

I think these figures are useful, but they may not describe the eventual condition after following designs as presented.

Any other organization that would like to speak?

(No response)

CHAIRMAN BROWN: Milt Copulos.

MR. COPULOS: Mr. Chairman, it is good to see you all again. I believe it was last October 13 when we last had an opportunity to chat.

I would like to begin by saying that all of us here, I think, in particular should recognize the very special thing that has been achieved, regardless of the ultimate outcome. As I told you last time we met, I was just a common soldier, a lot like Jan Scruggs, and I find it to be an extraordinary event that Jan has been able to bring his dream to fruition, and I think it is important to make clear that any disagreements we may have are disagreements over what are very important issues, but disagreements, I think, that are honest.

Frankly, it has been 16 months since I first became involved in this, and I can understand how Jan is as weary as I am of it, or I could understand Jan as being more weary and it has been a much longer time for him.

Be that as it may, as some of us have had last rites five times, we don't quit easy. Quite honestly, I believe

that the matter that we are here discussing today is one of import that will last through future generations, and it cannot be readily dismissed, and that is one of the concerns that I have.

When we came to you last time, on October 13, there was a parade of veteran organizations. Every single veteran organization in the United States, without exception, the Gold Star Mothers, members of the Congress, administration officials, all endorsed a single concept, which has been achieved through painful compromise, and which I personally had worked on for some six months, as one of four people on the sculpture selection panel. We felt that we had reached something which was at once aesthetically pleasing and which met the spirit and letter of what we all worked so hard to achieve, because underlying all of this is our principal goal, to reconcile the nation and its Vietnam veterans.

I can only say that I was very surprised, to say the least, when after having accepted the basic elements that we felt were needed to bring this experience to completion, the question of siting was not agreed to, as well, because siting is actually as important, ultimately, as the actual elements themselves. You yourselves have said that siting changes the tone of the memorial, and that is the key, that is the issue,

the tone of the memorial, but those of us on the sculpture selection panel had spent six months walking the site and, therefore, we were very much understanding how difficult it is to locate these things aesthetically. We went a step beyond. We had to stop and say, look, could we be wrong, could our decision be wrong, what would other people, people who are not so close to this that they can't separate their involvement with the process from the ultimate goal of the process, what would they think. How could we find out?

Obviously, we didn't have the resources to poll every Vietnam veteran in the United States, and, in fact, no really rigorous attempts have been made to poll on the specific question of location, as proposed before your Commission. There had been a pre-test of a poll that indicated certain things, and some other informal polls, but nothing of scientific rigors that followed all of the research techniques, and so on. We, therefore, assembled a group of college volunteers and made an effort to try to ascertain what the people visiting the memorial during the dedication ceremonies felt. We did this for a number of reasons:

First, this was as close to a national sample as you will ever assemble at one point at the memorial. Veterans from every state of the union were present.

Secondly, the people polled actually were physically on the site, had seen the existing walls and seen the model of the sculpture, and, in all likelihood, had had an opportunity to get some notion of what the relative placement would mean, and, finally, they would be people who are deeply interested in the memorial, people who had come, sometimes, tens of thousand of miles -- there was one group from the Pacific Islands -- to participate in this, and it was a very cold day that day, very wet, and yet the spirits were high.

I find myself constantly thinking of one individual who served with the 125th Infantry Division, the same unit I served with, and the emotions welling up within him as the crowd sang "The Star Spangled Banner" at one point during the ceremony, and I could not help thinking of how he and others with whom we fought, whose names are on that wall, would want to see this was done as proper as it possibly could be done, in the best possible fashion, and that is why I am here today.

I want to first share with you some of the principal results of the poll we took. I should add we used a standard survey research technique as established for polling by Michigan Survey Research Center, and later refined by CBS News. We had our questionnaires reviewed and, also, and this is impor-

tant in polling, the results on similar questions tend to check with previous polls which had been taken, albeit not scientifically, but generally if your results are at great odds with someone else's results, that tends to indicate something is wrong.

On the question of whether the flag should be prominently placed, as an integral part of the memorial -- I should note that the sample was 530 people that served in Vietnam -- 85.9 percent of the sample and 94.2 percent of the Vietnam veterans said it should be prominently placed.

As to the question of whether there should be an inscription with reference to what the Vietnam veterans fought for, and I will provide you with copies of this, 84.7 percent of the Vietnam veterans and 78.2 percent of the survey sample overall agreed.

In terms of the question of what their impression of the wall by itself is, there was no unanimity; that is to say, their impression of the wall without the flag and statute. The range of opinions, and I should say most people there were already assuming the flag would be added, so this does color their answer, but that ranged, from among veterans, 54 percent strongly unfavorable and 8.3 percent somewhat unfavorable, leaving you with almost two-thirds non-veterans, people

who had neither served in Vietnam or the military at all, and it ranged from 57.1 strongly favorable to 16.4 percent somewhat favorable, and the overall sample found the wall, without the addition of the flag and statute, lacking.

I think that the empirical evidence from people visiting the site also indicates the need for having a flag and statute. Everyone who goes to that site, virtually without exception, -- it is amazing -- brings something. You see them bringing flags, you see little bits of scraps of newspapers containing obituaries of the name of the fallen on the wall. You see people bringing flags.

I think many of you may have seen the news film of the four marines who, shall we say, liberated a flag during the dedication ceremony and sat there in a vigil throughout the dedication with that flag at the juncture of the walls.

The final thing we asked in our survey was the question regarding placement. We had three scale models drawn on our survey, but, beyond that, the people were physically on the site and could see what these options meant. One, which I am afraid is going to confuse you a little bit because we used a little different options -- our option "A" corresponds roughly to your option "B"; our option "C" corresponds roughly to your option "A", and our option "B" would correspond

roughly to your option "C". What we found was that among the veterans the option "B", among the Vietnam veterans, was selected by 74.1 percent of the group, among those who served in Vietnam, when given that choice. Among the same group, 12.8 percent selected what would be option "A".

Of the group overall, 69 percent selected option "B" and 16.3 percent selected option "A".

I think it is important to recognize something here. There is no question the overwhelming majority of Vietnam Veterans feel strongly, and they are glad just to see a memoria built, whatever it looks like, but given their preference, the overwhelming majority, not only of Vietnam veterans, but of citizens of the United States, I think it is safer to say, want that flag prominently displayed, and, moreover, the overwhelming majority, when given the choice, when allowed to have an option or some input into the decision, would choose option "B".

Now, Mr. Chairman, I humbly submit that, in keeping with what was said a little earlier by the fellow with the Vigil Committee, people are not going to be channeled by paths. I have walked that site many, many times, and spent a lot of time looking at that very location they are talking about for the entryway. The simple fact is people will be coming from

Constitution Avenue and from the sides, and in order for them to be able to experience the totality of the memorial, which is what we all readily want, in order for them to have the opportunity for the paralyzed veterans to have the opportunity to see this all at once, and I have spent time in a wheelchair and I understand how difficult it is to come up a four degree incline and then back down again, so it would be best to go with Option "B".

With that, if you have any questions, I will be happy to answer them, and I will also give you a copy of the poll.

CHAIRMAN BROWN: Thank you very much.

Other individuals?

We have Harry Robinson.

MR. ROBINSON: Mr. Chairman, members of the Commission I thank you for the opportunity to testify on the matter of symbolish and aesthetics of the issue before you.

I am presently Dean and a professor for urban design at the Howard University School of Architecture and Planning. I hold degrees in architecture and planning and urban design from the Howard University, the graduate School of Design at Howard University.

Equally important for purposes of my testimony, I am a combat veteran of the war in Vietnam. I received an