

I'm addressing this to the three of you confidentially -  
~~to~~ <sup>"for"</sup> reactivate a phrase I haven't used for some thirty-odd  
years - <sup>of this submission</sup> "Eyes Only". My reasons for the confidentiality are,  
I think, <sup>valid</sup> ~~important~~ - and it's my devout hope that ~~they will be~~ <sup>it will</sup>  
~~receive the same attentive, friendly~~  
~~considered with the same courtesy and professional understanding~~  
~~you~~ afforded me throughout our recent all-too-few-all-too-brief  
meetings.

*(The ensuing comment and suggested material)*  
For my part, I intend ~~them~~ to reflect my understanding  
of ~~both~~ <sup>PROJECT</sup> the magnitude of the ~~project~~ to which you've been  
committed <sup>and also my enthusiastic support for it -</sup> and the deep responsibility I feel towards my  
<sup>personal, in particular,</sup> possible contributions to ~~it~~. Together with, (despite the  
<sup>its successful consummation. Not only</sup>  
absurdly short time allotted me even to indicate, much less  
<sup>the immensity of your undertaking, but the staggering</sup>  
fully realize that contribution) some pertinent and constructive  
<sup>potential of your PROJECT present a</sup>  
reactions to what I have thus far read, seen and been told -  
and, I hope, some worthy and viable suggestions for an under-  
taking and challenge <sup>quite</sup> unlike any I've encountered during a  
very full half-century of writing, directing and producing  
entertainment of all kinds for audiences of all ages and  
varied demands:

1) Somehow, substantial documents arriving at "major"  
establishments (in your case not only ~~Major~~, but the last  
survivor of your species) are very often routinely fed into  
a copying machine and distributed rather more widely than  
wisely.

It's quite possible (make that probable) that some

.....2

or all ~~three~~ of you will disagree with some or all of my perceptions, opinions and suggestions. In which case, it seems to me, you should be presented with every opportunity to delete <sup>privately</sup> what displeases you - and either act upon, or pass on to other<sup>s</sup>, whatever you find relevant and/or helpful.

~~2) As agreed with Frank Paris, I'm still making every effort to get to you as quickly as possible my suggested content for the "Pavilion" which is now erroneously named SPACESHIP EARTH. Unhappily, however, I've been forced to conclude that "just sending <sup>it</sup> along" to you ~~the material for that very important earth-shaped "Pavilion" out of context, as it were, would be to render all of us a great disservice. I'm frankly apprehensive about <sup>submitting</sup> sending on the forthcoming material, without having had a chance at least to remind you of the overall concept within which it belongs, and which it introduces - a concept which interrelates not only all of the the "Pavilions" - but also "PUTURAMA" - and includes, indeed justifies, what I find myself calling THE NEIGHBORHOOD OF NATIONS".~~~~

~~3) Let me hasten to point out, if reassurance is necessary, that each and every "Pavilion" has a separate and complete identity as a fully realized individual attraction/production - providing for its audience a total experience of what should be unique entertainment and (one hopes) enlightenment. The concept of "interrelation" <sup>will be</sup> is never heavy-handed, or belabored; its treatment will be such that visitors will, <sup>within</sup>~~

.....3

within themselves and by themselves, inevitably become aware of it.

4) In addition to our concept, perhaps overlaying it: (perhaps - who knows? - the source of a new name for your entire project) - I want to present, for your consideration, a Theme. But, please - you've been considerate and patient thus far with me - let me disclose it when and where in this document it should be made known.

2) 3) Facing ('challenging' might be more accurate) me from the opposite wall of my study as I write this, is the large striking color photograph of the "EPCOT" model, with which Marty Sklar was kind enough to provide me. Visually, it's almost staggeringly intriguing and impressive. Both as a physical <sup>configuration</sup> ~~concept~~ and as <sup>technological achievement</sup> ~~an achievement of technology~~, it is - in every true meaning of the word - unique. Only DISNEY/WED, in all the world, could conceptualize a structural compound such as this - and only DISNEY, <sup>WED</sup> uniquely <sup>DISNEY/WED -</sup> ~~DISNEY~~ could make of it an actuality.

What, then, I must ask myself, can I possibly contribute - ~~What prompted that first phone call to me from my good and gifted friend, John DeQuir - and why was I sent for?~~ After all, whatever creative expertise I've acquired after fifty years of professional experience is <sup>people</sup> ~~is~~ people. Young and old, living and long gone, the raw material with ~~which~~ and <sup>- and, oddly enough, the market place for that work -</sup> about which I've been working for a lifetime ~~- is people~~ People

And

...4 <sup>still</sup> ~~also~~ has always been, and is -  
And ~~always~~, oddly enough, the marketplace for my work has always  
been - people. People as audiences.. non-animatronic

structure One can build a ~~house~~ which nobody wants either  
to buy, rent, or live in - but nevertheless, it's a structure.  
visit An inanimate object; ~~it has an undeniable existence~~ - and will continue to

be until it's either torn down or rots away. However, no one  
~~can~~ <sup>no one has, or ever will</sup> ~~create~~ - and nobody ever has or ever ~~will~~ - create an enter-  
tainment, a work of art, a star performer, a public attraction  
of any ~~kind~~ <sup>importance</sup> whatsoever, unless a continuing and approving  
audience confirms the actuality <sup>its identity as an</sup> of that entertainment,

work of art, stardom or public attraction. And nobody has  
~~ever lived - or lives, to my knowledge - qualified and/or~~ <sup>audience-affirmation of its substance and validity -</sup>  
~~to all intents and purposes, its creator might just as~~ <sup>without that</sup>  
~~well have~~ <sup>audience - affirmation of its substance and validity -</sup> ~~competent to point at any book, play, painting, film,~~  
~~and predict infallibly: "Yes, that'll be a hit - he/she~~ <sup>will have</sup> ~~will be a star".~~ <sup>Even the creator of "STEAMBOAT WILLIE", for</sup>  
a long suspenseful time, worked and waited - worked and waited -  
until a worldwide audience unequivocally proclaimed Walt Disney  
a genius in his genre..

<sup>room, one perfect smoke ring</sup>  
~~not only in terms of its technological display but, more often than not~~ <sup>Audiences will evaluate significant public attraction</sup>  
~~of the 'creation', is evaluated always against standards~~ <sup>Creativity, not only the execution but also the content</sup>  
~~low or high, according to its intent (an important noun~~ <sup>these days - most importantly look to its content, and the intent</sup>  
~~relative to "EPCOT": it must be kept in mind).~~ <sup>of that content.</sup> <sup>the</sup> <sup>Protest</sup> A dreadful,  
tasteless, tit-and-tatter dirty movie can - and does - rake  
in barrels of moolah for the contemporary producer/packager/  
procurer. <sup>of today.</sup> Counting his money, he hides very glibly behind  
one of the many nonsensical cliché defensive shibboleths

Standards are no longer simply 'high or low', G, PG, R or  
X; an entire spectrum of applicable standards now exists

~~our business has unhappily too often accepted: "nobody liked it but the customers", "I'm crying all the way to the bank", "if it makes money, it's a good picture; if it loses money, it's a bad picture", etc. Jacqueline Susann repeatedly boasted in public that her writing was "better" than that of William Faulkner and Sinclair Lewis because she "outsold" them ten to one." Faulkner and Lewis will be read by our grandchildren; Ms. Susann has already joined Kathleen Winsor and Elinor Glyn on the other side of Lethe..~~

I've set high standards for myself, perhaps too high for my reach. But <sup>just because I haven't yet attained</sup> ~~the mere fact that I can't attain~~ the standards I demand of myself <sup>is</sup> no reason for abandoning them. I'm quite sure that <sup>the</sup> same - and there the resemblance ends, believe me - was true <sup>of</sup> ~~to~~ Walter Elias Disney.

"Walt's Dream" was really DISNEYLAND, wasn't it? I may remember incorrectly, but it seems to me he never did stop realizing that dream; continually adding something new, improving something old - he meant <sup>DISNEYLAND</sup> ~~it~~ to become everything he'd ever fantasied as a kid. <sup>And we</sup> ~~We~~ all know that a kid's fantasies never do come to an end. Not even at age sixty-five..

<sup>THE</sup> And <sup>WALT DISNEY WORLD,</sup> <sup>factually</sup> ~~seriously~~ and realistically <sup>appraised</sup> ~~examined~~, <sup>applicable</sup> is - in just about every possible <sup>practical</sup> aspect - EPCOT. In his speech before the Urban Land Institute on October 5, 1976, Cardon Walker devoted most of it to that <sup>but existing -</sup> ~~the~~ incredible <sup>the</sup> technological breakthrough of major obstacles faced by modern communal living - one to which <sup>continuously</sup> ~~people~~ pilgrimage <sup>believers</sup>

~~growing audience~~ - THE pilgrimage from every corner of the earth, known to them as WALT DISNEY WORLD.

He then quoted Peter Blake, the architectural editor of New York Magazine, and David Brinkley, who needs no identifying (I, too, with millions of others, have seen and heard David on the subject): "(Peter Blake) recommends that all of New York City's town planning work be turned over to the Walt Disney ...organization because they seem to be the only people in America who are able to get anything done...When you look at this new town they have built here in central Florida, you will think he is right. It is the most imaginative and effective piece of urban planning in America...they have built roads, transportation systems, lakes, golf courses, campgrounds, stores, houses, hotels and so on. And they all fit together in a setting of land, air and water better than any other urban environment in America...this is the future...and nobody has done it but Disney...after Disney's people take over the big cities, we will talk about bringing them to Washington."

If ever I have heard an exact and explicit description of an "Experimental Prototype Community of Tomorrow", those words - added to the <sup>earlier</sup> information supplied by Mr. Walker - were it.

the underscoring is mine;

technological

\* \* \* \* \*



7  
My assignment, as I understand it, is to render  
certain services ~~to you~~ in connection with the ~~project~~ PROJECT

[known as EPCOT];

1) To ~~examine~~ <sup>review</sup> the existing suggested content of the various Pavilions which makes up what could be described as the ~~Major Compound~~ <sup>MAJOR COMPOUND</sup> of the ~~Project~~ <sup>PROJECT.</sup>

2) To suggest alternate and, it is to be hoped, improved material for the Pavilions in question, so that they <sup>^</sup> together with the FUTURAMA (or FUTURE WORLD THEME CENTER; I've read or been told various names for it) - which, in turn, ~~fits~~ <sup>will present</sup> to the superbly conceptualized WORLD SHOWCASE (I hope to persuade you to change this to a nomenclature more suggestive of a NEIGHBORHOOD OF NATIONS; my reasons will soon be very clear) - all three segments <sup>to</sup> ~~fit within and~~ <sup>which together constitute</sup> ~~indeed~~ <sup>will present</sup> ONE OVERALL CONCEPT.

3) To describe clearly not only the structure and character of ~~the concept~~ <sup>this CONCEPT</sup> but also its importance as a unique undertaking which only DISNEY, in all the world, could bring to fruition. A ~~concept~~ <sup>CONCEPT</sup>, also, that will more than probably justify, indeed win <sup>understanding</sup> ~~universal~~ approval for the necessarily enormous expenditure of money required for its total realization.

4) To supply, as completely as possible, suggested material for the Pavilion now erroneously called SPACESHIP EARTH - but which, in fact, will have to do with MANKIND

8  
AND ~~THE~~ <sup>ITS</sup> PLANET EARTH: ~~ASSUMPTIONS~~ SURVIVAL, TRIUMPH, -  
~~CHOICE~~  
AND DILEMMA... (this Pavilion <sup>will,</sup> in fact, miniaturize  
almost the ~~CONCEPT,~~ <sup>CONCEPT,</sup> itself - but not quite all.)

5) To supply also one basic THEME, within which the  
concept rests - and which can characterize the entire  
~~PROJECT.~~ <sup>PROJECT.</sup> And possibly supply, or inspire, either a new acronym  
or name to replace the now irrelevant "EPCOT".

6) In other words. Given the already visualized  
extraordinary OUTER CONCEPT of the total ~~PROJECT~~ <sup>PROJECT</sup> (the  
physical realization of which, I understand, has begun) -  
the area of responsibility with which this document concerns  
itself might well be described as the INNER CONCEPT..

\* \* \* \* \*

~~I am proceeding on~~ <sup>some</sup> ~~basic~~ <sup>assumptions</sup> ~~which I have~~  
~~heard~~ <sup>heard</sup> repeatedly, and with which I completely concur; ~~and~~ <sup>and</sup>

1) The ~~PROJECT~~ <sup>PROJECT</sup> should most certainly not be miscon-  
strued - nor should there be available "ammunition" for  
either well-meant or malevolent misrepresentation of it -  
as no more than a super-colossal DISNEYLAND. <sup>or as</sup>

2) Similarly, the ~~PROJECT~~ <sup>PROJECT</sup> must not be regarded - nor  
must there be opportunity for either well-meant or malevolent  
distortion of its unique identity - as no more than an  
"extension or magnification of WALT DISNEY WORLD."

3) Nor must the ~~PROJECT~~ <sup>PROJECT</sup> emerge - or give cause to be  
considered to have emerged - as a 'world's fair'. Not in  
any proper sense of the phrase, <sup>that description. Not</sup> ~~not even close.~~

\* \* \* \* \*

This INNER CONCEPT has its origins

I'm addressing this confidentially - to reactivate a phrase I haven't used for some thirty-odd years - "For Eyes Only". My reasons for the confidentiality are, I think, valid - as is the trustful assumption that my submission will be considered with the same attentive and friendly understanding afforded me throughout our recent all-too-few all-too-brief meetings.

To begin with - the ensuing comment and suggested material will, I hope, reflect a practical appreciation of the magnitude of the PROJECT to which you've been committed - my most enthusiastic support for it - and, in particular, the great responsibility that must accompany any personal contribution to its successful consummation. Because not only the immensity of your PROJECT ("EPCOT"), but the staggering potential of it presents a challenge quite unlike any I've encountered during a very full half-century of writing, directing and producing entertainment of all kinds for audiences of all ages and varied demands:

1). Somehow, substantial documents arriving at "major" establishments (in your case not only Major - but the last functioning survivor of your species) are very often routinely fed into a copying machine, and distributed rather more widely than wisely..

It's quite possible (make that probable) that some or all of you will disagree with some or all of my perceptions, opinions and suggestions. In which case, it seems to me, you should be presented with every opportunity to delete privately what displeases you - then either act upon, or pass on to others, whatever you find relevant and/or helpful.

2). Facing ('challenging' might be more accurate) me from the opposite wall of my study as I write, is the large color photograph of the "EPCOT" model, with which Marty Sklar was kind enough to provide me. Visually, it's tremendously impressive - and intriguing. Both as a physical configuration and technological achievement, it will be - it is, in every true meaning of the word - unique. Only DISNEY/WED, in all the world, could conceptualize a structural compound such as this - and only, uniquely, DISNEY/WED - could make of it an actuality.

3). What, then, I must ask myself, can I possibly contribute - and why was I sent for? After all, whatever creative expertise I've acquired after fifty years of professional experience is - people. Young and old, living and long gone, the raw material with and about which I've been writing and/or directing and/or producing for a

lifetime - and, oddly enough, itself the marketplace for that work - has always been, and still is - people. People as non-animatronic audiences..

One can build a physical structure which nobody wants either to buy, rent, visit or live in - but nevertheless, it remains a structure. An inanimate object; it is, it has an incontestable existence - and will continue to be until it's either torn down or rots away. However, no one can - no one has or ever will - create an entertainment, a work of art, a star performer, a public attraction of any importance whatsoever, unless a continuing and approving audience confirms its identity as being an entertainment, work of art, stardom or public attraction. Without that \*audience-affirmation of its substance and validity - to all intents and purposes, its creator might just as well have blown, in an otherwise empty room, one perfect smoke-ring. Even the creator of "STEAMBOAT WILLIE", for a long suspenseful time, worked and waited - worked and waited - until a world-wide audience unequivocally proclaimed Walt Disney a genius in his genre..

4). I've <sup>always</sup> set high standards for myself; perhaps too high for my reach. But just because I haven't yet attained the standards I demand of myself - is no reason for abandoning them. I'm quite sure that the same - and

there the resemblance ends, believe me - was true of Walter Elias Disney.

"Walt's Dream" was really DISNEYLAND, wasn't it? I may remember incorrectly, but it seems to me he never did stop realizing that dream; continually adding something new, improving something old - he meant DISNEYLAND to become everything he'd ever fantasied as a kid. And we all know that a kid's fantasies never do come to an end. Not even at age sixty-five..

5). Likewise THE WALT DISNEY WORLD, factually and realistically appraised is - in just about every applicable aspect - EPCOT. In his speech before the Urban Land Institute on October 5, 1976, Cardon Walker devoted most of it to that incredible - but existing - technological breakthrough of the major obstacles faced by modern communal living - one to which believers continuously pilgrimage from every corner of the earth - THE WALT DISNEY WORLD.

He then quoted Peter Blake, the architectural editor of New York Magazine, and David Brinkley, who needs no identifying (I, too, with millions of others, have seen and heard David on the subject; the underscoring is mine):

"(Peter Blake) recommends that all of New York City's town planning work be turned over to the Walt Disney... organization because they seem to be the only people in