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CHAIRMAN MARKS: Good morning, calling this October 14, 2014, meeting of the Citizen’s Coinage Advisory Committee to order. Before we get into our agenda, I want to welcome the folks who are joining us today for our meeting.

We have in the room today as program liaisons for the portfolios that we will be reviewing today: Mr. Brian Anderson, who is a Sergeant-at-Arms with the Doolittle Tokyo Raiders; Dr. Greg Wagner, who is a board member of the American Fighter Aces Association; and later on we’ll have Mr. Sam Rodriguez, a liaison to the 65th Infantry Regiment Borinqueneers Congressional Gold Medal; and we have Bill McAllister here, with Coin World.

And before I go on, I just want to ask if we have journalists on the phone today? If you are out there, could you identify
yourself, please?

MS. BRADLEY: Hello, Debbie Bradley from Numismatic News.

CHAIRMAN MARKS: Good morning.

MR. GUNther: Mike Gunther from Coin News.

CHAIRMAN MARKS: Okay, well, good morning to both of you.

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN MARKS: So with that I think we’re going to get into our agenda. First item on the agenda is our discussion and approval of the letter and minutes from our September 23rd and 24th meetings. You all received the minutes and the letters in advance of the meeting, are there any comments on those documents?

Hearing none, I would entertain a motion to approve both?

MR. JANSEN: So moved.

CHAIRMAN MARKS: Is there a second?

MR. HOGE: Second.
CHAIRMAN MARKS: It’s been moved and seconded to approve the minutes and the letters associated with the September 23rd and 24th, 2014, meeting. All those in favor, please say “aye?”

(Ayes.)

CHAIRMAN MARKS: Opposed?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN MARKS: Motion carries unanimously, thank you.

Before we get into our program reviews I just wanted to offer a word about our process, for those who might not be familiar with it, particularly to our liaisons in the room. I did mention some of this prior, but on the record, I'd like to just go over the process.

Basically, what you’ll hear today is a fairly thorough review of the designs that we’ve been provided in both of the visual portfolios that are on the agenda today. We’ll start off with a program report from
April Stafford, with the United States Mint. She’ll give us the overview of the programs and provide to us an initial introduction to each of the designs.

At that point, April will introduce the appropriate program liaison, that individual will have an opportunity to introduce themselves, talk a little bit about their organization and if you have some thoughts or recommendations about the designs themselves, we would certainly be very interested in hearing what those might be.

Once those remarks are concluded, then the meeting will shift into the deliberations of the Committee. Under that heading, we will initially seek any technical questions, so if members have questions about the nature of the designs or how something might be produced, or what have you--rather than any commentary on the designs, anything outside of a commentary, we’ll handle those questions up front so we can get those out of the way.
At that point we’ll shift into the comments of each member. Each member will have a chance to offer their thoughts and insights about the designs in the portfolio. Once we’ve concluded with that I will recognize the liaisons for some final remarks. So, in the course of the deliberations, if the liaisons hear anything that they think they might want to follow up on, I’d ask you to make notes to yourself, save that for the second recognition that I’ll give to you towards the end of our review.

Once you’ve concluded with that, members will deal with any final issues, react to anything that you may have offered on your second go-around and then we’ll go through our balloting process.

So that’s the basic overview. You’ll also hear some passionate discussion. We here on the Committee are very passionate, we tend to speak our mind in a very frank way, so don’t be startled by any of that. Please
count it up for a positive in the passion that we bring to this.

There will be friendly disagreement, I think. Inevitably there is on the Committee, but don’t misinterpret that as something that’s gone wrong with our deliberations. We actually like to have the give and take and challenge each other. So with that, I’d like to get going on our first item for review today and that is the review and discussion of our candidate designs for the Doolittle Tokyo Raiders Congressional Gold Medal.

At this time I’d like to recognize April Stafford for her report, April?

MS. STAFFORD: Thank you. Public Law 113-106 authorizes a collective Congressional gold medal to the World War II members of the Doolittle Tokyo Raiders for outstanding heroism, valor, skill, and service to the United States in conducting the bombings of Tokyo.

As described in the findings of the
legislation, the raid of April 18, 1942, was the first strike by the United States against Japan during World War II, and the first joint mission by members of the United States Army Air Corps and Navy. The 80 men who volunteered for this mission came from the 17th Bombardment Group. Led by Lieutenant Colonel James Doolittle, they became known as the Doolittle Tokyo Raiders.

The Raiders launched from the USS Hornet and flew in 16 B-25 aircrafts towards Japan. They were 170 miles further away than their planned launch, but accepted the risk that their aircraft may not have enough fuel to reach the designated airfields in China. Because of that deliberate choice, none of the 16 airplanes reached the prearranged Chinese airfields. Of the 80 Doolittle Tokyo Raiders who launched on the raid, 8 were captured, 2 died in a crash, and 70 returned to the United States.

Of the eight captured, three were
executed and one died of disease. We’re fortunate to have with us today Mr. Brian Anderson, Sergeant-at-Arms for the Doolittle Tokyo Raiders Association. After we go through all of the obverse and reverse designs, Mr. Anderson, I’ll ask you if you could make a few comments to the Committee.

MR. ANDERSON: I’d be happy to.

MS. STAFFORD: We have 15 obverse designs for consideration today. Obverses 1, 1A, 2, 3, 4, and 5 depict the North American B-25B Mitchell launching off the USS Hornet on April 18, 1942. The 16 stars represent the 16 flight crews that made up the Doolittle Raiders. Inscriptions are: Doolittle Tokyo Raiders, First Strike Back, and April 18, 1942.

So here we have Obverse 1, 1A, 2, 3—and I’ll stress that this is our liaison’s preferred obverse design—Obverse 4 and 5. Obverse 6 depicts a seahorse, eagle, and 16 stars. The seahorse represents the USS Hornet
and is symbolic of knowledge, strength, and being the ruler of the sea. The eagle represents the B-25 Mitchell and is a symbol for ruler of the sky. Lightning bolts are included to symbolize the 17th Bombardment Group’s ability to strike fast and with precision. The 16 stars represent the 16 flight crews that took part in this combat mission. Inscriptions include: Doolittle Tokyo Raiders and First Strike Back.

Obverse 7 portrays a B-25B Mitchell launching from the deck of the USS Hornet as a signal officer gives the all clear for takeoff. A partial view of the USS Hornet is seen in the background. Inscriptions are: Doolittle Tokyo Raiders, First Strike Back, and April 18, 1942.

Obverse 8 depicts three B-25B Mitchells in formation after takeoff from the deck of the USS Hornet. A pilot looks to the west towards the target in anticipation of what he will encounter. One B-25B Mitchell is
shown close up as it begins its journey.
Inscriptions are: Doolittle Tokyo Raiders and First Strike Back.

Obverses 9 and 10 depict a B-25B Mitchell just as it launches from the flight deck of the USS Hornet. Inscriptions are: Doolittle Tokyo Raiders along the upper rim, with 16 stars below, and First Strike Back. Here we have Obverse 9 and 10.

Obverses 11 and 12--design 11 depicts a B-25B Mitchell flying along the coast over Yokosuka, Japan, while design 12 depicts the aircraft as it takes off the deck of the USS Hornet. Inscriptions are: Doolittle Tokyo Raiders, First Strike Back, and April 18, 1942. This is Obverse 11 and 12.

Obverses 13 and 14 depict the B-25B Mitchell recently launched from the platform of the USS Hornet. Design 14 includes a generic raider to represent the airmen included in this mission. Both designs feature 16 stars to represent the flight crews.
who participated in this mission. Inscriptions are: Doolittle Tokyo Raiders and First Strike Back. This is Obverse 13 and 14.

That concludes the obverse designs.

We have nine reverse designs for consideration. Reverse 1 depicts the arrival of aircrafts at their target. Two of the 16 B-25B Mitchells release their bombs, 16 stars are used to represent the flight crew participating in this mission. Inscriptions include: The Doolittle Raider’s motto, “Toujours au Danger,” which translates into “Always into Danger,” as well as 17th Bombardment Group and Act of Congress 2014.


Reverses 3, 4, 5, and 6 depict B-25B Mitchell aircrafts flying or launching from the USS Hornet, as well as the four patches
representing the four squadrons, including the 34th, the 37th, the 89th, and the 95th, which make up the 17th Bombardment Group. Design 5 includes a wreath of laurel and design 6 includes 16 stars. Inscriptions are: 17th Bombardment Group, “Toujours au Danger,” and Act of Congress 2014. Here we have Reverse 3, Reverse 4--this is our liaison’s preferred reverse, Reverse 5, and 6.

Reverse 7 depicts a thunderbird, lion, winged helmet, and mule, which represent the four squadrons within the 17th Bombardment Group. Inscriptions include: “Toujours au Danger” and Act of Congress 2014.

Reverse 8 portrays a bird’s-eye view of the 17th Bombardment Group as it nears the target. A graphic representation of the island Honshu is depicted below. Inscribed along the border are the four squadrons that make up the 17th Bombardment Group. Additional inscriptions are: 17th Bombardment Group and Act of Congress 2014.
Reverse 9 depicts the Army Air Corps star which appears on the B-25s and the tail numbers of the 16 aircrafts arranged in the order they left the deck of the USS Hornet. Inscriptions are: “Toujours au Danger” and April 18, 1942.

That concludes the obverse and reverse designs. Now I’d like to ask Mr. Anderson if you could please address the Committee.

MR. ANDERSON: Okay. Can you guys all hear me okay? First off, I want to thank you for the opportunity--

CHAIRMAN MARKS: I want to make sure that the transcriber is picking you up.

REPORTER: I’ve got it. He’s perfect right where he was.

MS. STAFFORD: You’re good here.

MR. ANDERSON: I’ve never been accused of being soft. First off, I’d like to thank you all for the opportunity to be here today. The U.S. Mint, the Citizen’s Coinage Committee, this is a big honor for me. It’s
something that was started a long time ago and I’ve admired your work. I’ve got a couple of the gold medals from some previous groups that you’ve all done and I can’t think of a better way to honor these heroes that we call The Doolittle Tokyo Raiders.

The work here is wonderful. I want to thank the artists, too, and April and Betty have been wonderful to work with so I want to give them a nod, also. Betty has kept me in the loop and on the straight and narrow, so thank you.

In doing this I felt honored that I was the liaison to work with you all. I only have four Raiders left, and of the four, three of them are kind of involved in this process. One of them, Dick Cole--Colonel Cole--knows what the designs we were looking at.

We have Dick Cole, who was Doolittle’s co-pilot on Aircraft Number 1. We have Dave Thatcher. If you’ve seen the movie 30 Seconds Over Tokyo, Dave was the flight engineer.
He’s still with us; he received the Silver Star for his action that day. I have Ed Sailor, who was on Crew 15. And what a lot of folks don’t know—a little history here—is they had to take one of his engines off the aircraft, go down in the hangar deck and work on it, and this was an aircraft carrier that had never had these airplanes on it before, they did not have the equipment or the tools to pull this engine off, especially on a pitching sea, but they did it.

They made the correction to the engine, put it back on, obviously no flight test, they did a couple run-ups on it, but the aircraft took off, so we had the 16 aircraft that morning.

And then Bobby Hite is still with us. Bobby was on Crew 16, he was one of the eight POWs and Bobby is still with us, but he’s suffering from Alzheimer’s and dementia, but he’s still here with us. Anyhow, those are the four Raiders that I have.
Dick Cole just turned 99, people, and he is the Eveready Bunny. He’s still out there doing appearances and honoring the Raiders for their missions. So, again, it’s honor and a privilege and I thank you all.

As April said, my preference--the Group’s preference--is, on the front side, number 3. The artist here, he hit the nail on the head--or she hit the nail on the head. If you are familiar with the raid, it was a choppy morning when they took off. You can see the waves breaking on the bough of the carrier and one of the carrier crew members who has passed away since, he says, “My nickname is Bear.” He says, “Bear, remember, we got them there.”

So we wanted to have a decent depiction of the aircraft carrier, the USS Hornet CV-8, because they were the ones that got the guys to that point and the crew members on the Hornet, they were not very happy when they found themselves taxiing--
being transport for some bombers—until they got out to sea and found out what the mission was and then they were quite happy to have been the taxi to help them out. But this was a brand new carrier and they hadn’t been to war yet, they were anxious to get into the fight and this was their first official foray into it.

One of the sailors, when the guys were told man your aircraft; one of the Raiders threw him his service cap and says, here, I don’t need this anymore. And when the Hornet sunk in October of ’42, he told us, he said, you know, I lost $600 in my key locker that day, but I lost that Raider cap. He says, I wish I still had that Raider cap.

So the Hornet guys were very much involved in this and we wanted to honor them by having a decent drawing of the aircraft there.

First Strike, this was the first strike on the Japanese homeland and, again,
going back to history—if you know the Battle of Midway—we won that battle a month and a half later. Because of this raid, the Japanese military decided to keep assets back and not send them to Midway, so we—instead of having six carriers to deal with, we only had four.

So this mission changed the course of history in the Pacific, so I think the artist covered it beautifully here. April 18th is that date, and you all have done medals for the Tuskegee Airmen and the Wasp and the 442 Nisei, and those were groups that did multiple things in their career.

When you talk about the Doolittle Tokyo Raiders, you’re talking about this one single event that was dramatic. It boosted the morale of us after Pearl Harbor, it got us some traction going, it made the Japanese change their thinking and, like I say, this action did change the course of the war and that’s what you think of.
If you look at history books, movies, newsreels, you see the aircraft taking off from the Hornet on that morning. Again, on the reverse side, I wanted to incorporate Number 4; I wanted to incorporate the squadron patches. You all did that on the 442 Nisei, you had their unit patches on the backside. I thought it would be good to--it’s the 17th Bombardment Group and this depicts the squadron patches. “Always in Danger” is the Latin there.

I know it’s got airplanes on both sides, ladies and gentlemen, but, again, when you think of the Doolittle Tokyo Raider mission, you think about the B-25s taking off from an aircraft carrier which had never been done under combat conditions. This was the longest B-25 mission flown during the war and, again, as April said, they had to leave early. They didn’t have the gas to get to where they had to go. Had it not been for the Hand of Providence, they had a storm over the South
China Sea and instead of having a headwind that night, they had a tailwind, and that’s what got them over the mountains in China.

All the Raiders—we lost three the night of the raid, 22 Raiders stayed in theater, the rest of them came back to the States, and during the course of the war, 19 other Raiders lost their lives during the war. So, again, this is a pretty historic event and that’s why we were looking at this.

Again, I’m not trying to downplay any other artwork here, but I think the people, actually, they hit the nail on the head here. So that’s our—what we want to do and I’m honored and privileged to be here with you all and I’m honored to represent the Raiders in this endeavor.

They’re going to be gone shortly, we’re going to be gone shortly, and the Doolittle Tokyo Raiders will forever have this gold medal that you all have come to pass here to do it and that will be here for anybody who
wants to study gold medals, who the groups were, and I’m hoping that this will help get kids interested in our history because, again, I eat, sleep, and drink this. I’ve been doing this World War II stuff for the last 30, 35 years and my buddy Greg here--I belong to the Aces, so this all ties in.

This is all good stuff, but people forget history. And when the wife and I visited up on Capitol Hill to all the different offices that we went to, you got that deer in the headlight look. Who are these people? What did they do?

So I want to have a gold medal that makes that mission, as to what they did in the aircraft they flew, and I’m hoping--I think you all know the medal will reside in Dayton, Ohio, at the Air Force Museum, which is where I wanted to have it go. They’ve got a wonderful display there. The museum’s been friends to us--and I don’t know if any of you guys have ever been to a Raider reunion, but
in 2010 and 2012 we had 20 B-25s at the reunion there in Dayton, Ohio.

And I’m hoping that when you put that medal in my hand, people, that I can deliver it to Dayton aboard a B-25.

So, again, that’s my spiel, and I do appreciate your time, folks.

MS. STAFFORD: Thank you. Thank you very much. Mr. Chairman?

CHAIRMAN MARKS: Thank you, Mr. Anderson. Okay, at this point before we get into our technical questions, I’d like to go through our process of culling— that’s C-U-L-L-I-N-G, not calling. It’s a process our Committee uses to reserve the time that we have here today to focus on those designs that we feel are most appropriate for this program. So I’m going to ask that we put each of these designs up on the screen, I’ll have them here at my place at the table, and as we go through each one I’ll ask for an indication from the Committee that they’d like to either review or
not.

MR. URAM: Point of information, here.

CHAIRMAN MARKS: Yes, Tom?

MR. URAM: Has the CFA seen these designs yet?

CHAIRMAN MARKS: No, CFA has not seen these designs.

MR. URAM: Okay.

CHAIRMAN MARKS: So, with that—and by the way, just for those who are listening in or here in the room, an indication by a single member that they’d like to review a design is enough to keep it in the hunt, as it were. So with that we’ll go to the obverses. First, Obverse Number 1—that’s the reverse there, can we bring up the obverses?

MR. URAM: Yes.

CHAIRMAN MARKS: Okay, thank you very much. So, members of the Committee, Design Number 1, Obverse 1? Is there interest?

MR. URAM: Yes.

CHAIRMAN MARKS: Okay. Obverse 1A?
MR. URAM: Yes.

CHAIRMAN MARKS: Obverse 2?
(Yeses.)

CHAIRMAN MARKS: Obverse 3?
(Yeses.)

CHAIRMAN MARKS: Is there interest in Number 4?
(Yeses.)

CHAIRMAN MARKS: Is there interest in Number 5?
(No response.)

CHAIRMAN MARKS: Setting Number 5 aside, Number 6? I’ll say yes. Number 7, interest in 7?
(No response.)

CHAIRMAN MARKS: Setting 7 aside, Number 8?
(No response.)

CHAIRMAN MARKS: Setting that one aside, as well. Number 9?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yes.

CHAIRMAN MARKS: Yes? Number 10?
(No response.)

CHAIRMAN MARKS: Setting 10 aside.

Number 11?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN MARKS: Setting that aside.

Number 12?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN MARKS: Passing on 12.

Number 13?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN MARKS: Passing on 13.

Number 14?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yes.

CHAIRMAN MARKS: Yes. Okay, so to review what we have for our focus today, and I’ll ask the members to focus their comments on these. If you have technical questions, they should go with these and not ones that we’ve set aside, for the interest of our time today.

So, we have still to consider today: 1, 1A, 2, 3, 4, 6, 9, and 14, for the obverse
designs. So, now shifting to the reverse designs. Is there interest in Design Number 1?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN MARKS: Setting Number 1 aside. Number 2?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN MARKS: Setting that one aside, as well. Number 3?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yes.

CHAIRMAN MARKS: Yes, on 3. Number 4?

(Yeses.)

CHAIRMAN MARKS: Number 5?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN MARKS: Setting Number 5 aside. Number 6?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yes.

CHAIRMAN MARKS: Yes? Number 7?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN MARKS: Setting that one aside. Number 8?

(Yeses.)
CHAIRMAN MARKS: Number 9?
(No response.)
CHAIRMAN MARKS: Setting Number 9 aside. So, for the record, on the reverses we are going to further consider Number 3, 4, 6, and 8. And I’ll ask the members again to focus your comments for the remainder of our deliberations on those designs.

So, with that I’ll ask the members if they have any technical questions about these designs or general program questions, if you would please ask those now? Are there any questions? Erik?

MR. JANSEN: We get into this every time, but because this is a medal and I think the options for various shading and treatments on the medals are maybe limited, or not. We’ve got a lot of shading on these designs and I would love to have the sculptors of the Mint comment on how they would embrace the shading, in terms of texturing or whatever on so many of these designs.
MR. EVERHART: Do you want me to answer that?

MR. JANSEN: Please.

CHAIRMAN MARKS: Yes, please.

MR. EVERHART: Well, I think for the most part the shading is just to indicate form, where there’s a background, like in Number 4 obverse where the Hornet is in silhouette, then that would be a textured background, but just to describe form I would not texture it because it will be described enough in the three dimensional shape.

MR. JANSEN: So in general we’re not dealing with--our technical representative, Steve Antonucci’s not here today, but in general we’re not going to be doing a lot of texturing here?

MR. EVERHART: Well, it’s going to depend on which one you pick, I’m sure, but I would just utilize the shading to define the form on the planes themselves. And if there’s any background, like on Number 9 that has--it
looks like there’s a textured field--

MR. JANSEN:  Yep.

MR. EVERHART:  --then we would apply it there.

CHAIRMAN MARKS:  Anything else, Erik?

MR. JANSEN:  Nope, thank you.

CHAIRMAN MARKS:  Are there other questions?  No other questions, okay, with that then we’ll shift into our comment phase. I’m going to start off on this one.

First of all, I want to say once again I’m amazed to find myself here, playing this role where each of us, we get to now be, in a very small way, a part of the history of the Doolittle Tokyo Raiders. We get to play a part in the American Aces and to me that’s just amazing and it’s an honor for me and I just want to have that on the record that I personally, and my committee, can participate in something that I think is so important and brings honor to some great Americans who I think are very much worthy of the honor of a
Congressional Gold Medal.

So, with that I also want to compliment our artist for another great portfolio. I think there’s some fabulous work here for us to look at today.

I’m excited about that and in this collection that we’ve been given there’s a mixture of both images that tend towards realistic portrayals of the subject matter. And then there are some others that are a little more abstract and I want to address that because I think what often is the case when we look at Congressional Gold Medals and we have organizations like those that the gentlemen in the room represent today, there is a tendency for those involved to naturally gravitate towards those images that tend more towards the realism.

And I think that there needs to be a balance between the realism--because you want enough information that people really understand what is being honored here, but you
also want to pay attention to the art and that’s very important. I think sometimes we lose track of the art and, in fact, this Committee has spent years now asking the Mint and its artists to give us more art and perhaps offerings that are less literal, and sometimes more abstract. And art in a way that calls on our better nature and pulls on those heartstrings sometimes to invoke those ideas about what it is that we’re honoring.

So with that, let’s talk about the people we’re honoring here. These were men who were virile men, they were strong, they were courageous, they were bold, and they were daring. So today it’s my hope that we don’t pick designs that don’t measure up to that; that they can’t be just blasé and they can’t be things that tend towards clip art; that we just put on a series of images just so we make sure we recognize every single little element that might be a part of the history.

At the end of the day, when we look at
the history of medals, and those that endure in the consciousness opposed to those that get set aside in the also-rans of history. Those that endure and are great and are recognized later and, therefore, call attention to that that is being honored much later in history because it’s the art that makes it beautiful, that makes it compelling, and makes people want to latch onto it. And when we do that, we continue to honor those men and women or whoever it is that we’re trying to recognize through the medal.

Yesterday I took a little trip over to the Smithsonian Museum of American Art. I made my way up to the top floor; some of you know what I’m going to go towards here. There’s a series of drawers at one corner of the top level and it’s filled with medallions, American medals. And as I looked through each of those cases and the ones displayed behind the glass, many of those were there because of their art. They weren’t there because they
had a storyline or some kind of a clip art-ish depiction. It was the art that had made them endure.

So when we think about great medals, you think about the European sculptors of bygone days, Karl Goetz, Pierre Morlon, Pierre Turin in France—if you know those pieces, you know that those are the ones that gravitate towards the art. And they’re great and they continue to be great and they endure because of the art.

So I’m going through all of this today because I want to appeal to my members on the Committee that we were not created to simply recommend designs that are strictly in the realm of the realistic. That Congress created us because they wanted to make sure there was quality in the products of the U.S. Mint, and the designs of that were put on the coins and medals of this nation. And each of you were put here because you have an expertise of some variety that makes you important to this
process. So I wanted to go first today because I wanted to give this discussion to you about how important it is that we don’t just simply go to that that it is real. That we seek a balance.

And so, with that I want to address the designs that we indicated we wanted to focus on. I think that 1, 1A, 2, 3, 4 are all fine designs. I think that Number 2, if we can throw that one up, that’s a very interesting design—

MS. LANNIN: No, I liked Number 2, Gary.

CHAIRMAN MARKS: Excuse me? Okay, Mary, I think I heard you?

MS. WASTWEET: I think she thought you said “throw out.”

CHAIRMAN MARKS: No, no, I didn’t say throw out, I was just going to make some comments on that, Mary. Are you hearing me, Mary? Okay, we’ll go on.

Anyway, I’m not sure this one really—
the way the ship is in the water and all, I’m not convinced that that’s a good portrayal, but anyway, what I want to focus on and I was the only voice that spoke up on this one. If we could go to Number 6?

That is a piece of art and it addresses symbolically, it addresses the pilots and the aircraft with the eagle, and it addresses the aircraft carrier and her crew with the seahorse, and those lightning bolts, those are symbolic of the strike. It was lightning fast, it was unexpected, and yet it’s art.

And so, I think if we were to pick something like this, it would be very important that we also pick a reverse that tells the story and that’s where I get at with the balance. But if we were to pick something like this and it were to become the medal, I truly believe that decades later this is one that’s going to be a standout. This is going to be one that people talk about, that it was
artistic, it was beautiful, and years later people are going to turn to this one and when they do there are going to be questions raised about, well, who were these men? Who were the people behind this piece of art?

There are plenty of medals out there that are informational in nature and I don’t believe that they’re going to get much recognition. After the initial ceremony, those who are involved in it buy their copy, a few of us who collect these, buy them--when you go on the aftermarket, you can’t find most of the medals in the bronze fashion that are for sale.

You can’t find many of those in the aftermarket. The ones you do find are the ones that are artistic and beautiful and you can find those out there because there are more of them made because there was more interest at the time that it was produced, because of the art.

So, with that, I want to look at the
reverse. I think that Number 4—if we could bring up Reverse Number 4, which I believe is the one that Mr. Anderson addressed. I think this is a great way to balance out this medal because it shows the aircrafts.

I guess I wanted to make sure that—maybe this should have been a technical question, but at some point I want to make sure that the aircraft are correct, as far as the type—there’s different variations of this aircraft and I want to make sure that’s the right one. But we have, up towards the top, we’ve got a map of the Japanese islands, which was the target, of course, Tokyo.

The aircraft in the sky, in their mission, you have recognition to each of the units that was involved, and it’s over the top, 17th Bombardment Group, and then the slogan in the middle. A tremendous slogan, put it right there in the middle of the reverse. Pair that with that more artistic obverse and I think you’d have a beautiful
Congressional gold medal that tells the story and has the gravitas to be important in the future, when others will be set aside.

And I would hate to have this happen to this medal. It’s an important one; it honors important people who literally turned the tide in the Japanese theater in World War II.

So with that—and many of the remarks I made here also apply to the Aces, and when we can talk about those later. I think we need to find balance with that, too. So, with that I want to recognize Heidi for her comments, and thank you for listening to me.

MS. WASTWEE: Thank you, Gary. I appreciate your comments about the art and I do like Design Number 6. I appreciate the effort that the artist made to represent this in an artistic way. It’s not my favorite design in the group, but I do like it.

The design that I was drawn to is Design Number 2, actually. And to tell you
why, I want to look at Design Number 3 first. There’s nothing wrong with this design, but the word that comes to mind here is “expected.” This is the kind of thing that we expect to see. And, frankly, on this Committee we see a lot of military subjects. There are a lot of military medals and coins and this looks like a lot of the other coins that we’ve done.

It’s a good design, but it’s not a standout. I want to look at the point of the viewer here. We are seeing these two crafts from a safe place, the ship’s in front of us, the plane is going overhead, off to do its duty, we’re sitting in a very safe place.

But if we look at Design Number 2, we’re the target and that shows to me the force. This is a very powerful, forceful design. It’s coming right at me, I’m the enemy and I’m scared. Oh, no, they’re coming after me. It’s a powerful, forceful thing. And I feel the fear of having that force
coming at me.

And artistically it’s a unique perspective and the way that it’s organized, the transition of the planes from smaller to larger, the way it comes in a very pleasing composition on the piece is very artistic. I think the waves coming up against the bow create a nice pattern. And I’m also looking at how these pair up, so I was drawn to this as a pair with Reverse 8.

Thank you, so with Obverse 2 we have the planes coming at us, we feel the force of them coming forward at us. But in Design 8 now we see a different point of view, also the planes are arranged in a harmonious--in a pattern which is artistically pleasing, but now we’re looking down at them, so we are one of them. So we feel both perspectives of the planes coming at us, as if we were the enemy, and what that must have felt like to have that force coming at us, and now we’re part of the team. We feel what it’s like to be in the
pilot’s seat looking down on our fellow pilots. And the outline of the target down on the map also connects us with what’s going on, on the ground.

So we have three points. We feel what it’s like coming at us, we feel like what it’s like being part of the team, and we can connect with what’s going on, on the ground. So I think that’s a lot of storytelling going on in a simple, organized way, an artistic way. And then along the rim we have in an organized fashion and calling out the different groups that were involved.

So we have the information there, but it’s not interfering with the design, it’s not crowding the design. Reverse 4 is similar in that we are also looking down on the planes and down on the ground. I don’t connect so much with the ground because I don’t see the target. And I do feel the patches crowd the design. The patches have been used elsewhere, so I feel it’s a little repetitive. And like
Gary said, in a future context it’s not as clean and powerful and it doesn’t attract me so much to say what’s going on here. So while this is a fine design, there’s nothing wrong with it. I feel that Design 8 is cleaner and more powerful and does better at the storytelling.

CHAIRMAN MARKS: Are you done?

MS. WASTWEEN: That’s it.

CHAIRMAN MARKS: Okay, Tom?

MR. URAM: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. And also, Brian, I appreciate the comments here. Before I get started I wanted to read something that I picked up. It goes like this, and if you’d indulge me on this for a minute? Just a couple of lines here.

“So we’ve got to reach history based on not what’s in fashion, but what’s important. Why the pilgrims came here. Who Jimmy Doolittle was and what the 30 seconds over Tokyo meant. You know, 4 years ago on the 40th anniversary of D-Day, I read a letter
from a young woman writing to her late father, who fought on Omaha Beach. Her name was Lisa Zanatta Henn and she said: ‘We will always remember, we will never forget what the boys of Normandy did.’

“Well, let us help keep her word. If we forget what we did here, we won’t know who we are. I’m warning of the eradication of the American memory that could result ultimately in an erosion of the American spirit. Let’s start with some basic, more attention to American history.”

If anyone remembers it, that was President Reagan’s farewell speech in 1988, and it hits exactly what you’re saying when you said you saw the deer in the headlight, when you saw that. So what the United States Mint does is basically--and what we do as a Committee, as the Chairman mentioned, is we preserve history. It’s what we do through art and so as I look at the designs for this and as we look at preserving the history, and
never forgetting, and remembering what we’re about.

And it was kind of interesting because in that talk he only mentioned, basically, two or three people, and it was the pilgrims, Jim Doolittle, and the father of that daughter. So I’d like to look at Number 2, 3, and 6 on the obverse. And, as Heidi mentioned, it is great that this is all coming at you. And it’s kind of a retro look at what happened and so forth. You do get the emotion and the feeling about it and I think it’s a great example, as well.

And Number 3, the choice of the Committee, I think it’s a very traditional approach and many times I’m pretty much traditional in the history--

(Interruption on phone.)

MR. URAM: And thank you for listening.

(Laughter.)

MR. URAM: And so the Design 3 here,
chosen by the Committee, is a traditional approach and so forth, but also looking at Number 6, I think that there’s something to be said for the futuristic design and what I mentioned in those opening remarks there is the preserving of history and the remembering of history.

And this is, in a way, a little bit allegorical, as well, but there’s a lot to this and what’s happening. And I think that if we did do Design Number 3, with some of the designs on the obverse, I am concerned that we have just too much going on. Too many planes, too much repetitiveness and I do like to see--as much as sometimes I get criticized as a result of the 9/11 medals of them being wordy on the back, but they are totally different.

So in this scenario, as well, I think that having option Number 6 as a obverse, coupling it with either the reverse of Number 4 or Number 8, of which I looked at. Looking at Reverse 4, I think that--will these planes
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be a little bit more three dimensional, Dawn, or is it going to look like they’re just flat on the medal there?

MR. EVERHART: No, it will be raised.

MR. URAM: They’d be raised?

MR. EVERHART: Sure, yeah. They wouldn’t be like--

MR. URAM: You wouldn’t want that front one; you’d want to see them up and so forth.

MR. EVERHART: Oh, absolutely.

MR. URAM: Yeah, okay. So I think that I tend to lean, if we don’t do the carrier and the plane on the obverse, then I think this is where it goes, with the patches.

And the other one I looked at was Number 8 on the reverse. Once again I think that will be a nice perspective, as well, from the air. I like both of those reverses and, once again, I think that coupling them properly is really the key, that’s why I’m probably going to lean more towards Number 6
over Number 3, although the design was really nice and I appreciate, Brian, the Committee’s liking it. I like it, too, but I think when you put it together in the medal you have to look at the pairings and I tend to lean more towards Number 6 with either a Reverse of 4A. Thank you Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN MARKS: Thank you, Tom.

Before we go any further, we are--so everyone knows--we’re having some trouble with keeping Mary on the line, so if she is on the line presently--

MS. LANNIN: I’m here, just for the moment, though, Gene.

CHAIRMAN MARKS: Okay, Mary, while we have you, why don’t you go ahead and give us your comments?

MS. LANNIN: Okay, thanks so much. I was kind of hoping that that would happen. The second time that I was lost and came back, I joined Heidi--or heard part of what Heidi was saying and it was words out of my own
mouth. My favorite combination is the Obverse of 2 because I look at those three planes coming at me and that giant carrier and all I can think of is, if I were the enemy is, uh-oh.

(Laughter.)

MS. LANNIN: And it is really powerful and direct. It’s coming right at you. And to me the completely logical reverse, again, is what Heidi said. Now we’re in the planes and we’re looking down and we’ve seen our target. And I just think it’s clean, it’s powerful. As much as they want the patches, I also was blocked out of part of another conversation, but I really do like the Reverse Number 8. So I think that that makes a good combination, so I’ll just keep my remarks brief in case I go away again.

CHAIRMAN MARKS: Okay, thank you, Mary. That will go over to Robert.

MR. HOGE: Thank you, Gary. I like the care and skill which so many of these
designs have been prepared. I want to go over the appearance of the Hornet on some of these. It looks sometimes a little bit less realistic than what might be appropriate.

Regarding the Obverse Design Number 6, while I like the idea of including these allegorical elements, I have a little difficulty accepting the combination of the strange looking eagle and the hippocampus, as designating the planes and the aircraft carrier. And I don’t know if this is something that would be well understood ages into the future.

But aside from that, I do like Obverse Number 2 for the power the imagery suggests. Number 3, I think, is probably my favorite in terms of the historical representation of the actual appearance of the aircraft carrier and the plane and the bomber. But when I think in terms of all of these in combining an obverse and a reverse, in looking at the reverses I do favor Reverse 8 for the same reasons which
we’ve already addressed here, but I think that it might be more appropriate to put the motto, the “Toujours au Danger” around the margin, rather than the descriptions, thunderbird, lion, winged helmet, mule. These don’t really explain anything without the appearance of the patches. And I think it’s just a lot of additional lettering and wording that isn’t going to really signify anything. I would much prefer to see that “Always in Danger.”

And perhaps we might even want to bring in “First Strike,” the inscription from the obverse, into a combination here on the reverse, as well. And on the obverse, instead just make sure that we have the date, April 18, 1942, along with Doolittle Tokyo Raiders. This gives some interest in the design.

Well, what happened? Here’s this group and here’s a date, what’s going on? It’s obviously an attack if you look at Obverse Number 2 and on Number 3, as well, and the others. I think they give the idea of the
attack and then the result would be the reverse, the actual bombing. That’s all.

CHAIRMAN MARKS: Okay, thank you, Robert. Any comments? Michael?

MS. LANNIN: Thank you.

MR. MORAN: Thank you, Gary. Overall I respect the attempt of the designers to include both the carrier and the bombers. I think it’s a very difficult situation to do because you have a difference in scale here between the bombers and the aircraft carrier. And to get this, in terms of equal representation on the medal, you run into some difficulties.

Looking first at Number 1 and 1A, you have resorted to a semi-abstract aircraft carrier to get this done. The problem is it’s not abstract enough and it comes across very simplistically like stacked blocks for the superstructure there. Also you have the wrong model of the B-25 there in both of those.

Image 2, this one grows on me. Being
tied to realism, and I can’t divorce myself from that very often, I’m troubled that we don’t see some image of the superstructure there, but where I originally didn’t like this, it has continued to grow on me and it will get some of my votes today. It is powerful seeing the carrier come at you.

I would have preferred the perspective be a little bit closer to the water, so that you eliminate that need for the--I just won’t look for the superstructure to be down at the water, but again, it’s good work.

Number 3, I think, suffers from the same problem as Number 1. You’ve gone with detail on the carrier and, in a medal, I don’t care how much relief you put into that thing, you’re going to have difficulties with that. It’s going to be a lot of busyness representing the ocean and the carrier itself.

Number 4, I like that concept because you’ve got the plane, you’ve got the carrier in silhouette. I know it doesn’t give the
Navy effort in this joint task force enough credit, but it has something to lend in that it does acknowledge the carrier and I don’t believe the best of the art is going to get full balance with an entire carrier anyway.

Number 6, I struggle with the symbolism here. It is a compromise in my mind, if we can’t get 2, the depiction of the carrier and the planes at the moment of takeoff. I’m probably the only one that liked Number 9. I didn’t hear anybody else say “aye.” And I probably got sucked in by some of the shading that won’t be there, but I like the perspective of looking at the bomber from the underneath. I like the fact that the carrier’s at an angle. It was choppy water there; I’ve seen the film clips. I don’t know how the hell they took off.

You’ve got enough detail in the superstructure, but it is not overwhelming. If the propeller motion can be captured on the medal, that one looks good to me, as well.
Turning to the reverse, my vote is probably going to go to Number 4, in support of the choice of the Raiders. I don’t like, though, the texturing continuing on beyond the inner parameter, down below around the patches. I think the patches would look better if you continued that parameter and had the patches breaking up the parameter as you go and leaving Act of Congress 2014 in a clear field.

I have problems with Number 8. Conceptually I like Number 8. I don’t know that the patches bring that much or the squadron designations bring that much to the medal. My problem here is that the point of attack is a harbor that I first thought, well, maybe that’s Tokyo harbor. It’s not readily apparent what they’re attacking here. If it were even just an outline of Japan, or the islands of Japan—as it is in Number 4—I think you would have conveyed the thought better than like this.
I understand Heidi’s point that these are four bombers in formation and we’re looking down at them, as if we were in another layer up above of another strike, but I just can’t get past the depiction of the target there.

CHAIRMAN MARKS: Thank you, Mike. We go to Herman.

DR. VIOLA: Thank you, Gary. First of all I just want to heckle the other comments here about how valuable this Committee is and actually the historical importance of what we’re doing. As a historian, I feel I have an obligation to protect that. And as we know, historical education in our country is getting watered down constantly and I think having planes like this that can really have a story and a message are vital.

We are going to lose our spirit and the importance of history in our education. And so I feel extremely honored that I’m part of these two very important commemorative
moments.

And then I have to really defer to my colleagues here as far as design, art, and all this. It’s amazing how my opinions change as I listen to people talk. Heidi is very persuasive, but I also like what Gary had to say.

Now, Number 2, the obverse--I find that extremely dramatic, but I feel that the perspective is a bit wrong. It looks like the ship is really closer than the airplanes and I would think it should have been more distant in the background, that the planes have taken off and are coming at you. But I do like this one quite a bit.

But I’m also persuaded by what Gary had to say about Design 6. And my own thought would be that I would put the Reverse Number 4 and make that the obverse because then you’re always in danger. I think that’s just very striking and you could change the lettering about First Strike or Doolittle Raiders, but
make that the obverse and then put that very dramatic art scene, Number 6, as the reverse, but I suppose that’s not going to happen.

But I would say that for the reverse my favorite is Number 4, but I also like Number 8, but I agree with the other comments that this lettering above the patches on Number 8, that doesn’t make sense. I think we ought to have something on there like “Always to Danger” or some other wording, but to put down “lion,” that just doesn’t mean much at all. So if we can fiddle a little bit with some of these design concepts I think you’ve got some very, very important designs, very historic designs and I’m just glad to be able to be part of the voting on that. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN MARKS: Thank you, Herman. And before we go to Erik, I just wanted to comment on your discussion about obverse versus reverse and which is which. Historically the Committee at times has, as part of its recommendations, suggested that
certain designs that were presented as obverse or reverse should be switched to the other, so it’s not without precedent.

And if, given the event that designs that you are interested in, that you feel should be flipped around—after we go through our initial balloting, if you want to make a motion to that regard, please understand that you can do that. So I tell you that now because that may influence how you want to tally your votes. So, just so you have that information, as the rest of us have.

So, Erik, with those comments I’ll go to you.

MR. JANSEN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. My initial reaction in going through the obverse and the reverse art was to try to find a way to avoid airplanes on both sides. It’s a bit of a challenge just based on the way the art is rolled in, and so I’ve put that aside.

On the obverse, to me, I narrow it down to four designs, which is not really a
narrowing. But each of the four stands on a slightly different dimension.

If I were to pull the art intention here, I think the Obverse Number 6 is a very powerful image. If you do take a moment to really look at it and get over its busyness, you do see the eagle of freedom on the lightning bolt, very energetic.

And you see the horse with the scaled tale, which gives you the context of the sea attack. It’s a very, very deep and energetic artistic image; however, it is a bit obscure and invites examination until you really get it. If you were to go for just plain, in your face energy, I think you end up on Image Number 2.

Having said that, it might be interesting to shrink the size of the carrier again to apply the perspective that my cohort here previously said, that if those planes were a little closer to me—perceived as closer and not so intimate to the takeoff
point—the way the perspective is drawn here, at the edge of the carrier, there is this, oh, my gosh, here they come. This is going to be a high energy attack.

I think that is the big value of this design. I would love to see the date on here somehow. And that could get into moving some text from reverse to obverse here. I think the date lends itself very rapidly to a recognition by the observer that this is a World War II award because the date is so obviously amidst the early forties of World War II.

If you go for the most dramatic picture, I go Design 3 because it is, as the story we’ve heard, the tough waves. It is the plane leaving the carrier. I have a bit of trouble with the perspective. I think it’s a bit contrived. And then my fourth choice goes towards the fully balanced Design 4. The fully balanced documentary view, it’s a little bit low energy. It’s a nicely balanced
design, carries the date, carries the message and in that sense is a very, very down the middle sufficient design.

It lacks the energy. The plane doesn’t have the sense of Design 2’s energy, but those are my four designs. If I prefer one of them, with the modification of backing the carrier off, I’d probably prefer Design 2 because I think that carries the hard impact here. It challenges the eye immediately to say, wait a second, this is an odd image. What is this about? And then you suddenly get the very harsh reality of, oh, my gosh, here they come.

When I go to the reverse design, to me this is a battle between two designs and one of those would be Design Number 4, which is favored by the pilot’s group themselves. I think this nicely carries their four images of--would they be wings? I don’t know, is that a Navy term? The four groups that actually flew these sorties?
MR. ANDERSON: Squadrons.

MR. JANSEN: Squadrons, okay. I do agree that I think the parameter should be carried around consistent around the bottom, from 5 to 7 o’clock, and not have the texturing of the center portion bled off the edge. I don’t think that detracts, I think that adds to the contrast and the pull of the eye to those four symbols.

However, when I look at the full 8-inch image of Design Number 4--no, I take that back. The image I’m confusing with something else. I also liked Design Number 8. Design Number 8 puts me in the belly of an overflying airplane and were getting ready to bomb this place. I am sensitive to the comments that if you’re not a geographic expert you won’t recognize that as Tokyo Harbor, and perhaps the artistic balance of the design might get a little screwed up if that were to be backed off and made into more of an image of the Japanese islands.
I also think the parameter should be widened just a bit, so that the lettering is a little bit more substantial.

Act of Congress certainly disappears, but more than that, I think if the parameter lettering area were expanded by maybe 50 percent we’d get a little more emphasis on the bombardment group, the names, the numbers, which I think is important to the constituents being honored here.

So I don’t have hard recommendations and I’ll probably split my votes along those lines. This is an interesting medal; it is an absolutely fascinating group to be honored, by historical precedent what they accomplished, the courage it took to do it, and I’m just very honored to be here to be part of putting them in the history of the Mint’s medal series. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN MARKS: Thank you, Erik. I’ll note, as far as our agenda; that we are now a little bit behind. We were supposed to
come to a close of this subject at 10:30, so I will ask for members to give any final comments they may have. We’ll go to the sponsoring organization for their final comments and then we’ll need to get to our balloting.

For my final comments, I’ll just add that when I first spoke, when I spoke of medals that have endured I failed to mention something of great significance, at least to me. And that was a series of medals that was produced in the sixties through the maybe the early nineties by a group called the Society of Medalists.

And if you’re familiar with those, and many of us in the hobby are, there were some very significant pieces created through that series and we actually are honored to have one of the medalists here on our staff, Don Everhart, who I think has the distinction of being one of the only--a couple of people had two recognitions under the Society of
Medalists and those medals were ones that were about art. And they endure today because of the art and the messages they convey—endure—and I’ll contend, by large measure, from the artistic quality that was within those.

So with that I’ll just mention that if six were chosen, and I’m not sure that it’s going to be on the obverse, I would want to have a discussion about the legs on the seahorse. Seahorses don’t normally have legs. So I don’t know what the rest of the Committee would feel about that, but we don’t need to have a discussion with that unless it’s chosen.

And I heard some comments that people might not understand what this is. I’ll remind the Committee that’s why I emphasized balancing it with a reverse that contained the information that was relevant to the subject being honored. And, also, I don’t think it’s a bad thing for people to ask questions because often that’s the first step in gaining
knowledge and wanting to educate oneself. And that goes to my whole point about art and invoking something in us that impacts us and in some ways, and oftentimes, one of those impacts is to seek more education.

So are there any other quick follow-ups?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN MARKS: Okay, hearing none, then I will go to one of our sponsors. Mr. Anderson, did you have any further comments you’d like to give the Committee?

MR. ANDERSON: Just a couple. I appreciate the comments from you all. I’m not an artist, I’m a historian. I believe in history and following it. I’ve got a pretty extensive World War II artwork collection. I’ve probably got up to 100 pieces, but I bought those pieces because they were accurately correct. And that’s just how it is.

So you guys are the Committee, you’re
going to do what you think is best, but please remember what the guys would like. And if you’re going to go with Number 2, it needs to have a date in there. It’s an aircraft carrier because I know it’s an aircraft carrier, but other people may not be able to figure that out. Remember, the Japanese carriers didn’t have a superstructure either. And, again, I don’t want—we don’t give little descriptions out with the medals, do we, when people get them, that says what we’re trying to convey?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Sometimes.

CHAIRMAN MARKS: I’m not sure what—

MR. ANDERSON: Just so—again, I appreciate your time and effort. I’m just speaking for the Raiders and for the community. After Sea is wonderful, but whatever you do, we need to have First Strike, it needs to have the date on there and I hope that we can come to some conclusion and some consensus, so thank you.
CHAIRMAN MARKS: Thank you, Mr. Anderson. Okay, at this point I’ll ask the members to fill out their scoring sheets and pass those into our Committee secretary, Erik. And he’ll begin that tally.

MR. JANSEN: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN MARKS: Meanwhile, I’m going to ask April if she would give us her report on the American Fighter Aces Congressional Gold Medal, April?

MS. STAFFORD: Yes, it’s Public Law 113-105. It authorizes a Congressional Gold Medal in honor of the American Fighter Aces collectively, in recognition of their heroic military service in defense of our country’s freedom throughout the history of aviation warfare.

As described in the findings of the legislation, the American Fighter Aces are United States military pilots credited with destroying five or more confirmed enemy aircraft in aerial combat during a war or
conflict in which the American Armed Forces have participated.

Aces have served in World Wars I and II, Korea, and Vietnam. More than 60,000 fighter pilots have flown since World War I, but fewer than 1,500 are called Fighter Ace. The term “Fighter Ace” applies to a pilot in command of the attacking aircraft. Specific requirements are a minimum of five confirmed aerial kills, and both the attacking plane and the target plane must be in the air dogfighting.

The unique valuable skills that have make Fighter Aces successful include courage, judgment, keen marksmanship, concentration, drive, persistence, and split-second thinking. Many Aces have achieved the ranks of admiral and general, 19 received the Medal of Honor. We have with us today Dr. Greg Wagner, board member of the American Fighter Aces Association. And after we go through the obverse and reverse candidate designs, I’ll
ask Dr. Wagner to say a few words to the Committee.

Starting with the obverse designs, we have six for consideration. Obverse Number 1 depicts Ace pilots and their aerial combat skills. It features four pilots representing each conflict and a hostile aircraft in the crosshairs. Included are the inscriptions American Fighter Aces, and superimposed over crosshairs, Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marines. This is a preferred obverse design from our liaison.

Obverses Numbers 2 and 3 represent the global impact of the Aces accomplishments. The designs feature pilots, each representing a branch of the military, five stars representing the aerial combat victories required for Ace qualification, a globe symbolizing the various combat theaters, and a spade in military wings representing the American Fighter Aces themselves.

Design 3 includes a four-blade
propeller to represent each conflict. Inscriptions are Courage, Tenacity, and Duty Above All, American Fighter Aces; and Courage, Leadership, and Duty Above All. So here we have Obverse 2, which is also a preferred obverse design from our liaison, and Obverse 3.

Obverse Number 4 depicts a World War II Ace pilot surrounded by four fighter aircrafts from four different conflicts. We have the SPAD S. XIII biplane from World War I at the top of the design, a Grumman F6F Hellcat from World War II, a North American F-86 for Korea, and an F-4 Phantom from Vietnam in the foreground. A spade and five stars seen at the base of the design are emblematic of the Aces and the aerial combat victories required for Ace qualification. Inscriptions are American Fighter Aces and Act of Congress 2014.

Obverse Number 5 depicts crosshairs and five stars symbolizing the aerial combat
victories required, a globe representing the various combat theaters, and a spade and two aerial combat aircrafts. It is inscribed American Fighter Aces and Courage, Valor, and Duty Above All.

Obverse Number 6 depicts five stars representing the aerial victories needed for Ace qualification, a globe representing the various combat theaters, and a spade and four aerial combat aircrafts flown during each conflict. It is inscribed America Fighter Aces.

Moving on to the reverse designs, of which there are eight for consideration. Reverse Number 1 features aircraft flown during each conflict in which the Aces served, and five stars representing the aerial combat victories required for Ace qualification. Inscriptions are Courage, Tenacity, and Duty Above All; 2014-An Act of Congress. This is a preferred reverse design from our liaison.

Reverse Number 2 depicts a hostile
aircraft in the eye of crosshairs and includes five stars at the bottom of the border, representing the aerial combat victories required. It is inscribed WWI, WWII, Korea, Vietnam; and Courage, Leadership, and Duty Above All.

Reverse Number 3 depicts a propeller superimposed over a map. Inscriptions are WWI, WWII, Korea, Vietnam; and Courage, Leadership, and Duty Above All.

Reverses Number 4, 5, and 6 depict an eagle with outstretched wings among four aircrafts representing each conflict in which the Aces served. The designs are inscribed Navy, Air Force, Marines, Army; Act of Congress 2014; and Courage, Leadership, and Duty Above All. Here is Reverse 4, 5, and 6.

Reverses Number 7 and 8 feature an eagle clutching four thunderbolts with its wings formed in the shape of a spade. Five stars are featured at the top of Design 8 symbolizing the aerial combat victories
required. Design 7 has four stars symbolizing the four conflicts. It is inscribed Courage, Tenacity, Duty; and Act of Congress 2014. So here’s Reverse 7 and 8.

And if I can ask Dr. Wagner to make a few comments.

DR. WAGNER: Thank you, April. My name’s Greg Wagner. I’m a board member of the American Fighter Aces Association and am very proud to represent these great aviators. And first of all I’d like to thank the United States Mint, the CCAC, and also April and Betty for all of your help in designing this medal for us.

A little bit about the American Fighter Aces. April touched on some of these points. The United States has trained over 60,000 fighter pilots since the advent of armed flight in World War I, but yet less than 1,500 became Fighter Aces with the required five aerial kills since World War I. American Fighter Aces came from all walks of life, they
were students, they were farmers, they were educators, they were engineers. When this country called for duty, they came. A lot of the didn’t even know if they could fly, but there was this inner desire within them that said, I want to take to the air, and they did.

And they fought hard. The American Fighter Ace was not a fighter pilot who stood back in an aerial battle and he was one that was aggressive. And that’s one I want to talk about later, but aggressiveness—he took the enemy head-on in an aerial dogfight. He was one that would fight until the very last bullet. Several Fighter Aces, who had no bullets actually used their wing to slice the enemy in half during the Battle of the Torres Strait, in 1942, which was just north of Australia.

That was Colonel A.T. House, his commanding officer needed help and he responded by slicing the Japanese Zero completely in half with his wing. And he
actually landed that aircraft back on Horn Island and it was quite an event. And so there are many Aces that actually did that. He’s not the only one.

Anyway, as I said from the beginning, I thought this would be a very challenging project because of the number of combinations and permutations associated with the American Fighter Aces. In other words, there were four wars, World War I, World War II, Korea, and Vietnam, that produced Aces.

In World War I, again this is another point I want to come back to later, we had over 100 Aces, in World War II we had over 1,200; in Korea, we had exactly 40; and in Vietnam, we had exactly 2. But I’ll come back to that later in my more detailed comments.

Today the United States has only 87 Fighter Aces still alive from World War II, Korea, and both Aces from Vietnam are still with us. We continue to lose them at a very rapid rate.
Next I’d like to move to just some comments about this very top-level comments on the design. I, myself, as the liaison preferred Design Number 2 with modification.

MS. STAFFORD: Is that Obverse 2?

DR. WAGNER: Obverse 2, yep. General Cleveland, who’s the head of our association, he prefers Obverse 1, however he said he’s happy with both. And, of course, both with modifications. I want to clarify that.

And on the reverse, we are both in agreement on Reverse Number 1. Again, with modification. The general top-level comments are: The slogan Courage, Tenacity, and Duty Above All. And I guess our issue is with the word “Tenacity.” If you go back to the bill and read--I think April read Comment Number 7, 6 or 7. If you read some of the words in there, we would like your help in maybe coming up with a slogan that flows a little better and accurately describes aggressiveness and tenacity. So that’s one comment.
The other is the Navy and the Marines is really not, per se, represented on the chosen reverse and obverse. The Navy and the Marines make up—for instance, there’s almost 200 Marine Corps Aces out of the 1,460-plus Aces total and there’s almost 500 Aces from the Navy. So they’re going to ask me, well, where are we represented? There’s a lot on the Air Force and World War I, but not on the Navy and the Marines.

The other is we’d like to see the aircraft more balanced in—this is on Reverse Number 1—the aircraft more balanced—commensurate with the number of Aces that were produced. In other words, the F-4F Phantom, there was only two Aces produced by that aircraft, we would like to see that smaller. In World War II we had, by far, the most, so the World War II aircraft we think should be bigger and more in the forefront, as an example.

And also on Obverse Number 1 the Army
is not part of--it’s sort of a, how do I say it, a misnomer? Really, there were Aces in the Navy, the Air Force, and the Marines, but back in World War I and World War II the Aces were under the arm of the Army, so it was called the Army Air Service in World War I and the Army Air Corps in World War II, but all the Aces are really better known as Aces of the Air Force, as opposed to the Army.

So, anyway, those are my general comments. I have some more specific one for later, thank you.

CHAIRMAN MARKS: Thank you, Dr. Wagner. I’ll just--I hate to do this, but I call our attention to the fact that according to our agenda we have a half an hour to get through this program. I think we need to take the time that it requires, but if we can be efficient in our comments, I think that will be very helpful.

Let’s go through our culling exercise. We’ll start with the obverses.
interest in Number 1?
(Yeses.)
CHAIRMAN MARKS: Yes? Number 2?
(Yeses.)
CHAIRMAN MARKS: Number 3?
UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yes.
CHAIRMAN MARKS: Number 4?
(Yeses.)
CHAIRMAN MARKS: Number 5?
(No response.)
CHAIRMAN MARKS: Setting Number 5 aside. Number 6?
(No response.)
CHAIRMAN MARKS: Setting that aside.
So, we have remaining to focus our attention on the Obverse Designs Number 1 through 4. On the reverses, is there interest in Number 1?
(Yeses.)
CHAIRMAN MARKS: Number 2?
(No response.)
CHAIRMAN MARKS: Setting Number 2 aside. Number 3?
(No response.)

CHAIRMAN MARKS: Setting 3 aside.
Number 4? I’ll say yes. Number 5?
UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yes.
CHAIRMAN MARKS: Number 6?
UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yes.
CHAIRMAN MARKS: Number 7?
(Yeses.)
CHAIRMAN MARKS: Number 8?
(Yeses.)
CHAIRMAN MARKS: Okay, we didn’t achieve much there, folks.

MS. LANNIN: No, we didn’t.
CHAIRMAN MARKS: I will ask that we still keep our comment tight. I don’t believe that you’re all going to vote for all of those, so let’s try to be as efficient as possible so we can really focus on what matters here.

So, with that, before we go to our comment phase, are there any questions that should be asked now that bare more the
technical side? Heidi?

MS. WASTWEET: I’d like to ask about the faces on Obverses 1 and 2, are any of these faces specific people or are they generic people?

MR. WEINMAN: No, they’re generic faces.

MS. WASTWEET: What?

CHAIRMAN MARKS: Go ahead.

MS. WASTWEET: Did we have a problem with depicting actual people; can you tell me more about that?

MR. WEINMAN: Yes, typically because it honors a group, it’s been our practice not to honor specific individuals and it’s going back and you don’t want this to be a Congressional gold medal to individual people, but rather to the group as a whole. So we’ve instructed our artists to be generic when it comes to doing portrait.

MS. WASTWEET: That’s it.

CHAIRMAN MARKS: Okay, are there other
comments? Okay, we’ll go to our comment phase and in recognition of our member on the phone, Mary, are you on the line?

MS. LANNIN: Yes, I am.

CHAIRMAN MARKS: We’d like to start off with your comments, please.

MS. LANNIN: Okay, regarding obverses, I think Number 1 is fairly clean to me. I guess the differentiation between the Army and--the guy who spoke about it--can be touched up, but I did like Number 1. Number 1 is it for me, with the possible second of Number 4.

CHAIRMAN MARKS: Thank you, Mary.

MS. LANNIN: Do you want me to go with the reverse, Gary, or just the obverses?

CHAIRMAN MARKS: Let’s go with both, if you’re ready, please?

MS. LANNIN: Yeah, I really liked Number 1, I thought it was strong--for one thing it showed the development of aircraft, which I found very interesting. The five
stars, I liked it, I felt that it was very balanced. I think that that would turn out to be nice.

And surprisingly--I really surprised myself and actually like Number 8, because you remember everything we were talking about, they just wanted to have the Ace of Spades, the Ace of Spades, so I would like to commend the artist that did this for turning the eagle into the Ace. I just thought that that was pretty nifty, but I think we need to have Number 8 because that does show the five stars.

The other interesting thing may be, and we can all discuss it--is it possible to have Reverse Number 1 and an obverse? And Reverse Number 8 as the reverse? Getting away from people totally and just having symbols, planes and obvious (inaudible). So that’s it from here.

CHAIRMAN MARKS: Thank you, Mary. Now I’ll recognize Tom.
MR. URAM: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Number 1 and Number 2 and Number 3 are probably my top candidates for the obverse, but I’m leaning more towards Number 2 simply because of what the pairing might be for the reverse. And once again, the artists--both series today have been just outstanding on some of the art that we’ve had to look at today and a tribute to the creativity and trying to recognize properly the art and the history that’s relevant here.

But I’m leaning more towards Number 2 and as much as on the Reverse Number 1, in looking at some of the other reverses--and the reason why I chose Numbers 4, 5 and 6 wasn’t because of--they’re basically all the same to some degree, but it seems like Number 6 has more movement in it and what I like about it versus Number 1 is that in Number 1, everyone seems to be independent, whereas the eagle tends to unite the whole reason for having the different branches.
The eagle tends to unite the whole missions that have occurred, so in the uniting of the different avenues of military service here. And I think I’m leaning more towards Number 6, between the three of those, but I am intrigued also with Number 7 and Number 8 and I’m going to listen to some of my other colleagues as it relates to that. I think that’s extremely clever and I think that it’s very--I don’t think clever might be the right word, but it’s certainly artistic in the fact that it shows strength and it shows togetherness, as well, similar to what I was mentioning on Reverse Number 6.

So, depending on the planes, I’m probably going to be looking, more or less, at Number 6 and Number 8. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN MARKS: Thank you, Tom. We go to Heidi.

MS. WASTWEET: Thank you. This is a very difficult topic because it encompasses so
many different time periods and people and equipment, and this is a prime example of why this Committee is so much in favor of symbolism. Because when you get into detailed realism and you try to incorporate every nuance, the problem that you get, as we’re seeing here, is there’s going to be some group that feels excluded because the design is so specific.

And it’s so specific that it’s specifically excludes somebody, inevitably. In Obverse Design Number 1, for example, this is a beautifully drawn design, but I keep thinking over and over that these four faces look like brothers. I don’t see an variety of individuality or the different types of pilots that we had. They all look like they’re related, they’re almost the same person. And they’re so generalized and so generic that it loses me.

I would have found this more interesting if these were specific pilots that
stood out among the Aces, but we have legal reasons why we can’t do that, so it’s problematic to show faces at all. Going into this project I was really hoping to see an image of a crosshair because that depicts why these pilots stood out more than others because of their accuracy and their lethal abilities. So I like this design because it has the crosshairs and the plane coming at us invokes danger, so I like this design. It’s the faces that lose me.

In Design Number 2 I see more variety in the faces, so that attracts me and I like that they’re gathered around an ace, whereas in Design 3, they’re gathered around an earth and I think more of astronauts, rather than pilots. So I like Design Number 2, but again the specific faces, I wonder when I look at this, are these real people? Are these portraits? If I were coming into this unknowing, that would be the question that was raised in my mind.
So that brings me to Design Number 4. So here we have a human element, but we don’t see the face, so that solves the issue of being specific people, but yet it still has the human element. I like the arrangement of the planes, as well. There’s a lot of information here, but it’s well organized. Again, it’s very specific so we do run into the danger of excluding somebody somewhere and that’s just hard to get away from when you’re dealing with such realism.

In our obverse choices we don’t have a lot of symbolism; we just have these very specific designs. And they’re nice designs and I’m thinking again, always, how we pair up with the reverse. So I like Design 4 with its variety of planes and its organization. And I also like Reverse Number 1. The problem is these designs are so similar. We have a variety of planes shown in a very organized and appealing fashion, so I don’t think my favorite obverse would pair well with my
favorite reverse.

I don’t see this as being a problem in the size of the planes because I don’t see this as an important symbolism, but rather a progression of time.

So this brings me down to Designs Number 7 and 8. Let’s look at Number 7. Here we do have the symbolism depicted in a very creative and unique fashion and I like its creativity, its clarity, its simplicity, but yet it’s an attractive design, so I’m really drawn to Number 7.

The progression of Designs Number 4, 5, and 6, I have an interest in those, but I think they’re a little busy and they don’t attract me as much as 7. So even though I like Reverse Number 1 very much, it really depends on what we choose for the obverse, so I’m leaning more towards Number 7.

CHAIRMAN MARKS: Thank you, Heidi. I’ll start off by saying that I completely agree with Heidi’s comments about a program
like this having so much to honor across time and through military branches that we really can’t get too wrapped up in precision in trying to recognize everybody because that’s an impossible feat. And the more specific you go, the more likely it is that then you’ve missed something else more specific.

So I think it’s important to remember that this is a 3-inch pallet we’re talking about here. This is not a large canvas painting or photograph where there’s plenty of room for elements. You need something that is symbolic, that conveys the general sense of what’s being honored here, and I think we can strike a successful balance in recognition across time and military branches.

So my comments, I’m going to preface it first with my preferences are dependent on what’s chose for obverse and reverse. This might change and this is going to be tricky when I try to vote.

So, if we can go to the obverse
designs, I like both Obverse Numbers 1 and 2, let’s start with Number 1. I like the crosshairs. I think that this is an interesting presentation of images. It represents here the idea of time and those who achieved this level of success as fighters for our military force. With all of the four wars represented and actually named the different branches of the military, but yet it’s still kept in a clean presentation.

We go to Number 2; I like this one a lot. Again, we have the presentation of time with the various wars being represented. I really am very fond of the Ace of Spades symbol here. If we were to go with this obverse, then I would want to scuttle Numbers 7 and 8 on the reverse because then we’d be duplicating this Ace of Spades idea. So this is where it kind of gets tricky, so if we end up with Numbers 7 and 8 on the reverse, then I’m going to gravitate towards Number 1 for an obverse. So there may be a need for motions
after we all see how this all works out.

So if we go to Number 3, I think this one is just an example of we’re just cluttering it up. I don’t think the image of the globe adds anything, but to add more busyness, I don’t think the propeller really is necessary here in the middle of the Ace of Spades, so I think that Number 2 is much cleaner. So if you’re going to—obviously this is the same artist here, if we’re going to go one of those I would go with Number 2.

Number 4 is nice. I think this runs the danger of singling out World War II. Going back to my comments about keeping it general, I think there is room for recognizing the aircrafts through time, but I don’t know if that’s even completely necessary, depending on which obverse and reverse that we pick.

If we go to the reverses now, at first when I saw Number 1 I was drawn to it, but then I got to thinking, who is this that we’re honoring? And Dr. Wagner in his presentation
used a word that kind of struck me, "aggressive." These are men who were aggressive and, yes, they had tenacity, they were courageous men, but I think most of all they were aggressive. And so I look at Number 1 and I’m thinking, do these aircrafts—they’re aggressive aircrafts, yes, but are they presented in an aggressive way? Because there were lots of pilots, lots of them who didn’t even come close to five kills to be Aces.

This could represent every pilot. I think, if you’re going to show the planes, it needs to be an aggressive presentation, so I won’t support Number 1, but let’s go to Number 4.

I’ll submit to you, if you want to present the aircrafts that represent the Aces, this is it, folks. The lightning bolts, the eagle, which in American medallic iconology has long symbolized defense, strength, courage. All of those things represented
here, the American eagle itself, of course, our national bird. I think it’s arranged in a very interesting presentation. This would be a very, very attractive medal and it goes more towards that art idea that I was talking about.

And again the military branches signified above, we’re going to have to look at what obverse is selected, if this one were selected, but I’ll encourage my fellow members to please give this some consideration. I think this could be an outstanding design.

I think Numbers 5 and 6 are just versions of Number 4. I think the artist got it right on 4, I think there are balance issues with 5 and 6. They’re not quite as—I don’t know, they just don’t strike me as well as 4. I suppose maybe it’s because, to me, the eagle being larger in 4 is more important in the valuable space that we have on 3 inches. That just gives it that extra punch. And here again, we’re talking about
aggressiveness, that is kind of a defining quality of these men.

I’m really taken with both Number 7 and Number 8. I think taking the idea of the Ace of Spades, making it into the eagle, with all that it symbolizes, which I just mentioned. I think it’s fabulous. I like the bolts of lightning for the quick strike which, obviously, is something that these gentlemen had to master to achieve what they did. So I can support both of those.

I’m listening intently to my fellow members in their ideas about this before I make my final decision. So with that I’ll go to Erik.

MR. JANSEN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. This is really simple. Obverse Number 4, Reverse Number 8.

Now, the breakdown. When I go to Obverse 1, this is going to be made or broken by the sculpt. If the sculpt is not really, really good, this is going to come across as
just flat-out too busy. And I tell you, if you’ve got the crosshairs of an airplane flying straight at you, I would argue that you’re in your own crosshairs. So there’s something wrong about the picture of a plane flying straight at me in my crosshairs. That’s a problem.

So they got the crosshairs wrong there. I do like the faces in Number 2, Number 3 is a busified version of 2. However, you want exciting, you want aggression, you take Number 4. You take the pilot with the oxygen mask on, he has got one thing in mind and that is, he’s going to be the only one flying when this thing is over. And I like the modifications that came up later, getting all four historical archetypal frames in this.

I’d go with Number 4 as the hand’s down aggression, pictures of planes--it’s about the guy, it’s about the pilot, it’s about his survival mechanism, his aggression. I mean, the man has got his hands on the
sticks and he is going to take the guy down.

The title is right across the top American Fighter Aces, very strong, Number 4.

When we go to the reverse, I too liked the elegance, and kudos to the artist on Design Number 1. These are gorgeous. Historical accounting of the advancements of military airframes, however, I’m not sure this medal is about elegance and I got my airplanes on the Obverse 4. So where as I like the art in Number 1, I can’t put it on the reverse, teamed with Obverse 4.

I think Numbers 4, 5, and 6 are just plain flat-out too busy. I look at that and the first thing I see is clutter, clutter, clutter, clutter. I can’t sort it out and maybe the sculptor could fix that for me, but that may be too big of a challenge.

Now, when I go to Numbers 7 and 8, when we go to a big 3-inch medal on this thing, we’ve got a relatively big palette, as this goes. And 7 more than 8, although I’m
going to lean into either/or here, Number 7 uses negative space bled off the edge very effectively on a large medallic piece here. I love the spade, the elegance of the eagle, we’ve said that before. The lightning is here. My question would be, the difference between these two in my mind is, do you want the spade centered? If you do, because you eye wants it centered, go with Number 7.

If you don’t and you want a little more of a distraction--look at it, it disturbs you a little bit, think about it, it really invites the eye and the mind to investigate this idea, go with Number 8 because it’s off balance. However, I like the way the text is dispersed across the palette in 7; Courage, Tenacity, and Duty, perhaps even pumped up just a little bit larger in font size then they are there.

We lost a star.

MS. STAFFORD: In this design the stars aren’t meant to represent the four
conflicts.

MR. JANSEN: Stars might even be taken off of this one. We have stars on the obverse in my Obverse 4, wrapped around the spade at the very bottom. They’re subtle, they’re soft. Stars are not a big deal to me in this, I’d probably prefer 7, but it’s Obverse 4 teamed with some version of Numbers 7 or 8, in my book. It’s pretty simple.

CHAIRMAN MARKS: Thank you, Erik. We’ll go to Herman?

DR. VIOLA: Thank you, Chairman. Okay, well, I really like a lot of this artwork, but I kind of lean towards Mary. I don’t know if we’ve ever done this before here where you have the obverse and reverse switched like this, but I think on the obverses, I just don’t like all of those faces and they all look so generic and let’s face it, we don’t see any of the diversity, no Tuskegee Airmen or anything like that. I don’t know if any of them ever became an Ace,
but--so I’d rather do away with any of these faces.

So Number 4 could work for me, but I would really think I would prefer that on the reverse, Number 1 is the obverse, but change some of the terminology. And maybe reduce the size of that Vietnam aircraft because--

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Got it.

DR. VIOLA: --it does make it look like they were dominant, when they really only had two Aces. And I love Numbers 7 and 8. And I really think what I would prefer is to see 7 dropping those stars, because we don’t really need it and you’ve already got the Aces there. And I like the idea of having the Act of Congress and the date because as a historian--historians always love dates. And so we now can determine, looking at this, we did this too late. We should have done it really right after World War II.

And change some of the wording. I mean, “Courage”--I think “Tenacity” just isn’t
the right word. I’d love to see fearlessness, but of course that’s too long. So drop those stars and I would vote for making Number 7 the reverse and Number 1 of the reverses, I would make that the obverse. And thank you.

CHAIRMAN MARKS: Thank you, Herman. We’ll go to Michael.

MR. MORAN: My first choice on the obverse is Number 2. I agree with what’s been said about Number 3, the globe just clutters it. And I have questions on Number 3 because the first thing that popped into my mind when I looked at this was, that’s a Star Wars character, and I can’t get rid of that. I know it’s not, but I just can’t lose it.

Turning to the reverse, I’m with everybody--well, not everybody, most everybody in terms of Number 7. I think it’s an effective use of the eagle, but again you get into trouble here because you’ve got an Ace and you go to Number 2 on the obverse--and you don’t have to do that, April--you’ve got a
spade there, too. So if Michael Bugeja were here, he’d be going nuts over this duplication of iconography.

The stars are superfluous, they need to go. So, that’s where I am on these and I would like to suggest, as I sit here and think about this, that if I were to not get my choice on the obverse, it would dictate what I chose on the reverse. I think it would be much more effective for this Committee to choose the obverse and then go back and choose the reverse, after the obverse is chosen. I think it would save us a lot of confusion, in terms of motions after the fact.

And I would suggest we break the voting up.

CHAIRMAN MARKS: Thank you, Michael. Go to Robert.

MR. HOGE: Thank you, Gary. I think that I would probably have to select Obverse Number 4 as my preference of these, although I think it’s a little bit busy and confusing.
Maybe it is a Star Wars character, but--

MR. MORAN: Darth Vader.

MR. HOGE: Yeah. But I would prefer not to have these exact images of people’s faces showing like that. They do look like individuals and we don’t want them as individuals.

For the reverse, I would tend to prefer Number 7, as well, but again without the four stars, probably. I don’t think they’re necessarily very important. I agree that Numbers 4, 5, and 6 seem to be a little bit too busy.

Number 1 is attractive, but again the proportions of the planes and the selection of the planes seem to be a bit arbitrary. Perhaps not exactly what we would want.

This is a difficult kind of decision and I would be curious to see what people do trying to pair up obverses and reverses because I see a lot of good qualities and complexities in the selections for what the
elements would be on each one and how it would counterpoise and balance each other. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN MARKS: Thank you, Robert. Okay, I believe that brings us to the end of our comments.

MS. WASTWEEET: I have a follow-up question.

CHAIRMAN MARKS: And if there are follow-ups, let’s have those now.

MS. WASTWEEET: Because of your comments, Gary, I’m looking again at Reverse Number 4. My initial reaction is that this design was too busy, but in revisiting it and looking at it again I think that it could become a lot less busy if we simply take off the lettering and give it a little breathing space.

And this does, I think, show the aggressiveness that Dr. Wagner was talking about, but to put further complication in this, the eagle is very similar to the one
that we looked at for the Doolittle Raiders. So I suggest that we look at the voting on the Doolittle to see if there’s a danger of replicating that same eagle.

CHAIRMAN MARKS: Okay, that’s going to be a problem. Any other comments?

Mike suggested that we dispense with our normal process in the interest of time and staying true to our process, I’m going to ask the members to keep with the process and what we can do then is, once we get those scores, we obviously are going to have to take a look at obverse/reverse and if we matched them right.

So at that point, I suggest we follow our typical mode of action and take whatever motions we need to make to sure we get a good pairing. So, with that I want to go back to Dr. Wagner and ask him if he has any final comments before we wrap this up.

DR. WAGNER: Yeah, thank you. Let’s see, as I mentioned, my preference is Obverse
Number 1 with some modification to the phrase at the bottom. And one of the things that I like, if I may say, about Number 2 is the faces. I think that they represent the youngness of the World War I Aces, who were very young—not to say that there weren’t 18-year-olds flying in World War II, but they tended to be very young in World War I.

I like the man that represents World War II; he looks like a tough minded Marine Fighter Ace from Guadalcanal. You know, the Korean War Ace looks to the future and the same thing, I think, with the Vietnam Ace where they had to think fast in the jet age. So I think those faces to me say something.

And with the reverse, I like Reverse Number 1 because of the planes. Just that I think that there might need to be a modification of the way these planes are oriented and, again, highlight the—include the Marines and the Navy.

And then my other comment about Design
Number 4 is that in World War I they didn’t use this type--there were over 100 Aces in World War I, none of them wore this type of flight gear. So I just want to make that a comment for Obverse Number 4.

And as far as some of the others, to me they’re very busy. I think we heard that, but I think they’re a little bit too futuristic. That’s why I like the planes in Reverse 1. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN MARKS: Thank you. Okay, I’d like to ask members, if you haven’t already, fill out your scoring sheet and get that to Erik and--

MR. JANSEN: Thank you, Mary, for her votes.

CHAIRMAN MARKS: Yes, okay, we have hers. Okay, so while we’re collecting those up, I do have the balloting results for Tokyo Raiders, so for those of you who want to keep score, here they are.

CHAIRMAN MARKS: For the Obverse for
the Raiders, Design Number 1 received zero, 1A received zero, Design 2 received 17 and by that number would be our indicated recommendation, as a Committee. Number 3 received 4, Number 4 received 6, Number 5 received zero, and Design Number 6 received 14 and is the runner up.

And I would just mention that by Committee rule, given the number of Committee members here, we need to get to a score threshold of 13 for a recommendation to resolve.

Going on to the other designs, Numbers 7 and 8 were both zero, Number 9 received 3, and all the others Numbers 10 through 14, received zero.

On the reverses, Design Numbers 1 and 2 and 3 received zero, Design 4 received 12, Designs 5 through 7 were all zero, Design Number 8 received 20, and that is our recommendation, on that basis. And then Design 9 received zero.
And for those of you not familiar with our process, I should have noted that each member has up to three votes or points to cast in regard to any design. You can cast zero, 1, 2, or 3 for any design. And with that in mind, with 3 being the maximum, the total possible score with 8 members participating is 24. So to give you some frame of reference, when I say that Reverse 8 received 20, that’s a fairly strong indication—a pretty high level of support from the Committee, which is why we do it that way. Our balloting process measures intensity.

So at this point, Erik is busy putty together the scoring for the Fighter Aces. I want to ask people to keep in mind the time. I’m going to give us a five minute recess, but then we do need to get in the room to announce the scores for the Aces, but then also to have our thematic discussions that now appear for the balance of our agenda.

And I want everyone to be mindful that
there are members that have to take off immediately at 1:00 to get home tonight, and I’m one of them. So we’re going to need to keep to our schedule in the thematic discussion, but we are in recess for five minutes, and please be timely in getting back to the meeting.

Thank you, we’re recessed.

(Recess.)

CHAIRMAN MARKS: We are back on the record. I have the results for the American Fighter Aces. For those of you who are keeping track, design number one received six. Design number two received 14, and is the Committee’s recommendation. Design number three received two points. Four received 12. Five and six received zero.

Moving to the reverse for the Aces, design number one received six. Two and three were zero. Four received seven. Five and six were zero each. Seven received 15, and is the Committee’s recommendation. Design eight
received seven.

I will let those sink in for a moment, and meanwhile, we get to go back to our discussion on the Doolittle Raiders. If there are any motions as follow-ups, I would ask for any of those motions at this time.

MR. MORAN: Mr. Chair, I feel like having seen the voting on the reverse, that we need to take another look at the obverse. The voting was close between number two and number six. I think given the reverse that is the choice of the Committee number six is a better obverse and makes a better, more compatible medal. Therefore, I move that the Committee consider number six as the obverse.

CHAIRMAN MARKS: Okay. Is there a second to that motion?

MR. URAM: Second.

MR. JANSEN: Second.

CHAIRMAN MARKS: It is moved and seconded to shift our recommendation to design six rather than two. Is there any discussion?
MS. WASTWEEN: What was the vote?
CHAIRMAN MARKS: What’s that?
MS. WASTWEEN: What was the voting?

What were the scores?

MR. MORAN: It was 14, Heidi, on number six, and it was--
CHAIRMAN MARKS: Seventeen on two.
MR. MORAN: Sixteen on number two.

MR. JANSEN: That is against the 13 to select, so they both beat the threshold but design two by more.

MS. WASTWEEN: Fourteen or 16?
CHAIRMAN MARKS: 17/14.

MS. WASTWEEN: It’s a three point spread.

CHAIRMAN MARKS: Okay. If everyone understands the motion, I’m calling the question. All those in favor of the motion--

MR. JANSEN: Just a moment. I want to internalize this thing. So, this is two versus six. The vote is to change the vote from a selection of number two to move it to
selection of number six?

CHAIRMAN MARKS: Correct.

MR. JANSEN: So, a “yes” vote means you want to override the common vote and move to six as the obverse recommendation?

CHAIRMAN MARKS: Correct.

MR. URAM: Can we also see the reverse that was chosen so that we understand what was chosen?

CHAIRMAN MARKS: Yes, let’s go back to two, please.

MS. SULLIVAN: What was the number, the reverse, recommended reverse?

CHAIRMAN MARKS: The reverse is eight. We’re moving to obverse two to take another look at that. There we go. That’s the current recommendation. The motion is to switch that to six. Go to six, please. Is everyone clear?

All those in favor, raise your hand.

(Show of hands.)

CHAIRMAN MARKS: Four. All those
opposed, please raise your hand.

(Show of hands.)

CHAIRMAN MARKS: Mary?

MS. LANNIN: I want to keep number two.

CHAIRMAN MARKS: You’re voting no, so we have a 4-4 tie, the motion fails. Other motions? Heidi?

MS. WASTWEET: On obverse two, I make a motion to add the super structure for accuracy on the carrier, at the discretion of the Art Department.

CHAIRMAN MARKS: Did you want to tell why?

MS. WASTWEET: The liaison in our recess told me that the Japanese carriers did not have a super structure, so that’s a clear identifying distinction between the two, so to make our symbols very clear, I believe that should be added.

CHAIRMAN MARKS: The question is do we want it to appear that the American aircraft
are launching from a Japanese carrier or American.

MR. JANSEN: Question, do you also want to change the perspective, that is the size of the carrier versus the airplanes?

CHAIRMAN MARKS: That’s not the motion.

MR. JANSEN: I understand.

MS. WASTWEET: That would be separate. I like the proportion as it is.

MR. JANSEN: The motion stands only to add the super structure on the carrier on the deck at the discretion of the Art staff of the Mint.

MS. WASTWEET: Correct.

CHAIRMAN MARKS: Is there a second?

MR. JANSEN: Second.

MS. LANNIN: I’ll second.

CHAIRMAN MARKS: Mary Lannin gets the second.

MS. LANNIN: All the way from Vienna.

CHAIRMAN MARKS: It’s moved and
seconded. All those in favor, please raise your hand.

(Show of hands.)

CHAIRMAN MARKS: Mary, what did you say?

MS. LANNIN: I said “aye.”

CHAIRMAN MARKS: Okay. Seven. All those opposed?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN MARKS: Abstain?

MR. MORAN: Here.

CHAIRMAN MARKS: One abstention. Motion carries. Heidi, do you have another one?

MS. WASTWEEN: I do.

On the reverse, eight is our selection. Also, in my discussion with the liaison during our recess, he indicated they would prefer instead of calling out the squadrons on the rim to have their slogan there, the “Toujours Au Danger.” I would move to--I don’t know if we should specify the
lettering or leave that open.

CHAIRMAN MARKS: Would your motion be to replace the identification of the units with the slogan?

MS. WASTWEET: Yes. I have two slogans, actually. “First Strike” and “Toujours Au Danger.” Should I make two motions or one?

CHAIRMAN MARKS: If you could clarify it in one motion, it might help.

MS. WASTWEET: Okay. In one motion, I’ll clarify. The desired lettering changes--on the obverse, substitute “First Strike” with the date.

CHAIRMAN MARKS: Obverse two.

MS. WASTWEET: Move “First Strike” to the reverse along with the slogan “Toujours Au Danger,” instead of the squadrons.

CHAIRMAN MARKS: I’m going to let our motion recorder catch up.

MR. JANSEN: I got it. You describe it to the folks. Restate it, and I’ll get it.
CHAIRMAN MARKS: State it one more time and we’re going to vote.

MS. WASTWEET: On obverse two, replace “First Strike” back and replace it with the date “April 18, 1942.” Then take that “First Strike” lettering and move it to reverse eight, along with the slogan “Toujours Au Danger,” instead of the squadron names.

CHAIRMAN MARKS: Okay. Does everyone understand that? Robert, did you have a question?

MR. HOGE: If we were to do that, might we not want to include the date, April 18--

CHAIRMAN MARKS: Her motion does include putting the date on the obverse.

MR. HOGE: Okay.

MS. WASTWEET: Again, this was from my conversation with the liaison.

CHAIRMAN MARKS: Mary, did you catch all that? I’m not sure Mary is there. Okay. We’re going to go ahead and vote on this. All
those in favor, please raise your hand.

(Show of hands.)

CHAIRMAN MARKS: It looks unanimous here in the room. Mary, are you there?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN MARKS: The motion carries 7-0.

MR. JANSEN: With one abstention.

CHAIRMAN MARKS: Yes, just record her as an abstention. I don’t know how else to do it. She’s not voting. Okay. Other motions?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN MARKS: Okay. That takes us to American Fighter Aces. In light of our recommendations for obverse two and reverse seven, are there motions to be made?

MR. JANSEN: I’m sorry. Who was the second on that motion by Heidi just now?

DR. VIOLA: I am happy to.

MR. JANSEN: I will give that to Dr. Viola.

CHAIRMAN MARKS: Heidi, do you have a
motion?

MS. WASTWEET: I would suggest on obverse two that we simply remove the Ace in the middle since we have a large Ace on our selected reverse.

MR. JANSEN: The Spade symbol?

CHAIRMAN MARKS: The Spade; yes.

MS. WASTWEET: Spade symbol, yes.

That would reduce the repetitiveness and also reduces clutter on the obverse.

CHAIRMAN MARKS: Is there a second?

MR. JANSEN: Second.

CHAIRMAN MARKS: Moved and seconded to remove the Ace of Spades from the obverse in light of the Committee’s recommendation for reverse number seven. Does everyone understand the motion?

All those in favor, please raise your hand.

(Show of hands.)

CHAIRMAN MARKS: I see six in the room. Mary, are you on the line?
(No response.)

CHAIRMAN MARKS: All opposed?

(Show of hands.)

CHAIRMAN MARKS: One. The motion is 6-1. The motion carries. Are there other motions?

MS. WASTWEET: We have a duplication of wording. We have “Courage, Tenacity, and Duty Above All” on the obverse and we have “Courage, Tenacity, Duty” on the reverse as well.

CHAIRMAN MARKS: I would propose this is an opportunity just to simplify and remove one of those in favor of the other, and just give us some more negative space. I don’t think that harms anything.

MR. JANSEN: Yes.

MS. WASTWEET: I would suggest removing it from the obverse.

CHAIRMAN MARKS: Is that a motion?

MS. WASTWEET: I will make that a motion.
MR. MORAN: Second.

CHAIRMAN MARKS: It has been moved and seconded to remove the inscription “Courage, Tenacity, and Duty Above All” from the obverse. Heidi, just to clarify, there’s a difference with how that’s presented. It’s not exactly the same words for the inscription on the reverse. Are you proposing just to keep it as is?

MS. WASTWEET: I am.

CHAIRMAN MARKS: Do we all understand the motion? All those in favor, please raise your hand.

(Show of hands.)

CHAIRMAN MARKS: It’s unanimous in the room. Mary, are you on the line?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN MARKS: I will declare that seven in favor, one abstention. The motion passes.

MS. WASTWEET: He got a message from her saying she votes for the motion.
CHAIRMAN MARKS: She does; okay. Unanimous vote, 8-0.

Are there any other motions?

MR. MORAN: Gary, I have one. I’d like to go back to reverse seven and move we remove the four stars. I think they are superfluous.

DR. VIOLA: I second.

CHAIRMAN MARKS: Good catch.

MR. JANSEN: Wait a second. This is on the Fighter Aces?

CHAIRMAN MARKS: Fighter Aces. There are four stars rather than the five.

MR. MORAN: They were put there to represent the four conflicts, but four pilots are on the front, enough is enough.

CHAIRMAN MARKS: The motion is to eliminate the four stars on reverse seven for the Aces. All those in favor, please raise your hand.

MS. WASTWEEN: I have a question first. I’d like the liaison to weigh in with
his opinion.

DR. WAGNER: On the four stars?

MS. WASTWEEN: Yes.

DR. WAGNER: Yeah, I think there would be a lot of confusion when one looks at the four stars, four victories would be needed to be an Ace as opposed to five. That would be the first impression.

MS. WASTWEEN: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN MARKS: Good point. I was confused. All those in favor, raise your hand.

(Show of hands.)

CHAIRMAN MARKS: It’s unanimous in the room. Mary, are you on the line?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN MARKS: Until further notice, we will record that as 7 ayes, one abstention, and the motion carries. The motion was by Michael?

MR. MORAN: I made it and Herman seconded.
CHAIRMAN MARKS: Thank you. Are there other motions?

MS. STAFFORD: We have a question regarding the inscriptions. Originally “Courage, Aggressiveness, and Duty Above All” was suggested by the liaison, and then on second thought, “aggressiveness” seemed as if it were not exactly the right word, and I believe Dr. Wagner is also still unhappy with “tenacity.”

I don’t know if there is a recommendation from anyone on the Committee about whether “aggressiveness” suits or if there should be another word or phrase employed.

CHAIRMAN MARKS: Let’s give a couple of minutes to that, if we have any thoughts about wording.

MR. MORAN: I think there is certainly room on the reverse for changes in the wording. I don’t think this Committee is particularly well equipped to deal with it,
and I think we should leave it up to The Mint to address that issue.

MS. WASTWEEET: I agree.

CHAIRMAN MARKS: I’m not sure we would have much to lend to this. Personally, I’m satisfied with the word “tenacity.” We’re going to leave that to The Mint at this point.

MS. STAFFORD: We can always go back to the findings in the legislation. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN MARKS: We are concluded with both of our visual reviews today. Again, I want to thank the liaisons for being here today, for the knowledge and reports you gave to us. I’m looking forward to seeing your medals when they are produced. I’m sure that with all the art here, I don’t think you can go wrong, whether you go with what we suggested or perhaps where it differs with you or even with what the CFA comes up with. I think we are in a good position to have some beautiful medals.
With that, thank you very much.

DR. WAGNER: Thank you all very much.

CHAIRMAN MARKS: All right. We have now an hour to go through our two design concept discussions. The first one is the Mark Twain Commemorative Coin Program. April, is there a report?

MS. STAFFORD: There is. Can I ask if Cindy Lovell is on the line?

MS. LOVELL: Yes, I am.

MS. STAFFORD: Thank you. We will get to you in just one moment.

CHAIRMAN MARKS: Before we move on, I’m going to kind of put an idea in place here, that by 12:30, I want everyone to be focused on wrapping up this discussion. Let’s make the best use of our time for the next 30 minutes. Go ahead.

MS. STAFFORD: It’s Public Law 112-201 that authorizes the Secretary of the Treasury to mint and issue five dollar gold and silver dollar coins in commemoration of Mark Twain.
The design of the coins shall be emblematic of the life and legacy of Mark Twain.

Samuel Langhorne Clemens was born on November 30, 1835 in Florida, Missouri, the sixth of seven children. Halley’s Comet was visible and his mother predicted greatness for him. At the age of four, Clemens and his family moved to the small frontier town of Hannibal, Missouri on the banks of the Mississippi River.

After his father died when he was 11, Clemens began work as a typesetter, the first of many jobs he would hold during his lifetime. Clemens worked as a newspaper writer, riverboat pilot, and silver prospector before his first big break with the publication of a short story, “Jim Smiley and His Jumping Frog.”

Having lived all over the country, Clemens and his family settled in Hartford, Connecticut in 1870 where he completed some of his most famous books, including “The
Adventures of Tom Sawyer,” “A Connecticut Yankee in King Arthur’s Court,” and “Adventures of Huckleberry Finn.”

From 1891 until 1900, Clemens and his family traveled the world and witnessing the exploitation of weaker governments by European powers wrote his book “Following the Equator.”

His work turned dark and began to focus on human greed and cruelty. Many of the works he wrote during this time, however, were not published during his lifetime.

In 1910 at the age of 74, Clemens died with Halley’s Comet once again visible in the sky. Like any good journalist, Samuel Clemens, better known as Mark Twain, spent his life observing and reporting on his surroundings. In his writings he provided images of the romantic, the real, the strengths and weaknesses of a rapidly changing world.

By examining his life and his works, we can read into the past, piecing together
various events of the era and the responses to them. We can delve into the American mindset of the late 19th Century and make our own observations of history, discover new connections, create new inferences, and gain better insights into the time period and the people who lived in it.

As Twain wrote, “Supposing is good, but finding out is better.”

Initial conversations with the liaison indicates an interest in using the gold and silver coins to depict Mark Twain’s life and works, but not necessarily divided between the coins in any particular way.

Some concepts for the two categories are included in the Committee’s information that was provided earlier, and we have with us Cindy Lovell, Executive Director for the Mark Twain House and Museum in Hartford, Connecticut. She is our liaison for this program and on the phone with us today to discuss possible design themes.
Ms. Lovell, would you care to say a few words?

MS. LOVELL: Thank you for the opportunity. I would just welcome your questions that you have of me, and I’ll just listen.

MS. STAFFORD: Thank you. Mr. Chairman?

CHAIRMAN MARKS: Thank you for the report, April. With that, we will go to our discussion. I’m not going to start off with my comments first. I’ll just suggest this, in other coin programs we have had where we have had multiple coins, in this case a gold and a silver, up to this point, we have received portfolio’s that attempt to divide obverse and reverse, and we ended up mixing that up and adding some complexity to the consideration.

Not that you would do this necessarily, but I’d ask you to give some consideration to just simply providing us some obverse designs and some reverse designs and
letting us kind of sort that out. I don’t know if that works for you, if it’s too problematic, then certainly do what you need to do. I think that would help our process if we could receive it that way. The nominations could be fixed whenever.

With that, Robert, are you ready to make your comments? I can go to someone else if you’re not ready.

MR. HOGE: No, that’s okay. Many images come to mind when I think of Mark Twain and his work. A portrait of him, he’s so distinctive looking, and we think of him in his later years really as representing this aspect.

Another thing perhaps that is read by everybody is some work related to his boyhood, so the little figure of a little boy in overalls and bare feet, the straw hat, and the fishing pole. Tom Sawyer. Huckleberry Finn. Mark Twain himself.

Also, the idea of the riverboat pilot.
Maybe we would want a riverboat image, too. There are so many images that come to mind that I can’t really prefer one over another, but since we have four opportunities here, two obverse and two reverses, I think we could do a good job with the different aspects of his life. That’s it.

CHAIRMAN MARKS: Thank you, Robert. We will go to Michael.

MR. MORAN: I’m going to differ from Robert in one regard. I don’t want to see Tom Sawyer with a fishing pole on a raft in the back. I agree Mississippi was very informative in his culture and his approach to things. There are a lot of things that I think you can do without resorting to that kind of simplicity for Tom Sawyer and Huck Finn, and with that, I’ll pass.

CHAIRMAN MARKS: Thank you, Michael. We will go to Herman.

DR. VIOLA: This is really a very significant medal because I think everyone is
acquainted with Mark Twain. I loved him. I really like the idea of having this portrait on here. He has such a distinctive face. What about having Halley’s Comet in the background? It kind of defined his birth and death, we were told.

I certainly would like to see a steamboat. I don’t know, obverse or reverse. Certainly with the Mark Twain and Clemens’ face, I think you have something here. My own feeling, do we tell the artists what they should come up with? Aren’t they going to come up with a lot of their own concepts?

CHAIRMAN MARKS: I’m sorry, Herman. I should have explained this process a little better. Our discussions are just an opportunity for us as members to share any ideas we might have of a particular subject matter. What comes out on the other side, you know, is due to The Mint’s process. This is our opportunity to weigh in.

DR. VIOLA: Okay.
CHAIRMAN MARKS: With any ideas that we think we might be interested in seeing translated to designers.

DR. VIOLA: Okay. I’ll pass.

CHAIRMAN MARKS: These will come back to us for a vote on the visual designs to consider.

DR. VIOLA: I’m looking forward to what they come up with.

CHAIRMAN MARKS: Erik?

MR. JANSEN: Although in general I would say text on these coins is to be avoided. I would suggest as part of the research here if there is to be concluded a single phrase, nothing comes to my mind right now, but if there is to be a single short phrase that might help the public relate to some of his works, that phrase might be somewhere where it might match the graphics.

We often think of a barefoot boy with a fishing rod, fishing pole, rather, dangling in the water, as symbolic of Twain. I hope we...
can maybe avoid that and come up with something a little more creative or perhaps embed that in a more symbolic kind of design.

The history says Halley’s Comet was the bookends of this man’s life. That might make for an interesting piece as well. I think that has been mentioned.

I would hesitate to or I would resist the urge to stop after the first cursory image of the fishing boy, Huck Finn, the river, the riverboat, the frogs of Calaveras County, and continue to dig deeper in the research here to see what else might be there.

Finally, I would add that because his image, his likeness, if done well, is so iconic, I think, to the man’s place in everyone’s mind between the wild shock of hair and the large brushy mustache, I think that is probably deserving of perhaps one of the two sides of the coin, somehow worked into other symbols of Americana, of the time and growth of America in the mid-1900s—rather, in the
1800s, late 1800s, when he flourished in his work so much.

I would encourage some real depth in the research here and not stopping at the surface level images that come to mind.

CHAIRMAN MARKS: Thank you, Erik. I’m going to go on record asking that the artists take an expansive view. I’ve heard some of the members say I hope I don’t see this or that. I think that’s the wrong approach. I think that we would be well served if we received 31 designs like we did the platinum program at our last meeting. I would certainly hope that we would see images that were very much a part of who Mark Twain was.

My observation is that Congress passed a bill to commemorate Mark Twain, not Samuel Clemens. Same man, I know that. There is a significant point to be made here, that Mark Twain was his pen name or probably his most significant pen name. There were other pen names that he used throughout his life. Mark
Twain was the most significant one. It comes from the river.

I think that maybe you all know, but Mark Twain is the call they would call out on a riverboat to indicate the water is deep enough, it’s two fathoms deep, Mark Twain, “Twain” being two. He kind of picked that up from his life in Hannibal, Missouri where he grew up, and then becoming someone--I forget what his title was on a steamboat. That was very much a part of his early life, and it heavily influenced his writing.

In fact, arguably two of his most significant books, both “Tom Sawyer” and “Huckleberry Finn,” are rooted in that culture on the Mississippi during the 19th Century, a very distinctive period which I think calls for any assortment of ideas.

Also, I think important is his break out piece, which I think most people would agree with me, the celebrated Jumping Frog of Calaveras County. From the research I have
done, that’s the piece, although a short story, the one that first brought him recognition on a broad scale nationally and even internationally.

I think with four coin faces here, obverse/reverse for both gold and silver, there are lots of opportunities here. I can see frogs. I can see boys on rafts. I can see paddle boats, steamboats. I can see lots of those sorts of images that would be iconic to a figure like Mark Twain.

I also think that given the distinctive image of Mark Twain, that we most definitely want to look at his image as an obverse for these coins. I’m not sure how that all sorts out. I think we ought to have those portraits available to us.

I think that’s all I wanted to say. I’ll recognize Heidi.

MS. WASTWEEET: Thank you. Here’s the challenge to the artists, to be emblematic without being cliché. A little research will
show that there are lots of other medals that have been produced showing Mark Twain and Huckleberry Finn, and we don’t want to copy those or mirror those too closely but be original.

One of the purposes of coins is to be educational, but we don’t want to be so educational that we become obscure in our symbology. For example, listed here is his love of cats. I don’t think that really encompasses his power on our imaginations through his writing. I think that is a little too obscure.

I also think some of the suggestions about the Hartford House, for example, a building, I think, is too static for someone as animated a person as Mark Twain.

I do like the image of the Comet in conjunction with his portrait. I think that is an interesting story that I hadn’t heard before, and I think the public would be interested to read about that as well. It
adds interest to an otherwise expected portrait. I think that would be very interesting to see.

That’s it.

CHAIRMAN MARKS: Thank you, Heidi.

Tom?

MR. URAM: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I think there will be a lot of fun with this, I hope, and I think this could be a great opportunity for us to maybe look at both sides, a boyhood version as well as the iconic image. I agree, too, I think the Comet approach for the iconic image would be great.

What I would hope to see is that this would entice some interest in young collectors since it is a great power for us to really have some new interest and new blood on coins itself.

I think I would like to see one like very childlike that would be enticing for a young collector to collect, and the other coin to be more of the iconic. Thank you, Mr.
CHAIRMAN MARKS: Thank you, Tom.
Mary, are you on line?

MS. LANNIN: Yes, I am. As an original Minnesotan, I would like to remind everybody that the Mississippi began in Lake Itasca, Minnesota, so I’m all for showing the Mississippi in some way, shape or form.

Also, I think the riverboat is very important. “Mark Twain,” we have talked about, is actually a measurement of depth. Gary, you mentioned that. I believe different colored strips of either cloth or leather to these depth markers to figure out how deep the river was, that might be kind of an interesting design element in the coin.

We talked about some people didn’t want the image of a little boy with a fishing pole. A view from the back of Mark Twain turning into a profile of a young boy with a fishing pole heading toward a river. That might be something. I don’t know.
I think we have lots of opportunities of what an exciting person he was. I also did not know the Halley’s Comet connection. I’d like to see something done on one of the coins as well. That is it for me.

CHAIRMAN MARKS: Thank you, Mary. I think that takes us around the ranks. I will just conclude this by saying what I said before, and that is I hope we can have an extensive portfolio presented to us that covers a range of subjects and topics related to Mark Twain. I think that would give us the best opportunity to come up with two coins that will be really appropriate for commemorating Mark Twain.

MS. STAFFORD: Cindy, if you are still there, when we had initial conversations with you, you shared with us some of Mark Twain’s famous quotes specifically regarding money. Did you want to share some of those with the Committee?

MS. LOVELL: I did note the comment
earlier about the possibility of some phrases, and one of his most famous quotes, of course—we know he had real financial challenges as a boy and later as an adult which he did overcome—one is “A lack of money is the root of all evil.” Another had to do with paying for debt, when the rest of the country was filing bankruptcy and paying 10 cents on the dollar, he paid his debt in full, and he said “Honor has no statute of limitations.”

One is more humorous, as we think of Twain as a humorist, but he was certainly a very serious man with a very serious side and not to be dismissed as a mere humorist.

I really, really appreciated the comment—I was sitting here smiling and taking notes—the idea of his image, I think everyone agreed that is so important and so distinctive and recognizable. I agree his face as older Mark Twain, the most recognizable man, really should appear on one of these coins.

The idea of a steamboat, which is so
critical not only to his life but to his work, and I think that can be incorporated with the Mississippi River, with Huckleberry Finn, and I would consider Jim’s presence. Huckleberry Finn is iconic but Huckleberry Finn is unique for so many reasons that maybe first and foremost it was the first book really written in the American vernacular, and second, it made a black man a major figure, a main character, treated him as a human, treated him with respect, and this had never been done in American history.

I think everyone is sort of on the same page, I think the artists will probably have a lot of fun interpreting this, and I hope Jim will be on here in some fashion, but I think everybody said wonderful remarks, all of which were appropriate and very fitting for him.

CHAIRMAN MARKS: Thank you very much. I want to thank Ms. Lovell for her comments and participating in all this, and I look
forward to having you involved in the review of the designs when we come back to this project.

MR. URAM: One comment, Mr. Chairman. Also, maybe not so much from the medal point of view but from the packaging point of view, if we could something that would maybe even be from a PR point of view, maybe package this in a book format, so it’s like you’re opening one of his books, or something like that, very similar to what we do with the Teddy Roosevelt packaging, where it would be very attractive for youthful people who want to start collecting, this might be something that might want to open up.

From the packaging side, I’m just throwing that thought in there because I think rather than just doing the blue box with the normal, I think this is a great opportunity to put that story in there that we just heard about as well.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
CHAIRMAN MARKS: We are going to conclude this, but as we depart from this subject, I’ll just have one final comment, and that is again, let’s try to be expansive, and even on these quotes, I love the quotes that were shared, even the humorous one, it’s a quote. It’s not an official inscription from the United States Government. Twain was a humorist.

It would be refreshing to see something like that, especially that one mentioned, that no money is the root of all evil. I don’t know if that works, but I would get a kick of seeing that on a design.

Let’s move now to our discussion on the Monuments Men Congressional Gold Medal. April?

MS. STAFFORD: First let me check to see if our liaisons are with us. Robert Edsel, are you with us?

MR. EDSEL: I am.

MS. STAFFORD: Great. It is Public
Law 113-116, granting a congressional gold medal collectively to the Monuments Men in recognition of their heroic role in the preservation, protection and restitution of monuments, works of art, and artifacts of cultural importance during and following World War II.

On June 23, 1943, President Franklin D. Roosevelt formed the American Commission for the Protection and Salvage of Artistic and Historic Monuments in War Areas. This commission established the Monuments, Fine Arts, and Archive Section under the Allied Armies.

The men and women who served in the MMFAA, as it was known, were referred to as “Monuments Men.” Each had expertise as museum directors, curators, art historians, artists, architects, and educators.

In December 1943, General Dwight D. Eisenhower empowered the Monuments Men by issuing orders to all commanders that stated
they must respect monuments so far as war allows.

Although they were initially employed to protect and temporarily repair the monuments, churches, and cathedrals of Europe suffering damage due to combat, their mission was adapted to identify, preserve, catalogue, and repatriate almost five million artistic and cultural items.

The Monuments Men grew to approximately 350 who joined front line military forces. Two Monuments Men lost their lives in action. Following the allied victory, they remained abroad to rebuild cultural life in Europe through organizing art exhibitions and concerts.

Design concepts as suggested by the liaison is to represent the relationships between the American, English and French joined operations, to represent the shared sacrifice of the nations that contributed to the efforts of the Monuments Men, and to
represent the vast number of art and cultural items recovered.

Suggested inscriptions include “Monuments Men” and “Act of Congress 2014.”

I will also note before turning it over to Robert Edsel, our liaison, that there were suggestions to portray specific art, sculptures, in fact, such as the Bruges Madonna. In fact, we are not going to be able to portray any art that has religious overtones.

With that, let me introduce Robert Edsel, the Chairman of the Board of the Monuments Men Foundation. He is our liaison for this program. He’s on the phone today with us to discuss possible design themes further. He is joined by Christy Fox, Executive Vice President, also at the Monuments Men Foundation.

With that, Mr. Edsel, would you care to say a few words to the Committee?

MR. EDSEL: I should take you on the
road with me. You have made it easy for me.

These were a remarkable group of men and women. They were referred to as “Monument Men.” Of course, the women couldn’t serve in combat. The story that we have told through the three books I’ve written has primarily focused on the role of the men. The women played an important role at the end of combat in assisting with the repatriation of some five million objects that the Monuments Men found in salt mines, caves, and castles of which about four million were stolen. It is actually far more than four million because some of these objects like chests filled with hundreds of jewelry objects were counted as one.

We are talking about the most important library books, the accumulation of Western civilization’s artistic and literary achievements, almost a million paintings and drawings, sculptures, tapestries, furniture, jewelry, religious objects from the most
famous things that you might know of in churches and museums throughout Western Europe and some from Eastern Europe to more obscure things. Really, nothing was left out of the mix.

The group was primarily 70 percent Americans, 30 percent British at the beginning, until the end of the war. It was an American led operation with the support of Great Britain. There are no more--by the end of World War II in Europe, May 1945, there was no more than probably about 120 or 130 Monuments Men in the field, probably a couple of dozen on the front line, many others are behind the front lines.

At the end of the war, when all the troops were coming home, we started this discovery of thousands of hiding places of works of art containing not only stolen objects, which is the four million number, but about a million objects found belonging to German museums and other German cultural
institutions and individuals, which the Monuments Men were custodians of for about five years until Germany’s institutions could be rebuilt and a new post-Nazi government put in place.

The needs of the Monuments Men increased dramatically while combat troops were coming home. They began adding to their numbers additional men and women, this is where the women really come into play, and increased where the number of people who had served turned out to be about 350. There were never that many at one time.

There were new Monuments officers coming in, some of the first initial groups are going home, and you have Monuments officers from 12 other nations besides the United States coming to the central collecting points where the stolen objects are grouped and sorted through, a process that takes almost six years.

Things that were stolen from Poland
were piled up in one area, as an example.

There are Polish Monuments officers that help identify which things came from Poland, and there are officers from Belgium, from Holland, from France, and so on.

That is essentially the composition. Obviously during the period that those countries were occupied, they couldn’t produce Monuments officers, per se. It really took to the end of combat operations. As these countries were liberated, they started supplying people from their own country that knew about the works of art that had been taken from their respective countries.

I think that should give you a good overview. These are on average, average age, about 40 years old, almost all of these men and women had very established careers. Many of them had families, some had kids, and they had every reason to not do this. They were charged with saving rather than destroying.

There are two aspects I should mention
and then I’ll answer any questions you all may have, that are really changes with the way war has been fought. These are the legacies but you wouldn’t know it by what we have done since World War II because we forgot all this. We didn’t do very well in subsequent wars.

The two changes with the break of civilization were it was the first time an army on a comprehensive basis attempted to fight a war on the one hand and mitigate damage to cultural treasures at the same time. That was a change in how wars had been fought, and no average war.

The second thing was in a break with wars past, it was the policy of the western allies that the victors did not get to keep the spoils of war, and these things that had been found were returned to the countries from which they were taken.

Those are the two lasting legacies of the Monuments Men that only now through the books we have drawn to people’s attention,
policy makers, leaders, reminding them this was the gold bar, the highest standard ever established for the protection of cultural treasures, and we should know about it and re-implement it.

That is really how we have gotten to where we are in a nutshell.

CHAIRMAN MARKS: Thank you, Mr. Edsel. I guess I will start off with a question, a couple of questions, I guess. Are there any pieces of art that were recovered with themes outside of the religious realm that were celebrated and signaled out as important finds? Are there just a few that come to mind that might be images that could represent the five million pieces that were recovered and repatriated?

MR. EDSEL: Yes. Well, you are boring now I think on the right thing, and this is why we made recommendations. I think the Bruges Madonna--I think it is unfair and inaccurate to redline that one. Let me make a
point. I know something about art having collected it, et cetera.

In the 13th/14th/15th Century, that is all anybody painted. They didn’t paint it as religious art. It wasn’t considered religious art. They painted the subjects at the time. That is what the subjects were. You won’t find anything that can’t be construed in that context.

Madonna and Child by Michelangelo, the Bruges Madonna and Child, that I don’t think is a religious subject as much as say the Kent Altarpiece, which is the land of Christ, et cetera. No question there.

Leonardo da Vinci’s Lady with an Ermine would certainly be a non-religious piece and it is one—I don’t know if you have a copy of my first book, it is on the front cover of that book with Monuments officers holding that painting and returning it.

There are only 15 accepted paintings by Leonardo da Vinci in the world. This is
one of the ones he has done entirely in his own hand and signed. It was stolen by the Nazi’s from Krakow, Poland. The Monuments officers found it and returned it in that dramatic photo, holding it in front of a train.

There are works. Michelangelo’s David, which I consider no more a religious work or no less than the Bruges Madonna-- anyway, the David wasn’t stolen because nobody could pick it up and get it out of the building. It was under threat of damage during the war.

CHAIRMAN MARKS: Thank you. I would argue that the David isn’t necessarily a religious figure and David was a King in the real world. I think in a program like this, we’re going to need some images that can represent the broad spectrum. Clearly, we can’t put everything on a three inch medal.

MR. EDSEL: That’s the problem. I hear where you are coming from.
Unfortunately, it was the Monuments, Fine Arts and Archives Group, MFAA was the acronym, nicknamed Monuments Men, they never even had their own insignia or designation because they were just a bunch of individual officers, most of whom volunteered, which is one of the elements that makes their service so noble.

They came out of private careers in private enterprise and volunteered to go into military service to do this, or they were in reserves and volunteered to be called up or transferred into, because everyone had to go into the Army. A lot of these guys were Naval Reserve’s and had to transfer over.

There is no insignia, there is no patch. We don’t have anything to work off like you would have with 101st First Airborne or anything like that. What we do have are a work of art recognized.

The problem with the David is the great concern of protecting it from damage, the Italians’ effort to protect it out of fear
of allied bombing, so it would be a correct depiction to say it was under threat during the war. I think it would be misleading in the sense that someone might come along and say well, the greatest danger the David faced was being damaged by allied bombing as opposed to the Leonardo painting, which is just so iconic, which doesn’t get any bigger as far as the name.

There are also some paintings by Vermeer that were stolen, but I think it pales in comparison to the paintings of Leonardo da Vinci.

CHAIRMAN MARKS: Thank you, Mr. Edsel.

MR. EDSEL: Christy, haven’t we provided some images for them?

MS. FOX: We did in the Dropbox, but I’m not sure that’s the best way to communicate them to the full Committee.

CHAIRMAN MARKS: Thank you. I want to thank both Mr. Edsel and Ms. Fox for your comments. I need to preserve the balance of
our time for actual discussion with the Committee. We need to conclude this at the top of the hour.

I’ll just quickly conclude my own comments, and that is I think there is also a potential opportunity here for maybe the reverse in honoring the nations that were involved in the effort. This is to honor the men and women who were part of this effort to discover and repatriate the art.

I think this is an opportunity to observe the different nations that contributed to the effort. That is one idea that I think might do well for this medal.

MR. EDSEL: You might get some stars on there or something to indicate each country, but the thing to remember is until the end of the war, the burden falls predominately on American and British soldiers, and there were two Monuments officers killed, one American and one British, in March and April 1945, respectively.
I don’t think--we run a risk in trying to recognize all countries if we do more than something symbolic like a star.

CHAIRMAN MARKS: I understand what you are saying. We need to preserve the balance of our time, like I said, for the members. I’m going to recognize Heidi to let us know what her ideas might be.

MS. WASTWEET: This is a very challenging topic to portray and I wish the artists much luck. I don’t want to underestimate how difficult this is. There’s going to be a temptation to get too busy in the designs, to get too narrative, so I encourage the artists to try to distill this down to some iconic images, like the Girl with the Ermine as a representation of the pieces, it is an iconic and important image, and I would encourage use of that.

I think that is all I have.

CHAIRMAN MARKS: Erik, if you’re ready, go ahead.
MR. JANSEN: Echoing Heidi’s thoughts, I think it’s going to be very tempting to drill into the actual artifacts and deliver a collage of artwork like one might see in an auction house or something. I think that is probably not the symbolic direction we might want to go here. As I was sitting here listening to all of this, what came to my mind was the idea of the give back, the restoring, the recovery of the world’s cultural memory.

I see two big hands kind of delivering back to the world the artwork and cultural and history and signatures and memory of the past. I also see a stewardship kind of symbol here. I’m not sure where that comes or goes in terms of pulling symbols out.

We have an effort by the Monuments Men to be the stewards for what was confused as ownership and theft. There is something there I think has a huge ethical piece to it. I would encourage the artists to maybe explore
the symbolic history of stewardship, ownership, those kinds of things.

That is what this feels like to me. We have two large images here. This is a large medal, so we’re not in a small pallet of a gold coin or even something as large as an one dollar eagle kind of size. This is a large pallet.

I would also not shun some key verbiage, if in the diligence here there are some phrases made by any of the leading politicians, either FDR when he established this or Eisenhower when he empowered the Monuments Men by issuing the orders. There may be some verbiage in some of their political statements or otherwise there that might be worth digging out.

A question for our executives on the phone here, I know in the wake of some of the battles in the Middle East, some of the destruction of the icons of Islam and otherwise over there, has there ever been a
move to resurrect this kind of Monuments Men movement more recently, or did this effort formally terminate, and if so, how and when?

MR. EDSEL: Those are good questions. The Monuments' effort was so successful that it really was the foundation for the creation of the UNESCO laws in 1954, the Hague Convention, concerning the protection of cultural properties.

The countries around the world that are signatories, the United States being an early one, although it was not ratified until President Clinton or President Bush's time, were responsible for having their own respective Monuments officers, and no one really did that. In other words, each country was responsible for protecting its own stuff.

Rolling forward, no. There was no ongoing effort by the United States, as an example, to have a designated group of Monuments officers in any wars fought since World War II. Of course, we know from the
looting and damage to the National Library, et cetera, it was a giant black mark on our record.

After that happened, the Army, to its credit, brought in experts, and they have a different section now, I think they call it Arts, Monuments--they have a different acronym for it. There are people in the military now that are being trained to do this. There are more military people being trained rather than outside experts being brought in, as took place in World War II. Of course, we see the horrible destruction that is going on.

Commenting quickly about your point about stewardship. It’s an excellent point. One element of stewardship is these countries in Europe were lying flat on their back. We all know that, they were broke, they were starving, and the role of the Monuments Men over and above finding and returning these works of art, was to get the cultural life jump started, to start exhibitions, temporary
exhibitions, using their works of art that they had that had been stolen, and trying to get people back into doing the things they had been doing during the war.

You are right to pick that as a theme, and there are all sorts of wonderful phrases, including from a couple key Monuments officers who actually thought of this program and were the ones that proposed it to President Roosevelt, and we have a lot of those phrases in the Dropbox for your people to look at.

MR. JANSEN: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN MARKS: Who else might be ready to comment?

MS. LANNIN: I can comment. I guess I can say I was fortunate to have been in Bruges earlier this week and have seen the Bruges Madonna. I think the Lady with the Ermine would be a good one. It gets away from any religious aspect that people may be complaining about.

I was just thinking that because this
is such a large medal, maybe an interesting thing, if we are talking about words in the background or something, if a medal was textured and initially looked like just lines in the back, what if they were artist signatures or artist names all rolled together as one long line representing the art that had been saved? You, Van Dyck, Michelangelo, Leonardo da Vinci.

MR. EDSEL: We created something like that. It’s a work product, we had a list of artists, and they just all ran together, but then you could bore in on it. I think it’s a great idea. Christy, you know what I’m talking about?

MS. FOX: Yes.

MR. EDSEL: We will send that to you.

MS. LANNIN: It was so much more than just something from the 15th/16th Centuries. Because the names keep going on and on and on, that gives you the scope of how many things were actually took.
MR. EDSEL: Yes.

MS. LANNIN: I think that would be absolutely gorgeous.

CHAIRMAN MARKS: Thank you, Mary. Who else would like to make some comments? Herman?

DR. VIOLA: I don’t have a whole lot to say. My background, of course, is museums. Talking about individual pieces of art, I think the timing of this is so appropriate because right now we see the destruction of amazing monuments in the Middle East, the Taliban has been destroying sculptures. I think this would bring a lot of attention to the fact that we are witnessing at this very moment such great destruction of these memorials.

So, was there like a museum, let’s say The Louvre, or some place that got a number of these objects and have put them back into place, and we could kind of highlight one of these famous museums to bring attention to
this preservation.

Military records are at the National Archives. For any of these people that had like their own unit, maybe there are records, and we can actually go and look and see if there are any drawings or things that are there now.

MR. EDSEL: We spent countless hours at the Archives. By the way, Corine Wegener and others there at Smithsonian, we worked with them, too. You are absolutely right to focus on what’s going on today, it’s a tragedy, what’s happening, it’s a tragedy that we haven’t learned more from what these guys did during World War II.

Their initial responsibility was to work with the allied air commanders to steer bombing away from these kinds of buildings. The one that we almost blew up was the refectory in Milan holding Leonardo’s Last Supper. A British bomb almost leveled the building, and it was a miracle that it
survived.

The problem is other than that, I don’t think there is a single building or monument that is so iconic that everybody can look at it and instantly recognize what we are talking about. That’s the problem with that.

In the case of Leonardo’s Lady with the Ermine, you have Leonardo da Vinci’s name on it, and everybody recognizes who you are talking about.

I don’t know of any drawings. There are plenty of drawings done by Monuments officers, a number of them were artists. I’ve included some of the drawings in some of my books. We will go back and look. I don’t think you are going to see a drawing of any iconic building, per se, or monument, that is going to convey that. Therein lies our problem.

If we use the Lady with the Ermine painting, it really has to be symbolic because they saved musical instruments, musical
manuscripts by the most important musicians of our time, Chopin and others. They saved manuscripts written by some of the most important people that were in the libraries that were saved.

At least in our way of understanding, having worked this 12 years, we don’t know of one thing that is so much of a silver bullet that you have an “ah-ha” moment that it represents the breadth of what the Nazi’s stole. There were church bells stolen. We have a photo of 5,000 church bells. There are gold bars. Not one of those things—they all work to the exclusion of others. That’s the problem.

MS. LANNIN: What about the salt mines?

MR. EDSEL: If we have it, we will make sure you have photos of salt mines with all the things inside. I don’t know by the time you shrink that down to the size of the medal how that will look. I don’t know.
CHAIRMAN MARKS: Okay. Who else would like to comment?

MR. MORAN: Gary, I’ll try to make it quick. I know we are running against a deadline. If you look at the items that were saved, at any one point in time, they represent the sum total of humanity, particularly the Western culture, up to that point in time in which they were created.

What you had in World War II was a chance—lost all of our Western culture. That is what these men did that was so significant, and it was in a time when there was just absolutely inhumanity on both sides; bright spot there.

I would suggest that we might want to take a look at the very beginnings of Western culture in terms of what we want to express on this medal. I would go back, when you want to express the arts, to the original Roman and Greek images for the arts, et cetera. You may very well have a very effective design in that
regard.

I think if we start trying to do some of the things of the 20th Century and some of the pieces that are saved, we’re going to get a very mediocre medal, with the exception of I think there are some potential--per Mary’s suggestion--the signatures running together in a field.

MR. EDSEL: I think that’s a good idea. It’s not just all of the things they found that they returned that were stolen. You have to consider--this is why I think one particular museum won’t work--every single museum in Europe is closed for six years.

All the things in those museums is hidden somewhere so the Monuments officers ultimately have to find and return some five million objects, but all the museums out here then have to relocate all the things that were in the museums that have been hidden in various places back in the museums.

You’re correct. You have the
accumulated artistic and manuscripts of mankind’s thinking all hanging in a pendulum during this period of time, and that is our civilization as we know it, and I think that is very interesting and a thought, and not one that we had given thought to, going back to the classics.

CHAIRMAN MARKS: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Edsel. We will go to Robert now.

MR. HOGE: I don’t really have very much to say on this. I think we can leave it with the talent, knowledge and intelligence of the artists. I think it is important to have some evocative verbiage on this piece to kind of tie these disparate elements together, something about “Heritage Regained” or “Civilization Revived” or “Restored.” Combining with the wording of “Stewardship.” I think that is very important. “Stewardship for Heritage Regained” or something like that.

I would like to leave this to the artists and to our constituencies to try to
come up with these ideas.

MR. EDSEL: Show stewardship, again, Monuments officers had to babysit the one million things that belonged to Germany, and show respect for those things, even though they were aware of the concentration camps.

CHAIRMAN MARKS: Okay. Thank you. Are there any other Committee comments on the Monuments Men?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN MARKS: I want to thank Mr. Edsel for his comments. I hope we have given at least a little push to the considerations for this congressional gold medal. I know the whole Committee will be looking forward to seeing the results of that in a visual portfolio.

MR. EDSEL: There are some great ideas. There are a couple more things that we will supplement.

CHAIRMAN MARKS: Actually, if there is more you would like to contribute, I would ask
you to provide that to us in writing. We are about out of time and there is still another item I need to consider for our agenda. Thank you very much, Mr. Edsel, for your very insightful comments.

MR. EDSEL: You are welcome.

CHAIRMAN MARKS: With that, I wanted to note that we had three of our members not able to participate with us today. Two of them did provide to me some written comments that I told them I would seek the Committee’s approval to put on the record.

I’m going to make a motion that the remarks from Jeanne and Michael Bugeja be included in the record in totality. If this motion passes, I will actually include it at the end of our minutes so their ideas and thoughts about these subjects today can be preserved.

Is there a second to my motion?

MR. MORAN: Second.

CHAIRMAN MARKS: It has been moved and
seconded to include Jeanne and Michael Bugeja’s remarks on the record. All those in favor, please raise your hand.

(Show of hands.)

MS. LANNIN: Aye.

CHAIRMAN MARKS: That is an unanimous vote. Thank you very much. We have reached the end of our agenda today. I want to thank everyone who participated. I want to thank the staff for an excellent job, well done.

In the matter of the thematic discussions, I for one and I know the Committee are very much looking forward to the portfolio’s once they reach us.

With that, for those who need to travel, I wish you safe travels.

MR. MORAN: And Merry Christmas.

CHAIRMAN MARKS: Yes. We are not meeting again this calendar year, so all the seasonal greetings to all of you and your families. Health, happiness, and Happy New Year.
I think we are going to convene again in January, so I will see you all then. Thank you very much. We are adjourned.

(Whereupon, at 12:50 p.m., the Committee meeting was adjourned.)
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