

that has not yet received that circle, at this particular siting I think would be inappropriate. It would be very easy for all of you to reach a compromise that is reflective of everyone in the room today, but I would ask you to think about the people, and I am really speaking for somebody that is not in the room today, and that was the intent of this scheme, the modifications and the completion of it, and that even with as subtle a siting as has been established here, this is not important enough for Ms. Boulay's and the other very evocative speakers' needs and they shouldn't be attached in an awkward way to a completed design; they should have a very special site that speaks to the contribution of women in war much more eloquently than an attachment to the Vietnam Veterans Memorial.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BROWN: Thank you very much.

MR. DOUBEK: The next speaker, at least that I am aware of, is Ms. Carla Corbin, who was the project architect with Cooper-Lecky and she did the detailed, enormous detailed leg work to actually produce the Memorial.

MS. CORBIN: My interest in the Memorial is as an architect having a long-term involvement with the site. As

Bob said, I was the project architect with Cooper-Lecky, the firm that was to develop Maya Lin's design and see it through construction.

As others have said, the Memorial is designed to honor all who served, and it is stated specifically in the inscription adjacent to the large dates that bracket the names on the Memorial.

The siting of the Memorial was developed very carefully by all of those concerned---Maya Lin, Henry Arnold, the first landscape architect involved, Cooper-Lecky, Edaw, and the Memorial Fund--over a period of months to create a unity. The entire site is the Memorial design, from the placement relation to the Lincoln Memorial and the Washington Monument to the preservation of the larger trees that enclosed the site, the realignment of the paved walk, the subtle sculpturing of the earth and the judicious addition of trees.

The requirement to add a flag and sculpture was again considered very carefully in terms of approach, visual site lines, and spaces between the elements of the design. The shift to focus from flag to sculpture to the wall as one walks through the site was deliberate. The addition of elements such as the one proposed today to this design will

disrupt that clarity and will dilute the experience visitors have at the Memorial.

In terms of simple functional circulation, it will be inevitable that a path will be added between the east wall and the new sculpture, truncating a visual flow between the tree shaded space that is a setting for the Memorial and the Washington Monument. This shouldn't happen. This is where I see a walk inevitably occurring.

It should be remembered that Maya Lin saw this site as a living park, not a memorial grove. She envisioned a grassy hillside on which families would picnic and children would play, a living memorial at which to experience both the solemnity of lives lost and in life enjoyed. The desire to add a sculpture now, and perhaps more in the future, implies that what is now at the site is somehow incomplete. The fact of hundreds of thousands of visitors to the site over the past five years would say that is not so.

Additionally, the design community has been consistently laudatory. Memorial sculptures are symbolic. The sculpture of the servicemen now at the site stand for all.

The proposed sculpture is also symbolic, though for a group it isolates itself. The wall is not symbolic -- at

least not in the sense of our familiar vocabulary of symbols. It is wretchedly specific. The individuality of the names, the specifics of nationality evidenced by the names, have a power beyond symbolism. The Memorial as it exists is unique and should remain as it was designed.

CHAIRMAN BROWN: Thank you very much.

MR. DOUBEK: Mr. Chairman, it happened late last evening that I received a call from Maya Lin, the designer --

CHAIRMAN BROWN: Her letter has just come in.

MR. DOUBEK: I saw that the letter had come in and I thought in the interest of simply public perception that the letter could be read aloud.

CHAIRMAN BROWN: All right, let's read it into the record.

It is from Maya Ling Lin, to The Commission of Fine Arts.

To the Members of the Commission:

I spoke before you five years ago about the dangerous precedent being set by the addition of new sculptures to the Memorial's design -- I think at this point that danger is clearly evident.

I am as opposed to this new addition as I was to

the last. I cannot see where it will all end. I could think of numerous other groups that might also like to be represented pictorially, and I wonder once you start making individual concessions to these groups who is to say which groups should be allowed to become a part of the Memorial and which should not.

The three earlier statues were added before the walls were constructed, well before people had come to visit the Memorial; they were added in haste by those who did not visualize what the Memorial would be. This is no longer the case. The Memorial has existed peacefully for five years. The number of visitors should attest to its acceptance. It is not the - quote - black gash of shame and sorrow - close quote - that some people thought it would become. Instead, as you have seen, it is a living wall, people react with it, bringing emotions and memories to it, placing themselves within its chronological order, and finding their own time upon the wall. It heals the living and it is representative of all those who served.

The Memorial was dedicated and given over to this

country in 1983. I see no reason to add anything more to the design

Maya Ling Lin

MR. ATHERTON: We also apparently have received additional letters in opposition to this proposal, one from Wolf von Eckardt, architectural critic, and one from Mrs. Robert Kendig, and one from Mr. Earl Stock, Jr., who supports the idea of a memorial, but not this particular design, and we also have had one call this morning from a former Red Cross nurse, Wendy Wendler, in opposition to this proposal.

CHAIRMAN BROWN: All right. We now have a chance to have members of the Commission comment, if anyone wishes to do so.

MR. PORTERFIELD: I would like to say something.

I agree with what Joe Brown had to say about this design, and I can't say it any better than he has. He knows this project intimately. It was designed as a whole, and we all attest to its success. It is an absolutely unparalleled emotional experience to go to the site today.

I would also say, on the other side of this, that this is not going to achieve what its proponents hope that it will, simply because the design of this is an, essentially,

sequential event, and it has its emotional impact and its recognition because of that sequence of events.

The design deliberately blocks the view of it as one enters, which it rightfully should do, and one comes in in this direction and it ends with this event here. This means that there is a very strong possibility those coming in that direction will never even see the piece of sculpture.

There was emphasis put on the fact that if one was at the site looking back toward the wall, that would be a rather dramatic view, and I agree with that, but the way it is designed is there is no reason why a person moving through this site is even going to look back at this point and the approach to it is that after you get here, where your attention is drawn to the other monument, the Lincoln Memorial, so that you must know it is there, you must be given a map to it, to travel down this walkway and find it, so I think aside from what it might do to destroy the dynamics that are here by setting the precedent of putting other artifacts at the Memorial, I think that it will also not succeed as a monument itself.

CHAIRMAN BROWN: Any other members have any comment?

Carolyn.

MS. DEEVER: Well, I think this is really a very difficult decision to arrive at, but I have to go back to my initial instinct, which happened before I was even on the Commission, when there was the controversy of the additional sculptural piece to the design, and at that point I must say, Mr. Hart, I was not in favor of the addition of your sculpture. I felt that it was an unneeded clarification of something that could be revealed personally.

I, too, must say I was wrong. I think the sculpture enhances it, but I think it is now complete. It makes a statement, and I just feel that it should be left as is.

CHAIRMAN BROWN: Diane.

MS. WOLF: I would like to study it further.

CHAIRMAN BROWN: Rick.

MR. HART: Well, I can just candidly share with everyone my experience. When we conceded the sculpture as an addition, the question arose as to how to portray -- what did you do for the entire group of Vietnam veterans, that entire population. There are a vast number of ethnic entities, as well as job entities, and so on and so forth, and it was a very difficult decision as to how to pick among those and



do something which would be appropriate as a symbol for all.

There were two choices you could make. You have to make a choice between a symbolic work or trying to do something which is literally depictive of everybody who participated in proper proportion. We made the choice of doing something, which was fully symbolic, of doing the "grunts", that group of Vietnam veteran population that bore that greatest burden as a symbol for the entire population, so even though we had, like Bob Doubek said, Navy pilots, Air Force pilots, any innumerable groups who have a very strong claim to a depiction there, we had to stop at the idea of doing something that was symbolic of the whole group. That choice has been made.

In terms of the design relationships, as everyone knows it was extremely difficult what we went through, and everyone here is pretty much aware of the years and months of anguish and pain and misery that we went through, to try to come up with the solution of the relationship of the figurative sculpture and deep magnetic power of the wall itself, but we succeeded. There is an extremely fragile balance between these two elements, and it is that fragile balance that is the success of that relationship. I think that the whole is

is greater than the sum of its parts because of that relationship. But I believe that if other focal elements are brought into play that all else will be demolished.

I am not opposed to anyone having a design relationship with the Memorial, but I do just want to share with you those candid convictions about the success of the Memorial and why it is a success and what went into it.

CHAIRMAN BROWN: Okay.

Well, I have been very moved by all of this testimony. Obviously this is an enormously impressive record of service that we are being asked to consider here. I would submit there are, of course, other enormously impressive records of service which are somehow involved in the three million people who did serve in the armed forces and the fifty-four thousand, or whatever it is, who actually gave their lives and whose names are recorded, including the names of the women whose lives were lost and whose names are inscribed on that wall. So I think, as I heard Senator Durenberger say, women's sacrifices are unrecorded, I think that that really misses the point. It does go to this basic question of symbolism.

As Ms. Boulay pointed out, she considers the

stethoscope on this design submission to be symbolic of the whole process of listening and hearing, and I would hope that if one has that kind of breadth of mind, one could understand that the figures that are there now are symbolic of human kind and everyone who served.

I think that as a Commission we have to deal with this in design terms, recognizing that there are these risks to the future. I think, obviously, people whose every day business is to be in a legislative body and add amendments on, hoping to improve legislation over the years, are operating in a different sphere from works of art, which are not subject to that process, and the concept of completion is one that I think is crucial here.

The word that the proponents of this change have been using is to make it "complete". I hope that they can recognize that it probably does the opposite. It dramatizes one more way the "incompleteness", if you are going to look for literal representations, as I would predict from many of the Americans who have already spoken up -- the Park Service has even heard from Scout Dogs Associations -- will never end. You have a big forest there, you have lots of room, and once you start, you do get a proliferation.

Congress has addressed the issue of proliferation of memorial elements and they have passed legislation very recently in the Commemorative Works Act which specifically tries to apply a brake to this system. At the same time the Congress has recognized the importance of women in serving their country in the armed services, and there has, as was mentioned, been recently passed an Act on behalf of a memorial on just this subject, and that would seem the way to approach it, to do it from the beginning so that one has a sense of doing an integrated design solution that could give women the dignity, which I feel an afterthought, sort of a put-down, almost a ghettoization of them in this context, will end not doing. And so, I suppose, I come at it much the way that Joe Brown did, that this really isn't good enough for the amount of service that women rendered in the Vietnam War, and most certainly render and continually increasingly render in our armed services.

Roy, I am sorry, I forgot to ask whether you had any comments.

MR. GOODMAN: When you are through, I have just one brief comment.

CHAIRMAN BROWN: Go ahead.

MR. GOODMAN: Is this the moment?

CHAIRMAN BROWN: Sure.

MR. GOODMAN: This is a difficult decision, and I think if one were to make it solely on the basis of the esthetic balance of the Memorial, there would be very serious hesitation about changing its equilibrium. I am very conscious of that argument. But I think each of us, perhaps subject to his own personal frame work of experience -- it happens that I am the son of an individual who was a Naval surgeon who was entrusted with the lives of men who were wounded in the first terrible rate of casualties in the 2nd World War, at Guadalcanal, because my father was Chief of Surgery at the Mobile Naval Base, and from whom I learned secondhand from him of the extraordinary contribution made in that war by Navy nurses. Also, I am deeply conscious of the fact that there is an unintended balance in the recognitions which the role of women has received in the overall complex of memorials in the nation's capital.

There is also the charge that decisions are made on the basis of politics. That is inevitable in a free democratic society, but I don't think the fear of being charged with making political decisions should obfuscate our

our objectivity in trying to analyze something of this sort, and I must say that although, had I been asked to vote at the very beginning of this meeting, I very probably would have allowed my concern for the esthetic balance to be the predominant theme. I have been profoundly moved by the presentation that has been made by the group in favor of this project, and since ours is a business of making difficult decisions, I would find that I would come out on the other side of this and would vote in favor of the inclusion of what I regard as a deeply moving and, in the total balance, highly appropriate memorial recognition of the real role of women in the Vietnam War, and, indeed, in many wars.

MS. WOLF: I think perhaps you were out of the room when we discussed that there be a memorial to all women who served in the armed forces.

MR. GOODMAN: Yes, I heard several references to that. That is at some distant time in the future. It is at the moment a problematical question. I don't think it is anything concrete we can count on, unless you know something I don't.

MS. WOLF: I understand that the law has been passed.

MR. GOODMAN: The passage of the law and creation

of the memorial are two different matters.

MS. WOLF: I do believe that it is proceeding.

MR. J. BROWN: My understanding is Congress has authorized a group to put together a memorial, and I believe they have five years in which to come up with a design and raise a significant amount of money, and it may well be that there will be a memorial, and I am glad to hear you and, I think, the others recognize that the memorial is due. On the other hand, there are many slips between the cup and the lip, and there may not be such a memorial. I think it would be appropriate for the group to perhaps reflect on the very difficult issue you have here and think about what is possible now in the context of a very difficult situation that this country went through, and I think the history that you all have gone through of contention about the memorial reflects the feelings of the country about the war, and changes have been made. The memorial, as Maya Lin said, is a living object. It struck me as living in a different way than people picknicking on the grass and looking at the names of my colleagues and comrades no longer here. It is like a growth organically. Mr. Hart's statue was not contemplated in the original design, but it is there and it is very satisfactory.

Who knows -- perhaps in the future other things will happen. Trees will die and new trees will have to be planted. That kin- of organic growth, reflecting what the country stands for, it seems to me, Mr. Chairman, is what your Commission should really reflect on.

CHAIRMAN BROWN: I think this is a key issue. I am very sensitive to the people who have used the word "healing". I think that one great role that this memorial project has been able to fulfill is one of healing, and I would simply submit that if you don't allow the wounds to close and heal up, that if you go back and back and reopen it, that this purpose of healing will have been abrogated, and I foresee a long string of similar emendations on the basis of a misguided literalism in what this memorial stands for. It is written right in the English language, as it was in the original legislation, that it is dedicated to the men and women of America who have served this cause, and that American flag that flies over it I hope does still represent us all.

Well, I think we have a long agenda and a lot of other things to cover. We have given more time to this, probably, than any other subject since the Vietnam Memorial came up. I think that it is appropriate to vote, if anyone



would like to make a motion.

MS. DEEVER: You want to make the motion?

MR. PORTERFIELD: I move that we disapprove this proposal for the Vietnam Memorial.

CHAIRMAN BROWN: Do I have a second?

MS. DEEVER: I second it.

CHAIRMAN BROWN: All in favor of the motion?

MR. HART: Abstain.

CHAIRMAN BROWN: Mr. Hart has abstained.

MR. GOODMAN: Opposed.

CHAIRMAN BROWN: Thank you very much everybody.

VOICE: What was the vote?

CHAIRMAN BROWN: The vote was three to one against.

I only vote to break a tie.

(Record temporarily suspended)

CHAIRMAN BROWN: Back on the record.

In discussing the parliamentary procedure, whether it is appropriate or not for the Chairman to vote, the members thought it was and, therefore, the Chairman casts his vote against the proposal, which makes the tally four to one opposed, and Mr. Goodman opposed it and Mr. Hart abstained.

Let's go to the next submission, the Department of