

would remind you, however, that the document had the support of most of the members of a distinguished advisory committee and a substantial number of other authorities in the field. The revised script issued in June attracted even broader support. I believe that the very positive comments of leading scholars refutes the charge that the early versions of the script were "bad history."

Criticism of the script has centered on the question of balance. Those of us who developed the exhibition believe that the experience of the people of Hiroshima and Nagasaki is an essential element of any full telling of this story. I think most of our critics agree with that point of view. Moreover, all of us agree that the atomic bombing of Japan must be understood within the context of the justice of the Allied cause, and the incredible heroism of those who fought, and died, to push the forces of Japanese tyranny back across the Pacific.

Professor John Dower of MIT expressed the hopes and intentions of the curatorial team when he commented that: "the original script had a great potential to convey . . . [a] larger dimension of tragic ambiguity . . . without denying the bravery of individual American fighting men, or the worthiness of the fight against Japan. It would have been an immense challenge to pull this off, but I thought the first script gave every promise of doing so."

Our critics took issue with the ambiguity to which Professor Dower refers. While the exhibition was never intended to attack the justification for the use of the atomic bomb, it did suggest that the decision has been the subject of considerable study and analysis over the past half-century. Moreover, we failed to appreciate the deep and powerful links that bind memory of the bomb to the incredible sense of joy and relief at the end of the war. As individuals and as an institution, those of us at the museum have paid a high price for that misjudgment.

In closing, I want to assure you that I remain committed to the mission of the National Air and Space Museum, and to the mandate of the Smithsonian Institution to increase and diffuse knowledge. I appreciate the opportunity to appear today, and will do my best to answer any questions that the Committee may have. Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you.

Secretary Heyman, I want you to know we recognize that you came into this matter after it started and if you want to defer to others to answer questions, we would be happy to have you do that. I will try to limit mine on the first round here, but I do have a series of questions I want to get answers to, if we can.

Does the Smithsonian intend now to display the *Enola Gay* on a permanent basis anywhere after the scaled-down exhibit is over?

Mr. HEYMAN. We certainly intend to exhibit it, sir, when we have a place to exhibit it. We cannot put it in the Air and Space Museum because it is too big. So the intention has been to exhibit it at Dulles as the extension begins to be built out.

The CHAIRMAN. There are members of the groups that have criticized the Smithsonian who have urged that you place it on display at another prominent area. There are several prominent areas for display of artifacts of the air war of World War II. Have you considered doing that?

Mr. HEYMAN. My view about that is that when we take this exhibit down, if there is an opportunity to lend the *Enola Gay* to another place and we can work out the expenditures for getting it there and getting it back and its maintenance, we would certainly take quite seriously a request for it to be lent and exhibited elsewhere.

QUESTION PERIOD

The CHAIRMAN. Then you would be receptive to a request from these organizations that it be displayed just as an artifact somewhere in the country?

Mr. HEYMAN. Yes, sir. But we would like to retain ownership of it for its eventual display as part of our collection.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you envision someday the museum would be large enough to hold that as a permanent exhibit?

Mr. HEYMAN. I think if we build out what we intend to build out at Dulles, the extension of the Air and Space Museum, we will have the requisite room. That is the plan.

The CHAIRMAN. I do not really view the Dulles site and facility as being very accessible to many people. But that is another question; we will deal with that later.

In your letter to Congressman Johnson you stated that you were conducting an examination of how the exhibits are framed philosophically at the outset. Could you tell us the status of that examination?

Mr. HEYMAN. What I am trying to put together is a procedure so that prospective exhibitions are quite well reviewed. The first step in that, in my view, is for those within a museum to deal with, to be consulted on, to discuss fully the plan of any curator or curators for an exhibition, to look at what the purpose is, to get a full explication of how it is supposed to work, and to start to make judgments with regard to whether or not it is framed properly in order to be accurate and full and balanced.

Let me give you an example. My biggest problem with the first script of the *Enola Gay* is how it was framed. It was an inquiry into the use of atomic weapons with a sidebar, a secondary look at the *Enola Gay* and the use of the atomic weapons in ending the Second World War. I think that, at least now that I have become more sophisticated about this, if I had been involved at all at the outset, and if I had thought about it very hard, I think I could begin to predict some of the problems that would arise if that is the way an exhibit was to be framed to be held at the time that it was.

I want the museums in the first instance to really take that seriously. I want to be put on notice whenever an exhibit is begun to be discussed which could be a controversial exhibition in the terms that we are talking about or perhaps other ones. Then secondly, I want those procedures to state quite clearly that—and we are talking about historical exhibitions here basically—that not only should we be putting together an historian's committee to assure accuracy, but that if there are special groups that are specially affected by an exhibition, that they are consulted meaningfully too, and early enough so that that consultation affects the design of the exhibition.

I want to put those in writing. We are getting close to being able to do that. I want an elaboration of them from each of the museums. I want accountability with regard to whether or not they are being followed. And I want to be informed personally,

and certainly persons other than me who are on staff in the Secretary's office, with regard to whether there are exhibitions contemplated that raise special problems of this sort. I want to know about that early in the game.

The CHAIRMAN. What is the status of this examination to find out how the exhibits are framed philosophically at the outset?

Mr. HEYMAN. I do not know if philosophically is the right word, but I really mean—

The CHAIRMAN. It is not my word; it is yours.

Mr. HEYMAN. What I mean by that is, how—I gave the example for the *Enola Gay*. I would like to know what the purpose and the story line of the exhibition is, and I would like explicit conversation about that at the outset.

The CHAIRMAN. You also said that you are satisfied there has been no fundamental effort at the Air and Space Museum, or any Smithsonian museum, to do exhibitions only of the newer sort. What is the "newer sort"?

Mr. HEYMAN. I think that was the discussion Senator Feinstein was having. Let me just give this as a little bit of—

The CHAIRMAN. Is it what we would call revisionist—

Mr. HEYMAN. No.

The CHAIRMAN. —or politically correct? What is "newer sort"?

Mr. HEYMAN. "Newer sort" is—let me start this way. Historically, at least in my view, what our museums and museums in general have done is to show objects. And they have shown objects with not a lot of signage. It has essentially been, you look at the object. You get a little bit of an idea what it is. You bring to that object and you understand that object in relationship to seeing it.

The newer sort is what is occurring now in a lot of museums around the country where in historical exhibitions we are beginning to write books on the wall. We are beginning to have so much signage that it overwhelms, at least in my view—and this is a lively argument—but it overwhelms the objects that are the centerpieces of the exhibition. That is the tendency. That is the trend.

I have some problems, all aside of what the messages are, whether or not exhibitions that are primarily made up of an awful lot of text that is put up on the wall are very effective exhibitions with respect to visitors.

The CHAIRMAN. Have you looked into the question of copyright? Does the Smithsonian have the copyright to scripts that are prepared by people you hire with Federal money?

Mr. HEYMAN. I believe we do.

The CHAIRMAN. That it not my understanding. It is my understanding that the work of Federal employees under your control is not copyrightable; that under the authority of the Smithsonian there is no copyright protection for scripts that are written for the Government.

Ms. NEWMAN. I will have to get the general counsel's ruling on that, but my understanding is—

The CHAIRMAN. Respectfully, Ms. Newman, I do not want your legal opinion. I want to know what you have been doing. Are these scripts copyrighted?

Ms. NEWMAN. Yes, some of them are.

The CHAIRMAN. When?

Ms. NEWMAN. At what point in time?

The CHAIRMAN. At what point in time do they become Federal property with copyright protection?

Ms. NEWMAN. At the point that the script is final and the exhibit is going on the wall.

The CHAIRMAN. They are copyrighted then?

Ms. NEWMAN. But it varies. I know, Mr. Chairman, that you do not want me to talk to the general counsel about this, but the reason I—

The CHAIRMAN. No, I just do not want another opinion. I want to see what has been done. I am told it has not been done.

Ms. NEWMAN. What I have to do is—frankly, there are some issues before the courts now that affect this question of yours and I do not want to put us in an awkward position with regard to our issues before the court. So I would like, respectfully—

The CHAIRMAN. I respect that. But we have been told that you have copyrighted these, and there is a serious question here as to protection of public property.

Ms. NEWMAN. May I explain? What has happened is a number have gone into texts that are published by the press. Some of the scripts have gone into texts published by the press in catalogs, and that is copyrighted.

The CHAIRMAN. I believe that you should get an opinion of your counsel. I think your law is not adequate to give us the protection we should have for scripts prepared at public expense under your jurisdiction. Because of the unique status of the Smithsonian, I am told that you have not sought copyright protection in some instances, and that is one of the things we should look into while we are looking into the management concepts of the Smithsonian.

Mr. Secretary, you appointed Mr. Hoffman, the acting provost, as the temporary director of the Air and Space Museum. Did you discuss this exhibit with Mr. Hoffman in connection with that appointment?

Mr. HEYMAN. The *Enola Gay* exhibit, sir?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes.

Mr. HEYMAN. We have been so close for the 8 months that I have been here, we have discussed the *Enola Gay* exhibit a lot of times. So I did not have a special conversation with him at the time I appointed him as the temporary director.

The CHAIRMAN. What role did the Air and Space Museum advisory board have in the preparation or review of these

scripts? I am told there are 10 members of that; 3 appointed by the President.

Mr. HEYMAN. I do not think much of a role, sir. I met with the advisory committee this past week. As a matter of fact, I asked them and they will take a preliminary look at the exhibition that I am in charge of, the new *Enola Gay* exhibition. But I know they discussed the *Enola Gay* exhibition at their last meeting. They only have historically met once a year. But I do not think they went through the script in any detail.

The CHAIRMAN. What is the role of this advisory group? Were they consulted, Dr. Crouch, at the beginning of this exhibit?

Mr. CROUCH. Yes, Senator. There were repeated discussions of the exhibition at advisory committee meetings over a period of at least 2 years.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there any record of their expression of views?

Mr. CROUCH. Yes, Senator. In the minutes of the advisory committee.

Mr. HEYMAN. Are you speaking of the statutory advisory committee?

Mr. CROUCH. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. On that group was Lieutenant General William Forester, who is military deputy assistant to the Secretary of the Army, the Chief of Staff of the Air Force, the deputy chief of staff for aviation, Rear Admiral William C. Donnell, Rear Admiral Brent Binnett, General John Daly. Were they consulted at the beginning of this exhibit?

Mr. CROUCH. Yes, sir. The plans for the exhibition were discussed at meetings of the mandatory advisory committee.

The CHAIRMAN. They saw the script in the beginning?

Mr. CROUCH. I do not believe so, Senator.

The CHAIRMAN. That is what we are getting at in terms of management. At what point do the advisors who are appointed to try and protect you against this kind of controversy come into this process, Doctor?

Mr. HEYMAN. If you had been at the meeting that I had with the advisory committee this week, which obviously you would not, I told them that I really looked forward to a rather deep, consultative relationship between that advisory committee and NASM, and we are going to do that.

The CHAIRMAN. You have a series of directives, regulations, et cetera. Is there any sort of directive to those who are managing the Air and Space Museum that they shall consult with these advisors before they undertake matters of public controversy?

Mr. HEYMAN. I do not know, but the under secretary says that we do not have stated policies that directly give that directive.

The CHAIRMAN. I think that it is unfortunate, when you have high-caliber public members such as Mr. Thomas Hall, Susan Woo, and several others, who are there in order to give advice to the museum to prevent the kind of controversy that developed,

and they are not involved. I urge you to discuss it and give us some response on how the advisory committee is going to be used. If it is not going to be used, maybe we should abolish it. But the real problem is that they were not used.

Now tell me this. I am sure you heard the comments that were made last week by the veterans organizations. What percent of the Air and Space budget has been spent on actual restoration of aircraft or aerospace vehicles over the past 3 years? Do you have any idea?

Ms. NEWMAN. I would have to submit that for the record. There was \$1 million spent on the restoration of the *Enola Gay*. But if you are asking for all of the dollars spent on restoration, I would have to submit that for one other reason. Some of the restoration is done by third parties. We get the aircraft to them and they expend their resources. So I would have to split it out for you, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Tell me this, any one of you who wants to answer—In a period when we are trying to celebrate the history and the contributions to the preservation of our democracy made by those who lost their lives in World War II—those of us who served do not feel we require any recognition. We survived. We are trying to remember those who gave their lives—Why do we have a Barbie doll exhibit in the Air and Space Museum instead of exhibits commemorating those who gave their lives? What is the Barbie doll doing there in the first place?

Mr. CROUCH. The curator would have to answer that question directly, Senator. When it comes to exhibitions of this sort at the museum, a curator proposes an idea for a project. That proposal is discussed at an exhibition committee meeting which includes the leading managers of the museum. Decisions are made and passed on as advice to the director.

The Barbie doll exhibit is a very small case exhibit. I would call your attention too to the fact that 1 week ago tonight we had a marvelous Charles Lindbergh memorial lecture commemorating victory in Europe, particularly those who participated in the air war in Europe. We filled the Langley Theater in the museum, in fact to overflowing. We had to move in extra seats.

I think if you look at the record of our museum over the past years in terms of exhibitions—

The CHAIRMAN. Doctor, if you do not see the difference between having a Lindbergh lecture in a theater and a permanent exhibit proposed on the *Enola Gay* which would portray us as the aggressors, I do not think we are going to get very far in this hearing.

Mr. CROUCH. Our next exhibition, I would point out, Senator, is the F6F Hellcat, a World War II Navy fighter.

Mr. HEYMAN. Senator, on the Barbie dolls. I do remember a little bit about it. It is two small cases. It is temporary. It is about \$6,000 that was paid by outside sources, or most of it was. The

notion was to have something there that got young people's attention. Largely what it is, by looking at the dolls—I am told, although I have not seen it—you can see an evolution of the role of women in aviation and aeronautics simply by the way that Barbie dolls were clothed over a 20-year period. It is not a very central exhibition, but it seems to—but that is its intention.

The CHAIRMAN. I am going to have to yield in a minute. But let me ask, Doctor, what is the exhibit, "Beyond the Limits"? What is that exhibit?

Mr. CROUCH. It is an exhibition that has to do with computers, electronics, avionics, Senator, in modern aviation; the way in which they have revolutionized flight technology.

The CHAIRMAN. You sought and obtained four contributions from Japanese interests and Japanese nationals to put that in our national museum. Why?

Mr. CROUCH. It was not my exhibition, Senator. I could not respond to that question.

The CHAIRMAN. I would like to know. I will have some other questions later. I will yield to my colleagues. I do want you to know, Dr. Crouch, that those of us who lived through World War II have great admiration for Lindbergh's accomplishment in flying across the Atlantic; but we have no regard whatsoever for his position as a collaborator with our enemies during World War II.

Senator?

Senator FORD. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Doctor, I want to bridge over here just a little bit. I want you to look at me as a friendly enemy because I do not want to do anything to downgrade the Smithsonian because it is too valuable. The only thing I want to do here is to help you improve it. So not being a professional, I come as a member of the jury. It appears that you, sir, recognize the direction of the *Enola Gay* exhibit was inappropriate from the start, and perhaps in hindsight you agree that the exhibit did not reflect the experience of those who lived in this history.

I understand, Doctor, that the Museum of American History will display an exhibit this summer to commemorate the end of the war. What assurance can you give this committee and the public that the American History Museum exhibit has been developed differently so as to avoid the problems we faced in this one? And have you applied your new procedures to this exhibit?

Mr. HEYMAN. I have read the script, Senator Ford, and I am satisfied with it.

Senator FORD. How did you apply your new procedures to it?

Mr. HEYMAN. These procedures are being formulated presently. Certainly in the interim I am asking if we are going to have an exhibit in an area that might be controversial that the script of it be shared with me. This was and I have—it is a relatively short script. I have read it and I think it is quite good.

Senator FORD. This could be another sensitive thing and I want to be sure that we are going in the right direction.

Mr. HEYMAN. I do not think you will find it is. It is one that really has paintings and objects that really evoke memories. It does not tell stories. It really is very object-based and not one in which there are a lot of wallboard labels.

Senator FORD. Doctor, let me step into your next panel if I may for minute. I apologize for having to do that but I am an hour late to where I was supposed to go. You mentioned trends a while ago as it related to history and that sort of thing — trends. I did not know we had any "trends" in history, unless it was the improvement of knowledge or additional facts that would be added on, not interpretation. But you mentioned the word "trends" and that bothered me a little bit, whether it is politically correct or not or whatever.

Now the study of NAPA that you referred to in your statement, was that in process before you came on board?

Mr. HEYMAN. No, sir, that was instituted after I came aboard.

Senator FORD. That is just the Aeronautics and Space Museum and not anything else?

Mr. HEYMAN. That is correct.

Senator FORD. I read in here that during the tenure of Dr. Harwit he most notably broadened the museum's agenda, especially in deepening research and exhibitions concerning scientific aspects of the space and the cosmos. Now also you say in here, that the Smithsonian's usefulness to our citizens should not be about that one class visit in the 10th grade. Without taking on the impossible, we must be about carrying our mission across the country. We must find ways to deliver to the American people, wherever they live, the wonders of the institution they have supported for over one and a half centuries.

Now I am troubled. I am troubled because of the Barbie doll exhibit. I do not know if they are all dressed up in aviation uniforms and all that, but the Barbie doll, we have to get that straightened out. Communication is probably the hardest thing we have to do. You have an art section and you have a batik cloth exhibit with abstract paint; is that correct, Dr. Crouch? I saw you inhale real quick. Is that correct?

Mr. CROUCH. We did, Senator, have an exhibition batiks created by artist Mary Edna Frazier. They are based on aerial photography. The artist is a pilot who makes use of those images—

Senator FORD. You tell me that it looks like, and I am not a professional. If you have a stream and some trees behind it, I understand it. You may understand abstract art. But it was on batik cloth, right?

Mr. CROUCH. Yes, sir.

Senator FORD. And it was abstract; is that correct?

Mr. CROUCH. Well, they are based on aerial photographs, Senator. What the artist sees from the sky as she flies.

Senator FORD. All right. You are going to have to draw me another picture because I did not understand it that way, Doctor. I do not think many people who come through there understand it either. You may understand it and sit up there in that six-by-six with a 60-watt bulb and green shade on and say, the world is great out there. But there are a lot of people who come through that Aeronautics and Space Museum, one of the most visited museums in the world, and it has to be the best. No question about that, it has to be the best. And the best you can do is when people leave there they understand it. They do not understand batik cloth and abstract paint, most of them.

Now we get back to the education, Doctor, spreading it out. I understand that in the educational realm of Aeronautics and Space you are being community selective. You are going into communities, maybe where they are unfortunate or I do not know what the level is that you picked, and you are concentrating on that. Now you say here you want to spread it out all over to the country, but you are selecting the communities and it is not a national effort. That bothers me some.

Mr. HEYMAN. First of all—

Senator FORD. I have talked to the people that do it, Doctor, so do not try to—

Mr. HEYMAN. No, I am trying to tell you what I was saying in the document from which you read. What I am saying is that we are seeking to take the Smithsonian into the electronic world and have our exhibitions and a lot of information that is contained in the Smithsonian available in electronic form. We just went on the Internet with about 20 or 25—more than that—a huge amount of information that is being built up in the various museums, also including a very good exhibition called, "Ocean Planet." In the first 3 or 4 days that we were on the Internet we recorded over 2 million visits. In other words, 2 million people tuned in.

I see that—it is still a limited audience. There are about 30 million who are on the Internet around. But I see that, probably as it combines with the television medium, as being a very extraordinary way to reach an awful lot of people so that they can, in a way, partake of what we have at the Smithsonian and not have to be there.

The other is that we are taking what I think is going to be an absolutely wonderful exhibition as part of our 150th anniversary called, "America's Smithsonian." We are going to travel that around the country and that is going to contain a lot of our really fine objects. I think that people who have not been able to come to Washington are going to be able to get a very good sense of the Smithsonian by visiting that. That is what I meant in those references from which you were reading.

Senator FORD. Do you have any knowledge, or do your colleagues there have any knowledge, of the selected communities now?

Ms. NEWMAN. I know, Senator, throughout the institution there is an effort to work with school systems around the country. We have a math and science program. Each of the museums has a program. What has happened is that some of the museums, and Air and Space in particular, have programs for the Washington area, just because it is physically easier to get the students in the Washington area into the museums. But if you are suggesting that it is selective in that they are not interested in all of the schools in the area, that is not true.

Senator FORD. I am talking about the country. This is a national museum, not an area.

Ms. NEWMAN. Within the country, the programs that I talked to you about on the science and math are throughout the country. We have curriculum materials that go throughout the country. I can show you by each State which of the schools are benefiting from these various programs, and I would like very much to do that.

Senator FORD. Fine, I will be glad to accept it. But when you select the communities and the criteria you have by which you select the communities disturbs me because the programs ought to be universal and not selective. And the criteria that you have down there for your people who make these decisions, the criteria they go by limit the where and how much of the exhibits and the education and the communication. So I hope that maybe my questions today will give you an opportunity to revisit some of those things and perhaps redirect it.

Now, Doctor, you have got a raft of assistants at Air and Space Museum. Do you think you need all of them or are you going to wait until the NAPA comes? You have got half a dozen there or more.

Mr. HEYMAN. I am clearly going to wait until I get a really—I will keep you posted, Senator.

Senator FORD. It is like the football coaches in my hometown. They never fired them, they became assistant superintendents. We had a lot of football coaches that retired from coaching and became assistant superintendents. They do that all over the state. Somehow or another, we just like to take care of our sports figures. I do not want you to get loaded up with a lot of assistants, and then you get five different points of view. That may be good, but somehow, at some point you have got to say, we can be more efficient. You have a director, and he has an assistant and they have certain things to do. Then you can put that big shadow over their shoulder.

Mr. HEYMAN. Right. Senator, I think we are beginning now to try to look at these issues since obviously we are going to start to—I have to live on leaner budgets. Clearly, 85 percent or so of our budget is in personnel. Clearly, if we are going to have to tighten our belts it is going to have to be that we are going to have to thin out numbers of people.

Senator FORD. So it may come automatically.

Mr. HEYMAN. Yes. One of the things though I do want to—this is just really by way of information. I am sitting on 17 museums and galleries and 4 or 5 very large research institutes. So I just want you to know that these efforts are going to have to be systematic.

Senator FORD. I understand that. As I said earlier, if I am viewed as an enemy, I would like to be a friendly enemy because I think what you are doing is so important. If I am critical, I hope it is constructive. What I have done is talked personally to people. I have not just taken a piece of paper and read it and this is the report. I have talked to people at the Air and Space Museum who participate every day in what you do down there.

So I have not just come here with a piece of paper staff shoved under my nose and said, you ask him these questions. I have got them personally because I thought it was so important.

Mr. HEYMAN. I understand that.

Senator FORD. At some point we will grade you. When I first came here your board was never brought before the Congress. They would just send the names up and we would approve them. Senator Mathias decided we ought to see who is going on the board, and get their background, have a little financial statement like all the rest of the appointments around here, because you do handle a lot of money and you are important to the country. Now we are beginning to give you some oversight, and you are going through some of the problems other agencies are going through.

Mr. HEYMAN. I realize that, sir. But do not forget my Board of Regents because they are—

Senator FORD. I understand your Board of Regents. I hear from your Board of Regents almost daily. I want to tell you, they are on your side. And I happen to be on their side because we are trying to do the same thing. They defend you strongly. When that defense goes away you had better—

Mr. HEYMAN. I will be in trouble.

Senator FORD. You will.

The CHAIRMAN. Senator Pell, do you have any questions?

Senator PELL. Yes, thank you. Speaking of the regents, I think one of the stupidest things I have ever done was when I thought I had a conflict of interest and resigned from the board. I have regretted it ever since, sought to get on it and have not succeeded. I think that the exhibition you are talking about is great. As one who was in the North Atlantic convoy duty in the North Atlantic, I would hope that you might honor the anti-submarine warfare there as well, have an exhibition.

I also note your statement that the Smithsonian has "an obligation to consider the opinions of the interested public" in framing your exhibitions. My question is, are there limits to the extent to which the Smithsonian should be responsive to public opinion? And does the Smithsonian reserve for itself an area of judgment that will honor opinions that might not necessarily be

popular? I realize I am coming at it from a slightly different angle than you have received so far.

Mr. HEYMAN. Senator Pell, I think any institution of our sort has to reserve the final decision. But I think we have to be sensitized to viewpoints that otherwise we might not get if we did not make the kinds of consultations and seek the sort of advice that I am speaking about there. But no, we have got to make the final decision.

Senator PELL. Thank you very much.

The CHAIRMAN. Senator Cochran?

Senator COCHRAN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Dr. Crouch, you may have heard Mr. Linenthal say when he was talking about an exhibit of the V-2 rocket that in order to really show what the V-2 rocket was all about, what it did needed to be shown and was shown to fully explain the context of that artifact. I suppose that the same kind of thinking went into the development of the *Enola Gay* exhibit, that to show the context of the airplane that dropped the bomb, you had to show the results.

Is this something that has been followed over time at the Air and Space Museum? And do you see it as something that will continue to be a part of every exhibit? For example, you mentioned the Hellcats. I just wondered, are you going to show the damage and the results of the weapons system that the Hellcat was in order for people to understand why it was made, and what it was for, and how it was used? Is that going to be an important part of that exhibit, or any part at all?

Mr. CROUCH. I think exhibitions perform a great many functions, Senator. When people ask me what I think the National Air and Space Museum does best, I usually say that we inspire wonder and awe and an appreciation for the past. But the museum also teaches, I think, something about the context in which those objects that people see in the museum were used.

The Hellcat exhibit is commemorative, for the most part. It is the airplane, labels, and images of the airplane in use, and the men who flew it.

Senator COCHRAN. No dead people lying around in photographs?

Mr. CROUCH. No, sir, not that I—

Senator COCHRAN. None at all?

Mr. CROUCH. Not that come to mind.

Senator COCHRAN. Why not? Why would you consider it to be a complete exhibit if you do not show the people it killed or the damage that was done by the use of the Hellcat? Why is that different?

Mr. CROUCH. I think the exhibition of the Hellcat does show the complete story of that airplane. It is a fighter airplane, Senator. That exhibition was not designed to deal with a turning point in history.

Senator COCHRAN. I do not remember when I have gone through the museums that it is commonplace to show the victims of weapons systems in ways that would be repulsive or alarm or disgust or enrage, all the other emotions that we get when we see someone who has been killed, particularly in a pretty graphic scene. The Vietnam War is a very good example of what happens, I think, to all of us when we see that kind of thing on television or in photographs or pictures. It has quite an impact.

Is the Air and Space Museum going to consider, for example, in the future showing some of the airplanes that were used in Vietnam and what was done in the use of those planes, the napalm? Are these things that we can look forward to in the future?

Mr. CROUCH. No, Senator. An exhibition on the air war in Vietnam has been under discussion. It is on hold at this point. We still have to reach a decision with regard to that one, as the Secretary has commented in the past.

I really thought and think of the exhibition on the *Enola Gay* as a genuine departure from what had come before at the museum, and did see it as an attempt to tell a story, perhaps in a different way than the museum had before.

Senator COCHRAN. I am disturbed about the possibility of a trend setting in where this is the kind of thing that we can expect at the Air and Space Museum. I certainly disapprove of that mind set and that attitude. We all regret war. We regret we have to defend ourselves and spend all the money we do for national defense. But the security of our country is important, and our citizens security is uppermost in the minds of this Congress. It is probably the number one obligation that we have as a Government.

To see it ridiculed, or those who have been involved in protecting the security of our country demeaned in some indirect way—even though there certainly may not be a conscious effort to do that—by our own national museum is very disturbing. I think that is what comes from this experience.

I hope that those who are involved in thinking about what the role of the museum is, and what the goals are, and the mission, use good common sense and good judgment for a change. I think that is what we are asking you to do. All the regulations and guidelines and everything are going to be helpful maybe. But I think just good common sense and good judgment will be required.

Mr. CROUCH. Senator, I have been at that museum for 21 years and it is today, as it was on the day we opened, the most popular museum in the world. Certainly no one wants to endanger that or to alter the fundamental course of that museum. There is nothing related to this controversy that I regret more than the suggestion that that Institution which I love, which I helped to build, has somehow devalued the heroism and sacrifice of American veterans. That was certainly, and I hope obviously,

never the intention. My own father is a veteran of the Pacific war and I would never, and neither would anyone else involved in this project, wish to do anything other than to honor the soldiers, sailors, and airmen who defeated Japanese tyranny.

Mr. HEYMAN. Do not forget the Marines.

Mr. CROUCH. I am sorry, Mr. Secretary. I apologize for that.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Secretary, I have to get back to the statutory authorization for the National Air and Space Museum. I want to call your attention to that. It says, in Section 77, Title 20 of the U.S. Code, "There is hereby established under the Smithsonian Institution a bureau to be known as the National Air and Space Museum, which shall be administered by the Smithsonian Institution with the advice of a board to be composed of the Chief of Staff of the Air Force, or his designee, the Chief of Naval Operations, or his designee, the Chief of Staff of the Army, or his designee, the Commandant of the Marine Corps, or his designee, the Commandant of the Coast Guard, or his designee, the Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, or his designee, the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration, or his designee, the Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution, and three citizens of the United States appointed by the President from civilian life . . ."

Now, as I understand it, before this exhibit started there was no reference to that board for advice. Is that correct?

Mr. HEYMAN. I cannot really tell you. I can only tell you that at the meeting that we had this week it was told to me by members of that advisory committee that at the meeting they had had the last year, which I guess was in April or May of last year, there was discussion at that meeting about the *Enola Gay* exhibition. I do not know what the nature of that discussion was. I do not know the extent to which what that exhibit was to be or looked like in the first draft was discussed. I just do not know the nature of it. I just can tell you that is what they told me when I saw them this week.

The CHAIRMAN. I think you miss my point. My point is, the statute says you run this with the advice of this board. It is a specifically designated advisory board, composed primarily of the military advisors to the President of the United States. They are the chairmen of the individual services, the chiefs of staff. But I do not see anything in your procedure which follows this law. You do not get their advice except once a year.

Mr. HEYMAN. I do not know whether our procedures state it. They probably do not. We will rectify that. But I want you to know that my own intention, which I discussed with them this week, was of a much closer advisory relation between that board and the museum. So you and I are on the same wavelength.

The CHAIRMAN. I hope we are. You and I are not going to be here forever, and I do not want the Smithsonian to be destroyed by revisionists or people who are seeking some way to express their own point of view to the world despite the official policy

of the United States when using taxpayer money. Now the problem with this is that the law also says this is the function of the museum. This is the law that gave you the authority to build this museum and spend taxpayers' money to support it:

The National Air and Space Museum shall memorialize the national development of aviation and space flight; collect, preserve and display aeronautical and space flight equipment of historical interest and significance; serve as a repository for scientific equipment and data pertaining to the development of aviation and space flight; and provide educational material for the historical study of aviation and space flight.

Now, Dr. Crouch, how do you go about planning an exhibit which primarily is to raise the question of the use by the United States of atomic weapons under that statute? You were involved in this.

Mr. CROUCH. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. I do not think he was there at that time, but you were there when it started. I do not think you have any authority under this law to proceed with the exhibit that you planned, which basically was to raise the issue of the correctness of our use of atomic weapons at the close of World War II. That has nothing to do with the *Enola Gay*.

But I do not think you get our point. Suppose we gave you the F117 today, which was the classic weapon used in the Persian Gulf. Are you going to show pictures of the people who were in the way of those weapons they used so effectively and efficiently? Are you going to show those people who unfortunately suffered death because of the policy of their government in Iraq? Or are you going to show it to be a scientific instrument, really one of the best weapons in history and one of the key functions of our system to win the war in the Persian Gulf? Are you going to go out on the streets of Iraq and get pictures of babies it killed or are you going to show the pilots who flew it?

Mr. CROUCH. Senator, we did an exhibition on the air war in the Persian Gulf.

The CHAIRMAN. I saw it. But you miss the point. As Senator Cochran said, I do not remember seeing pictures of dead Iraqis.

Mr. CROUCH. Agreed, sir. I do not think there were.

The CHAIRMAN. So your exhibit was an exhibit that tried to raise the issue of the correctness of the decision of the President of the United States to use atomic weapons to end World War II.

Mr. CROUCH. No, Senator. We did not regard the exhibition that way. This was an attempt to say something about the airplane as a player in a turning point in world history. I do not think you can understand the meaning of that airplane, which has become such a symbol of so many things for people, without seeing it as having an historic role.

The CHAIRMAN. It delivered the final weapon of World War II, but there are a lot of other weapons that killed many more people than it did; the Hellcats for example. How many people were killed by the Hellcats strafing operations?

Mr. CROUCH. I am sure a great many, Senator.

The CHAIRMAN. But you are not going to show those. What were you doing in terms of the *Enola Gay* exhibit? We want to know, how are we going to prevent the kind of judgment that was made to use taxpayer's money beyond the authority of the Smithsonian and beyond the authority that created the museum that you spent 21 years in?

Mr. CROUCH. I can assure you, Senator, we did not think we were going beyond the authority of the museum or the Smithsonian. I tried to indicate the sorts of procedures that we passed through in the development of the project.

The CHAIRMAN. Let me read you another portion of the law, and I am sure I will get the answer I have gotten before. In the middle of President Kennedy's first year, I believe he actually sent this language to Congress and asked that it be enacted:

The Smithsonian Institution shall commemorate and display the contributions made by the military forces of the Nation towards creating, developing, and maintaining a free and peaceful and independent society and culture of the United States. 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 demands placed upon the full energies of our people and the hardships endured, the sacrifice demanded in our constant search for world peace shall be clearly demonstrated. The extensive peacetime contribution that the armed forces have made to the advance of human knowledge in science, nuclear energy, polar and space exploration, electronics, engineering, aerospace, and medicine shall be graphically displayed. The Smithsonian shall interpret through dramatic display significant current problems affecting the Nation's security. It shall be equipped with a study center for scholarly research into the meaning of war, its effect on civilization, and the role of the armed forces in maintaining a just and lasting peace by providing a powerful deterrent to war. In fulfilling its purpose, the Smithsonian shall collect, preserve, and exhibit military objects of historical interest and significance.

Now, Mr. Secretary, I am informed that section was never complied with. Is that right?

Mr. HEYMAN. It is complied with in many ways. There are a lot of exhibitions at the Smithsonian that fulfill exactly the purposes that are stated there.

The CHAIRMAN. I understand that. But did you ever develop such an armed forces display?

Mr. HEYMAN. No, and we also never got an armed forces museum which was the subsection under which that statute was included.

The CHAIRMAN. But you did get the Air and Space Museum.

Mr. HEYMAN. Yes, we had gotten the Air and Space Museum before that statute was enacted.

The CHAIRMAN. You did not get it before 1961. I beg to differ.

Mr. HEYMAN. Then I am incorrect. I guess the authorization for the Air and Space Museum had been passed before that because there's reference in that statute, as I recall, that it does not affect the provisions relating to the Air and Space Museum.

But putting all that aside, I believe that we will do our best to—

The CHAIRMAN. I think you are right. I think you got the authorization for the Air and Space Museum in 1946. You did not get the actual museum until substantially later.

Mr. HEYMAN. That is correct, sir. What I am saying is that putting aside technical arguments about applicability of that statute, we really do try, and I think successfully so in many regards, to fulfill the statements that are in that section. We could submit, sir, if you would like for the record, a history of exhibitions that we think are related to the words in that section.

The CHAIRMAN. I think I am going to put in the record the letter that you wrote to Congressman Sam Johnson on April 4 of this year when he raised the same question.

[The letter is included in the Appendix.]

The CHAIRMAN. I understand that the position of the Smithsonian is that the legislative language quoted pertaining to the National Armed Forces Museum was authorized but never funded, and you take it that this section that I just read was not intended to apply to the National Air and Space Museum. I have to tell you, we will correct the statute. I believe the intention of President Kennedy was one the American public wanted to see in that Air and Space Museum.

Now let me go back, if I may, to questions on the future. What policies are you establishing that will change old policies with regard to advice from advisory committees that have been authorized by Congress or the President pertaining to new exhibits?

Mr. HEYMAN. Sir, I know what I want to do but I have not written them yet. We are going to write them this summer and I will submit them to this committee for information and for advice. But my intention is what I stated before which is, certainly in the case of statutory advisory committees, that they play a very real role in terms of the policies that are established respecting the museums for which they are created. This is true with the Hirshhorn. This is true at the Freer. This is true on a number of the museums where we have—the Museum of the

American Indian—where there are specific statutes that create specific advisory boards and the same is true.

It could well be, sir, and I certainly would follow the kind of advice you are giving, that we should state the procedures by which that becomes effective rather than just leave it to the statutory language.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you have directives or regulations that pertain to the use of Federal funds or Smithsonian funds to travel? Who approves the travel of museum directors, curators, and other Smithsonian employees? Who approves the hiring of people in the separate museums? Are there regulations and directives on that?

Ms. NEWMAN. Mr. Chairman, there are regulations. There are delegations from the Secretary to responsible officials. There is a system in place that assures that the travel is in accordance with the Federal laws. We do have a system whereby the directors notify the provosts or me of their plans to travel. Now with the new Secretary, those are often discussed with the Secretary. And I have a sign-off.

The CHAIRMAN. Are you aware of the complaint of the various veterans and aviation organizations that the employees hired at the Air and Space Museum by Dr. Harwit had no background in aviation, aviation history, aviation engineering, or air and space museum management? They were in fact going towards a revisionist concept of history. How do we protect against that if it is true?

Ms. NEWMAN. There is a system whereby panels review the qualifications of people who are hired by the institution, and there is to be a matching of their credentials with the job requirements. You are telling me something that I had not heard: that there are large numbers of people who are in positions for which they are not qualified, which is different from saying that they may not agree with their position on certain issues.

The CHAIRMAN. That is correct. They are saying that a large number of the employees of the Air and Space Museum had no background in either aviation, aviation history, aviation engineering, or air and space museum management, and that they were hired for the purpose of this exhibit. Is that true, Dr. Crouch?

Mr. CROUCH. May I make a comment, Senator? The last curator I hired is a retired Air Force colonel, an SR-71 pilot, who retired after a full career in the Air Force. We were happy to get him. His operational experience, his knowledge of aircraft, and his cockpit time and so on and so forth are obviously the kinds of skills and experiences that the National Air and Space Museum has to have to do its work. There are other kinds of skills as well, and when you need those you advertise for a different sort of person.

The CHAIRMAN. Were you the lead curator on the *Enola Gay* exhibit?

Mr. CROUCH. No, sir, Dr. Neufeld was. I am his supervisor.

The CHAIRMAN. Who?

Mr. CROUCH. Michael Neufeld. I am his supervisor.

The CHAIRMAN. You were the supervisor of the lead curator?

Mr. CROUCH. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. What did you believe was the basic purpose of that exhibit?

Mr. CROUCH. As I said, Senator, to tell the story of that turning point in human history in the most honest, balanced way we could.

The CHAIRMAN. Who created the name, "A More Perfect Union" for the exhibit?

Mr. CROUCH. I misunderstood, Senator. I thought you were still talking about the *Enola Gay*. You are talking about the exhibition, "A More Perfect Union" in American History?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes.

Mr. CROUCH. Yes, I was the lead curator for that exhibition.

The CHAIRMAN. It is my understanding that because of that exhibit you were selected to lead the *Enola Gay* exhibit. Is that not right?

Mr. CROUCH. No, sir, that is not true. Let me correct, now that I understand your question. I was——

The CHAIRMAN. "A More Perfect Union" was concerned about the Japanese who were placed in camps in our own country, right?

Mr. CROUCH. Japanese Americans, yes, sir. I was the curator of that exhibition, yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Who determined the scope and title of the exhibit that caused this controversy?

Mr. CROUCH. This one?

The CHAIRMAN. The *Enola Gay* exhibit.

Mr. CROUCH. The scope and——?

The CHAIRMAN. ——title of the exhibit.

Mr. CROUCH. The final title of the exhibition went through various iterations. It was the result of a group decision that everyone, including then-Secretary Adams, was willing to accept. The scope of the exhibition developed through early planning documents and discussions.

The CHAIRMAN. Is it true that members of your staff are now, either in an official or unofficial capacity, assisting American University and others in a teach-in or some program for use of the artifacts and materials that were in the original plan of the *Enola Gay* exhibit and that this exhibit will be farmed out, in effect, to other universities in other areas in the country?

Mr. CROUCH. Not to my knowledge, Senator. I am aware that someone at American University has been reported in the newspapers as doing that. But certainly to my knowledge, we have not been involved.

The CHAIRMAN. That is not with any help from the Smithsonian or the personnel who assisted in the creation of this exhibit?

Mr. CROUCH. Again, not to my knowledge, Senator.

Mr. HEYMAN. I asked specifically the curator of the exhibit, Michael Neufeld, and he indicated to me that he is playing absolutely no role and having no discussions with the people at American University.

The CHAIRMAN. Do we know who was the author of the statement in the script that said, "For most Americans it was a war of vengeance; for most Japanese it was a war to defend their unique culture against western imperialism"? Who authored that?

Mr. CROUCH. I am really not sure, Senator. In terms of authorship, I supervised the project but I also wrote one unit; not the one in which that statement appeared. Dr. Neufeld wrote two units. The remaining two units of the exhibition were the result of a joint effort between Dr. Neufeld and the curatorial assistants, and that statement was in one of those units.

The CHAIRMAN. You took the trips to Japan and you were the one who requested the loan from the city of Nagasaki of the artifacts to be displayed, the head of an angel, an infant's dress, a Madonna and child, leaflets dropped from American planes, pictures of the keloid scars of individuals rather than surgically removed keloid scars? You are the one who made the decision to obtain those for the exhibit, right?

Mr. CROUCH. No, those decisions were group decisions. I signed the letter.

The CHAIRMAN. Was there a group of you in Japan, Doctor?

Mr. CROUCH. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. How many?

Mr. CROUCH. Well, we did not make that decision in Japan. The first trip Dr. Harwit led and I went with him. On the second occasion I took the curator and the designer of the exhibition to Japan to look at materials and to gather information about objects that we might request for loan. But the decisions were all made after we had returned.

The CHAIRMAN. Did you meet Mr. Takahashi on your trips to Japan?

Mr. CROUCH. I believe so. Hiroshima?

The CHAIRMAN. Do you agree with what Dr. Harwit wrote to him, "For most of us in America the *Enola Gay* is an uncomfortable symbol. It represents a destructive act which many of us feel to be incompatible with our perceived national character"? He also states that you will be visiting with Dr. Takahashi. Did you meet with him to discuss that letter?

Mr. CROUCH. I met with him, yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Did you discuss that point of view expressed by Dr. Harwit?

Mr. CROUCH. No, not in those words, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Were you aware of it?

Mr. CROUCH. Someone read that letter to me yesterday and I did not recall having—

The CHAIRMAN. When you went over there were you familiar with the correspondence that had been sent by your superior to Japan?

Mr. CROUCH. For the most part, Senator. But that was a couple of years ago. I honestly do not remember having seen that letter.

The CHAIRMAN. Did you give the mayors of Hiroshima and Nagasaki a promise that they could film a statement in which they were free to say anything they chose for inclusion in the exhibit?

Mr. CROUCH. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. You object to the statements of American veterans, and they have been accused of trying to seek a veto, yet you gave the mayors of two Japanese cities a free license to say whatever they wanted to. Is that right?

Mr. CROUCH. No, Senator. No, it is not correct.

The CHAIRMAN. It is not right?

Mr. CROUCH. When we first went to Japan, one of the first questions that was posed to Dr. Harwit was, will this exhibition, in one way or another, express opposition to the use of nuclear weapons? Dr. Harwit told the Japanese that, of course, we could not do that. The National Air and Space Museum does not make national policy. But he said he would consider the possibility of filming short statements from both mayors in which they could express their own point of view, and those statements would be used in a videotape that would include opposition points of view, also unedited. So that visitors to the exhibition—

The CHAIRMAN. American veterans were to be able to put their views in this exhibit unedited. Is that your statement?

Mr. CROUCH. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. You made that offer to the veterans groups?

Mr. CROUCH. I believe that Dr. Harwit did, or intended to.

Ms. NEWMAN. Mr. Chairman, may I intervene here just for a second?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes.

Ms. NEWMAN. But I, on the other hand, made it clear that if the videos covered subjects and matters that were of concern to the institution that the videos would not play. Dr. Harwit was present with me in discussing that matter with representatives from Japan.

The CHAIRMAN. Again I get back to management, Ms. Newman. How are the veterans groups to understand that the commitment made by the curator is not the policy of the Smithsonian unless we have some responsibility somewhere? I get the feeling I am playing with a feather pillow. Every time we ask a question we are told, no, it is over here. Then we go over here and ask Dr. Crouch and they say, oh no, over here, I vetoed that. Do you see our problem, Dr. Heyman?

Mr. HEYMAN. Yes, I understand, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Is it a valid one? I am getting pilloried at home by some people who believe that I am somehow attacking the Smithsonian. I got that viewpoint too when I questioned the exhibit on the west, and I got that when I questioned the statements and the toadstool you gave to Professor Fuentes. It is part of the life we lead.

But I think you need some management structure. You run the equivalent of two divisions in the Army, and it appears that all your regiments are going off in different directions. Is that wrong?

Mr. HEYMAN. It is very hard for me to answer that. I do not know whether it is wrong or not. I can tell you that the Smithsonian has been a place that has been analogized, and certainly was by my predecessor, very much to a university in which museums and research institutes are viewed like schools in colleges that make an awful lot of their own decisions for themselves.

I think the undertaking that I am making at the moment, for instance, with regard to exhibition policy and exhibition review is a little shocking to a number of my colleagues, and we are going to have an awful lot of conversation with respect to that. As I am doing this, if I come across, in relationship to what you are saying, processes that really ought to be put on paper, we will put those on paper if they are not on paper yet.

The CHAIRMAN. I thank you for that.

Mr. HEYMAN. But I do understand your frustration. I really do.

The CHAIRMAN. I do thank you for that. I am worried, because we are going to discuss the budget for the next 5 years, and there is not room in that budget for the projection you have made to manage the institution you have. I am sure you know that. I believe you should have the money, and we have to find ways to raise money from the public.

Let me tell you, I believe you should have the money you outlined in your last presentation—not the one in 1992, but the last one—for the management of the facilities you have and for the exhibits that you have planned. I do not know how we are going to get it from the public. I can tell you, you will not get it from this Congress if we have controversies like this. You cannot expect to have dramatic increases in funding at the time of controversies of this size.

I am worried that you seem to be turning to foreign sources for support of the Smithsonian. I do not want to get into that now, but there are lots of rumors running around here now about the extent to which you are turning to foreign sources for the support of our institution. That is a unique American institution. I have to tell you, I think the American people will be very, very upset if it is determined that substantial foreign contributions are made in a way that might influence exhibits like this.

Mr. HEYMAN. My view is that contributions ought not to influence any exhibit.

The CHAIRMAN. You have three exhibits in Japan now, right?

Mr. HEYMAN. We just have one on gems.

The CHAIRMAN. I thought you had three going over there. Are the others back now?

Mr. HEYMAN. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Were they paid for by Japan?

Ms. NEWMAN. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Were the same curators who went over there on the *Enola Gay* exhibit also a part of those exhibits?

Ms. NEWMAN. No. The one exhibit that was in Japan that was funded by NHK and Yomiuri Shimbun took many of our major objects and talked about American culture based on a desire on the part of the funding that this generation of Japanese do not understand the culture and the contributions of this Nation, of the United States, to science and technology. Therefore, they funded completely the exhibit that took the ruby slippers and things like that to Japan. That exhibit no longer exists. That was for a short period of time in 1994.

The CHAIRMAN. Have you any further questions, Senator?

Senator COCHRAN. No, I do not, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Secretary, I am still disturbed by the letter you sent to Congressman Johnson indicating that you believe the law applies to a museum that was never funded when it specifically says the Smithsonian Institution shall take action. That has been on the books for over 30 years. I do believe it is a function that is required.

I am going to ask the Congress to modify the statute to make clear our intent because I believe it might help settle this controversy if we did have a fulfillment of the original instruction of the Congress and the President to the Smithsonian to take the action required to commemorate the service of the men and women of the armed forces, and to portray them as an inspiration to present and future generations. That is not me. That is, as I recall, President Kennedy's request to the Congress.

I do not know what it is going to take to have you live up to that law, but I do think that would go a long way towards meeting the problem that has been brought out by this hearing. Do you have any further comments, sir?

Mr. HEYMAN. No, I do not, sir. But we were going to make another presentation on the Commission for the Future. We could do that at another time if you wish, or we could do it now.

The CHAIRMAN. I think Dr. Singer is here and we are prepared for that, yes.

Mr. HEYMAN. Fine, thank you. This is Dr. Maxine Singer, president of the Carnegie Institution, who has been the chair of our Commission on the Future which is a commission of 26 people of enormous quality, intellectually and otherwise, who undertook to look at the Smithsonian in its present form, and to

try to look at the future and to try to give ideas and directions with respect to how the Smithsonian most profitably, for the benefit of the country, should face that future.

I had a longer prepared statement, but I would just put that in the record, sir, and just introduce Dr. Singer.

[The prepared statement of Mr. Heyman follows:]

STATEMENT OF I. MICHAEL HEYMAN, SECRETARY, SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION

I would like to have Dr. Maxine Singer join me. Dr. Singer served as the Chair of the Commission on the Future of the Smithsonian Institution. In September 1993, the Board of Regents established the Commission and charged it with the task of examining the Institution, its mandate and roles. The Commission was additionally charged to examine the cultural, societal, and technological factors that influence the Institution's capacity to act. I would like to thank Chairwoman Singer and the members of her commission for their invaluable service to the Institution. I am committed to studying these recommendations and to working with the Regents, the administration and my staff in the months ahead to respond to the challenges presented in the report. I will ask Maxine Singer to provide the committee with the highlights of the report. However, I'd like to comment briefly on several initiatives that are responsive to the Commission's recommendations.

We are committed to developing institution-wide an ability to make our collections and information available to more of America, directly and through technology.

On May 8, 1995, the Smithsonian officially went "on-line" with our "home page" to the Internet. This single event takes a giant step toward my goal of a "Smithsonian without walls" and delivers the Institution's vast resources to Americans throughout the country. People around the world can now view portions of our collections as well as enjoy those exhibitions which we are putting on line in their own homes.

Moreover, teachers can design curriculum relying upon our extensive collections, research, and exhibitions. This ability will be enhanced as more of our materials are put in digital form. I'm pleased to report that the Smithsonian home page on the World Wide Web logged over 2 million "visitors" since its first day.

While a great number of visitors come to the Mall each year, we recognize that many Americans can never get here and those who do can manage the trip at best once or twice in a lifetime. The Smithsonian's usefulness to our citizens should not be just about that one class visit in the 10th grade. Without taking on the impossible, we must be about carrying our mission across the country; we must find ways to deliver to the American people, wherever they live, the wonders of the institution they have supported for one and a half centuries.

One of my first decisions as Secretary was to authorize the creation of an exhibition of some of the Institution's treasures that we can take around the country beginning in our 150th anniversary year, 1996. With the aid of corporate support which we are now seeking, we will bring "America's Smithsonian" to locations around the United States. This is as it should be if we are to "increase and diffuse knowledge."

Thank you. I would like to ask Dr. Singer to make a few remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Let me, if I may, correct the record to a certain extent. In June of 1961, the Kennedy Administration did support the bill that led to the direction to the Smithsonian to authorize an expansion to portray the contributions of the armed forces of the United States. That idea, however, was based on a report from President Eisenhower to the Committee on the American Armed Forces Museum. He had stated very succinctly the reasons for such action by the Smithsonian, but it was apparently