

Dwight D. Eisenhower Memorial Commission
Meeting -- June 11, 2003 (APPROVED 3/25/04)

Chairman Siciliano called the meeting to order at 4:15 pm, welcoming the Commissioners, staff, and guests.

Commissioner Geduldig moved that the minutes of the September 12, 2002 meeting be approved. Commissioner Harris seconded this motion, which passed unanimously.

Chairman Siciliano reviewed the Commission's work since the last meeting. He noted the completion in December of the Eisenhower Legacy Committee's report, which was sent to the Commission. He observed that the Legacy Report has been well received, and expressed his regret that the Chairman of the Legacy Committee, Prof. Louis Galambos, was unable to attend the Commission's meeting.

The Chairman reviewed the research report prepared by consultants that was sent to the Commission on March 3, 2003, *Options for the Dwight D. Eisenhower Memorial Commission*. Among its other features, this Options Report supplied commentary regarding the scope of the Commission's authority. The Chairman noted the report's observation that the law creating the Commission, Public Law 106-79, gives it advisory power to formulate plans and recommendations to be sent to the President and Congress for further legislative action. The Chairman also noted the statement in the Options Report to the effect that "the legislation stipulates 'design' and 'construction' as corollary issues to the 'nature' and 'location'" of the Eisenhower Memorial. He further noted the report's attention to the issue of funding. Finally, he reviewed the three conceptual memorialization options presented in the report: (1) the option of a purely physical memorial; (2) the option of a purely "living" or programmatic memorial; and (3) the option of a memorial combining the elements of physical and living commemoration.

The Chairman noted that a majority of Commissioners had shown interest in the option of a combined physical and living memorial during the Commission's meeting of September 12, 2002. He further noted that the Options Report had been placed on the Commission's agenda for a meeting in March that was postponed.

Chairman Siciliano then reviewed the proposal of the Eisenhower family for an Eisenhower memorial that would emphasize "living" programs. He reported receiving a few hours earlier an expanded and revised Eisenhower family proposal dated June 11. (A previous Eisenhower family proposal draft with a transmission letter dated June 9 had previously been entered into the Commission meeting agenda.) Chairman Siciliano noted that this latest proposal from the family was now on the meeting agenda.

The Chairman then called the Commission's attention to the text of a draft resolution included in the June 11 meeting materials and delivered to the Commissioners prior to the

meeting. He asked Andrew Demetriou, the attorney who drafted the text *pro bono*, to elucidate its purpose.

Mr. Demetriou explained that the purpose of the draft resolution was to forge a path upon which the work of the Commission could proceed towards the goal of creating a memorial combining the elements of physical and living commemoration. He stated that the text was deliberately framed as a sense of the Commission resolution. He emphasized that the draft resolution should *not* be construed as an endorsement of any particular programmatic element, site, or structure; rather, the draft resolution was intended to achieve the following results: (1) to establish a conceptual link between a permanent memorial edifice and programmatic elements; (2) to recommend an Area I location for the Eisenhower Memorial; (3) to recommend the creation of an Eisenhower Memorial Authority to oversee the creation and continued viability of the Eisenhower Memorial; (4) to recommend suitable appropriations of public funds to create and maintain the Eisenhower Memorial, with proviso for supplementation through private funding.

Chairman Siciliano observed that the Eisenhower Memorial Authority recommended by the draft resolution was comparable in concept to the Eisenhower Institution recommended in the Eisenhower family proposal.

The Chairman then drew the attention of the Commission to his own proposal for an "Eisenhower Memorial to Public Service," along with the tentative concept for a Maryland Avenue site for the Eisenhower Memorial, both of which were included in the June 11 meeting materials previously delivered to the Commissioners. He observed that National Park Service staff regarded the Maryland Avenue site unattractive ["as a mess"] in its existing configuration and that Park Service staff had expressed great interest in plans for developing the site.

Commissioner Geduldig asked Mr. Demetriou whether the proposed Eisenhower Memorial Authority would constitute a central authority to supervise both the physical and living components of the memorial. Mr. Demetriou replied that the Authority was indeed envisioned as a superintendent body that would work to ensure the durability of both memorial components. Commissioner Geduldig followed up by inquiring whether philosophic guidance for memorial activities and programs would emanate from the Authority. Mr. Demetriou replied in the affirmative, explaining that the members of the Eisenhower Memorial Authority, with assistance from staff, would make policy decisions. He added that the existing Eisenhower organizations would be recognized as affiliated with the Authority and would participate in decision-making. Chairman Siciliano observed that this arrangement was comparable to the governance structure of the Woodrow Wilson Center.

The Chairman invited Susan Eisenhower to comment on the latest iteration of the family proposal, observing that the latest document extended and updated the family's earlier 2002 proposal.

Susan Eisenhower affirmed that the most recent submission by the family was not a new proposal. She explained that a new submission had been sent to the Commission on June 9, following a lengthy discussion with her father John Eisenhower on the previous day. She drew the Commission's attention to the comprehensive list of existing Eisenhower organizations in the submission of June 11. She observed that this large universe of Eisenhower organizations would make it difficult to achieve organizational balance and equity. [She said that she considered the idea of an organizational "equality" among the "Eisenhower stakeholders" a "political nightmare."] For this reason, she continued, the Eisenhower family wished to elevate the Eisenhower Institute into a paramount Eisenhower Institution for the purpose of leading and coordinating the other Eisenhower organizations in developing "living memorial" programs, especially programs to train future leaders, and in serving as a channel or portal for funding at the federal level in support of such efforts. She observed that the family was not opposed to the draft resolution and its recommendation of a combination physical and living memorial. She closed by requesting a nine-month planning grant from the Commission for the purpose of developing the family's proposal into a specific business plan. She requested that the Commission defer consideration of an Eisenhower Memorial Authority until the conclusion of the requested nine-month study. She expressed the hope that the Commission would consider the concept of allowing the Eisenhower Institute under her leadership to develop this part of the family's proposal. She observed for the record that she would receive no personal compensation for this effort, adding that her personal interest was to provide the kind of leadership that would ensure the family's continued support for the Eisenhower Memorial.

Chairman Siciliano responded by observing that nothing in Ms Eisenhower's presentation appeared inconsistent with the draft resolution.

Senator Inouye requested an opportunity to make a statement to the Commission. He stated that he had gradually come to some conclusions in regard to the work of the Commission. He observed that while a strong element on the Commission supported the creation of a permanent physical memorial to Eisenhower, another element desired the creation of a living memorial. The Senator stated his belief that if the Commission should choose to favor one approach over the other, the result would be a failure. He acknowledged the existence of many successful living memorials, but stated his preference for an Eisenhower Memorial at which large masses of people could see visually what Eisenhower was all about. He observed that while the Library of Congress was in some respects a great living memorial, he had yet to see school buses or high school students there to learn about American heritage and history. He cited a recent poll suggesting that less than half of American high school students know the historical significance of events on December 7, 1941. He expressed full confidence that if the members of the Commission come together and put both the physical and living approaches together, the Memorial would be successful.

Senator Inouye added that he was interested in the proposed Maryland Avenue site, observing that the adjacent National Air and Space Museum, currently the most popular and best-attended museum on the Mall, would soon be joined by the National Museum of

the American Indian, a museum that would probably surpass the records of the Air and Space Museum in popularity and attendance. He said that building the Eisenhower Memorial across the street from the Air and Space Museum was a natural. He concluded by sharing the following observations: that living memorials by themselves could run into trouble, that the Wilson Center was experiencing problems, and that 99 percent of the American people had probably never heard of it; that physical memorials by themselves were often forgotten and that many of the four hundred statues in the Nation's Capital were generally forgotten; that the Franklin D. Roosevelt Commission had made a mistake by excluding the Roosevelt family from their deliberations until rather late in the process; and that the proposals of Chairman Siciliano and the Eisenhower family should be considered and implemented together rather than one at a time.

Commissioner Geduldig made a motion to consider the draft resolution.

Susan Eisenhower requested the opportunity to respond to Senator Inouye's statement. She stated she did not disagree with the Senator's suggestion of considering the family's proposal and the Chairman's proposal together, but added that the Maryland Avenue site would require a change in traffic patterns that might take many years to approve. She stated the family's concern that consideration of the Maryland Avenue site could take fifteen years, and requested the Commission to consider moving forward in the one area suggested by the Eisenhower family.

Chairman Siciliano replied that the Commission had identified twenty-two possible sites for an Eisenhower Memorial in the District of Columbia and that the Maryland Avenue site was merely one possibility in Area I. He added that the National Park Service is enthusiastic and optimistic in regard to the Maryland Avenue site. The Chairman observed that the draft resolution was primarily a concept resolution, and that it was now necessary in order to give clear direction to the work of the Commission after two years of interrupted deliberations.

Senator Stevens stated he was not certain that the draft resolution effectively commenced the two-prong process for simultaneous development of the proposals under consideration.

Susan Eisenhower stated that although the family has come to support the concept of a physical memorial combined with a living memorial, the question remained as to "which is the tail and which is the dog." She added that the emphasis of the memorial would determine the timing of its implementation. Senator Stevens stated that a part of the Commission's goal should be to assist the Eisenhower family in consolidating the work of the Eisenhower organizations.

Chairman Siciliano replied that the concept of an Eisenhower memorial combining physical and living elements should not be depicted as a dog-and-tail arrangement but rather as an entity with two equal legs moving simultaneously. He added that the draft resolution addresses both concepts with equal concern.

Senator Stevens stated that the draft resolution needed language to specify the goal of centralizing federal funding for the Eisenhower organizations. Chairman Siciliano replied that the draft resolution was conceptual and that specific implementation would follow its adoption.

Commissioner Geduldig addressed the issue of defining a "living memorial," observing that the consolidation and centralization of federal funding for existing Eisenhower organizations appeared to be the Eisenhower family's concept of a living memorial. Susan Eisenhower replied that the family's proposal of a single portal for federal funding for private-sector Eisenhower organizations would not preclude additional fundraising activities by any of the Eisenhower organizations.

Commissioner Harris supported the idea of going forward with the draft resolution, adding that in her opinion it was time to proceed after two years of work. She stated that the details of implementation could be added later.

Chairman Siciliano stated that a two-pronged approach could be feasible, even if one of the approaches should happen to move more quickly than the other, at least for a while; the important thing was that they both move simultaneously.

Senator Stevens stated that the draft resolution, while recommending that Congress proceed in authorizing a physical and living memorial, contains no language regarding the Eisenhower family's desire to centralize federal funding in the name of Eisenhower into one institutional entity. The Senator observed that any land-use issue in the Nation's Capital could easily turn into a protracted fight; in light of this situation, there was no good reason to wait in respect to the wishes of the Eisenhower family. Senator Stevens proposed the addition of language to the draft resolution to address the proposal of the family.

Commissioner Geduldig asked for a clarification as to how the authority of the Dwight D. Eisenhower Memorial Commission would relate to the power of the suggested Eisenhower Memorial Authority. Senator Stevens stated that this matter was not clear, but that the family's approach should be considered without delay, a view supported by Senator Roberts in their discussions.

Commissioner Geduldig observed that the draft resolution was merely the endorsement of a two-prong conceptual approach. He added that the implementing details of both the physical and living components needed further development. Senator Stevens replied that the living memorial approach could be developed without delay, and that an interim study with an interim report by the Eisenhower Institute should be possible.

Representative Thornberry stated that a living memorial to Eisenhower could encompass much more than just the consolidation of existing Eisenhower organizations. Senator Stevens replied that consolidation was far less important than creation of a centralized federal funding channel as the Eisenhower family proposed.

Senator Inouye stated he was not really sure that the Commission could or should advocate the centralization of federal funding for Eisenhower organizations, adding that there might be objections to such an arrangement. Senator Stevens replied that specific funding authorizations could change and that nothing is perpetual. Susan Eisenhower observed that if the creation of a single portal for federal funding should not prove possible, the establishment of a living memorial along the lines that the Eisenhower family suggests would give the Eisenhower Institution moral authority to recommend funding allocations to Congress.

Chairman Siciliano returned to the issue of delay in constructing the physical part of the memorial, observing that eligibility for an Area I location had been received from the Commission of Fine Arts in only one year, without a fight. Senator Stevens replied that the litigious issues were usually elicited by specific details of a particular site, and he referenced the prospective closing of streets as such an issue.

Commissioner Geduldig returned to the definition of a living memorial, and asked the Chairman to clarify the actual content of what the Commission was requested to approve. Chairman Siciliano replied that the intent behind the draft resolution was precisely to avoid definition of a living memorial program at a point in the process when such action could be premature. Susan Eisenhower agreed that the work of defining a living memorial to Eisenhower should remain a work-in-progress. Senator Stevens observed that the living memorial should constitute a magnet for funding.

Commissioner Geduldig asked whether the draft resolution anticipates a gradual transfer of authority from the Eisenhower Memorial Commission to the Eisenhower Authority. Mr. Demetriou replied in the affirmative, adding that the draft resolution was intended to recommend a sequence of events that would vector the work of the Commission in a certain direction.

Commissioner Harris stated that the work of memorialization was an opportunity to focus the attention of Americans on Dwight D. Eisenhower's legacy. She asked whether some or all of the existing Eisenhower organizations would be able to contribute to a public awareness campaign as the work of memorialization went forward. Susan Eisenhower replied in the affirmative, adding that the Eisenhower organizations could also assist with fundraising.

Chairman Siciliano returned to the issue of litigious delays, and observed that if a first-choice location for the Eisenhower Memorial should be challenged, the Commission could recommend a different one.

Representative Thornberry asked whether the term "architecturally significant structures" in the draft resolution implied the creation of an edifice such as a large museum. Mr. Demetriou replied in the negative, explaining that the term was meant to imply that the physical component of the Eisenhower Memorial would not be just a box but rather an entity possessing aesthetic and architectural distinction.

Commissioner Geduldig reminded the Commission that he had made a motion on behalf of the draft resolution. Commissioner Harris seconded the motion. Chairman Siciliano requested the Commission to defer a vote upon the motion until Senator Stevens, who departed temporarily due to legislative business, had returned to the meeting.

Representative Thornberry asked whether the next step in the work of the Commission would be the development of an implementation plan, and the Chairman replied in the affirmative.

Senator Inouye observed that the Dwight D. Eisenhower Memorial Commission would clearly have a limited life span, adding that whenever the preliminary plans had been completed, an operational organization would have to take over the responsibility for the Eisenhower Memorial. Specifically, an entity corresponding to a board of directors would have to be established, and the Eisenhower Memorial Commission could certainly make recommendations for the membership of such a board.

Chairman Siciliano introduced Melynda Clarke of the General Services Administration and invited her to address the Commission in regard to the liaison between GSA and the Commission's consultants. Ms Clarke congratulated the Commission for its progress and reported that she and her colleagues had worked closely with the Chairman and Commission consultants. Ms Clarke added, however, that she and her colleagues at GSA wished to recommend measures to improve the efficiency of the Commission's operations and to remedy a serious deficiency, specifically the Commission's lack of authorization to hire federal staff. This lack of authorization has required the Commission to employ its staff strictly on the basis of contract consultantships. Ms Clarke recommended that the Commission request new legislation to remedy this deficiency.

Susan Eisenhower asked how long the Dwight D. Eisenhower Memorial Commission would remain in existence if Congress should establish an Eisenhower Memorial Authority. Chairman Siciliano replied by agreeing with Senator Inouye that the Commission's life span will be relatively short.

He added, however, that the Commission should have at least one regular federal employee on its staff when the work of implementation begins. Senator Stevens, who had just returned to the meeting, expressed the opinion that the work of the Commission could continue indefinitely without a regular federal employee. Senator Inouye replied that every federal commission on which he had ever served had had federal employees on its staff. Chairman Siciliano observed that the commission working to commemorate the victims of the September 11, 2001 attacks had approximately sixty federal employees on its staff. Senator Inouye asked Ms. Clarke whether a regular federal employee on the staff of the Eisenhower Memorial Commission would need to have specific kinds of authority. Ms. Clarke replied in the affirmative, informing the Commission that the federal employee would have to have authority to obligate funds. Chairman Siciliano pointed out that the financial transactions of the Commission and its staff are currently being handled by consultant Eileen Krichten, a former bank examiner. Ms Clarke stated

that Chairman Siciliano was currently vested with sole financial authority for fund disbursement on behalf of the Commission.

Chairman Siciliano returned to the discussion of the draft resolution, and Senator Stevens inquired about revision of the draft resolution. Susan Eisenhower asked for a clarification of the draft resolution's language concerning the physical component of the memorial: specifically, must the physical component consist of new construction? Or might the physical memorial re-use existing facilities, which might be less expensive? Senator Inouye replied that new construction was often less expensive, due to the cost of rehabilitating older buildings that might be designated for protection as historic landmarks.

Senator Stevens stated that he would vote to approve the draft resolution if the family's concept, along with an authorization to proceed in a preliminary manner, were included in the resolution text. He added that he had Senator Roberts' support in favor of the resolution if it was revised to address the Eisenhower family's proposal. Chairman Siciliano replied that he would support a revision of the draft resolution's wording, observing that Senator Stevens appeared to be voting "aye" on the resolution, on condition of a modification of its text. Senator Stevens replied that the Chairman was correct in this matter. The Chairman called for a vote on the draft resolution, with provision for its revision, and the resolution passed unanimously, with eight votes in favor and none opposed. The following Commissioners voted in favor of the resolution: Chairman Siciliano, Senator Inouye, Senator Stevens, Senator Reed (proxy by Senator Inouye), Senator Roberts (proxy by Senator Stevens), Rep. Thornberry, Mr. Geduldig, Ms Harris.

Susan Eisenhower inquired about a timeline for activity pursuant to the resolution. Senator Inouye replied that a timeline could be determined by Congress, and that the Senate Appropriations Committee could take the Commission's resolution as a signal to consider legislation. Rep. Thornberry inquired about the possibility of Commission consultants providing a suggested implementation timeline for both the physical and living components of the Eisenhower Memorial. Chairman Siciliano replied that the Commission staff would work on such suggested timelines. Senator Inouye observed that the Commission's work was proceeding quite rapidly in light of the fact that the Franklin D. Roosevelt Memorial took thirty years to develop and the Museum of the American Indian took ten years to build. He noted that the process of architect selection for the latter museum took four years.

Susan Eisenhower observed that it seemed unclear as to who would have the authority to lead discussions among the Eisenhower organizations. Chairman Siciliano replied that he had no wish to undertake such a role. Senator Inouye observed that the reality of the matter was that the Commission had selected Susan Eisenhower for this role, and that this was the reason for her presence as a member of the Commission. Chairman Siciliano stated for the record that Susan Eisenhower is *not* a member of the Commission, whereas her brother, David Eisenhower, *is* a member. Senator Inouye asked that the record be

corrected to state that he regarded Susan Eisenhower as a spokesperson on this occasion for David Eisenhower.

Commissioner Harris inquired about the possibility of a September meeting of the Commission. Chairman Siciliano replied that such a meeting might be feasible,

The meeting as adjourned at 6:30 pm.

(Minutes approved March 25, 2004)