

that "our whole effort in this thing is to commemorate an event, not celebrate a victory."

Some might argue so what's in a word—Victory over Japan, Victory in the Pacific—Let's celebrate an event, not a victory.

I say everything is in a word. Celebrate an **EVENT!**

Kind of like celebrating the opening of a shopping mall rather than the end of a war that engulfed the entire Earth—which left countless millions dead and countless millions more physically or mentally wounded and countless more millions displaced.

This assault on the use of language is Orwellian and is the tool by which history and memory are blurred. Words can be just as destructive as any weapon.

Up is Down.

Slavery is Freedom.

Aggression is Peace.

In some ways this assault on our language and history by the elimination of accurate and descriptive words is far more insidious than the actual aggression carried out by the Japanese 50 years ago. At least then the threat was clear, the enemy well defined.

Today the Japanese justify their conduct by artfully playing the race card. They were not engaged in a criminal enterprise of aggression. No, Japan was simply liberating the oppressed masses of Asia from **WHITE** Imperialism.

**Liberation!!!** Yes, they liberated over 20 million innocent Asians by killing them. I'm sure those 20 million, their families and the generations never to be, appreciate the noble effort of the Japanese.

I am often asked was the bomb dropped for vengeance, as was suggested by one draft of the Smithsonian exhibit. That we sought to destroy an ancient and honorable culture.

Here are some more inconvenient facts.

One, on the original target list for the atomic missions Kyoto was included. Although this would have been a legitimate target, one that had not been bombed previously, Secretary of State Henry Stimson removed it from the list because it was the ancient capital of Japan and was also the religious center of Japanese culture.

Two, we were under strict orders during the war that under no circumstances were we to ever bomb the Imperial Palace in Tokyo even though we could have easily leveled it and possibly killed the Emperor so much for vengeance.

I often wonder if Japan would have shown such restraint if they had the opportunity to bomb the White House. I think not.

At this point let me dispel one of many longstanding myths that our targets were intended to be civilian populations. Each target for the missions had significant military importance—Hiroshima was the headquarters for the southern command responsible for the defense of Honshu in the event of an invasion and it garrisoned seasoned troops who would mount the initial defense.

Nagasaki was an industrial center with the two large Mitsubishi armaments factories. In both Hiroshima and Nagasaki the Japanese had integrated these industries and troops right in the heart of each city.

As in any war our goal was, as it should be, to win. The stakes were too high to equivocate.

I am often asked if I ever think of the Japanese who died at Hiroshima and Nagasaki?

I do not revel in the idea that so many on both sides died, not only at those two places but around the world in that horrible conflict. I take no pride or pleasure in the brutality of war whether suffered by my people or those of another nation. Every life is precious.

But it does seem to me such a question is more appropriately directed to the Japanese war lords who so willingly offered up their people to achieve their visions of greatness. They who started the war and then stubbornly refused to stop it must be called to account. Don't they have the ultimate responsibility for all the deaths of their countrymen?

Perhaps if the Japanese came to grips with their past and their true part in the war they would hold those Japanese military leaders accountable. The Japanese

people deserve an answer from those that brought such misery to the nations of the Far East and ultimately to their own people. Of course this can never happen if we collaborate with the Japanese in wiping away the truth.

How can Japan ever reconcile with itself and the United States if they do not demand and accept the truth?

My crew and I flew these missions with the belief that they would bring the war to an end. There was no sense of joy. There was a sense of duty and commitment that we wanted to get back to our families and loved ones.

Today millions of people in America and in southeast Asia are alive because the war ended when it did.

I do not stand here celebrating the use of nuclear weapons. Quite the contrary.

I hope that my mission is the last such mission ever flown.

We as a nation can abhor the existence of nuclear weapons.

I certainly do.

But that does not then mean that, back in August of 1945, given the events of the war and the recalcitrance of our enemy, President Truman was not obliged to use all the weapons at his disposal to end the war.

I agreed with Harry Truman then, and I still do today.

Years after the war Truman was asked if he had any second thoughts. He said emphatically, "No." He then asked the questioner to remember the men who died at Pearl Harbor who did not have the benefit of second thoughts.

In war the stakes are high. As Robert E. Lee said, "it is good that war is so horrible, or we might grow to like it."

I thank God that it was we who had this weapon and not the Japanese or the Germans. The science was there. Eventually someone would have developed this weapon. Science can never be denied. It finds a way to self-fulfillment.

The question of whether it was wise to develop such a weapon would have eventually been overcome by the fact that it could be done. The Soviets would have certainly proceeded to develop their own bomb. Let us not forget that Joseph Stalin was no less evil than Tojo or his former ally Adolf Hitler. At last count, Stalin committed genocide on at least 20 million of his own citizens.

The world is a better place because German and Japanese fascism failed to conquer the world.

Japan and Germany are better places because we were benevolent in our victory.

The youth of Japan and the United States, spared from further needless slaughter, went on to live and have families and grow old.

As the father of ten children and the grandfather of 21, I can state that I am certainly grateful that the war ended when it did.

I do not speak for all veterans of that war. But I believe that my sense of pride in having served my country in that great conflict is shared by all veterans. This is why the truth about that war must be preserved. We veterans are not shrinking violets. Our sensibilities will not be shattered in intelligent and controversial debate. We can handle ourselves.

But we will not, we cannot allow armchair second guessers to frame the debate by hiding facts from the American public and the world.

I have great faith in the good sense and fairness of the American people to consider all of the facts and make an informed judgment about the war's end.

This is an important debate. The soul of our nation, its essence, its history, is at stake.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you very much, General.  
Colonel Cooper?

**TESTIMONY OF COLONEL CHARLES D. COOPER, DIRECTOR OF PUBLICATIONS, THE RETIRED OFFICERS ASSOCIATION**

Colonel COOPER. Mr. Chairman, and distinguished members, this statement is submitted on behalf of The Retired Officers

Association (TROA) which has its national headquarters at 201 North Washington Street in Alexandria, Virginia. TROA has a membership of more than 400,000 active duty, retired, and reserve officers of the seven uniformed services, including approximately 65,000 auxiliary members who are survivors of former members of that association.

On behalf of all the TROA members we would like to thank the chairman and the other distinguished members of the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration for holding these important hearings and inviting us to share our concerns with you.

The Retired Officers Association became involved in the *Enola Gay* issue in the spring of 1994 after many of its members, especially the World War II veterans, including Colonel Schuh, became aware of the direction that was being taken by the curators at the National Air and Space Museum. In April of 1994, Admiral Tom Kilcline, president of The Retired Officers Association, contacted Dr. Martin Harwit, director of the National Air and Space Museum, to discuss the issue. Dr. Harwit suggested a luncheon meeting at the Smithsonian with some of the curators to talk about what they were planning to do.

Admiral Kilcline requested that representatives of the other veterans associations be included in that discussion. That meeting came to pass on July 13, 1994. In attendance at that meeting were representatives of the Air Force Association, the American Legion, Disabled American Veterans, the Military Order of the World Wars, The Retired Officers Association, and the Veterans of Foreign Wars as well as staff members of the Air and Space Museum, the Department of Defense 50th Anniversary Commemorative Committee, and the House Veterans Affairs Committee.

Following a briefing by the curatorial staff, a lively discussion of the then-existing show script ensued, but since the Air Force Association and The Retired Officers Association were the only two outside organizations that were privileged to have copies of the script in hand, the discussion was rather limited and very non-productive. Scripts were later provided to the other associations with a request to get back to NASM with comment.

The Retired Officers Association responded on July 19 providing Dr. Harwit with extensive, in-depth written recommendations that dealt with historical accuracy, context, and objectivity. Specifically, we were concerned with the lack of historical background to define the events that led up to the decision to use the A-bomb. We were disturbed by the lack of balance in imagery portraying the casualties of the Hiroshima bombing as compared to the brutal deaths from Japanese aggression that preceded America's entry into the war as well as the escalating battle deaths as the war proceeded. Finally, we were appalled by the extensive section expounding upon the

post-war heritage of the nuclear age that was totally unrelated to the advertised theme of the display, "The Final Act."

On September 8 the curators provided a third script. While it offered some minor tweaks it still failed to address the basic philosophical disagreements that had been raised in our earlier communications with the museum. On September 23 Admiral Kilcline met with the Undersecretary of the Smithsonian, Constance Newman, who explained that she was assuming the role of oversight for the *Enola Gay* exhibit "to get the Smithsonian off the front page of the news." Newman also advised Kilcline of her separate and ongoing negotiations with the American Legion.

In a September 27 letter to Dr. Harwit, Admiral Kilcline provided an extensive list of ongoing concerns raised by the third script that were still being ignored. He further expressed the Association's concern that the reputation of the Air and Space Museum was being placed in jeopardy by the recalcitrance of the museum staff.

Version four of the script came out on October 3, 1994 and again there was some progress. But things that had been fixed in earlier versions were put back in. At the invitation of the Undersecretary, representatives of the Air Force Association and The Retired Officers Association met at the Smithsonian and additional fine-tuning was applied to address specific philosophical and factual problem areas.

On October 26 Undersecretary Newman provided script revision five. While we could still not fully endorse it, significant progress was being made. During these many months, and especially since Newman had assumed the active role in the discussions, the earlier offensive script had been bowdlerized. Gone were the references to the U.S. "war of vengeance against a nation attempting to preserve its unique culture." Gone were the controversial political arguments of the post-war nuclear age. Finally we thought we saw a glimmer of hope that an excellent exhibit was close at hand.

In early December, at the insistence of several associations negotiating with the Smithsonian, scripting for a new 4,000-square-foot introductory display was produced. This new section defined the course of events from the early 1930's to just before the Hiroshima bombing. Those changes provided the essential historical background of Japan's brutal aggression, clarification of the driving forces behind the nuclear decisions, and a modicum of balance to the planned visual materials.

An added video finale to the exhibit incorporated the remembrances of the actual crew members, bringing a poignant personal perspective to the story of this fateful mission. With these modifications there was a growing consensus, at least among the reviewers of the Air Force Association, The Retired Officers Association, and the VFW, that the exhibit would have been found acceptable by most veterans. This sense was

conveyed to Undersecretary Newman and Dr. Harwit at a joint meeting at the Smithsonian on December 15, 1994.

Sadly, any sense of mutual agreement and understanding was shattered in early January when Dr. Harwit fired yet another shot across the bow of our Nation's veterans. In a letter sent only to the American Legion, excluding the other military-related associations that had been striving to work to bring this exhibit to fruition, Harwit without a "by-your-leave" or "let's talk about this", reinserted into the show script new and radically minimized casualty numbers for the planned invasion of the Japanese home islands. This clear breach of faith cast grave doubt upon his perspective and leadership ability and provided further evidence of his lack of sensitivity to the Smithsonian's reputation for integrity.

At this point the discussions between Harwit and the Legion went to critical mass. Upon receipt of the letter the Legion abruptly and publicly called for the outright cancellation of the exhibit and raised the ante calling for these congressional hearings. We share the Legion's frustration in trying to deal with Dr. Harwit's recurring recalcitrance. Nonetheless, we believe that with the continued patience of Job that some of the associations had shown we were at the point where a satisfactory solution could have been reached. But regrettably, that door was slammed shut. There would be no further opportunity for discussion to rebut the so-called newly found information.

On January 30, Secretary Heyman called an end to the rancorous debate over the planned *Enola Gay* exhibit. Rather than continue the controversial effort to conduct a wallboard-and-artifact academic extravaganza during this significant World War II commemorative year, he announced his intention to take personal charge of the exhibition. His plan called for the simpler, scaled-back display limited to only the already restored fuselage, appropriate signage, and possibly a video treatment reflecting some of the crew comments.

While we understand the secretary's rationale, The Retired Officers Association sincerely regrets the need for that decision. As a result of the severe gutting of the display, future generations of Americans and the world have lost a golden opportunity to learn anything more except the barebones history of the *Enola Gay* and its role in bringing to an end a brutal and emotional war, one of the defining events in world history.

Further, because of this dragged out brouhaha, the high stature of our Nation's most respected institution and its funding has been unnecessarily put to a test. While the eviscerated *Enola Gay* exhibit has put the role of America's national museum squarely in a spotlight of distrust and distaste, The Retired Officers Association stands ready to work with the Smithsonian to restore to its prestigious pedestal this gem of America's historical tiara.

That concludes my presentation, Mr. Chairman, and I am prepared to answer questions from you and the distinguished members of the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you very much, Colonel Cooper.

We have been joined by Senator Pell. Senator, did you have an opening statement?

Senator PELL. No opening statement.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Harrington?

#### TESTIMONY OF HERMAN G. HARRINGTON, CHAIRMAN, NATIONAL INTERNAL AFFAIRS COMMISSION, THE AMERICAN LEGION

Mr. HARRINGTON. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, members of the committee, my name is Herman Harrington. It was my privilege to serve as National Commander William Detweiler's designated representative during the line by line review and discussions of the Air and Space Museum exhibit. I would be remiss if I did not extend to you the commander's sincere regrets that he is unable to be here today. As you may know, he is in Moscow as a member of the President's official party participating in the commemoration of V-E Day.

We appreciate this opportunity to present our views on the controversy, its causes and possible remedies for the future. We have submitted our written testimony for your consideration and for the next few minutes I would only draw attention to our more prominent concerns and recommendations.

It is altogether apparent from the events surrounding the planned display of the historic aircraft, the *Enola Gay*, that the institution has sustained serious blows to its reputation, the causes of which unless discovered and corrected will only be repeated to the detriment of the Smithsonian, the Nation, and our society. We were accused of censorship, but it was not we who wanted only one view included. And we were accused of political arm-twisting, but we did little more than seek from our Government a redress of grievance. Our involvement is proof that our system works. It should be an inspiration and not a threat to those who value constitutional government and the democratic process.

Our first involvement came when we agreed to listen to the museum's point of view and were not convinced. We later agreed to suspend our opposition to the exhibit pending a line by line review of the script. We spent nearly 40 hours on three separate occasions clarifying language, questioning artifacts and narratives, arguing historical fact and exchanging research.

We ended our discussions only when it became apparent that the curators, and most especially the director, could not be relied upon to honor their commitments to us and that any script that we agreed upon could be, and most likely would be, changed without our knowledge right up to the opening of the exhibit.