

CHAIRMAN BROWN: Then it would be possible, and it could be very moving to have it there. I think if you start getting into a kind of advertising spotlighting ethos there you are then going to be saying that this monument is open at night and then you are going to be running the risk of the people tripping over the wall or falling off it or not being able to read the names. It seems to me that this should be worked out before you are locked into a wording in an inscription that somehow can't be matched.

MR. NOVAK: I would like to add an observation that doesn't even go to the aesthetics, but as we sat on this matter over the last months or years, or however long it has been, it is an interesting evolution in the process itself. The memorial was intended from the outset as a means of reconciliation, and the testimony of many of the people today, the observations of those who have gone to the memorial, testifies that objective has been substantially achieved, but another testimony, too, comes out of the process that we had here ourselves the stridency of the combatants to the question of whether or not the memorial as conceived by Maya Lin was appropriate and fitting and would do honor to the Vietnam veterans, the compromise, which is the additional elements that were added, and then the struggle over the appropriate site. I think that

today there was, although people talked about the greater permissiveness, as I listened I think the overwhelming majority of the people who spoke or who represented veteran organizations or organizations close to the matter, were in substantial agreement that addition of the elements and addition of the elements in the location that the Commission approved was altogether appropriate and that the memorial as it will be completed is satisfactory and really a rewarding memorial for the Vietnam veterans.

Granted, there were voices in opposition, and there were voices whom we must respect for the position they take. They were veterans, they were wounded, they served their country and had strong views, but even those voices, I felt, were not as rancorous as they had been in the past. I believe the principal reason for that is that the memorial is an enormous success, and it is very difficult to gainsay that. We were there this morning. It doesn't matter how often you go, you are always overwhelmed by it. The conception as realized is even greater than the very fine design that caused the jury to select it. The elements that have been added, as one witness so eloquently testified to, are elements of specificity that very often people need. They need that reassurance that the patriotism is being stated, and that it is

present in the memorial to the war dead or missing, and I think that all of those people who strove for the addition of those elements, and then having the elements added in the way they have been added, have brought about still further reconciliation, so that we see in this process what these really wonderful people who have worked so many years, Mr. Scruggs and Mr. Wheeler and Mr. Cooper, Bob Doubeck, have been striving for, and it is really a remarkable thing, and today's testimony was, over and over again, very moving. I commend you all. The Commission commends you.

CHAIRMAN BROWN: We have a long agenda ahead of us. There is one other element, the directories.

MR. NETSCH: I would say the honeymoon is over. I haven't taken a poll of my fellow Commissioners, and I am not objecting to the height and accessibility, but the idea of just one person looking and finding things seems to present a difficulty, and I see sort of specificity of the shape of the angle of the memorial in the base of the lectern, and I find that an inappropriate way to restate, you know, an aesthetic element which is much deeper and much more compelling as you visualize what you see along the wall. I think that the other thing is that groups will want to look at things together. I think this is a togetherness adventure into one's