

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.

Our approach was open, honest, and scholarly. We have included in our written testimony some of the sources we relied on. Yet despite our efforts the answer to one question eluded us: Why? Why did this Nation's most revered, most respected, most visited museum undertake such an exhibit? Why was an exhibit devoted to international concerns over the proliferations of nuclear arms spawned in a museum dedicated to America's achievements in flight and space exploration? Even if the answer is never given, Congress nevertheless can ensure that the institution uses its position and the funds Congress provides in a manner consistent with the institution's congressional mandate.

What is most disconcerting to the American Legion and perhaps most telling to the mind set of those at the institution is that when challenged for failing to present the service and sacrifice of American servicemen and women as described in Title 20, Section 80a of the U.S. Code, officials claimed that their museum is not required to comply with that language.

The American Legion was also condemned for questioning the museum's employment of a non-citizen in a key curatorial position. We have done so only because we see it as further evidence of the Air and Space Museum's disdain for, and defiance of congressional oversight. Title 20, which we have cited in our written testimony, clearly requires U.S. citizens to have preference in hiring for key positions unless no U.S. citizen is qualified. We still wonder why the Nation's historians have not complained about that, given its implications.

The American Legion recommends that Congress take steps immediately to either conform its mandate to the realities of the Smithsonian Institution or to enforce its intent and mandates as contained in Title 20 as they pertain to personnel practices. At a minimum, the American Legion recommends that Congress, among other measures: One, clarify the personal and professional goals of future museum directors; two, receive regular information on the use to which museum resources are put; three, ensure that docents and volunteers are treated with dignity and respect; and four, be aware of the relationship of the National Air and Space historians to a particular school of historic and political thought when such relationships become exclusive of knowledge rather than inclusive.

We also strongly recommend that this committee ask why the archives concerning Stimson, Marshall, Truman, and MacArthur were not contacted, and why the acknowledged experts and biographers of such men were not consulted. The American Legion successfully contacted many such institutions and individuals in the course of its research and found them to be accessible and readily cooperative.

At the center of this controversy rests the history of B-29 *Enola Gay*. Much has been said and written about casualties, President Truman's motives, the military and diplomatic

intentions of the Imperial Japanese Government and whether or not lives were indeed spared by the mission of *Enola Gay*. But little has been said about the cynical use of this aircraft to justify the presence of an exhibit in the National Air and Space Museum that fails to conform to the museum's broad mandate.

Is it the intent of Congress that after 46 years this aircraft be shelved for another 10 years until those alive when she flew are gone? The American Legion recommends that Congress direct the loan or the transfer of the *Enola Gay* to another Federal facility where it can be displayed properly without commentary or controversy. We respectfully suggest that *Enola Gay* join her sister ship, *Bock's Car*, at the Air Force Museum at Wright-Patterson Air Force Base near Dayton, Ohio. Or failing that, at any of the other facilities that have expressed an interest in displaying the aircraft.

The American Legion is not in the business of tearing down American institutions nor do we concern ourselves with the persons or personalities of those involved in vital national enterprises. But we are in the business of protecting and preserving our American heritage. As the battle over the *Enola Gay* has demonstrated, we are willing to invest our time, our money, and if need be, our reputation, to fight for the principles we espouse.

We believe in honesty, in integrity, in fair play. We believe in honoring the service and sacrifice of those who took up arms in defense of the Nation. We believe in passing a sense of America's unique role in world history and a sense of its greatness on to future generations. And we believe the National Air and Space Museum consciously and intentionally violated every one of those principles by setting out to alter our citizens' view of themselves. We believe that those responsible for the exhibit did so in a most cynical and insensitive way by using the very aircraft that thousands of World War II veterans credited with saving them from death on the beaches of Japan, to suggest that their lives were purchased at the price of vengeance of racism.

In summary, the American Legion's recommendations for the future of the Smithsonian Institution and for the management guidelines are simple, common sense safeguards. We recommend: One, congressional oversight and review of the museum's plans and practices; two, periodic review by independent professionals and knowledgeable laypersons; three, tighter review and control over the use of appropriated funds; four, improved management controls and establishment of reporting disciplines; and five, redefinition and clarification of the roles of the Smithsonian museums in American society and the establishment of measures to guarantee compliance.

Mr. Chairman, that concludes the testimony of the American Legion and I would at this time be happy to answer any questions you may have. Thank you.

[The prepared statement of Mr. Harrington follows:]

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

The American Legion considers the future management and oversight of the Smithsonian Institution and its subordinate museums, most particularly the National Air and Space Museum, to be a matter of singular significance to the people of the United States. For that reason, we welcome the opportunity to bring the views of our organization before the committee. It is our hope and intent that the net effect of these hearings will be to restore the Smithsonian Institution to a position of respect and reverence among all our citizens, and to preserve the bonds of our common history which bind us as a nation. It is altogether apparent, from the events surrounding the planned display of the historic aircraft, *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.

This testimony of The American Legion has been prepared at the direction of and under the review of our National Commander, William M. Detweiler, who currently is among the President's official entourage in Moscow where he will participate in commemorations of the 50th anniversary of V-E Day. Commander Detweiler participated in all face-to-face discussions between the National Air and Space Museum and The American Legion. He communicated and corresponded directly with both the Secretary and the Under Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution, and presented the position of The American Legion time and again to the media, professional historians, the general public and members of The American Legion. His experience on this issue is real, and this testimony has his full support and approval—and thus, represents the position of the more than 3.1 million men and women who comprise Legion membership.

The American Legion comes to these hearings in precisely the same spirit with which it participated in the discussions and review process with officials of the National Air and Space Museum. It was then our stated goal to work with NASM officials to protect the legacy of those who fought and died during World War II; to assure future generations of Americans access to historically accurate information and artifacts; and to assist in the restoration of public confidence in the institution. Today, in the wake of the controversy, the admission by the Secretary that the original exhibit was "flawed from the beginning," and the cancellation of the original exhibit, it also is among the goals of The American Legion to do what it can to help identify and establish safeguards which can reasonably be expected to prevent such future catastrophes.

That, in our opinion, can best be accomplished by identifying what went wrong and what factors contributed to it. The American Legion will present to you applicable information gained from our participation in the review process, but further, will recommend lines of inquiry in instances where our efforts to gather information were unsuccessful.

The qualifications of The American Legion and those who participated in the discussions—the very idea of the participation of The American Legion in this controversy—has been questioned and soundly criticized in many circles. Most, if not all, criticism contains implications which are both offensive and repugnant to those who truly respect our form of government. The American Legion was qualified by rights guaranteed to all Americans, and credentialed by dint of diligent effort and sound reliance on divinely granted talents and abilities.

We have been accused of censorship, but most certainly we do not have the power to censor.

What is curious is that those who most loudly accuse us of censorship are the very ones most opposed to including our views in the discussion and the display. It remains a fact that the original exhibit proposed one interpretation of history at the exclusion of all others. We asked only that all views be included, ours as well as theirs. Who sought to censor whom?

We have been accused of historical naïveté, at best; ignorance at worst.

But what is curious is that the very historians whose task it is to record and pass on our history, the very men and women whose books we read and whose

research we poured over, seem to have little confidence in how well they are doing their job. Where is the freedom of thought and inquiry and to whom would they have it reserved?

We have been accused of grandstanding the news media.

Again, what is curious is that those who so vociferously oppose our public statements are those who so totally depend on the freedom of expression by which their books are published, their speeches made and their academic courses free from restraint. Where would they have truth and falsehood grapple?

We have been accused of political arm-twisting.

Even again, what is curious is that only the successful effort to enlist Congressional support is seen as arm-twisting. It was not only our side seeking the support of the peoples' elected representatives. We were aggrieved by the action of an arm of our government, and we petitioned the government for redress of that grievance. Our critics were aggrieved by us, yet they sought redress not from us, but from government—a blatant and repugnant effort to silence dissent.

What right did we have to do what we did, question who we questioned and say what we said? We claim the rights of every citizen, successfully and aggressively exercised. Our success, painful as it may have been to those whose real intent was to prevent the expression of any view but their own, is proof that our system works. It should be an inspiration, not a threat, to those whose very livelihoods depend on our fundamental freedoms.

Our involvement came at the request of the Under Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution who, when the exhibit began to encounter rising opposition from the Air Force Association and other groups of veterans, wisely sought to establish communication and consensus among the exhibit's critics and supporters. The effort came too late. Many groups were increasingly suspicious of NASM officials, and increasingly frustrated by the lack of response and progress. The American Legion was on record in opposition to the exhibit, but standing apart from the fray. Once the controversy erupted into public disgust with the museum, we became deeply concerned that not only was the reputation of World War II veterans at risk, but also that the entire institution was losing ground among the general public.

We first 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 and face-to-face review of the script with the curators and the museum director. We spend a total of 36 hours in three separate sessions, clarifying language, questioning artifacts and narratives, arguing historical fact, and exchanging research.

We did not at any time object to the portrayal in the exhibit of the effects of nuclear detonation. We asked only for balance and the elimination of needlessly repetitious images. We did not object to objects or narratives unless their validity could not be established, and where such was the case, objects were removed. We presented facts born of original and other research which raised legitimate questions of interpretation and conclusion, and requested their addition to the script. We successfully argued for a longer view of history than the original script presented, including the history of Japanese aggression and expansionism which planted the seeds of the Pacific war. That portion of the exhibit was being prepared when our discussions broke down.

We ended our discussions with NASM officials only when it became apparent that they would not conform to the directions of their superiors and only after we learned, in correspondence from the former director, that he intended to include unilateral changes to the script that violated agreements and understandings we had reached with him. By the end of the discussions, The American Legion fully understood that the curators and 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.

We could not let our support or lack of opposition be so cynically manipulated and remain true to our responsibilities to our members and to the thousands of veterans who were relying on us.

Our approach was open, honest and scholarly. Our research included, but was not limited to, the sources listed below:

- The Making of the Atomic Bomb**
Rhoades, Richard; Simon and Schuster, New York; 1986
- The Last Battle**
Ryan, Cornelius; Simon and Schuster, New York; 1966
- Manhattan Project**
Groueff, Stéphane; Little, Brown and Company, Boston & Toronto; 1967
- The Great Decision**
Amrine, Michael; G.P. Putnam's Sons, New York; 1959
- James B. Conant: Harvard to Hiroshima and the Making of the Nuclear Age**
Hershberg, James; Alfred A. Knopf, Inc., New York; 1993
- The Invasion of Japan**
Skates, John Ray; University of South Carolina Press, Columbia, S.C.; 1994
- The Wages of Guilt: Memories of War in German and Japan**
Baruma, Ian; Farrar, Straus, Giroux, New York; 1994
- Fighting to a Finish: The Politics of War Termination in the United States and Japan**
Sigal, Leon V.; Cornell University Press, Ithaca and London; 1988
- MacArthur's Ultra: Codebreaking and the War against Japan, 1942-1945**
Drea, Edward J.; University Press of Kansas; 1992
- Brassey's Encyclopedia of Military History and Biography**
Margiotta, Franklin D. Ed.; Brassey's, Washington and London; (annual)
- Codename Downfall: The Secret Plan to Invade Japan—and Why Truman Dropped the Bomb**
Allen, Thomas B. and Polmar, Norman; Simon & Schuster, New York; 1995 (Publisher's Proof)
- Marching Orders: The Untold Story of World War II**
Lee, Bruce; Crown Publishers, Inc., New York; 1995

In addition, The American Legion researched a number of original sources, some uncovered in original research and others provided by historians, museums, biographical libraries and archives, and the NASM curators themselves. They include:

- Copies of documents and minutes from official meetings of government leaders
- Copies of military orders, communiqués, and intelligence reports
- Accounts of diplomatic and tactical code-breaking operations
- Direct conversations with the Army and Air Force Historians
- Conversations with and written reports from other historians
- Conversation and correspondence with veterans of the 509th Composite Bomb Group
- Professional Journals
- Scholarly Papers

It is singularly significant that very little among our research documents is of Japanese origin. The explanation is simple: The Japanese government continues to restrict release and access to its archives of the time, not only to us, but to most of the world's historians. We repeatedly pointed out to NASM curators that, as a result of Japanese recalcitrance, only half the history can be known. NASM officials, like paleontologists building a dinosaur from a jawbone, had no choice but to fill in the gaps from best guesses, speculation and incomplete understanding of Japanese intentions in the summer of 1945. Those gaps now are being filled by new research, and the picture being painted of Japanese actions and intentions points to significantly different conclusions than those drawn by NASM for this exhibit.

Yet, during our own research, we gained the answers to many questions about the exhibit and the history it sought to portray. We learned something about the curators and others who informed the exhibit. But one question remains unanswered: Why?

Why did this Nation's most revered, most respected, most-visited museum undertake such an exhibit? Why was the museum permitted to proceed so far into the realm of conjecture and condemnation? Why was an exhibit devoted to

international concerns over the proliferation of nuclear arms spawned in a museum dedicated to America's achievements in flight and space exploration? And why were Americans, through their tax dollars, expected to underwrite such propaganda parading as history?

The people of the United States deserve answers to these questions. As their representatives, you deserve answers. And as lawmakers entrusted with the stewardship of our wealth, you have a responsibility to ensure that the Smithsonian Institution's museums use the funds Congress provides for the purposes and in a manner consistent with the Institution's Congressional mandate.

That mandate is contained in 20 U.S.C., Chapter 3. The Smithsonian as a whole is charged with an approach to its collections, displays and educational activities that not only informs, but enriches and uplifts. What is most disconcerting to The American Legion—and perhaps most telling of the mindset of some at the Institution—is that, when challenged for failing to present the service and sacrifice of American service men and women as described in 20 U.S.C. 80a, NASM officials claimed that they are not required to comply with that language since, they say, it applies to an as yet unbuilt museum.

Nevertheless, the language is clear and specific, applying itself not to some obscure museum of the future, but to the entire Institution:

The *Smithsonian Institution* shall commemorate and display the contributions made by the military forces of the Nation toward creating, developing and maintaining a free, peaceful, and independent society and culture in the United States of America. The valor and sacrificial service of the men and women of the Armed forces shall be portrayed as an inspiration to the present and future generations of America . . . The extensive peacetime contributions the Armed Forces have made to the advance of human knowledge in science, nuclear energy, polar and space exploration, electronics, engineering aeronautics, and medicine shall be graphically described. (Emphasis added.)

NASM's argument that it is not subject to that language is an astounding defense and a tacit admission that it does not so comply. NASM's position is not that it does so portray the service positive contributions of American veterans, but that it is not required to. Nevertheless, it is the position of The American Legion that the language in 20 U.S.C. 80a, Subsec. (a), is quite clear in applying that standard to "the Smithsonian Institution" and not to just one of its museums. Perhaps the best question is what compels NASM to want to do otherwise?

The American Legion recommends that the Congress closely review the language of the applicable codes, clarify its intent and direct all museums of the Institution to comply with it.

The American Legion has been condemned for inquiring as to the propriety of the National Air and Space Museum's employment of a non-citizen in a key curatorial position. Is this latent xenophobia? Evidence of jingoism? Not at all. It is simply a question of why the National Air and Space Museum did not comply with another of the strict intents of Congress, as stated in 20 U.S.C. 46a:

The Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution, subject to adequate security and other investigations as he may determine to be appropriate, and subject further to a prior determination by him that *no qualified United States citizen is available for the particular position involved*, is authorized to employ and compensate aliens in a scientific or technical capacity . . . (Emphasis added)

Clearly, in light of that language only three explanations exist:

1. Management was ignorant of its duties and responsibilities;
2. The museum disdains and defies the intent of Congress;
3. No U.S. citizen is as well educated, trained, and experienced as the Canadian historian who was one of two primary curators on the exhibit—an explanation that reasonably could be expected to raise the concern of American historians, but so far doesn't seem to have done so.

Not one of those explanations is sufficient for The American Legion, nor do we believe any should be sufficient to the American people or to Congress.

The American Legion once again simply recommends that Congress take steps immediately to either conform its mandate to realities at the Smithsonian Institution or to enforce its clear intent and mandate.

During the course of our discussions with NASM we became aware that, although NASM curators have repeatedly declared the original script was never meant for public consumption, the museum itself sent the script to the Japanese peace museums in Hiroshima and Nagasaki for review and comment pending loan of artifacts to NASM. Officials described it as nothing more than a courtesy, but it was, in fact, more than that. It was deceit, either of the Japanese or of the American people.

If the script was not to be taken as the basis for the exhibit, then the Japanese were being asked to make decisions about the loan of artifacts on an incomplete understanding of what they were being asked to do. On the other hand, if the script was a legitimate basis on which the Japanese were to reach a lending decision, then subsequent statements downplaying the first script were disingenuous. NASM cannot have it both ways.

Moreover, NASM denies the existence of a prior agreement or understanding between the Nagasaki and Hiroshima museums regarding the original exhibit. However, it is generally understood by informed members of the public—and most certainly by professional historians and museum curators with international connections and experience—that those museums are, in effect, Japanese “Holocaust” museums, and that no artifacts would be loaned to museums or exhibits that did not conform to their philosophy and message. NASM curators and officials surely knew what was expected of any exhibit that benefited from loans of artifacts from those museums, and it can be concluded that if they did not intend to conform to the Japanese perspective, they would never have sought the artifacts in the first place.

It is known that the former director and one, if not both, primary curators visited Japan and the peace museums many times in preparation for this exhibit. What is not known is the frequency, cost and purpose of those visits, and the extent to which that purpose conforms to the intent of Congress.

The American Legion strongly recommends that this Committee open that line of inquiry and based on what is discovered, set guidelines requiring the disclosure of the purpose and outcome of such travel.

More disturbing, however, and a line of inquiry which The American Legion was wholly unsuccessful in following, is whether or not the conditions of the cooperative agreement between the Nagasaki and Hiroshima museums were put into writing. This Committee should be given every opportunity to review any such document, should it be proven to exist.

The American Legion recommends that this committee seek information to either confirm or put to rest this recurring speculation among a number of veterans organizations and news reporters.

It is not and never has been The American Legion’s practice to pursue individuals in the course of policy or issue disagreements. Throughout this controversy, we have refrained from asking for resignations or suggesting motives for one course of action or another. Still, it seems to us that a prudent course of action for Congress to take is to review the personnel policies and practices at the Smithsonian Institution to insure that employees and volunteers there not only meet their responsibilities but also retain and enjoy their rights as citizens.

At a minimum, The American Legion recommends that:

1. The personal and professional goals of future museum directors be clarified and determined to conform to the intent of Congress before their visions are permitted to affect the direction of a museum. It is clear that, in the case of the former NASM director, his goals, plans and intentions to reform the museum were reasonably well known inside the museum and to readers of *The Washington Post* at the time of his appointment, and may well have led to the controversy over the *Enola Gay*.
2. Congress oversee and seek regular information on the use to which museum personnel, physical resources and funds are put,

with an eye to containing the lines of inquiry to those included in the museums’ charge.

3. Congress insure that docents and volunteers retain their rights and dignity as essential resources for the efficient operation of museums, and not sanctioned for their opinions.
4. Congress be aware of the relationship of NASM historians to a particular school of historic and political thought, when such relationships become exclusive of knowledge, rather than inclusive.
5. Congress review periodically the role of experienced military professionals in informing the displays and exhibits mounted by NASM, and take appropriate measures to assure a balance between practical knowledge of history and academic understanding, both in hiring and in the utilization of human resources.
6. Congress implement review procedures by which only those curators with professional and academic credentials applicable to the subject of an exhibit be assigned to curate a display.
7. Congress solicit from among the employees and volunteers at NASM comments and experiences relating to the way in which the museum has been administered, heed their concerns and take immediate steps to assure that the museum operates in conformity with sound management and personnel practices.

Additionally, The American Legion notes with some concern that much of the outside information and analysis brought to bear on the *Enola Gay* exhibit came from a limited number of historians and specialists whose expertise have little or nothing to do with air and space, but more to do with diplomacy, ethics, and philosophies of government and intergovernmental relationships. It is noteworthy that historians exclusively from the revisionist school were consulted on the *Enola Gay* exhibit—historians such as Alperovitz, Bird, Bernstein and others—and that the curators made little or no contact with historians and institutions which might have provided information and analysis contrary to the exhibit they were planning.

The American Legion strongly recommends that this Committee inquire as to why no contact for the exhibit was made with the archives concerning Stimson, Marshall, Truman or MacArthur, and why few, if any, of the acknowledged experts and biographers of such men were contacted. The American Legion successfully contacted many such institutions and individuals in the course of its research and found them to be accessible and readily cooperative.

Finally, The American Legion is deeply concerned about future use of the canceled exhibit’s artifacts and script, and the future of the historic aircraft itself.

It is the view of our organization that the exhibit, declared “flawed from the beginning” by Secretary Heyman himself and admitted by former NASM Director Harwit to contain many errors, should not be resurrected and presented by any other institution, unless and only after it is subjected to rigorous review by a broad cross-section of acknowledged historians. This is not an effort to restrain freedom of expression, but rather an effort to quash propaganda presented in the guise of history—propaganda researched and prepared at the expense of the American people.

At a minimum, The American Legion recommends that Congress satisfy itself as to the status of the script and artifacts, and determine if plans to loan the exhibit to institutions such as The American University for public display, conform to Congress’ view of the best interest of our country.

At the center of this controversy, and often overlooked as the central cause by many commentators, rests the historic B-29, *Enola Gay*. Much has been said and written about casualties, President Truman’s motives, the military and diplomatic intentions of the Imperial Japanese Government, and whether or not lives were indeed spared by the mission of *Enola Gay*. Those are legitimate lines of academic inquiry which may never be settled to the agreement of all historians.

But little has been said about the cynical use of this aircraft to, in our view, justify the presence of an exhibit in the National Air and Space Museum that otherwise fails to conform to the museum’s broad mandate. And little has been

said about the Smithsonian's thinly-veiled efforts to hold the aircraft as ransom for future appropriations and, in the process, withholding it from the view of the public and a generation of veterans which has waited for half a century to see it displayed proudly.

First, the Smithsonian Secretary's insinuation that failing to approve the FY 1996 appropriations request would further jeopardize the planned NASM extension at Dulles International Airport is disturbing. That certainly was the message he brought to hearings in the House concerning future Congressional funding. Perhaps it is true. But there is no need whatsoever for the *Enola Gay* to repose unreassembled and undisplayed until some distant date in the future when the now twice-delayed Dulles facility is complete. The *Enola Gay* has undergone a complete restoration, at a cost far in excess of what would have been necessary if the aircraft had been properly cared for when it was delivered, fully operational, by then-Col. Paul Tibbets in 1949.

The extensive restoration is described in a NASM video production and the original exhibit script contains a description of the restoration in which the aircraft was characterized as completely restored, but not re-assembled. The exhibit of *Enola Gay* now planned for the Air and Space Museum will include only 56 feet of the forward fuselage, perhaps an engine or two, and some other components.

However, is it the intent of Congress that after 46 years, this aircraft repose another 10 or more years—until all those alive when she flew are gone—in either pieces or obscurity? Does the Congress feel the same sense of shame about this historic aircraft that the Smithsonian Institution seems to have felt for nearly half a century?

The American Legion recommends that Congress direct, and provide funding specifically for, the loan or transfer of *Enola Gay* to another federal facility with the will and the means to display it properly without commentary and controversy. We respectfully suggest that *Enola Gay* join her sister ship *Bock's Car* at the Air Force Museum at Wright Patterson Air Force Base near Dayton, Ohio, or failing that, at any of the other facilities that have expressed an interest in doing so.

We are aware that Smithsonian officials have rejected this option, but we also believe that NASM's misuse of the aircraft and the Smithsonian's historic disdain for it disqualify officials there from having the final say. Just as those officials have argued that loan and exchange of artifacts between museums is a common practice—so held in defense of their efforts to surround *Enola Gay* with artifacts from Hiroshima and Nagasaki—we would argue that loan of this particular artifact to another American museum poses no threat to the aircraft.

Thousands of World War II veterans believe, with solid justification, that they owe their lives to *Enola Gay* and her historic mission. They have asked repeatedly that they be given an opportunity to see her and to reflect on the meaning of her mission in their lives. The American Legion strongly urges the Congress to fund and direct such a loan of the aircraft. There is an entire generation soon to pass from the scene which has waited long enough.

In this, the 50th anniversary of their victory over the enemies of freedom, it would be a fitting and inexpensive tribute. It would protect this artifact from the Smithsonian's feared deterioration due to underfunding. And more important, it would be a gesture of good faith by the Institution. For the Smithsonian to unselfishly make this aircraft available for our people to visit, immediately, would go a long way to restoring the American people's faith in an institution described by Secretary Heyman in his testimony before the Appropriations Subcommittee on the Interior as, "a unique and revered institution which represents the best of America and its people. The Smithsonian is the mirror in which we, as Americans, see our history and culture from the past, in the present, and towards the future."

The American Legion is not here to address any aspect of funding for the Smithsonian Institution other than that specifically concerning the display of *Enola Gay*. We do not ask for or support the idea of withholding legitimate funding for the Smithsonian. The American Legion is not in the business of tearing down American institutions, nor do we concern ourselves with the per-

sons or personalities of those involved in vital national enterprises. But we are in the business of protecting and preserving our American heritage. As the battle over *Enola Gay* has demonstrated, we are willing to invest our time, our money and, if need be, our reputation to fight for the principles we espouse. We believe in honesty, in integrity, in fair play. We believe in honoring the service and sacrifice of those who took up arms in defense of the Nation. We believe in passing a sense of America's unique role in world history, and a sense of its greatness, on to future generations.

And we believe the National Air and Space Museum consciously and intentionally violated every one of those principles, by setting out to alter our citizens' view of themselves. We believe that those responsible for the exhibit did so in a most cynical and insensitive way: by using the very aircraft that thousands of World War II veterans credit with sparing them from death on the beaches of Japan, to suggest that their lives were purchased at the price of vengeance and racism.

If such as we believe is proven to be the case, then it is our view that the National Air and Space Museum has forfeited, for the time being, any legitimate claim on the generosity of the American people. The museum ceases to be an American museum and becomes something else entirely—and as such should depend for its funding on those who share its views. It should not enjoy the support of our citizens, and indeed, evidence is mounting that this exhibit, along with several others in recent history, has resulted in a drastic reduction in Smithsonian memberships, individual and corporate contributions, and even the willingness of major contributors to be publicly associated with their donations.

Nevertheless, we encourage Congress to be skeptical of Smithsonian claims that prudent cuts in the institution's funding levels would adversely affect its ability to care for its collections. Recent revelations of the disappearance of World War I artifacts would indicate that even with full funding, the museums are doing a poor job of protecting their collections. Certainly, the nearly \$300,000 spent on the *Enola Gay* exhibit, and now gone for nearly no good purpose, would indicate room for improvement under tighter funding controls. And the cancellation of many of the Institution's near-term plans and exhibits suggests more funds expended for nothing. It is our opinion that tighter funding should not adversely affect the collections, but should instead impose some discipline on free-spending curators and administrators.

We see no reason to fund the Smithsonian Institution according to its whims under the thinly veiled threat that failure to do so would result in deterioration of collections or decline in the physical plant or plans, until such time that the Institution has demonstrated the will and the ability to manage its finances more responsibly.

In summary, The American Legion's recommendations for the future of the Smithsonian Institution and for management guidelines are few in number and relatively simple, common sense safeguards common to prudent management of any public institution. They are:

1. Congressional oversight and review of museum plans and practices
2. Periodic review by independent professionals and knowledgeable lay persons
3. Tighter review and control over the use of appropriated funds
4. Improved management controls and establishment of reporting disciplines
5. Redefinition and clarification of the role of Smithsonian museums in American society, and establishment of measures to guarantee compliance

This concludes the testimony of The American Legion, presented on behalf of its more than 3 million members and, we trust, of countless other Americans.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you very much, Mr. Harrington.

Next we will hear from R. E. Smith, president of the Air Force Association. Mr. Smith?