

Date November, 1978

Mr....  
Mr....  
Mr....

WED  
Address  
Address

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

<sup>To begin with -</sup>  
~~For my part, I intend~~ the ensuing comment and suggested  
<sup>will, I hope, reflect a practical appreciation</sup>  
material ~~to reflect the magnitude of the~~ of the magnitude of the  
PROJECT to which you've been committed - <sup>most</sup> ~~my~~ my enthusiastic  
support for it - and, in particular, the <sup>great</sup> ~~responsibility~~ responsibility  
<sup>that must accompany any</sup>  
I ~~feel towards my possible~~ personal contribution to its successful  
consummation. <sup>Became not</sup> ~~Not~~ only the immensity of your <sup>PROJECT ("EPLOT")</sup> ~~undertaking~~, but  
the staggering potential of ~~your~~ <sup>it</sup> 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 <sup>functioning</sup>  
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 - ~~and~~ <sup>then</sup> 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~~, 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~~ <sup>hugely impressive - and</sup> intriguing, ~~and impressive~~. Both as a physical configuration and technological achievement, it ~~is~~ <sup>will be -</sup> 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/WED~~, 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 <sup>professional</sup> experience is - people. Young and old, living and long gone, the raw material with and about <sup>writing and/or directing and/or producing</sup> which I've been ~~working~~ <sup>that</sup> for a lifetime - and, oddly enough, the marketplace for that work - has always been, and still is - people. People as non-animatronic audiences ..

One can build a <sup>physical</sup> structure which nobody wants either to buy, rent, visit or live in - but nevertheless, it <sup>remains</sup> a structure.

...3

An inanimate object; <sup>it is,</sup> ~~it~~ has an <sup>incontestable</sup> ~~indefinable~~ 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 <sup>being</sup> ~~as 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 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). <sup>Like-wise</sup> ~~and~~ THE WALT DISNEY WORLD, factually and realistically

appraised, is - in just about every possible applicable aspect - EPCOT. In his speech before the Urban Land Institute on October 5, 1976, Cardon Walker devoted most of it to <sup>that</sup> that incredible - but existing - technological breakthrough of the major obstacles faced by modern communal living - one to which believers <sup>continuously</sup> 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): <sup>P</sup>"(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 <sup>there's been</sup> ~~known~~ an exact and explicit description of an "Experimental Prototype Community of Tomorrow", those words - added to the technological information earlier supplied by Mr. Walker - were it.

..5

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 there's been an exact and explicit description of an "Experimental Prototype Community of Tomorrow", those words - added to the technological information earlier supplied by Mr. Walker - were it..

6). During my most recent and briefest visit to DISNEY/WED, I was given good cause from many sources in many ways, to infer that "EPCOT" as a viable acronym for the contemplated PROJECT, was no longer really valid. It becomes, in fact, increasingly invalid as the PROJECT, for itself and from itself, acquires a unique identity of its own. I'm confident that the eventual public label or logo - even if not a future-world acronym - will evolve successfully from within the proposed CONCEPT..

7). I've applied, in setting down this necessarily unfulfilled (but, I hope, comprehensible) proposed concept, three assumptions. I've heard them repeatedly expressed as apprehensions, and I couldn't agree more as to their possible denigrating effect upon the entire PROJECT:

A. In its ultimate realization, the PROJECT must not be regarded as - nor should it provide 'ammunition' for either well-meant or malevolent misrepresentation as - "a super-colossal DISNEYLAND".

B. Nor should it, in any way, lend itself to being distortedly described as no more than just "...an extension or magnification of THE WALT DISNEY WORLD..."..

C. ~~No aspect of~~ <sup>T</sup> the PROJECT's ultimately realized unique identity <sup>\*</sup> should, in ~~any~~ <sup>no</sup> way, justify reference to it as: "DISNEY'S WORLD'S FAIR" or, even more disparagingly, as "DISNEY'S WORLD SHOPPING CENTER.."

I'm sure we all agree that ~~justification for~~ any of those three designations, ~~and~~ applied negatively to the overall PROJECT - or to any segment of it - would be damaging, indeed. Not only to the intent of your undertaking - to the investment of enormous sums of money and the world's most advanced technology displayed by the world's most skillful artisans within it - but also to the hitherto unimpeachable credibility of the name DISNEY..

8). I've examined all of the written inner content

made available to me, descriptive of the various Pavilions (the only one I don't have is COMMUNICATIONS). Unhappily, but ~~legally and~~ determined to discharge that 'great responsibility' mentioned above, <sup>to repeat,</sup> which I have not lightly assumed, believe me: for the most part, simply stated - and by any standard of quality even remotely applicable to a PROJECT such as this - the presently contemplated material is not good enough. Not nearly good enough..

2). Some explanation is certainly in order for this seemingly very off-handed and generalized disparagement of both the content and quality of the overall content ~~and writing~~ within the various Pavilions. So may I, at this point, quote two of the several sources from which I have evolved a standard of content not only for each of its components but also for the overall concept of the PROJECT? (The underscoring, in both instances, is once more mine):

A) From an address by Donn Tatum - May 15, 1976:

"At first glance, it might seem presumptuous <sup>that</sup> any business enterprise, particularly one like us emanating from the world of entertainment, should aspire to such an ambitious goal."

B) From an address by E. Cardon Walker - October 5, 1976:

"...we intend to bring to bear all Disney skills to communicate information to the public that will be understood by the public. Perhaps EPCOT's greatest contribution can be in the

potential for information transfer in new and unique ways."

And may I add a positive conviction of my own - because the proposed concept will have "an ambitious goal" and because, in addition to its fundamental purpose as an entertainment, it will "communicate...(a unique and fascinating abundance of)...information to the public that will be understood by the public"? It's simply this: that I can recall few - very few professional undertakings in which I've been involved about which I've felt so deeply confident.

All of which doesn't make it any easier for me to carry out, with honest objectivity, that responsibility. All professional writers <sup>\*</sup>feel, or should feel, an uneasiness when they're called upon to evaluate and perhaps modify - possibly even suggest replacing - the work of others. In my case, I'm particularly sensitive to and aware of, the inescapable fact that DISNEY and WED have, for many years, been a closely-knit family of very highly skilled artisans' possessed of a fantastic technology at which I can only gape; and that, however high and unimpeachable my enthusiasm and eagerness to be of help, - I'm an "outsider", really, and therefore suspect. Well...to that I can submit only that I am fascinated by this PROJECT; that I want very much for it to succeed as a truly unique concept, proudly reflective of both our time and our culture - and, accordingly,

hope that my opinions and suggestions be received as those of, at the very least, an honest and good family friend..

So, just a moment in defense of what might be described as the well-intentioned disarray of the presently contemplated content within the nine Pavilions which, as an interrelated compound, make up one half of the entire PROJECT.

10). Returning once again to the brilliantly executed model of that magnificent structural outer concept (working title: "EPCOT"), confronting me across my study:

I don't know - I didn't ask, and I wasn't told - over how long a time that momentous structural outer concept was conceived and re-conceived. How often plans were discarded and started again from square one, designed and re-designed - each and every Pavilion placement moved first here and then there. <sup>7</sup> How many lengthy conferences devoted exclusively to the thinking and re-thinking of just the Lake and its encircling Community of Nations - how continuously every detail of the overall and individual architectural and engineering concept and content were examined and re-examined - until it all finally resulted in the very best combined effort of recognizably the very best attainable creative artists, designers, architects plus the indigenous resident masters of DISNEY/WED's

..10

unique technology...one full year? Two years? Longer?  
I'd place a small bet on the latter..

Was there an equal amount of time, planning, effort  
and - in particular - quality of talent dedicated to the  
content (to what was going to happen, ~~to~~ be done and said)  
within those nine Pavilions? To their nine separate iden-  
tities - to how and whether there might even exist a viable  
overall concept, justifying not only their individual con-  
tributions - but making clear their inevitable, inescapable  
interrelationship? <sup>(About which, more later)</sup> That, integrated, they could tell the  
story of MAN'S TOTAL EXPERIENCE UPON THE PLANET EARTH -  
UNTIL NOW?

But, concept or no, how many years went into the  
thorough considered examination of all the contemplated  
material for the Pavilions - and the <sup>qualitative standard</sup> ~~ultimate refinement~~  
of its writing? Were the authors of the content within  
each Pavilion selected - as were the designers of its  
outer structure - from among the very best writers, histo-  
rians and/or authorities of international repute on the  
relevant subject matter of each?

Surely, whether it had to do with SEA, COMMUNICATIONS,  
ENERGY or whatever - the author of that particular aspect  
of Man's experience and existence must be chosen from among  
the very best and most knowledgeable in all the world. ~~At~~  
~~At~~ the very least, from a level of excellence comparable to

.011

the mind-boggling technology which will surround the content, and with which it <sup>will inevitably</sup> ~~will~~ be forced to compete for that all-important audience-affirmation of which I wrote earlier. I learned many years ago that once you permit the background to become the foreground (the technology to overwhelm the content), once the audience becomes more interested in the "how" than in the "what" - you've had it...your show is down the drain.

I understand that the presentation in each Pavilion is intended to have a 'running' - or 'audience-participation' - time of approximately 30-35 minutes. 30 to 35 minutes in which to present uniquely its unique content. The former is there; the latter is not. I may be repeating myself, but the necessity - the obligation - cannot be exaggerated; to fill every one of those minutes with new - uniquely new - and exciting content.

It must be borne in mind that the DISNEY audience arrives almost 'pre-conditioned' - already expecting to be impressed to the point of being overpowered by a brilliant, world-renowned technology. Therefore, unhappily too often - instead of rising to the challenge of <sup>what overstimulation</sup> ~~the complex~~ technology - the content simply buckles under, and quits. It falls back upon (or adapts previously tried-and-accepted) simplistic and predictable material; ranging from "let's have an adventure together" ride (DISNEYLAND) - to cracker-barrel

..12

mother-and-apple-pie, old-hat homilies on the Andy Hardy level of homespun philosophy and not-for-years-relevant hackneyed platitudes.

(I could not, if I tried, come up with three more done-to-death - less exciting, enlightening and entertaining - less challenging to the incredible technology of audio-animatronics if only because of their utter predictability than those boringly-familiar-by-now ~~ubiquitous~~ stand-bys of TV 'specials' galore, TV-and-radio commercials ad infinitum, actors whose careers have become "an evening with.." - on endlessly revolving <sup>"one-night stands"</sup> ~~turns~~ of auditoriums large and small throughout the land - tiresome ol' Ben Franklin, Mark Twain and Will Rogers. All three, because of guaranteed audience inattention to banalities and bromides they've heard endlessly since 1976 - will very quickly insure that the focus of interest becomes, and remains, the technology of the presentation:

**P** "Hey, I'll bet they just took three extra dummies they made for the HALL OF PRESIDENTS, gave them different faces and voices and wardrobe, that's all..". **II** I don't think the PROJECT will benefit from havings its guests not quite sure, upon emerging from a Pavilion, whether they'll find <sup>their cars parked</sup> ~~the~~ <sup>outside</sup> in Anaheim, California - or ~~in~~ "The Magic Kingdom"..)

I was delighted to hear, from Frank Paris, the name of Kenneth Clark as a suggested contributor to the PROJECT. Wisdom and wit on any level approaching Lord Clark's, visually

..13

realized by DISNEY/WED's technological brilliance, could result only in an end product of which everyone concerned would be proud, indeed. There are very many very learned and talented authorities in every aspect of this undertaking - both Academic and in The Arts - who could provide the unique <sup>existing</sup> material ~~perhaps even challenging the technology~~ for those precious 30-35 minutes - and whose services, enthusiastically rendered for a concept such as ours, would surprising cost far less than the facile, glib and hack Hollywood "B" film talent <sup>dragged up thus far for the most part..</sup> ~~at hand~~. Names such as Barbara Tuchman, Arthur Schlesinger, Jr., William Manchester, <sup>Jacques Barzun</sup> and many, many more come to mind - their works selling by the tens of thousands of copies - seemingly always in the "best seller" lists - their readers precisely those whose holiday plans would inevitably include an extended visit to the PROJECT..

<sup>I have liberally dozens of notes about</sup> ~~(Occasionally, in the various 'scripts' which I~~ have examined, <sup>about which I, quite simply, do not have time to do so - I</sup> ~~have~~ come across not only overlapping but <sup>have also</sup> actual duplication of both material and the accompanying technology. I cannot urge emphatically enough that the content of each Pavilion be carefully scrutinized and considered in terms of its relevance to the subject with which it's concerned - that the contents of no one Pavilion be finalized until the contents of all nine have been completely finished, properly written, approved and - as the saying goes - "locked". Any other procedure, I assure

..14

you - and you know as well as I - leads inevitably to that great big bottomless hole into which irrecoverable money just pours and pours...)

I'm fully aware that there's much more - infinitely more - than money at stake here. I've tried to be duly attentive to the needs and participation of your corporate sponsor/partners in an enterprise of such magnitude; I'm equally confident that not only will their product/services participate prominently but also intrinsically within a concept which will afford them both great pride and great profit.

My deepest concern, frankly, is with the unique\* repute and public image of credibility throughout the world, of the DISNEY name ~~to~~ together with the unique public trust it commands - they're all on the line here. DISNEY has always promised to an almost universal ~~constitu~~ constituency - and delivered more often than not - the first of the best of the hitherto inconceivable. Once more, it's expected to do no less..

11). One more short preamble (probably also in the none-of-my-business department): it's rumored that future plans do not include additional accommodations of any consequence beyond the present capacities which barely meet the needs of THE WALT DISNEY WORLD. I'd suggest some important contingency planning - because I can't agree. Anymore than I can agree with the denigrating implication

(Business Week's) that you're not basing WDC's success

(Business Week's) that you're "not basing 'EPCOT's' success primarily on attracting additional visitors...but rather on the gamble that visitors to DISNEY WORLD will lengthen their stay a couple of days...". I'd stake my good name, pretty good reputation and - if I had one - my fortune, on exactly the opposite. ¶ In time, as the PROJECT inevitably achieves world-wide recognition as a unique entertainment in its own right - providing days and weeks of a first-time experience of fun, enlightenment and personal significance - be prepared, please, for an enormous, untapped, brand new audience.

~~Not only~~ ¶ The community groups, societies, families, and individuals without number who travel the world over, both abroad from here and here from abroad, in search of new personal experience that can be both entertaining and edifying - not only scheduled gatherings of students, but entire grades of schools both from this country and especially from overseas which might very justifiably include the PROJECT as a welcome, innovative and effective addition to the educational process...sounds overblown and over-ambitious, does it? ¶ Perhaps. But, alternatively, what you're undertaking might turn out to be - no more than just one hell of an expensive "added attraction"..

12). And so:

THE PROJECT

(WORKING TITLE: .. "EPCOT")

Concerning  
~~its Content and Concept~~ its Content and Concept

+ + + + +

THE PROJECT, in its entirety, should be considered as having two parts. (Not in actuality, of course - but for the purposes of this submission.) Inasmuch as the concept has, in fact, been "fitted" to the visual layout - it will not, to any consequential extent, affect it. On the contrary, as if by pre-arrangement, the overall physical structure is not only supportive of the proposed concept - properly realized, the two will seem to have been simultaneously conceived.

PART ONE is the entire "cluster-compound" comprising nine separate Pavilions. Practically speaking, and the concept has taken it into account - the guests cannot be presented with either a pre-determined sequence in which the Pavilions are to be visited or even how many of the nine they are to attend. But here again, as if so conceived, - the proposed layout of THE PROJECT has solved the problem:

The great golden earth-shaped sphere which is the First Pavilion, and which first greets the visitor - becomes, of necessity, the opening door to THE PROJECT:

That First Pavilion ~~(of which ~~more~~ later)~~ is will present:

SPACE →

MANKIND AND ITS PLANET EARTH:

A STORY OF SURVIVAL, TRIUMPH, AND - ?

SPACE →

As indicated in the short opening paragraph of

the script dated Feb. 7, 1978, this First Pavilion does:

"...introduce the concept and meaning of THE PROJECT.

Sitting in the gateway complex, it will be the first thing guests encounter and plays a key role in their visit".

INSERT  
"A" →

The "show" (content<sup>of the Pavilion</sup>) will be divided into two (not three) major segments:

1.) The Descent ... where guests are physically taken back in time. But <sup>again,</sup> the NARRATOR cannot be something called "Universal Man". There is all-too-frequent usage, throughout all nine Pavilions, of utterly meaningless "futuristic" catch phrases such as this - permissible, perhaps, in a display of Future World Gadgetry - perhaps effective in labeling Amusement Park Attractions or hemorrhoid cures - but confusing and counterproductive to an audience entranced <sup>by</sup> the reality of an audio-animatronic re-creation of a vivid moment in the past history of its own survival. You simply cannot expect audience-affirmation of reality in something called a "unicore".

(to me)

and factually  
true

The VOICE of the NARRATOR, then, who supplies relevant information to the guests in the course of their descent, will be a David Brinkley, Walter Cronkite, Alistair Cooke, etc...a voice or personality, instantly recognizable - and carrying with it, above all, the reassurance of authority and credibility..

At the very end of "the slow, spiral descent...

down through the well of Time...eventually becoming more and more primitive..."-there is HEARD from the NARRATOR:

NARRATOR

"...even what he ate or drank - there was always the first time, for everything - would it poison him, ~~or~~ would he survive? As James the First of England said, once: 'He was a bold man who first swallowed an oyster..'"

The descent has finally come to <sup>its</sup> end - in total darkness. At a moment in time when Man first walked upright upon the earth. Slowly, as the NARRATOR continues, the SCENE of primitive darkness becomes light - and in the heavens, the full galaxy of stars, planets, possible other spatial occupants, and the Moon..

NARRATOR

"But Justice Oliver Wendell Holmes is reported to have ~~said~~ <sup>stated</sup> - and I think we can agree with him: 'It occurs to me that one of the most momentous decisions of all history was the moment when Man decided to walk upon his feet rather than his hands.'.."

And now - the DRAMATIZATION (by the technology of Animatronics or otherwise) of that most "momentous decision" and event, Mankind's first tentative small step

as a Man. In HIS earliest form as recognizably human - He descends, symbolically, from the branches of a tree. For an instant - alert always for the SOUND or SIGHT of imminent danger - he clings to the tree, looking this way and that. His attention is caught by:

A luscious cluster of fruit - hanging, shoulder-high, perhaps six or seven feet away. HE stares at it hungrily with his piercing dark eyes. Motivated by both need and greed, HE holds the trunk of HIS tree with one hand - stretches as far as HE can with the other towards the fruit. HE can't reach it. Instinctively, HE sags to a half-stooping position, one arm extending toward the ground as a steadying device - then unaccountably stops. Slowly, HE resumes HIS erect position. Both hands grasping HIS tree. Once more HE stares toward the wanted fruit. HIS huge jaw sets, HIS eyes narrow, HIS body tenses as if obsessed by an irrevocable command from an unknown source..

First, HE frees one hand - then the other from the security of the tree trunk. HE stands. HE stares at the fruit. HIS huge chest expands and contracts with excitement, anticipation - and fear. Slowly, very slowly, he extends one foot in the direction of the desired fruit - HE wobbles - quickly brings back HIS foot, grabs the tree trunk for support. A beat of indecision. Try again? HE does.

..20

This time, HE extends HIS other - HIS right foot, HE seems to have more control of it...

And ~~and~~<sup>then,</sup>, with Primitive Man FROZEN MIDWAY in the completion of HIS first small step - SUDDEN TOTAL DARKNESS once more.

+ + + + +

Immediately, ~~the attention of our guests is drawn to either~~ a new SETTING, or one giant MONITOR - or separate MONITORS for each guest - or FILM, or an entirely different technology (an area, to repeat, in which I have neither ~~the~~ expertise nor ~~an~~ intention to meddle) - but which, however, reveals:

+ + + + +

THE ACTUALITY: July 20th, 1969. NEIL ARMSTRONG FIRST FROZEN MIDWAY - AND THEN COMPLETING his first step to the surface of The Moon..

NEIL ARMSTRONG  
(saying)

"That's one small step for MAN -"

+ + + + +

(Actually, an audio-animatronic recreation of that historic moment might be most <sup>useful</sup> ~~effective~~ (Armstrong's first step upon the Moon, and his memorable remark - ~~using~~ his own voice, of course). We will utilize it importantly, as you will see: "That's one small step for Man -" being the concept

..21

for the first half of THE PROJECT -

- and "one giant leap for Mankind" conceptualizing the second half of THE PROJECT, which <sup>will</sup> concern itself with THE FUTURE..)

+ + + + +

Armstrong having completed his first step, immediately following, "That's one small step for MAN - " again there is SUDDEN DARKNESS, and our guests are swung back once more to confront:

A LATER, STILL PRIMITIVE SETTING ... our NARRATOR, having already imparted and supported our concept: "Yes, it's been quite a step - that 'first small one' - and completing it <sup>must</sup> must have seemed endless to begin with, during those early millions of years..."

THE SCENE is a lush, tropical savanna, perhaps a brook running through; a grouping of far-less-primitive-perhaps-almost homo sapiens are gathered at a campsite. ONE, seated in the foreground, nearest our guests, rummages among a pile of loose stones scattered about the rock upon which he sits.

NARRATOR

"That just-getting-started species - developed all of the obvious advantages of walking upright - the stronger feet and legs and thighs - strength in the arms

for lifting and carrying - and  
increasingly, his hands could grasp  
and shape and manipulate - "

The ONE seated on the large rock suddenly picks  
"up a water-smoothed stone, and with a few skillful strikes  
transforms it into an implement."

(Note: this material, and the information accompanying  
it, are based upon the findings of Richard E. Leakey. His  
work and writings, together with those of his family, con-  
cerning the Origin and Development of Mankind, are generally  
recognized to be the highest authority and best writing on  
the subject. I urge that every effort be made to secure not  
only the authenticity Leakey would provide - but also the  
wit and quality of his writing - concerning anything and  
everything in the PROJECT that deals with Man's earliest  
existence..)

NARRATOR

"...where, in times gone by, he would  
have had to find tools accidentally shaped  
for him by nature - by now, transforming a  
stone into an implement for slicing flesh  
off a dead animal, or fashioning a ~~stone~~ <sup>stick for</sup>  
digging up roots - by now, this had become  
a deliberate piece of Man's tiny acquired  
technology - "

The homo habilis stands, carries his weapon towards OTHERS in the campsite..

NARRATOR

" - to be making tools of wood and stone - to be living already in organized social groups and to be sharing food with other creatures just like him - surviving in a world world of other shapes and unknown dangers..."

+ + + + +

DARKNESS, again. And then - the guests perhaps begin their:

INSERT A - p. 1...

← space ↓

2.) Ascent...to a time ~~perhaps~~ even later than in the presently contemplated script. (THE MAMMOTH HUNT is, I think, <sup>unimportant</sup> ~~typically~~ <sup>sole</sup> routine material in which the naked technology becomes the focus of audience interest - impressed, ~~perhaps to be sure~~ <sup>perhaps,</sup> by "the natural movements" of the imaginary beasts but ~~with~~ <sup>no more involved</sup> certainly ~~less~~ involvement with reality than ~~is provided~~ by the superbly realized ~~but~~ "bathing elephants" of DISNEYLAND. <sup>and dangerously</sup> ~~And a waste of precious moments that can be filled with the ~~entertainment~~ unique peaks of Man's perils "one small step"~~  
No, whatever the content of this First ~~Exhibition~~ <sup>Pavilions</sup> Pavilion, and all others - the technology must ~~be~~ <sup>serve always</sup> ~~utilized~~ <sup>provide</sup> to ~~provide~~ for your guests a mirror: a reflection of themselves <sup>as they were, thus permitting</sup> providing immediate identification and participation <sup>while</sup> as they retrace ~~the~~ <sup>that</sup> incredible voyage from their origin and roots ~~to~~ <sup>heights</sup> reliving the ~~peaks~~ of their triumphs and ~~the~~ <sup>major</sup> depths of their disasters <sup>with</sup> never a self-generated choice except to go on or go under - live or die - and thus <sup>continue</sup> the never-ending quest of survival.