

I commend the Secretary for his efforts. However, I am afraid that the experience with the *Enola Gay* exhibit is not an isolated example and indicates a general misunderstanding of the relationship between the Smithsonian and the American public. Experiences such as that with the *Enola Gay* undermine the broad support for the Smithsonian and jeopardize its unique role, and I underscore unique role, as America's museum.

It is vital to the continued congressional support of the Smithsonian that the management flaws that led to this situation not be repeated. The Smithsonian must understand that, as an institution supported with Federal funds, it is ultimately accountable to the American public, whose lives and history its exhibits reflect.

I look forward to hearing the response of the Smithsonian to the issues raised last week, and the Secretary's proposals to prevent a recurrence of such a controversy in the future. It will also be helpful to our consideration of this matter to hear from the other witnesses who bring different perspectives to this discussion. The Smithsonian will not be able to move forward until we have fully aired these issues and management has taken steps to ensure that this situation will not be repeated.

I thank the Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Senator Feinstein, do you have an opening statement?

Senator FEINSTEIN. I do not, Mr. Chairman. Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN. Congressman Johnson, as I stated, I believe that we who serve in the Congress are all under oath. We will be happy to have your statement.

**TESTIMONY OF HON. SAM JOHNSON, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF TEXAS**

Mr. JOHNSON. Thank you, sir. I appreciate it, and I thank you for giving me the opportunity to participate in this very important hearing.

From what has been said already, I just want to emphasize that you represent those who fought for us in World War II and were able to respond to the *Enola Gay* episode, I think, more emotionally than some of the Americans who were not involved in that conflict. Being a military man, I appreciate the posture that you have taken and I thank you for your patriotic approach. I think that the Smithsonian does reflect, and will reflect in the future, the values that America so greatly loves.

Last summer, amid great controversy, I became involved in the development of the *Enola Gay* exhibit. I became involved because I was, like you, disturbed by the biased and unbalanced text of the script, and by the assumptions that were made by a few individuals questioning America's actions in ending World War II.

Through the tenacity and perseverance of Members of Congress, staff, veterans, and outside groups, a series of constructive negotiations were held and I felt that some progress was being made to rewrite the script. I was wrong.

The problems continued and were exacerbated by the uncooperative spirit of the museum's director and curators, and their inability to understand the reasons for the opposition toward the exhibit. It seemed that they were willing to disregard history in order to promote their own ideological agenda.

While the revised scripts did move closer to a balance, the museum director and curators persisted with their questioning of American intentions, while maintaining the innocence of the Japanese. When these differences could not be reconciled, Secretary Heyman, who became Secretary as you know only in September, responded quickly and responsibly. He cancelled the exhibit as planned and put himself personally in charge of revising the *Enola Gay* exhibit.

At that same time, I was honored when the Speaker appointed me to sit on the Smithsonian's Board of Regents. Unfortunately, over the past few years, I believe that the Board of Regents was not as diligent as it should have been in its oversight and guidance of the various museum directors, curators, and other Smithsonian personnel. We must remember that it is the Board of Regents in whose hands the Institution and all its museums have been entrusted, with the help of the Secretary.

Today, however, I am pleased to tell you that it is a very different Smithsonian than the one that existed just a few months ago. There is a renewed interest and energy on behalf of the Secretary and the Board of Regents that I am proud to be a part of.

Although we found that the *Enola Gay* was not the only exhibit that had been overcome by political correctness and revisionism, which you stated, I do want to stress that the majority of the exhibits at the Smithsonian are very impressive and historically accurate. I am confident that under the leadership of Secretary Heyman, the entire Smithsonian Institution will get back on track.

I would like to outline a few of the Secretary's reforms. First, he has initiated a full management review of the entire Smithsonian Institution. Second, he has taken a hands-on role by placing himself in the position to oversee and ensure that every exhibit is of the highest caliber. Finally, he has renewed and stressed that the Board of Regents take an active role in the operations of the Smithsonian. That is what has been the problem—there has been no involvement. I feel secure about the direction of the Smithsonian's future with Dr. Heyman at the helm.

I think we must be extremely mindful in our oversight and management of the Smithsonian Institution and its exhibits, because we are talking about our national museum. It is vitally

important, in my view, that all of the exhibits are factually correct and properly reflect the values that this great country is based upon. Most importantly, museums have an incredible responsibility to our nation's children. Our national museums must, at the very least, surround and teach them, I believe, what is good about America.

I am proud to say that after working with Secretary Heyman and the other regents, I am confident and excited about the prospects for this great institution in the future. We recognize the financing problems and we are out, along with the Secretary, to find some private funding to help us get over the hump. We are on the path to restoring the Smithsonian to its once prominent state and we, as regents, have a solemn trust to the nation to do that, and I am very honored to be a part of it.

Mr. Chairman, I thank you again for having these hearings, and allowing me to participate. I would be happy to answer some of your questions.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you. We are proud, too, that you are there. I am delighted to have your statement. We have found the same relationship with the Secretary, and I hope that we can put this issue behind us.

Do you have any questions?

Senator FORD. I have no questions for the Congressman. We do thank you for being here and thank you for your fine efforts.

Mr. JOHNSON. Thank you for allowing me to be here.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Johnson, let me tell you that the legal advisor to the Senate has just sent me word, through my staff, that I am incorrect. Members of Congress take an oath to support the President of the United States, but they do not take an oath to testify truthfully at every instance.

So, do you swear that the testimony you have just given is the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

Mr. JOHNSON. I do.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you, sir.

Our next witness is Dr. Edward Linenthal. Professor, you are going to be the first one to do this before us officially.

Do you swear the testimony you are about to give is the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

Mr. LINENTHAL. I do.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you. We are happy to have your statement, Professor, please proceed.

**TESTIMONY OF EDWARD T. LINENTHAL, PROFESSOR OF RELIGION AND AMERICAN CULTURE, UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN-OSHKOSH, OSHKOSH, WISCONSIN**

Mr. LINENTHAL. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, members of the Committee, I am very pleased to be here this morning.

I served on the advisory committee for the National Air and Space Museum's proposed exhibit, "The Last Act: The Atomic Bomb and the End of World War II" because of my engagement with a number of controversial historic sites and issues, particularly the changing interpretation of the Little Big Horn Battlefield National Monument, my experience working at the U.S.S. Arizona Memorial at Pearl Harbor during the 50th anniversary events, and a recently published book on the creation of the United States Holocaust Memorial Museum.

The Little Big Horn is one of the great success stories of American public history, as visitors learn that different, often clashing, stories can be told at a historic site and that these clashing voices deepen rather than impoverish our understanding of the events of 1876. At Pearl Harbor and at the United States Holocaust Memorial Museum, I felt the power of the commemorative voice which speaks with the authority of the witness, "I was there. I know what happened because I saw it and felt it." As a historian, part of my obligation is to attend to this voice, to listen carefully in this instance to Pearl Harbor veterans and Holocaust survivors.

Scholars, including museum professionals, are obliged to provide a comprehensive and balanced rendering of the human experience. Frequently, there is a tension between the commemorative voice and the historical voice, which seeks to discern motives, understand actions, and discuss consequences that were impossible to analyze during the event itself. It is a voice that to some can feel condescending, even when no condescension is intended. It can feel detached, even when those who speak out of this voice view their work as a way to deepen our understanding of an event.

The National Air and Space Museum tried, unsuccessfully, to represent both these perspectives in one exhibit. In hindsight, there were too many complicating factors — the presence of what many considered a sacred relic, the *Enola Gay* itself; the expectations of many that 50th anniversary events should privilege the commemorative perspective; the strongly held and sometimes irreconcilable belief about the use of atomic weapons; and fundamental disagreements about the function of the National Air and Space Museum. Should it be a place for uncritical celebration of technological prowess, or should it inform the public about the economic, social, and political context of the museum's artifacts? In my opinion, it is certainly not "gratuitous social commentary," as some have charged, that the museum, for example, reminds visitors that the V-2 rocket is more than a "milestone in the progress of rocket technology," what an old label read. Rather, that thousands of concentration camp prisoners died building it, and that it "killed 7,000 people and terrorized millions."

The museum tried to balance what historian John Dower has called the heroic and tragic narrative of the Bomb. Veterans and