

only by great works of art. Great art, and only great art should honor great memory and great service.

Our Capital and our law are such great works of art, so can be the Vietnam Veterans Memorial in the original.

Thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN BROWN: Our next is Henry F. Arnold, the Designer of Constitutional Gardens.

MR. ARNOLD: Mr. Chairman and members of the Fine Arts Commission, when all the furor over the present controversy is forgotten, there are issues that are forgotten today, that will assert themselves in ever growing consistency. These issues deal with specific design context, and the aesthetic purposes of the park in relationship to this memory.

The civic design context of the Federal Mall has certain criteria which must be respected if we are to respect the Nation's front yard. The intrinsic suitability for art in the Nation's Capital must be judged by the highest standards of art. Appropriate relationships to elements of the place, how does it fit, is it complimentary to the surroundings?

Finally, the question of precedents. Do we want more of the same caliber of work that we are approving today to be built tomorrow? That is a challenge that must be

answered.

Secondly, there are the aesthetic purposes of the park. These, incidentally, were affirmed by your approval of the plan of Constitution Gardens in 1975. The park was to be a place of dignified beauty, with broad open meadows surrounded by wooded edges. It was to be viewed uncluttered under the canopy of trees. There were to be no interruptions in the ground plane, except the tree trunks and the low ground cover. There were to be no vertical objects in the open meadow. Because the meadows were within view of the Washington Monument. There were to be no flags.

The Washington Monument is provided with this eloquently. How does the proposed addition meet these criteria? The proximity of the new proposal to the Lincoln Memorial diminishes the simplicity of the design by its incongruity.

What about the intrinsic suitability as art? The proposed, undistinguished, made to order statue is a sentimental response to a difference of opinion. The result is more likely to serve as a memorial to pettiness and corruptive endeavor.

Finally, the park design. By itself, the proposed statue is just a small, square on the visual integrity of the

17

park. The flag pole is a jar and intrusion. By their precedent, the park is more likely to become a repository for heroic statues and clashing symbols to detract from the aesthetic purposes.

Considering the importance of this issue, it might be prudent and appropriate for the Commission to delay their decision until each member of the Fine Arts Commission and the Memorial detractors have had the chance to visit the Memorial, after it is completed, and experience the mysterious power of this unprecedented work of art. Such a course might and the controversy, and become one more case in history where great art has become its own protector.

CHAIRMAN BROWN: Thank you very much.

Next on my list is Wolf Von Eckardt.

MR. VON ECKARDT: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, members of the Commission.

I read Tom Wolf this morning, and reflected on Maya Lin's wall, and looked, and I couldn't see Jane Fonda in there at all.

More seriously, Tom Wolf does point up a calamity of our time which I have very often long discussed, and that calamity is the enormous gap between what some call elite art and popular art. Between avant-garde and traditions1.