY CONSTANCE B. NEWMAN, UNDER SECRETARY, SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION, AND THOMAS D. CROUCH, ASSISTANT DIRECTOR FOR AERONAUTICS, NATIONAL AIR AND SPACE MUSEUM

Mr. HEYMAN. Good morning, Mr. Chairman and members of the committee. I am Michael Heyman, Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution, and I am accompanied by Constance Newman, who is the Under Secretary, and Thomas Crouch, who is the Assistant Director for Aeronautics of the National Air and Space Museum, and was involved with the *Enola Gay* exhibition. On the next panel, I will be joined by Dr. Maxine Singer, chair of the Commission on the Future of the Smithsonian Institution.

Before answering questions, I would like to make a few observations. As you know, I became Secretary of the Smithsonian on the 19th of September of 1994, so I have been there about 8 months. I began my tenure at a time of considerable controversy over the exhibition of the *Enola Gay*. I had some great concerns about and disagreement with the first script. In fact, it was not any secret to anyone because I commented in my installation address that our first script was deficient. I believed then, and I believe now, that too much of the context of the use of the atomic bomb was taken for granted, and that the proposed exhibition was out of balance, hence appearing to be historically inaccurate.

It was my view that in late October we had turned that corner. We benefitted by a long consultation with knowledgeable representatives of the American Legion, observations by other veterans organizations, and a substantial revamping by curatorial staff of the proposed exhibit that produced a much more balanced script. The revamped exhibit included a new 4,000 square foot section on the war in the Pacific, and extensive revisions to the script throughout. While these organizations did not endorse the exhibit, in part waiting for its finishing touches, they did not oppose it. Thus in January, I believed that we could

mount that exhibit. I was wrong. Shortly thereafter, a controversy once again erupted between the Smithsonian and the American Legion over the changing of one of the labels dealing with potential casualties. At that point, it became clear to me that we could not proceed, given renewed efforts to have the exhibition cancelled. I recognized that the problem was more than a question of balance and our efforts to achieve balance would not resolve the issue. The fundamental flaw, in my view, lay in the concept of the exhibition itself. The basic error was attempting to couple an historical dialogue centering on the use of atomic weapons with the 50th commemoration of the end of the war.

I have observed here today what I observed during this whole controversy, that people, especially those who were participants in the Second World War, remembered with vividness and with emotion their participation and their sacrifice, what happened to their lives in relationship to that. I think when you are dealing with a subject matter of this sort, where those who have in fact experienced have to be looked to, and you have to—if you are going to have a commemoration exhibition—you have to organize it consistently with those remembrances and those recollections. Moreover, in terms of the exhibition itself, as has been already testified, we could not escape the negative characterizations of the original script, which repetitively appeared in the media.

On January 30, I shared with the Board of Regents my decision to replace the *Enola Gay* exhibition. The central feature of the new exhibition, which is scheduled to open sometime in June or early July, will be a display permitting the *Enola Gay* and its crew to speak for themselves. In addition, it will contain materials on the history of the B-29 aircraft, and the restoration of the *Enola Gay* by the Smithsonian. It will include memorabilia from the 509th, and it will include a video of interviews with survivors of the 509th, which is not yet finished but ought to be finished in the next week and a half, or at least put into rough form so that I can take a look at it. I also announced that I would undertake a management review of the Air and Space Museum, paying particular attention to an examination of the museum's mission. That review is being conducted already by the National Academy of Public Administration, and those findings will come to us in September for consideration of the regents and the administration at the Smithsonian.

It is evident that I have to have, and I do have, concerns beyond the one controversial exhibit that we are talking about. The Institution has an obligation to be historically accurate and balanced in all of its exhibitions. We have an obligation to consider the opinions of the interested public in the framing of the exhibitions. To that end the Smithsonian needs to establish policies on exhibitions. We are doing that right now. We are developing guidelines that will establish appropriate

parameters within which museum directors and curators will collaborate on the choice and design of exhibitions, the processes for review and intervention, including a role for the Secretary's office, the extent to which historical exhibitions should speak within the context of the time, and ways to assure that our multiple audiences feel that their own ideas are being respected.

When I decided to replace the *Enola Gay* exhibition, I indicated that the Institution had much to learn from the experience. On April 19, the University of Michigan co-sponsored, with the Smithsonian, a day-long symposium entitled, "Presenting History: Museums in a Democratic Society." Participants included representatives from the historical community, veterans organizations, journalists and museum professionals. The purpose of the symposium was to examine issues surrounding controversial exhibitions. Discussions ranged from the evolution of the role of museums, and their responsibilities, including the differentiation potentially of the responsibilities of public museums and private museums, their responsibilities to various constituencies, and how to define controversy. These discussions, which we are summarizing right now, will help the Institution in putting together our guidelines.

I obviously have a number of regrets about this whole situation. One is that it has gotten in the way of the commemoration of our nation's victory over aggression 50 years ago. We at the Smithsonian did not want this controversy to overshadow the recognition that our veterans so richly deserve.

In that vein, we will be opening a display at the Museum of American History in June that focuses both on the war front and the home front during World War II. That museum has worked with the Center for Military History to design a unique exhibit where primary focus is to elicit memories and personal experiences from those who lived during the war years. In this way, the exhibit will become part of the history itself by capturing and preserving personal histories that otherwise might be lost to the ages.

In addition to that, there are other exhibits in American History and elsewhere, and other programs commemorative of the end of the Second World War.

I also regret that the *Enola Gay* controversy has led some to doubt the value of historical inquiry by museums. I believe that important artifacts of American history ought to be exhibited in historical context. I think that it makes them much more understandable. I think that great care has to be taken in the definition of that context and the reviewing process which I indicate is the manner in which to assure that that occurs.

Finally, an important point to be made is that in singling out a few examples of the Smithsonian's exhibitions and public programs, it is possible to draw a conclusion that does not reflect the fact that the Institution produces hundreds and hundreds of

exhibits and programs each year which are well received by the general public. Taken in their entirety, they provide a balanced and stimulating array of viewpoints on a myriad of subjects. More importantly, the Institution has great respect for its visitors and their abilities to appreciate the museum experience in their own way.

Dr. Crouch has a brief statement and I thought it best, with your permission, if he gave that statement and then we began to answer questions, if that is all right with you, Mr. Chairman.

[The prepared statement of Mr. Heyman follows:]

STATEMENT OF IRA MICHAEL HEYMAN, SECRETARY, THE SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION

Good morning, Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee. I am Michael Heyman, Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution. Today, I am accompanied by Constance B. Newman, Under Secretary, and Thomas Crouch, Assistant Director for Aeronautics, the National Air and Space Museum. On the next panel I will be joined by Dr. Maxine F. Singer, Chair of the Commission on the Future of the Smithsonian Institution.

Before answering your questions, let me make a few observations. As you know, I became Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution on the 19th of September of 1994. I began my tenure at a time of considerable controversy over the exhibiting of the *Enola Gay*. I had great concerns about and disagreement with the first script. In fact, this was no secret to anyone because I commented in my installation address that our first script was deficient. I believed then and I believe now that too much of the context for the use of the atomic bomb was taken for granted and that the proposed exhibition was out of balance, hence appearing to be historically inaccurate.

It was my view that a month later we had turned the corner regarding the controversy. Working throughout the summer and fall, the staff had substantially revamped the proposed exhibit, producing a fifth script that was more balanced. The revamped exhibit included a new 4,000-square foot section on the war in the Pacific and extensive revisions to the script throughout. I believed that we could mount that exhibit. I was wrong. Shortly thereafter, a controversy once again erupted between the Smithsonian Institution and The American Legion over one of the labels dealing with potential casualties. At that point, it became clear to me that we could not proceed given renewed efforts to have the exhibit cancelled. I recognized that the problem was more than a question of balance and our efforts to achieve balance would not resolve the issue. The fundamental flaw, in my view, lay in the concept of the exhibition itself. The basic error was attempting to couple an historical dialogue of the use of atomic weapons with the 50th commemoration of the end of the war. In this important anniversary year, veterans and their families were expecting, and rightly so, that the nation would honor and commemorate their valor and sacrifice. We did not give enough thought to the intense feelings surrounding such an event.

On January 30 of this year, I shared with the Board of Regents my decision to replace the *Enola Gay* exhibition. The central feature of the new exhibition, which is scheduled to open in June, will be a display, permitting the *Enola Gay* and its crew to speak for themselves. In addition, it will contain materials on the history of the B-29 aircraft and the restoration of the *Enola Gay* by the Smithsonian. I also announced that I would undertake a management review of the National Air and Space Museum, paying particular attention to an examination of the museum's mission. The review is being conducted by the National Academy of Public Administration. The Academy will present its findings by the end of September of this year.

I, however, have concerns beyond the one controversial exhibit at the National Air and Space Museum that is now a part of the public debate. The Institution has an obligation to be historically accurate and balanced in all of its exhibitions.

We have an obligation to consider the opinions of the interested public in the framing of the exhibitions. To that end, the Smithsonian needs to establish policies on Exhibitions. And we are doing just that. We are developing guidelines that will establish appropriate parameters within which museum directors and curators will collaborate on the choice and design of exhibitions; the processes for review and intervention, including a role for the Secretary's office; the extend to which historical exhibitions should speak within the context of the time; and ways to assure that our multiple audiences feel that their own ideas are being respected.

When I decided to replace the *Enola Gay* exhibition, I indicated that the Institution had much to learn from our experience. On April 19, the University of Michigan co-sponsored with the Smithsonian, a day-long symposium entitled, "Presenting History: Museums in a Democratic Society." Participants included representatives from veterans organizations, historians, journalists, and museum professionals. The purpose of the symposium was to examine issues surrounding controversial exhibitions. Discussions ranged from the evolution of the role of museums and their responsibilities to their various constituencies, to freedom of speech, and defining "controversy." Those discussions will help the Institution in its development of the guidelines.

On May 2, Dr. Martin Harwit, Director of the National Air and Space Museum, resigned believing that the welfare and future of the museum required that action. In his resignation announcement he noted that 3 months after the cancellation of that planned exhibition, the controversy still continued. He said:

I believe that nothing less than my stepping down from the directorship will satisfy the museum's critics and allow the museum to move forward with important new projects, such as the extension to be built at Washington's Dulles International Airport to provide better care for the collections.

I want to express my gratitude to Dr. Harwit for his contributions to the Smithsonian over the 8 years that he served as the Director of the National Air and Space Museum. That museum is the most visited museum in the nation with over 8 million visitors annually. During his tenure, Dr. Harwit most notably broadened the museum's agenda, especially in deepening research and exhibitions concerning scientific aspects of space and the cosmos.

I have a number of regrets about this situation. One is that it has gotten in the way of the commemoration of our Nation's victory over aggression 50 years ago. We at the Smithsonian do not want this controversy to overshadow the recognition that our veterans so richly deserve.

In that vein we will be opening a display at the Museum of American History in June that focuses both on the warfront and homefront during World War II. The NMAH has worked with the Center for Military History to design a unique exhibit where primary focus is to elicit memories and personal experiences from those who lived during the war years. In this way, this exhibit will become part of the history itself by capturing and preserving personal histories that otherwise might be lost to the ages.

I also regret that the *Enola Gay* controversy has led some to doubt the value of historical inquiry by museums. I believe that important artifacts of American history ought to be exhibited in an historical context. I believe that is what the American public expects of this great national institution and they deserve no less.

Finally, an important point to be made is that in singling out just a few examples of the Smithsonian's exhibitions and public programs, it is possible to draw a conclusion that does not reflect the fact that the Institution produces hundreds upon hundreds of exhibits and programs each year which are well received by the general public. Taken in their entirety, they provide a balanced and stimulating array of viewpoints on a myriad of subjects. More importantly, the Institution has great respect for its visitors and their abilities to appreciate the museum experience in their own way.

Dr. Crouch has a brief opening statement. Then we are prepared to answer your questions on the exhibition.

Senator FORD. Mr. Chairman, if I understand, the Secretary's statement is broken down into two phases, with a first panel and a second panel. Now we are not going to have the testimony that way, as I understand. We are just going to have testimony on *Enola Gay* and then we are going to have—then they are going to come back? We have kind of jockeyed back and forth. I have some questions and I did not want to lose you.

Mr. HEYMAN. No, I will be on that second panel also. So long as I can make a 2:50 plane to San Francisco where I have to give a speech tonight if that is at all possible. Or would you prefer to have questions first—

The CHAIRMAN. As long as you are prepared to come back next week, Doctor.

Mr. HEYMAN. No, I am prepared to stay here for a good period of time. I just wanted you to know—

The CHAIRMAN. We have other things scheduled, too. That is all right, we will proceed with Dr. Crouch if that is your desire.

Mr. HEYMAN. Then I thought we would both answer questions.

The CHAIRMAN. I intend to continue this until we get answers to our questions and until we get some understanding of what the management situation is at the Smithsonian. If you wish to have Dr. Crouch testify now, Dr. Crouch, we will listen to you.

TESTIMONY OF THOMAS D. CROUCH, ASSISTANT DIRECTOR FOR AERONAUTICS, NATIONAL AIR AND SPACE MUSEUM

Mr. CROUCH. Thank you, Senator. I am grateful for this opportunity to discuss matters related to the exhibition that was to be entitled, "The Last Act: The Atomic Bomb and the End of World War II." Those of us who were involved with that project hoped to tell the story of the *Enola Gay* and the bomb that it carried in a full, honest, balanced fashion. We sought to explore a moment in time, a turning point in the history of our world, an event that ended one era and inaugurated another. At the very least, we were guilty of having failed to understand the depth and intensity of American attitudes toward Hiroshima and Nagasaki. To all of those who have been hurt or angered by this controversy, I apologize for that misjudgment.

The committee has asked me to clarify the roles and the responsibilities of the individuals involved in developing the content of the exhibition. As head of the department of aeronautics, I supervised the work of the curatorial team. Michael Neufeld, the lead curator, reported to me and supervised the two curatorial assistants assigned to the project. I reported to Martin Harwit, director of the National Air and Space Museum who established the general direction of the project and approved the various documents produced by the curators.

I certainly acknowledge that the first draft of the script completed in January 1994 was imperfect. It was short on context, although not so short I think as some of the critics have suggested. The Rape of Nanking and other Japanese atrocities against Asian people, the Japanese reliance on slave labor, and their brutal treatment of prisoners-of-war, Pearl Harbor, biological experiments on human subjects were all noted in the script. The fanaticism of Japanese troops, their preference for death rather than surrender, the kamikaze campaign, and rising Allied casualties in the Pacific in 1944 and 1945 were focal points of the first unit.

Still, it is clear that we should have provided much fuller coverage of those subjects and underscored the roots of Japanese militarism and imperialism.

In addition, the introductory unit and some other sections of the scripts contained a number of sentences that became genuine hot buttons. Believe me, I wish they had never seen the light of day. Those sentences were removed from the script at the time of the first review.

I would ask the committee to recognize the fact that the script was genuinely a first draft subject to a process of careful revision that began with the appointment of an extraordinarily strong advisory committee. That group included Pulitzer Prize winning authors. It included an ex-president of the American Historical Association. It included some of the leading scholars in the field; individuals who had spent their lives studying the topic.

We also wanted to ensure that a variety of points of view would be represented on the advisory committee. Richard Hallion, chief historian of the Air Force and his deputy would speak for the Air Force. Dr. Ed Bearss, a distinguished military historian, wounded veteran of the war in the Pacific, and chief historian of the Park Service was also represented on the panel. Ed Linenthal, who had worked closely with the Park Service, the Holocaust Museum, and other organizations seeking to understand the nature of commemoration was present for the same reason. We were honestly confident that this group could assist us in developing an accurate script and also help us to understand how it might be received by a wide range of visitors.

While the group offered useful suggestions for improving the draft script, they were also very generous in their praise of the document. The comments of Harvard professor Akira Iriye, ex-president of the American Historical Association are typical. "I do think that you and your colleagues have been subject to unfair criticism. The script as originally drafted was an excellent one reflecting current historical scholarship. I applaud your valiant effort to present an informative, balanced story of the atomic bombing."

Ed Bearss, historian of the Park Service concurred with that judgment. "As a World War II combat veteran I commend you

Senator FORD. Mr. Chairman, if I understand, the Secretary's statement is broken down into two phases, with a first panel and a second panel. Now we are not going to have the testimony that way, as I understand. We are just going to have testimony on *Enola Gay* and then we are going to have—then they are going to come back? We have kind of jockeyed back and forth. I have some questions and I did not want to lose you.

Mr. HEYMAN. No, I will be on that second panel also. So long as I can make a 2:50 plane to San Francisco where I have to give a speech tonight if that is at all possible. Or would you prefer to have questions first—

The CHAIRMAN. As long as you are prepared to come back next week, Doctor.

Mr. HEYMAN. No, I am prepared to stay here for a good period of time. I just wanted you to know—

The CHAIRMAN. We have other things scheduled, too. That is all right, we will proceed with Dr. Crouch if that is your desire.

Mr. HEYMAN. Then I thought we would both answer questions.

The CHAIRMAN. I intend to continue this until we get answers to our questions and until we get some understanding of what the management situation is at the Smithsonian. If you wish to have Dr. Crouch testify now, Dr. Crouch, we will listen to you.

TESTIMONY OF THOMAS D. CROUCH, ASSISTANT DIRECTOR FOR AERONAUTICS, NATIONAL AIR AND SPACE MUSEUM

Mr. CROUCH. Thank you, Senator. I am grateful for this opportunity to discuss matters related to the exhibition that was to be entitled, "The Last Act: The Atomic Bomb and the End of World War II." Those of us who were involved with that project hoped to tell the story of the *Enola Gay* and the bomb that it carried in a full, honest, balanced fashion. We sought to explore a moment in time, a turning point in the history of our world, an event that ended one era and inaugurated another. At the very least, we were guilty of having failed to understand the depth and intensity of American attitudes toward Hiroshima and Nagasaki. To all of those who have been hurt or angered by this controversy, I apologize for that misjudgment.

The committee has asked me to clarify the roles and the responsibilities of the individuals involved in developing the content of the exhibition. As head of the department of aeronautics, I supervised the work of the curatorial team. Michael Neufeld, the lead curator, reported to me and supervised the two curatorial assistants assigned to the project. I reported to Martin Harwit, director of the National Air and Space Museum who established the general direction of the project and approved the various documents produced by the curators.

I certainly acknowledge that the first draft of the script completed in January 1994 was imperfect. It was short on context, although not so short I think as some of the critics have suggested. The Rape of Nanking and other Japanese atrocities against Asian people, the Japanese reliance on slave labor, and their brutal treatment of prisoners-of-war, Pearl Harbor, biological experiments on human subjects were all noted in the script. The fanaticism of Japanese troops, their preference for death rather than surrender, the kamikaze campaign, and rising Allied casualties in the Pacific in 1944 and 1945 were focal points of the first unit.

Still, it is clear that we should have provided much fuller coverage of those subjects and underscored the roots of Japanese militarism and imperialism.

In addition, the introductory unit and some other sections of the scripts contained a number of sentences that became genuine hot buttons. Believe me, I wish they had never seen the light of day. Those sentences were removed from the script at the time of the first review.

I would ask the committee to recognize the fact that the script was genuinely a first draft subject to a process of careful revision that began with the appointment of an extraordinarily strong advisory committee. That group included Pulitzer Prize winning authors. It included an ex-president of the American Historical Association. It included some of the leading scholars in the field; individuals who had spent their lives studying the topic.

We also wanted to ensure that a variety of points of view would be represented on the advisory committee. Richard Hallion, chief historian of the Air Force and his deputy would speak for the Air Force. Dr. Ed Bearss, a distinguished military historian, wounded veteran of the war in the Pacific, and chief historian of the Park Service was also represented on the panel. Ed Linenthal, who had worked closely with the Park Service, the Holocaust Museum, and other organizations seeking to understand the nature of commemoration was present for the same reason. We were honestly confident that this group could assist us in developing an accurate script and also help us to understand how it might be received by a wide range of visitors.

While the group offered useful suggestions for improving the draft script, they were also very generous in their praise of the document. The comments of Harvard professor Akira Iriye, ex-president of the American Historical Association are typical. "I do think that you and your colleagues have been subject to unfair criticism. The script as originally drafted was an excellent one reflecting current historical scholarship. I applaud your valiant effort to present an informative, balanced story of the atomic bombing."

Ed Bearss, historian of the Park Service concurred with that judgment. "As a World War II combat veteran I commend you