

*An Open Letter to*

*Chairs of  
the National  
Humanities Councils*



*Convenors of  
the National Issues  
Forums*

*From Sheldon Hackney and David Mathews*



FROM  
SHELDON HACKNEY  
AND  
DAVID MATHEWS  
TO  
CHAIRS OF NATIONAL  
HUMANITIES COUNCILS  
AND CONVENORS OF  
NATIONAL ISSUES  
FORUMS

**W**hen, in the spring of the year, we invited chairpersons of the State Humanities Councils and convenors of the National Issues Forums to think together how they might address problems associated with diversity and pluralism in our nation — about our American identity, indeed — we obviously thought it a good idea, and one appropriate to those two groups of citizens. But we had not then examined ways of going about it, nor considered how the councils and the forums might best respond to the challenge that the National Endowment for the Humanities had offered in suggesting a national conversation on this topic.

What we began with, in fact, was only a sense that it might be important, in a time of jaded and fractious cynicism, to discuss the values we share despite our different racial, ethnic, and cultural identities. It seemed to us that we have often let what divides us capture

the headlines. And we thought it might be useful for us as a people, now, both to understand those differences more clearly and to discuss more fully what we share as common

American values in this plural society.

***State Councils and  
the National Issues Forums***

This very conviction had first led the National Endowment to issue its call for a national conversation. The Endowment had anticipated that organizations all over the country might join in such a conversation, and that the humanities own State Councils might lead the way. A challenge that the National Endowment has always faced has been to help people use the approaches of the humanities, and their wisdom, to enrich such conversations in our everyday lives; and the State Councils have consistently tried to bring the group of academic disciplines known collectively as “the

humanities” — history, literature, philosophy, and so on — to bear upon such work. For two decades now, State Councils for the Humanities have encouraged wide public exploration of the heritage and the patterns of our lives, and of the ideas and principles that have informed them, historically. But we

recognized, nonetheless, that if such a dialogue as was proposed by the National Endowment was to be a truly National one, it would need to enlist the resources and the passion of the broad range of citizen organizations across the country through which Americans characteristically vent

their concerns, pursue their goals, and join together both to assess their common needs and to devise answers to their common concerns. Among such groups, it seemed clear to us — and it has now become evident — (few could be) more appropriate to this task than the National Issues Forums.

In communities throughout the nation each year, citizens in thousands of these forums talk their way through critical issues that are at the top of the nation’s agenda. These forums are locally generated and controlled. They are convened by groups as different from one another as high schools and churches, senior citizens’ groups and colleges, libraries, civic leadership organizations, prisons — and tiny groups of neighbors, meeting together in each other’s living rooms.

The participants are, of course, self-selected; and no group of them — nor even perhaps the aggregate of all groups across the nation — represents the kind of sample that would satisfy

a social scientist or opinion pollster. But overall, the forums do cover a remarkable range of the American people: a rich ethnic mix, the poor and the well to do, teenagers and senior citizens, and people struggling to overcome their own illiteracy. Not every American voice is heard in

**In communities throughout the nation each year, citizens in thousands of these forums talk their way through critical issues that are at the top of the nation’s agenda.**

these forums; but altogether, each year, they constitute a kind of national town meeting and they yield unmistakably a public voice.

When people in these forums look at issues of national concern, they do not debate them in academic terms or consider them as abstractions at a

comfortable distance. Rather, they look at the choices such issues present to us and the values they call into question — their implications for our workaday lives. A study by John Doble Research for Kettering indicates that most people do not approach the subject of diversity or pluralism in America as it is often approached on the nation’s campuses. Typically, people understand it more quickly if it is described not in terms of abstract concepts but rather in the context of concrete problems that they encounter in their everyday life: immigration policy, bilingual education, minority representation on councils or commissions (or, indeed, in the workplace), or in connection with the “official language” of our public life and bilingual education in the schools. Indeed, the schools themselves, the subjects they are to teach and the values they either seek to or inevitably do impart, are often a context in which discussion of American pluralism comes to life in the public forum.

It is on such topics as these, then, that Americans engage questions of pluralism with intellectual vigor and deeply personal frankness. And on some of these topics, the National Issues Forums have already prepared discussion guides for use this year. In a number of states, for many years now, cooperation has flourished between the National Issues Forums and the Councils on the Humanities. Theirs is a logical partnership, and a fruitful one; and we now commend it to those of you who have not yet tried it. It seems to us a particularly appropriate partnership for the topic that has been proposed for national discussion by the National Endowment.

### *Deliberation in Our Public Life*

---

The National Issues Forums are not occasions for recriminatory and fractious rhetoric. Nor are they merely bull sessions. The Americans at these “town meetings” are convinced that the problems they want to solve cannot be solved unless the public does something. (They believe that the public has to act if politics is to work as it should.) So theirs is a deliberative dialogue with other citizens, a dialogue about whether and how to act together. The participants want more dialogue than debate. They want to be able to weigh carefully all the options for action as they explore the views of others. They want to test ideas, not to score points. They want to look at the shades of gray in issues that are often presented in extremes of black and white. They want all the emotions associated with public questions to come out — but without the acrimony that characterizes partisan debate.

An ongoing, deliberative dialogue is the *sine qua non* of a democratic society. It is more than a casual conversation or discussion. It is a particular kind of talk that promotes the reasoning required for making choices. Making public choices requires that we weigh carefully

the costs and consequences of possible actions — as well as the views of others on those costs and consequences. This weighing increases the chances that our choices will be sound and our public actions truly social. For a choice to be sound, we have to know (as best we can), and be willing to accept, the consequences of our actions for things that are most valuable to us, and we have to know their consequences for others.

The problems presented to us by our diversity — *practical* problems in our daily lives — demand such deliberative dialogue, we believe. Choosing can be difficult when things that are valuable are at stake and there is no authority to tell us what is the right decision — conditions always present in politics and in public matters. When the accidents of diversity impinge on the terrain of personal habit and conviction, then such circumstances call for the public to hold counsel with itself, in a dialogue that is exploratory, open to all options, and also reflective. In deliberative dialogue, listening carefully to one another is more important than speaking eloquently. A deliberative dialogue is a serious and intense interaction among people, so intense that it changes the participants and produces new insights.

### *The Humanities and A Public Voice*

---

The public television program, “A Public Voice . . .,” in which each year leaders from the Congress and from the press review the outcomes of the National Issues Forums, have made clear to us that genuinely deliberative dialogue among the public can reveal perspectives on public questions that are often not apparent in the noisy and sometimes recriminative debates of professional politics. Nor do the forums reflect only the talk of street corners and coffee shops. When citizens together

and openly in public forums work their way through choices that confront them, there often emerges a kind of truth, an understanding, a shared way of looking at complex questions that was not evident before.

(Arendt and Habermas would argue that it did not exist before.) This “public truth” emerges when widely differing experiences are brought together, when different perspectives are brought

to bear on each other, when a whole is simultaneously seen freshly by unlike individuals, who characteristically see only parts. In such acts of dialogue, *individuals* become a public — *people* make up a purposeful *polis*.

If the State Humanities Councils and the National Issues Forums can generate such a dialogue on the topic of our diversity, we anticipate that we can prepare a special edition of the television program, “A Public Voice . . .” — featuring, this time, humanities scholars as well as eminent individuals from the political and media establishments. We believe it would be appropriate to do so. For surely the task of the humanist — not unlike that of the politician and the journalist, and citizens acting together as a public — is to examine experience in all its heterogeneity and promise, its inadequacy and its potential, and to create from that the apprehension of a whole that is less flawed than the aspects of reality that tease us, variously, from day to day.

There is, we suspect, a public role for the humanist that we have as yet scarcely begun to explore. The National Endowment has always sought to bring scholars out of the academy to “do their thing” in the public square; and to bring the humanities to bear (as legislation puts it) on

“the current conditions of national life.” Yet, typically this has meant only a podium for the humanist — at best a seminar table — in an unfamiliar place. What we are now looking

toward, however, is a yet unimagined role for humanists as individuals among their fellow citizens, bringing their unique ways of knowing and disciplined minds into the service of the *polis*, where they among others

can play a coequal but distinctive part.

The matter of pluralism, of American diversity, surely concerns all of us in the American public; yet because its roots are tangled in our past, where they have been nourished by well-articulated ideas, fashioned out of manifold experience, it is a matter peculiarly pertinent to the humanities. So the conversation envisioned by the National Endowment and the deliberation planned by the National Issues Forums may offer a place for humanists strongly to affirm their commitment as citizens. It is in that spirit that we again urge your own deliberation on the question of our American identity. And we have enclosed a few further paragraphs for your interest.

Sheldon Hackney, Chairman  
National Endowment for the Humanities

David Mathews, President  
Kettering Foundation

**Making public choices  
requires that we weigh  
carefully the costs and  
consequences of  
possible actions.**

**A**merica has always been diverse, and its diversity has been a source of our richness as a nation as well as a source of friction and even conflict in our history. But as we move into the twenty-first century, we see many signs of fragmentation:

debates over school and university curricula, disputes over immigration, ethnic rivalries in our cities, the increasing use of violence to resolve conflicts, and — at the same time — an expressed longing for “community.”

In this context the National Endowment for the Humanities believes that a broadly based exploration of the history, development, and nature of our plural society has become a matter of some urgency, and that the disciplines of the humanities can play a vital role in this exploration. We therefore invite all Americans to join in a conversation, informed by scholarship, about the nature of American

## A NATIONAL CONVERSATION

pluralism and identity. This conversation is an opportunity for Americans of all backgrounds to study, learn, and speak face-to-face about our differences — of race, ethnicity, and culture — as well as about the values we share as

Americans. We hope that the conversation will involve people of all ages, from rural and urban areas, from large and small communities — in church basements and at PTA meetings, in schools, libraries and research universities, in community colleges and museums — anywhere Americans can talk together about these important matters.

We hope that, through this national conversation, Americans will engage in dialogue on questions central to the future of American society:

- What is our image of the America of the twenty-first century?

- Is America to become a collection of groups, whose members think of themselves first as members of an ethnic community, race, or culture and only second as Americans?
- Can our ideal be an America of shared values and commitment that nonetheless retains cultural differences? Can we identify those values and commitments that we need to share if we are to be a successful society?
- What picture of an ideal America will inform our struggles with current problems?

All of our people — left, right, and center — have a responsibility to examine and discuss what unites us as a country, what we share as common American values in a nation comprised of so many divergent groups and beliefs. For too long, we have let what divides us capture the headlines and sound bites, polarizing us rather than bringing us together. The National Endowment is proposing a national conversation open to all Americans, a conversation in which all voices are heard and in which we grapple seriously with the meaning of American pluralism.

The subject is elusive, but it is very important. If the conversation works well, we will stake out some common ground, and by doing that we will make it possible to celebrate more fully the variations among us that play against each other and reinforce each other to produce a dynamic national identity. As President Clinton said in a different context at the dedication of the Holocaust Memorial Museum, “We must find in our diversity our common humanity. We must reaffirm that common humanity, even in the darkest and deepest of our disagreements.”

The Endowment does not expect the national conversation to result in simple answers. Rather, the conversation is designed to establish public spaces, opportunities for Americans to explore the nature of our diverse society, our identity as Americans, and the evolving ideal suggested by our nation’s motto, *e pluribus unum*: one out of many.

**A** growing number of State Humanities Councils are already including National Issues Forums within their public humanities programming. Many councils find that the deliberation that takes place during forums

yields an important level of insight into the questions of American values and identity posed by the National Conversation initiative.

The Nebraska Humanities Council has already conducted a public forum in Norfolk on "Admission Decisions: Should Immigration Be Restricted?" in cooperation with the *Norfolk Daily News*, the Norfolk Public Library, and Norfolk Cablecom. According to Jane Hood, executive director of Nebraska Humanities Council, the participants represented a wide cross-section of the community, including students, community leaders, and recent immigrants to the area.

## STATE HUMANITIES COUNCILS AND NIF


The Nebraska Council provides National Issues Forums issue books and videotapes through its Humanities Resource Center, where Heather Ropes-Gale, program officer at the Council, coordinates NIF resources. "We're looking forward to helping make this program

available to the public and encouraging groups to take ownership at the local level."

The South Carolina Humanities Council is organizing public forums on "Contested Values: Tug-of-War In the School Yard" in three of its cities. Charleston, Sumter, and Greenville will host the forums; local television stations will film the events.

At their annual humanities festival in Buford, representatives from each forum share their experiences. In a dialogue with humanities scholars, participants will reflect on the insights from the deliberative process of the forums.





A diverse group of Nevadans met together in Reno to examine “Admission Decisions” in a forum cosponsored by the Nevada Humanities Committee and Reno Public Broadcasting. Participants included members of the clergy, local and state policymakers, high school students, scholars, social workers, law enforcement officers, and educators. Reno Public Broadcasting plans to air a one-hour edition of the forum.

According to Judith Winzeler, executive director of the Nevada Humanities Committee, the discussion was “lively, open, and very honest. It refused easy answers or facile agreement while taking on all points of view. That is a crucial step toward any understanding, and especially any action, on an issue of this importance and this complexity.”

The West Virginia Humanities Council in a statewide direct program to facilitate National Issues Forums, has developed partnerships with literacy programs, schools, the state prison system, the religious community and others who conduct forums on a wide range of

topics. The Council has sponsored regional programs that entail examination of literature, philosophy, and history, and culminate in a National Issues Forum, on topics such as free speech and immigration.

Chuck Daugherty, executive director of the West Virginia Council, believes these regional programs have emphasized the connection of National Issues Forums to the humanities and they parallel the national conversation initiative.

**D**eliberation is the means by which a democratic people must do their business. And public deliberation is often surprisingly different in both tone and preoccupation from that on which professional

politicians and experts typically expend their professional energies.

After deliberating with others, who are different from themselves yet their peers, individual citizens do not necessarily change their sharpest opinions, nor their ideological inclinations. Yet some understandings become clearer, and shared. More remarkable, participants tend quickly to sense that they ought to be taken seriously.

This is why democracy is sometimes thought to be a subversive and explosive idea. When citizens see democracy merely as a means of electing those who would govern them, it scarcely seems an empowering force,

## PUBLIC DELIBERATION

though it may provide the weak with some protection. But once citizens see it as a means whereby they may determine the character of the *polis* and the *policies* that it should follow, then it is indeed — at its best it has proved to be — the most powerful political

force in the modern world.

John Dewey saw deliberation as an imagining of alternatives from among which an action must eventually be chosen; and in *public* dialogue a range of alternatives are laid open by individual citizens in the democratic marketplace. In the democratic dialogue, too, we encounter experience and opinion that, placed in the common forum, is for once freed from the more familiar context of attack and defense. If imagined alternatives under deliberation are the shared products of many experiences, and if eventual action is the outcome (the “choice”) from that sharing, then deliberation is not merely a *product* of the

community, of a people working together, but in itself it *characterizes* that community. This is why the distinction between deliberative dialogue and the unhappily more familiar political debate is initially important—community is *created* in the act of public deliberation, a dialogue among unlike others. The *polis* or community is no mere accident of time and geography, but created by an act of will. So Hannah Arendt, ultimately, saw the action of judging together in a world we have in common as the essential political action, the very definition of the democratic community.

Since Walter Lippmann at least, it has been the fashion for intellectuals and political leaders to think they know better than the public. It is not their expectation that the public may have something to tell *them*; that the public might be ahead of the experts or the politicians. They do not expect to see people working through, reflecting on values, *discovering* what they think, discovering themselves and each other. They have not yet come to understand that public deliberation does not necessarily get people closer to what an elite thinks, but at its best reveals truths that elites themselves may not have typically begun to think about.

This has not been the view of the American public that has prevailed in this century. Democracy has prevailed; but an understanding that democracy depends on a public in dialogue with itself has not. In a nervous political establishment, a voracious press, and a television tradition that prefers

events to issues, those who recognize that the end of public deliberation is to create a truth that does not preexist are few indeed. Few have acknowledged that the public might and should have something to say that is unique to it and uniquely the product of its deliberation. But there is a kind of truth, a “public truth,” that is *only* found in public deliberation. It has no preexistence but is created in public deliberation; it is generated in dialogue among unlike others. And it is by this deliberation that we discover what we share with those whose choice of candidate or ideology might be quite other than our own. It is by this deliberation that we come to understand how the choice that we favor has its impact on them. It is by this deliberation that we discover the direction to which we are all willing to turn. And it is by this deliberation that we agree at what point we shall circle the wagons. This deliberation is the democratic habit of mind.

Deliberation does not lead people to change their opinion; it leads them to change their understanding. It produces not a refined, less volatile opinion, but a judgment that is more complex, more faceted, more flexible; not mushy, but more exquisitely textured, elusive, harder to describe, let alone capture, in preframed questions. This is what is variously called “common ground,” “public judgment,” a “public voice.” It is not easily caught and never ensured; but *when* it is captured, it is the most profound political force we know. It is the ultimate political permission.

# THE NATIONAL ISSUES FORUMS

*We need to find a better way  
for the public to learn the  
public's business.*

**T**his sentiment led to a new phase in the American town meeting tradition — the creation of a network of local National Issues Forums (NIF). In 1981, a few civic and educational organizations began to hold public forums using a different type of

policy issue book prepared by two nonpartisan research foundations, Kettering and Public Agenda. These NIF books and forums are distinctive in that they:

- (1) present issues in public rather than expert or ideological terms; and
- (2) encourage people to make tough choices rather than just discuss issues.

Prepared after careful research on public attitudes, the books lay out several different approaches to each issue. There are, inevitably, both pros and cons to each approach, which touch responsive chords in many, if not most people who think about

them. So by weighing these pros and cons, in open dialogue with people like — or often *unlike* — themselves, a forum, as a group, will tend to discover new insights, begin to see the issue in a common light, to approach a shared judgment. The National

Issues Forums process of talking their way through an issue, “choice work,” is an attempt to reach a “choice” about the direction of their life together, their *public* life. And it entails *work*.

Each year since 1981, Kettering and Public Agenda have prepared books on three different issues of national concern — poverty, health care, national security, the drug crisis, and the environment, to name just a few. Now, more than 5,000 organizations across the country — leagues and leadership programs, churches and synagogues, high schools and universities, libraries and adult literacy programs — hold NIF deliberations

annually as part of their own local programs.

It's important to understand that NIF is not a project of any foundation or other organization. All forums are locally controlled and financed. NIF is not an organization; rather, it is a voluntary network of civic and educational organizations, a network connecting a wide variety of associations, leagues, clubs, study circles, and schools in an ongoing public dialogue.

The public forums of this network are modern versions of America's oldest political institution, the town meeting.

### ***Who Participates?***

---

While the size of the NIF network is impressive, the diversity of the audience is equally significant. NIF participants vary considerably in age, race, gender, economic status, and geographic location. Students in literacy programs participate in forums and so do university students. NIF books reach teenagers and retirees, prison inmates and community leaders.

### ***What Are the Results?***

---

NIF deliberations don't elect anyone to office and they don't advance any special interests. Yet they do have a political effect of the most basic kind. They create a public; they turn private individuals into public citizens; they help set directions for governments and they build a common ground of shared purposes for public action.

People are tempted to think of politics as

influencing someone else. Citizens and special interests try to *influence* politicians and governments. But real public influence lies in the public's ability to make choices about purposes and directions for their communities and their country. Democratic politics begins in deciding what we as a people should do.

### ***Creating a Public Voice***

---

Each year, results from questionnaires in the NIF books and videotapes of forums around the country are used to make a national public affairs television program, "A Public Voice," shown on PBS stations. In this program, taped at the National Press Club in Washington D.C., members of Congress and distinguished representatives from the media themselves reflect on and react to the forums as they are captured on brief excerpts from videotapes. Typically, they recognize there a kind of dialogue, and often an understanding of the issues, that is significantly different from what they encounter in their professional lives, on Capitol Hill, or in the nation's press rooms. This "public voice" is the outcome of the forums, and it can have a genuine political importance. Excerpts from the video program (which is available on cassette from PBS Video) are subsequently printed in booklet form. Local forums use the versions in print and on television, and other means, to make their own reports.

**T**he National Foundation for the Arts and Humanities Act of 1965, which established the National Endowment for the Humanities (NEH), underscored the enduring connections between the humanities and

American democracy. In passing this legislation, Congress drew inspiration from an earlier report of the Commission on the Humanities, sponsored by the American Council of Learned Societies. The Commission conceived of the humanities “as functioning components of society which affect the lives of all the population.” The Congress recognized that “democracy demands wisdom and vision in its citizens” and called for new initiatives that would relate the humanities to “current conditions of national life.” Democracy requires an “active, educated citizenry” seeking “a better



THE  
HUMANITIES  
AND  
PUBLIC LIFE

understanding of the past, a better analysis of the present, and a better view of the future.”

Thus, NEH’s founding legislation recognized the importance of ideas to democratic culture. Implicit is the recognition that social coherence and advancement is made

possible largely through the power of ideas to clarify commonly shared problems and issues. Implicit as well is the recognition of the interrelation between ideas and the development of public policy. Ideas embody values, and values structure and substantiate public policy. In a democratic society, public scrutiny of values is essential to addressing public issues and to developing constructive public policy.

In reflecting on the significance of this legislation, philosopher Charles Frankel observed that “Nothing has happened of greater importance in the history of American

humanistic scholarship than the invitation of the government to scholars to think in a more public fashion . . . with the presence of their fellow citizens in mind.” But the legislation includes as well an invitation to the public to put the humanities to work on behalf of their communities and the nation as a whole. In extending this invitation, Congress placed the humanities at the very center, not the periphery, of public life.

Historian Merrill Peterson points out that it is misleading to regard the humanities as a set of academic disciplines. Rather, they should be identified “with certain ways of thinking — of inquiring, evaluating, judging, finding, and articulating meaning.” They are, he states, “the necessary resources of a reflective approach to life.” He points out that “where the humanities are vigorous, action follows form and is guided by reflection.” The cultivation of the humanities is important to the American people because of their capacity “to change, elevate, and improve both the common civic life and individual lives.”

Enhancement of civic life through the humanities takes many forms. The *dissemination of the humanities* to public audiences, through lectures, conferences, interpretive exhibits, and related programming, has been central to projects funded by NEH and the state humanities councils. The *use of the humanities to illuminate public issues* represents another form of the public humanities, especially when the results of such research are directed

toward public as well as scholarly audiences. A third, and very promising form, is that of *active engagement of scholars with the public*, finding its impulse in local communities that seek to use the resources of the humanities to clarify issues and interests that are of deep concern to them.

In pursuit of this third form of a public humanities, the collaboration of the National Issues Forums with the NEH provides opportunity for scholars to be actively engaged with the public on issues related to American pluralism and identity. The many scholars who will participate in these civic dialogues will bring to the table the resources of the humanities in ways noted by Merrill Peterson. Citizens who will participate in these forums will bring their experience, knowledge, and values, giving shape and focus to the conversation and to the participation of the scholars.

The vision evoked in the legislation establishing the NEH — that of an inquiring, educated citizenry sharing fully in the civic life of the nation — provides inspiration for this collaboration between NEH and the National Issues Forums. And for a longer-term engagement of scholars with the public!

**WHO TO  
CONTACT TO  
FIND OUT  
ABOUT WHAT**

For information about NEH's conversation on pluralism,

Call the National Endowment for the Humanities 1-800-NEH-1121

or write National Endowment for the Humanities  
The National Conversation  
1100 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.  
Washington, DC 20277-2885

For information about State Councils on the Humanities,

Call Carole Watson at 202-606-8254

or write Carole Watson, Director of State Programs  
National Endowment for the Humanities  
1100 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.  
Washington, DC 20506

Or

Call Esther Mackintosh at 704-908-9700

or write Esther Mackintosh  
Federation of State Humanities Councils  
1600 Wilson Boulevard, Suite 902  
Arlington, VA 22209

For information about the National Issues Forums,

Call Jon Kinghorn at 1-800-433-7834

or write Jon Kinghorn  
National Issues Forums Institute  
100 Commons Road  
Dayton, OH 45459-2777

For information about State Councils' work with the National Issues Forums,

Call Betty Knighton at 304-346-8500

or write Betty Knighton  
West Virginia Humanities Council  
The Union Building, Suite 800  
723 Kanawha Boulevard, E.  
Charleston, WV 25301



For guidance on how to moderate a forum,  
Call Jon Kinghorn at 1-800-433-7834  
or write Jon Kinghorn  
National Issues Forums Institute  
100 Commons Road  
Dayton, OH 45459-2777

For information about the national "Public  
Voice" television production,  
Call Milton B. Hoffman Productions  
c/o Public Agenda at 212-686-7016  
or write Milton B. Hoffman Productions  
c/o Public Agenda  
6 East 39th Street, (9th floor)  
New York, NY 10016

For videotape cassettes of past "Public  
Voice" television productions,  
Call PBS Video at 1-800-344-3337  
or write Public Broadcast Service  
1320 Braddock Place  
Alexandria, VA 22314-1698

For more information about the Kettering  
Foundation,  
Call Ed Arnone at 1-800-221-3657  
or write Ed Arnone  
Kettering Foundation  
200 Commons Road  
Dayton, OH 45459-2799

For issue books (**regular and abridged  
editions**) on,

*Admission Decisions: Should Immigration Be  
Restricted?* and

*Contested Values: Tug-of-War In the School Yard*

Call Kendall/Hunt at 1-800-228-0810

or write Kendall/Hunt Publishing Company  
4050 Westmark Drive  
P.O. Box 1840  
Dubuque, IA 52004-1840

For issue books (**college edition**) on,

*Admission Decisions: Should Immigration Be  
Restricted?* and

*Contested Values: Tug-of-War In the School Yard*

Call McGraw-Hill at 1-800-338-3987

or write McGraw-Hill Publishing Company  
Princeton Road  
Highstown, NJ 08520  
Attn: Order Services S-1

For more information about public  
deliberation,

Call Victoria Simpson at 1-800-221-3657

or write Victoria Simpson  
Kettering Foundation  
200 Commons Road  
Dayton, OH 45459-2799