

body understands, we really were not involved in that process, except to the extent as stated in our letter.

MR. HUNTER: Understanding that, I wanted you to understand and realize what went behind the compromise, as manifested in scheme "B", and that was this agreement, which was a landmark agreement that allowed this whole thing to go forward, and I must tell you there will be veterans who will feel that they have been betrayed because, as I said, after that agreement was reached the word went out from the east coast to the west coast that that flag would be placed at the apex and the statute in the center.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BROWN: Well, we can all be thankful that the United States of America is governed by laws and not by press releases.

Thank you. Who do we have next?

MR. ATHERTON: Mr. Bailey asked, also, to make a statement, I believe.

CHAIRMAN BROWN: All right. Mr. Bailey.

MR. BAILEY: Thank you very much. I will try to be brief.

You know, if it hadn't been, I suppose, for the efforts of some of us originally, there would not be a statute,

there would not have been a flag, there would not have been an inscription. Let me add that I hope none of us are naive about why we are here today and there is so much controversy. I have a hard time accepting the proposition that the issue is solely one of esthetics. I am, incidentally, assuming that it is a foregone conclusion that you people are going to place the flag and statute and inscription at the entryway. I wasn't born politically yesterday. And the resolution, the joint resolution and House resolution that were passed by the Congress, I am sure all of you are very much aware of what it says, and I will guarantee you that for those whose real desire was to see that the message of this memorial not be the one that I think we have largely succeeded in creating, and if I were back in that Congress to help Duncan Hunter, Mr. Chairman, it would be a matter of law. I found a way through that other body, I guarantee you, and I also want you to know that the struggle concerning the issue of message is not over -- it is not over.

I personally did not object to the original concept, and I don't today. I have seen every scurrilous tactic used in the press, in error in most cases. I do want to compliment the attitude of the people at VVMF, who, I think -- I am very sad to see the position they have taken here today, but

I think originally, in terms of the compromise, there was, I hope -- I would like to think so -- a sincere effort to provide an aesthetically acceptable compromise on the issue of message.

You know, we can talk about entrance experiences, but I am hopeful that the memorial -- the wall will not become the memorial -- the inscription on the memorial, the inscription on the flag and the statute, the statute will become the memorial and the wall will be the honor role that it is, hopefully. Time will yet determine that question.

I do want to make an appeal to you. The vast majority of those who wanted to make the so-called additions, and if the gentleman from Chicago, I believe -- I am not sure if he is from Illinois or Chicago -- in terms of setting the record straight -- I noticed he had a Daley button -- to use the word "additions" is not really correct either. The design as originally submitted, the concept, I think, raised some controversy. The message of the memorial is really what we are doing here today. We can cloud it with esthetics and that sort of thing. They are very important, but I don't think that statute and that flag, that proposal Duncan referred to as Proposal "B", is aesthetically displeasing. I have great difficulty with that. If one of those things were outlandishly

large or something, they could disagree, but I don't think we have that situation.

It is a very sad thing for me, and I will conclude with this, for this reason: When we cooperated with VVMF, and everyone involved in the venture, to not try to create any kind of political diversion that would prevent the going forward with the walls, the understanding really was that, and it was an assumption we erroneously made, and we did, and that was our fault for not analyzing things closely enough, but the understanding was that the memorial had not been committed for approval in toto, so I want to express my appreciation for the fact that you are accepting at least the flag and statute, but it saddens me a great deal that we have not had complete support on where to place it.

I want you to know that in good faith we did, because of some esthetic objections, try to reduce things in size and place them in a way that will still give us the message we want. I think we will win that battle. I did talk to some congressmen, incidentally, and you were not lobbied on this thing, and, in fact, they told me as of yesterday that they were lobbied by -- the words they used were "the fine arts community". I don't know if that is so or not. But it wasn't at least, by veteran groups.

I think we will be discussing this again, and I thank