

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

NATIONAL ENDOWMENT FOR THE HUMANITIES

Washington, D. C. 20506

SIXTY-SEVENTH MEETING OF THE
NATIONAL COUNCIL ON THE HUMANITIES

Friday,
February 18, 1983

Shoreham Building, 806 Fifteenth Street, N.W.
Washington, D. C.

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1330 VERMONT AVENUE, NW
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

I N D E X

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

III MINUTES

Mr. Wilkie Page 2

IV REPORTS

A. Introductory Remarks

Mr. Bennett Page 2

Mr. Agresto Page 7

Mr. Bennett Page 8

B. Introduction of New Staff

Mr. Marshall Page 13

C. Contracts Awarded in the Previous
Quarter (Tab A)

Mr. Marshall Page 20

D. Application Report (Tab B)

Mr. Tashdinian Page 21

E. Gifts and Matching Report (Tab C)

Mr. Tashdinian Page 22

F. FY 1983 Appropriations (Tab D)

Mr. Tashdinian Page 22

G. FY 1984 Appropriations Request (Tab E)

Mr. Tashdinian Page 30

I. Humanities and Social Science (Tab G)

Mr. Agresto Page 38

O. Bicentennial Initiative

Mr. Wallin Page 40

J. Dates of Future Council Meetings (Tab H)

Mr. Willkie Page 60

K. NEH Plan in Response to the President's
Initiative on Historically Black
Colleges and Universities (Tab I)

Mr. Marshall Page 61

P R O C E E D I N G S

(9:00 a.m.)

MR. WILKIE: Thank you, good morning.

The first item on the agenda are the minutes from the last meeting which have been circulated to Council Members. Are there any comments or questions on those minutes?

If not, we need a motion to ratify those minutes.

I move.

MR. WILKIE: Second?

Second.

MR. WILKIE: All in favor, say I.

I.

MR. WILKIE: Any opposed?

MR. BENNETT: Thank you, good morning. I won't use 15 minutes. I'd like to take a couple of minutes and then, John Agresto would like to take a couple of minutes too.

First of all, from the field, I've been talking about this a little bit to some people and I thought I ought to share it with the Council and the staff that's here.

People often ask--my brother still asks what are the humanities, what is if you're doing anyway. To give some sense of what it is we do, some flavor, this

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1330 VERMONT AVENUE, NW

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

1 particularly charming, in my view, endearing letter arrived
2 about two weeks. I will change the names to protect the
3 innocent, but it gives a -- again, I think -- an endearing
4 sense of some of the work we do. It's addressed to me.

5 "Dear Mr. Bennett: The final report for NEH
6 Grant RT -- blank, blank -- went forward to the Endowment
7 today, but I am favoring you with an extra copy as a means
8 of reassuring you that the Endowment's faith in the project
9 and in me as the moving force behind it has not been mis-
10 placed.

11 I have long been aware of some misgivings on your
12 part about the length of time this work has taken--39 years
13 this summer, but we have had to collect the material or
14 see that it is collected as a preliminary condition of
15 classification, compilation, and publication. But the
16 results of these wearisome and demanding labors are here to
17 be seen.

18 The first Chairman of NEH, Ronald Burman . . ."
19 You see, when you get into ancient history, things get dis-
20 torted. " . . . saw the files about 1966 and was duly im-
21 pressed with what he saw. And more recently, quite recently,
22 a member of your staff was here, in 1975, but much has
23 happened even since then.

24 Thanks once more for the help NEH has given over
25 many years time."

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1330 VERMONT AVENUE, NW
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

1 I just--that's one of my favorites--I just wanted
2 --it's part of the world in which we live.

3 By way of reminder and an introduction and, I
4 guess, report, let me just say a few words about initiatives,
5 about our interest in continuing to talk to our colleagues
6 in the humanities at various levels with different and
7 varying interests.

8 As you know, the legislation creating the NEH
9 says that the Chairman is to develop and encourage policy
10 for the promotion of progress and scholarship in the human-
11 ities. We are to aid, and assist, and complement the efforts
12 of others--the larger efforts of others, indeed--in the
13 strengthening and improvement of humanities study in the
14 United States and understanding and appreciation of the
15 humanities.

16 That's a formidable task, no doubt, and one would
17 be silly and foolish to try to do that alone. We have not
18 done that alone. A number of you have asked, "What is our
19 process of initiating suggestions and recommendations for
20 policy?" and we are really seeking good advice from all
21 quarters, taking it wherever we find it.

22 Jeff Marshall will report a little later on our
23 initiative on historically black colleges and universities.
24 Let me just say there that in our thinking about this, this
25 was an act of mind I think, mind M-I-N-D, on the part of

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1330 VERMONT AVENUE, NW
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

1 staff and Council and others whom we consulted. Not some
2 sop, not some generalized statement of good intentions, but
3 I think a very well-thought-out plan that, in its speci-
4 ficity and in its design, can really make a very appropriate
5 difference.

6 We've had a variety of meetings with institutions,
7 representatives of various groups, to talk about this
8 problem and to talk about other problems. We have tried to
9 be very accessible. I think we have succeeded. We have
10 gone to meetings not just to wave the flag and press the
11 flesh, but to sit and talk with people about their interests,
12 about their ideas and the like.

13 Let me give a number of examples: I'll be
14 speaking at ACLS in April. I have asked them, I have asked
15 ACLS to put together a panel to advise me and the Council
16 on priorities for funding at NEH. Let's hear from ACLS
17 about what they think our priorities oughta be. We have
18 asked others for this advice as well. We have worked, per-
19 haps, more closely in the past with the Association of
20 Community and Junior Colleges. Rich Heckman (phonetic) and
21 I will be going to New Orleans to address representatives
22 of the Community and Junior Colleges. They have been very
23 pleased with our interest and we will be there to spend
24 a day with them.

25 Many of the Council Members know of our work with

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1330 VERMONT AVENUE, NW
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

1 State programs, our continuing discussions there, and I
2 think this has all been to the good.

3 The point is that we are interested in ideas,
4 recommendations, suggestions about doing our work better,
5 doing new work, and we are interested in these ideas from
6 whatever source.

7 At a point of one year now, or a little more than
8 one year, the range of suggestions has been significant
9 and let me just very briefly give you some idea of how these
10 have arisen and been put into effect.

11 I had this idea of the summer seminars of secondary
12 school teachers, which I think has taken off well. It was
13 really the staff that came up with the suggestion for an
14 initiative in childrens' media in our Division of General
15 Programs. This looks to be a very promising idea. A
16 scholar from the field wrote us with a suggestion about
17 travel grants to collections and that is now something we
18 will be doing in 1984. So, there's another source where we
19 have responded.

20 The statement of purpose that we'll be discussing
21 this morning for General Programs was really a Council-
22 initiated idea. Something that brought many parties to-
23 gether were the new guidelines in the Education Division
24 where Council, staff, and people in the field worked to-
25 gether in a highly consultative way to come up with what we

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1330 VERMONT AVENUE, NW
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

1 think is a very satisfactory design. So, I just give those
2 as examples of being receptive, I think, to ideas from all
3 quarters and trying to think them through and not just
4 saying, thank you and going on our merry way.

5 We welcome and we'd like to invite suggestions
6 from the field and, of course, we continue to need the
7 advice and recommendation of the Council.

8 There are some other quarters we have gone to
9 lately for such suggestions. Let me ask John Agresto to
10 say a word about that.

11 MR. AGRESTO: Just very, very briefly. This past
12 week we had a meeting with all members of the Professional
13 Program staff here at the Endowment.

14 The purpose of the meeting was to ask them for
15 their ideas, their judgments to supplement the initiatives
16 we already have and to come up with ideas for new initiatives.
17 I've already gotten a couple of memos, more phone calls
18 than I've been able to answer, and a lot of stops on the
19 elevator. We will be getting together on a regular basis,
20 myself and the staff here, to go over ideas for initiatives
21 that will arise.

22 Bill didn't mention--we should mention--when
23 Ella Sandos (phonetic) got us started on social sciences,
24 that really has blossomed into quite a -- seeming now almost
25 a major initiative. The paper I wrote was not, I guess, as

1 I thought it at first merely an intellectual exercise, but
2 at the same time became and has been an invitation, I think,
3 to many social scientists who see their work in historical
4 or philosophic terms to come here to the Endowment for
5 support. Word of that got around. The American Political
6 Science Association came out and interviewed Bill and myself
7 for an hour or so, and a long interview will be published
8 in their professional journal this coming summer.

9 Along the same lines, the Bicentennial Initiative
10 is really underway. Jeff Wallin will speak to us for a
11 few minutes later on in the agenda. But we have now
12 Bicentennial Initiatives in almost all our divisions and
13 have made grants already and look forward to some very fine
14 programs.

15 I think the last thing and most important thing
16 is just to underscore one thing Bill said. The Council is
17 a major source for us of ideas and you should never hesitate
18 to call us. In fact, we really encourage and welcome you
19 to call us with any ideas for initiatives that you might
20 have.

21 MR. BENNETT: The other side of the political
22 science thing is, as you know, those of you who have been
23 around the Endowment for awhile, when you initiate some-
24 thing in some direction, its often interpreted as lack of
25 interest in another direction. So, the response to the

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1330 VERMONT AVENUE, NW

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

1 appearance of this article in the APSA was, does this mean
2 the Endowment's getting away from the humanities and is
3 getting into the social sciences..

4 I raised this at the American Philosophical
5 Association Meeting when, looking at some numbers here at
6 the Endowment, I pointed out to the philosophers that we
7 had a larger number of applications from sociologists than
8 we had from philosophers and a better success rate for
9 sociologists than we had for philosophers. The result of
10 that is, I've been asked to attend a four-hour meeting with
11 the Executive Committee of the American Philosophical
12 Association to discuss this. I think they think they're
13 going to grill me, but I'm going to grill them on why we're
14 not getting more applications. It's an interesting thing,
15 one has to work a lot of fronts simultaneously, but as long
16 as there are enough of us to get around to different places
17 at different, if not the same time, we can I think get our
18 word out to all people who should know what we're doing.

19 What can they grill you on?

20 MR. BENNETT: They can grill me on Aristotle, okay.
21 That's why we need four hours, I guess, yeah.

22 I'd like to express a lot of admira-
23 tion for the intellectual leadership and also the adminis-
24 trative reform and vigor that are expressed in your remarks.

25 Lots of new things are being undertaken and new

1 ideas are being solicited--excellent. But this is also--
2 you also raise the question, have you gone over or are you
3 going over existing programs to see things that you may not
4 think are worth doing or are worth doing in the way that
5 we've done them. When we do undertake new initiatives, when
6 we do undertake initiative, which are good; such as travel
7 to collections, we're confronted with an administrative
8 burden that I wonder whether anyone contemplated when he
9 came up with that bright idea. We're entering a program
10 which is very like the summer fellowships in the volume of
11 materials to come in, and I think the Endowment staff is
12 going to have some second thoughts even though it's an
13 excellent program. We covered this yesterday to the horror
14 of the committee which has to read all this stuff. Of
15 course, they asked us, they said, "If you don't want to
16 read it, it's okay with us, just sign your names."

17 MR. BENNETT: Right. No, of course, one can't
18 just take all these ideas and -- without thinking about
19 their proper implementation. We talked in detail about
20 this with the staff and we had the thought that maybe we'd
21 want to start this as a regrant program, but decided not
22 to. At least on an experimental basis the staff thinks we
23 can handle it; a simplified application form, and let's
24 see how it goes in the first year or so.

25 . Nothing we're doing here I think is carved in

1 stone, or it's back to the Council on how it works. I just
2 think that this one, from the response that we've had--I'll
3 speak to this one specifically--from the field, is that
4 many people who think neither the summer stipend nor the
5 fellowship is exactly what they want, but they applied for
6 that because there's no other option. This may give us some
7 economy somewhere else, but let's see. Yes?

8 --like the word horror.

9 --remarks, horror of the committee.

10 MR. BENNETT: Right.

11 --true, true.

12 MR. BENNETT: Yes true, second?

13 True.

14 MR. BENNETT: Strike the word horror. Okay.

15 Okay, stricken. Yes?

16 I too apply at the initiatives and
17 the increasing clarification of the direction. I just--as
18 a request to the staff, it seems to me that one of the areas
19 that we need to guidance on and perhaps you could help us
20 with is the mechanisms for reaching constituencies which
21 are not organized and I think this may come up in the
22 general purpose statement, I'm not sure. I'm speaking
23 specifically of the area of general programs and those other
24 so-called out-of-school publics which don't--insofar as I
25 know--It may be that there are places that they can be

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1330 VERMONT AVENUE, NW

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

1 reached, or single places, but I'm not aware of them. And
2 it seems to me that because of the current concern that the
3 Council has expressed about quality and contact, and so on,
4 that that is an area that we need specifically to address.

5 MR. BENNETT: You're right. I think--I don't
6 know that we'll pause over it this morning, but I know that
7 Steve Kahn (phonetic) and George Faher (phonetic) and
8 others in the Division have, again, simply done what I
9 described generally has happened specifically here in
10 general programs. Oh goodness, what a tangle. But it has
11 been widely and broadly consultative talking to people in
12 the field as best we can. I think that the kind of efforts
13 that have been made to talk with people; for example, in the
14 media area, about projects that the Endowment might do that
15 would serve a broad general public has increased.

16 Other than that, I leave to the lights of the
17 staff. Steve, do you want to comment at all on this?

18 Well, I was struck, Bill, when I
19 came to the Endowment, by the effort that had been made in
20 what were then public and special programs to reach out to
21 those constituencies. And the record that was achieved by
22 the staff I think is commendable. The list of projects in
23 Program Development, in the Youth Programs area, in the
24 museums area, really reach out, I think, very successfully
25 to those constituencies and we continue to try to do so.

1 MR. BENNETT: Okay. Should we move along? Thank
2 you.

3 Introduction of New Staff; Mr. Marshall.

4 MR. MARSHALL: You have in the brown folder before
5 you two pieces that I would like to draw your attention to.
6 One is a list of additions to the NEH staff, and then one
7 of--sort of master list of introduction to people working
8 with us under a program that I'd like to describe briefly
9 to you and to sort of catch up because I've not been intro-
10 ducing those individuals in the last few months.

11 As usual, I will not conduct a responsive reading
12 of the material that's in front of you, but I would like
13 the individuals to stand.

14 The one thing I would say is, I'd like to draw
15 your attention, as you skim these materials and maybe as
16 you look at them later on, to what we consider--I know you
17 encounter individuals in the course of the committee
18 meetings and so on, but I think perhaps by looking at this
19 list you get a sense of the genuine pride the Endowment has
20 in the caliber of people who are working with us, either
21 permanently or temporarily. Even if we talk just in academic
22 terms, we have individuals working for us that would be the
23 envy of a great many colleges and universities in the United
24 States; extremely well trained, extremely well qualified,
25 and wonderful colleagues. None of that character shows in

1 a list simply of disciplines and of degrees, but it is re-
2 flected, I hope, in our spirit and our appreciation for
3 these individuals.

4 Let me quickly then ask these individuals who
5 have recently joined our staff--and any list like this is
6 a little behind, and so it may well catch up again on a few
7 others.

8 Grace Cavalieri (phonetic) I saw this morning--
9 Grace?--who has just joined relatively recently the Media
10 Program.

11 Kathleen Gallagher I saw this morning I think.
12 There's Kathleen--good morning--who has joined the Division
13 of General Programs and Youth Programs.

14 Terry Creager. Now, I didn't see Terry this
15 morning. Is he here? Terry, I think some of you know
16 from previous incarnation at the Endowment and you'll have
17 a chance to see him again--is working in Public Affairs.

18 John Walters, who is -- John is a New Program
19 Officer in the Division of Education Programs.

20 There are two individuals who have recently
21 taken new assignments that I want to mention. They're not
22 additions to the staff, but their roles are new. First,
23 I think the people in General Programs are aware, but Jan
24 Gilmore is now acting as the Assistant Director of General
25 Programs for Museums. Jan?

1 Program Officers as you would at a private foundation and
2 so on, but that's the formal title, Humanist Administrator.

3 MR. BENNETT: I learned a new piece of jargon
4 yesterday, we call it Endowment Unique. Or EU.

5 MR. MARSHALL: The other list that you have
6 following the additions to the staff is a list that is
7 close to comprehensive. Of individuals who are working
8 with the Endowment under a wonderful law called the Inter-
9 governmental Personnel Act--and the Intergovernmental
10 Personnel Act, which we abbreviate as IPA, and so does the
11 rest of the Government--makes it possible for an exchange
12 between the Federal Government and local and state govern-
13 ments, and in this case, institutions of higher education.

14 Of individuals for periods of time of a year or
15 two to work in these various sectors, to learn more about
16 them, to be able to take back to their base information
17 about the field. We have done this in both directions,
18 though more often we have brought people into the Endowment
19 than we have sent people out, but some of you recall Mort
20 Sausna (phonetic) in the Fellowships Division. Mort was
21 an IPA in reverse, as the Endowment says, and went to the
22 University of Missouri for a year under that program.

23 But we have currently at the Endowment a group
24 of individuals who are listed in this sheet, and I'd like
25 to ask each of them to stand briefly also to identify

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1330 VERMONT AVENUE, NW

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

1 themselves for you. Again please, I would ask you to just
2 --as you scan this--take a look at the great advantage that
3 this program makes possible for us and to get some sense of
4 our gratitude for their willingness to work us.

5 Susan Parr. Is Susan here this morning?

6 She's not here this morning.

7 MR. MARSHALL: She's on the road I think. Susan
8 Parr in Education..

9 John Strasberger. I did see John this morning.
10 John? Thank you.

11 In Fellowships, Bob Boffner. I saw Bob this
12 morning I think. There he is. Thank you.

13 Martha Homiac is here this morning. Good
14 morning.

15 Nick DeMaura. Ron Hursman back at the column.
16 Here?

17 In General Programs, Dale Hartke. Is Dale here
18 this morning?

19 And I know Victor Sorello, who's name is here is
20 not. Victor is--that's correct, isn't Victor out today?

21 Highly probable.

22 MR. MARSHALL: In Research, Pierce Grove. There's
23 Pierce. Good Morning.

24 Marcella Grendler.

25 Where, over there?

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1330 VERMONT AVENUE, NW
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

1 MR. MARSHALL: Yeah. James Levine. I saw Jim
2 this morning I think. Thank you.

3 David Wright, whom I've not met yet, but I believe
4 he's here. Good morning. David will start in the next
5 month and is here because we are having the Council Meetings
6 so that he can get a chance to see that happen before he
7 actually begins.

8 And Jeff Whallin. You will have a chance to talk
9 to and hear from in just a little while.

10 Again, we're delighted to have these people
11 serving with us and I'm glad to bring you up to date on them.

12 Yes, ma'am?

13 I'd just like to ask this question
14 and I think it's a great idea they're here. I counted up
15 the number, 13.

16 MR. MARSHALL: That's right.

17 Does this mean there's a reduction
18 in staff of other people that these people come in, or' is
19 there office space for all of these, or--

20 MR. MARSHALL: Yeah.

21 --reassignment of duties. What
22 happened?

23 MR. MARSHALL: No, it's not a replacement question,
24 it's, the Program makes possible the exchange of individuals
25 in any numbers, for example, so that a large Agency, like

1 the Agriculture Department, might have quite a large number
2 of people in and out at any given moment. It does require
3 an even exchange.

4 One of the limits on our ability to use this
5 Program is, in fact, physical space, and desk space, and
6 so on, and when we move to the Post Office we're going to--
7 we've very carefully calculated how many desks and so on
8 we need. So, this number, which is roughly the number of
9 IPA's we've had now for about five years or so, is likely
10 to be a standard as long as we can preserve the Program
11 because we value it very highly, but it's not a matter of
12 displacing anyone. Our limits on other personnel are
13 determined without reference to the IPA Program.

14 How long is this--

15 Does the number increase over the
16 years or is it--you said it's about five years that it's
17 been going on.

18 MR. MARSHALL: No, it's--I think the number's
19 been the same for about five years. I'm not sure when we
20 began the IPA Program. Do you know?

21 73.

22 MR. MARSHALL: Okay.

23 The first semester in 73 that
24 there was a--it doesn't matter, the institution--

25 MR. MARSHALL: Yes.

1 the individual in this case is working with us as we con-
2 tinue to -- as these grants continue toward completion, but
3 there are no new grants being made under these titles. We
4 have grantees that might extend for, I would suppose, another
5 year or two, particularly in Implementation Grants. And
6 Barbara Ashbrook and Jean Moss together on our staff are
7 working with those projects. Is that right Rich? That's
8 essentially it, to see the program--we no longer make
9 grants, but we have active grantees, so they're working with
10 the active grantees while the program--

11 So, this just saves some staff
12 time?

13 MR. MARSHALL: Yes, that's right. And we don't
14 add permanent staff to handle the task which is going to
15 disappear.

16 MR. BENNETT: Okay. Now, for the next 25 minutes
17 without commercial interruption, Mr. Tashdinian.

18 These are commercials for the,
19 Endowment.

20 MR. BENNETT: All right, these are commercials
21 for the--

22 MR. TASHDINIAN: We have under Tab B, in the
23 Council Agenda Book, the usual quarterly report on appli-
24 cations. If there are any questions about that, I'd be
25 happy to respond to them. Otherwise, I thought that I

1 would just update a little bit, including the applications
2 being presented to this Council.

3 We still are not able to note any particular
4 trend in the applications. About half the programs seem
5 to be increasing--half of them. What are decreasing--we
6 have major deadlines in March and April, so by the time we
7 next meet it will be quite clear, I think, as to what the
8 scope of demand on Endowment funds is for this fiscal year.

9 So, unless there's some questions about that,
10 turn to the next item on the agenda, which is--Yes, is there
11 a question?

12 The Quarterly Report on Gifts and Matching Funds
13 is in your brown folder. Just the one sheet showing the
14 offers outstanding and the gifts we've received to date.
15 It seems to be running in track, so we don't--we expect to
16 fully utilize the Treasury appropriation this year, which
17 is about \$11 Million.

18 Unless there's some question about that, we can
19 turn to the next item and here I would suggest you turn to
20 the Council Agenda Book, Tab D, for the Report on our Final
21 FY 1983 Appropriations.

22 Before getting into that I would like to intro-
23 duce to the Council our new Budget Examiner at the Office
24 of Management and Budget, Kathy . Would you stand
25 so people can see you. Make sure they're nice to you in

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1330 VERMONT AVENUE, NW
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

23
1 the next few hours. Thank you. Kathy joined OMB in the
2 Fall and was assigned to us, or we were assigned to her,
3 and this coming year will be the, I believe the first--the
4 full cycle we'll be working with her. We look forward to
5 that.

6 In the memorandum, under Tab D, you will note
7 the final appropriation of \$130 Million as opposed to the
8 President's original request of \$96 Million.

9 As noted in the memorandum, there was earmarking
10 by the Congress of that money, but less earmarking than
11 the previous year, so we'll have a little more flexibility
12 than we did last year. The distribution of the funds was
13 included in the material we sent you on the 1984 budget
14 that we'll be turning to very shortly. Also included in
15 the material under this Tab, the report of the House
16 Appropriation Committee and I highlighted the major items in
17 that. If there's any question about either the final
18 appropriation or the House report, I'll be happy to take
19 those up now.

20 Yes, Louise?

21 Just out of curiosity, how do we
22 handle, again, the special projects to conclusion? I mean
23 do we--how are we proceeding?

24 MR. TASHDINIAN: Well, the Conference Committee
25 earmarked funds for four areas in the General Programs

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1330 VERMONT AVENUE, NW
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

1 Division. One of those areas is with the Committee called
2 Special Projects and it included pretty much the programs
3 which were included under the old Division of Special
4 Programs, with the exclusion of Humanities buying some
5 technology. So, we are free to operate within that level
6 in terms of the various program activities; the Youth
7 Programs, Program Development, and the old Special Projects
8 kinds of activities.

9 Should we wish to spend more than or less than
10 \$250,000 of the earmarked funds, then we would have to go
11 to the Congress and get its approval for reprogramming.

12 I just don't understand what the
13 Congress means by designating that in that way. Is that--
14 because this ends up being a division, not just a program.

15 MR. TASHDINIAN: No, it simply is a level set
16 aside for that area of activity. Those earmarks were
17 exactly the same as the 1982 Appropriation, in all cases
18 under definite funds, and it's our understanding that the
19 Committees thought that given the level of \$130 Million is
20 approximately the same as the 1982 level, that they thought
21 that the Endowment should be encouraged to try to spend
22 the money in the same way as the Committees felt the
23 previous year. So, that was why they earmarked those funds
24 for those areas. The same areas were designated in the
25 1982 Appropriation.

1 Armond, did the Committee articu-
2 late a reason for the cut in Challenge Grants and the in-
3 crease in Treasury funding?

4 MR. TASHDINIAN: Actually, that was at our
5 suggestion because during the year or so, which lapsed
6 between the original submission of our request and their
7 final action, we had had a number of developments here
8 regarding our matching authors and our Challenge commitments.
9 So that those particular levels were adopted by them mainly
10 at our own suggestion.

11 Are there any other questions? Yes, Mary Beth?

12 Armond, I was troubled by some of
13 the comments in the Committee Report; Page 128 of the
14 Committee Report, and this has to do with--then it's also
15 pointed out in the memo about the Committee Report which
16 has to do with calling on the Endowment to work with
17 applicants to improve the technical quality of applications.
18 And also, what is the Committee talking about when it says,
19 "It is the expectation of the Committee that the annual
20 reports and budgets will be provided on time and that the
21 Agency witnesses will understand what is in them."? I mean,
22 one thinks that that suggests that some Agency witness, I
23 assume not from this Agency, was not prepared when they
24 appeared before Congress, or at least that's what Congress
25 thought.

1 MR. TASHDINIAN: It was our understanding that
2 that particular sentence was not directed at us.

3 Okay, I'm glad to hear that.

4 MR. TASHDINIAN: Because we have submitted our
5 reports on time and the budget was submitted a little late
6 last year because of the very late arrival of the new
7 Chairman and we had the Committee's approval to do that.

8 Yeah.

9 MR. TASHDINIAN: That, however, I don't think was
10 the case with the--let's say, the other Agencies which fall
11 under this particular title.

12 A-huh, and what about the comment
13 about the technical--improving the technical quality?

14 MR. TASHDINIAN: I think that that relates back,
15 I believe, to the reprogramming of last year in which the
16 Committee suggested that--or questioned at that time whether
17 the fact that there were surpluses in certain program areas
18 have resulted from a failure by Endowment staff to work
19 with applicants in the way that they had previously and
20 whether that then led to fewer high quality applications
21 being approved.

22 Right.

23 MR. TASHDINIAN: And this is simply a strong
24 encouragement and there are other hints, if not outright
25 directives in this particular report which urges the

1 Agency to work with applicants, particularly in the area of
2 General Programs in order to increase the possibility of
3 actually making grants at the levels set aside by the
4 Committee.

5 Okay. I have another question
6 which relates to another part of this Committee Report,
7 which I must say I was astonished when I read about the
8 new provision on the Appropriations Bill that provides that
9 members of the Council shall serve until their successors
10 are confirmed. This obviously applies to me and the other
11 members of my class whose terms would have been up or will
12 be up with the November Council Meeting, in effect; although
13 our terms don't end until January.

14 This suggests that we will be continuing as
15 members of the Council for whatever time it takes Congress
16 to get its act together and confirm our successors. So I,
17 therefore, would ask the Chairman whether any movement is
18 yet afoot to nominate successors to us, or what the story
19 is about this?

20 MR. BENNETT: Yeah, we were mindful of this, on
21 the one hand not to appear to be trying to rush people out,
22 and on the other hand, trying to plan ahead. I have made
23 a call to the--a couple of calls--to the White House, cause
24 it needs the President's initiative,--

25 Yeah.

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1330 VERMONT AVENUE, NW
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

1 MR. BENNETT: --to remind them of this expiration
2 date and to urge them to consider the names and get the
3 names up to Congress so that this can be done with dispatch.

4 A-huh.

5 MR. BENNETT: So, we have pressed our point on
6 that.

7 A-huh. But am I correct in
8 assuming that it is likely that November will not, in fact,
9 be the last Council Meeting that I will be attending?

10 MR. BENNETT: No, I think--I have grounds to
11 think--I mean we have talked to them two or three weeks ago,
12 so we've given them plenty of notice. My guess is that
13 they will be moving on this beforehand, but you know, in-
14 voluntary servitude constitutionally, and we--you know, I
15 think we'll probably hear something back when they've got
16 a slate, a roster, and then hope they will move on it.

17 I think one can expect it'll be quicker this time
18 than, say, a year ago--

19 Right.

20 MR. BENNETT: --because there aren't quite so
21 many appointments left to be made that one has in the first
22 year of two of an administration.

23 Right.

24 What's being done to reassure the
25 Congressional Committee that applicants are being helped,

1 because we know they are? Are we kind of drowning them in
2 information to that effect?

3 MR. BENNETT: Well, we are--yes, we're giving
4 them a lot of information, but we responded, I think, to
5 point here when this was raised, and this was raised first
6 to me in conversation on the Hill that certain applicants
7 had complained that they were not being treated well or
8 fairly in the Division of General Programs, and not being
9 worked with sufficiently, and I said, "Who, when, where?"
10 and nothing was forthcoming. And Steve Kahn and George
11 Faher and I met, talked about this, it surprised them, but
12 you know this kind of general accusation without specifics,
13 people didn't want to come forward through the Congress,
14 they were invited to come directly to our Division staff.

15 I think it might be useful though
16 to tell them, in some detail in a letter, what the Division
17 does routinely, because that's something that struck me as
18 indicating they just didn't know. I mean, you could say,
19 look, here's a sample of what we did in a three-month
20 period.

21 MR. BENNETT: Yeah.

22 This is information we do have.

23 MR. BENNETT: Right.

24 Just give them a log.

25 MR. BENNETT: Well, that's certainly available to

1 them if they want. We have, again, encouraged people on
2 the Hill, particularly if they're concerned or interested,
3 to come to meetings, meet with our staff, to sit in on
4 panel and staff review, and I don't know what else we can--

5 I think it's an unfair criticism.

6 MR. BENNETT: Yes, I do too.

7 On the other hand, I do think that
8 it might be to our best interest to initiate a response
9 insofar as we can. I think it might be well to consider
10 initiating a response in this case, as we have taken
11 initiatives elsewhere in order to allay those fears and to
12 try to find out what the specifics are so they can be
13 addressed.

14 MR. BENNETT: I agree. We asked for the specifics,
15 they're not forthcoming, we then proceed in the best faith
16 we can.

17 MR. TASHDINIAN: Are there other questions or
18 comments about this item? No..

19 We can turn then to Tab E of the Agenda Book. We
20 have given you in your brown folder the full text of the
21 submission to the Congress, our budget request for 1984,
22 but I think it's better to -- I'll use the material that's
23 under Tab E of the Council Agenda Book.

24 Armond?

25 MR. TASHDINIAN: Yes?

1 Can you tell us a little bit about
2 the Simon Hearing?

3 About what?

4 MR. TASHDINIAN: The Simon Hearings, yes. They
5 are scheduled for March 3, which is about two weeks away.

6 What are they?

7 MR. TASHDINIAN: Mr. Simon is the Chairman of
8 the Oversight Committee in the House. That's the House
9 Subcommittee on Education and Arts and Humanities, or
10 Post-Secondary Education, excuse me.

11 He held similar hearings last year seeking to
12 gain information about the impact of the budget reductions
13 on the programs and the areas under the jurisdiction of
14 his Subcommittee. So, that's the general topic of--

15 Do we automatically participate
16 or are we invited?

17 MR. TASHDINIAN: No, we are--Agencies are
18 expressly invited. We were invited last year and testified.
19 We are invited again this year, along with the Arts
20 Endowment, The Institute of Human Services, and various
21 other Agencies. We will all be meeting with him--all the
22 Agencies will be meeting that same day and we will appear
23 before him.

24 What will be our message?

25 MR. TASHDINIAN: This is simply to respond in

1 terms of general questions about the impact of the budget,
2 where it was reduced and why, and the anticipated impact.

3 And what will we answer? What will
4 be our general policy?

5 MR. TASHDINIAN: Well, to -- the first question
6 is, what was reduced, and that is explained. The second
7 question is, why were these particular areas reduced? And
8 the third is, what we think the impact of those are. So
9 it'll be, from our standpoint, I think a fairly routine
10 kind of question and answer.

11 The Chairman has already met with Mr. Simon to
12 go over any particular interests or concerns that he has.
13 I don't know if you want to say anything about that?

14 MR. BENNETT: No, we met with Richard Eckman
15 (phonetic) and I, Jason Hall went with us to talk to
16 Congressman Simon last week. He had some particular con-
17 cerns about potential overlap between our work and the
18 Education Division, and work at the Department of Education.
19 I think we reassured him about that.

20 We have covered that ground year
21 after year.

22 MR. BENNETT: Yeah, sure. I reminded him too
23 that we were there first apart from generic differences.

24 MR. TASHDINIAN: As regards the Appropriation
25 Request itself, in the memorandum under Tab E we note the

1 changes from our request to OMB. As you may recall, that
 2 request was made in various levels. And I also should
 3 emphasize that the OMB request levels are confidential;
 4 that is regarded as internal Executive Branch information.
 5 The Congress does request that information we provided to
 6 them, they may release it if they wish, but we are not to
 7 release it ourselves.

8 There was an extensive period of negotiation with
 9 OMB about the level and the distribution. In the final
 10 stage the Agency was free to make the distribution of the
 11 actual allowance. The actual allowance turned out to be
 12 higher than most of us had anticipated, given the planning
 13 levels that we were given earlier that year by OMB.

14 There were various reallocations made from the
 15 planning levels; they are described. The reason for these
 16 are described on Page 2. If you have any particular in-
 17 quiries about that, I'd be happy to go into them.

18 The budget request does provide for one new
 19 program; that is the travel to collections for continuation
 20 of certain initiatives begun this year. We will be empha-
 21 sizing, even though the overall amount has decreased, in-
 22 definite funds in order to increase private sector's
 23 support for the humanities.

24 Our overall personnel ceiling will be reduced
 25 from about 261 to 250 next year. If there's any question

NEAL R. GROSS
 COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
 1330 VERMONT AVENUE, NW
 WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

1 about any of the detail of that, I'd be happy to go into
2 it.

3 The House Appropriations Subcommittee has set its
4 hearing for April 13. The Senate Appropriations Subcommittee
5 will have its hearing the following day, April 14. That
6 will be a busy month for us.

7 We also have a separate document. If people
8 would like a summary of the Appropriation Request, that's
9 also available. Please contact us if you would like it for
10 your own use or those of your colleagues back in your
11 institutions. Yes?

12 I'm sorry to go back to the Simon
13 Hearing. I wasn't waving my hand energetically enough. Do
14 we prepare any documentation on applications, grants, et
15 cetera, by Carnegie-type institution, or in any other way
16 of describing how we're serving different kinds of educa-
17 tional institutions?

18 MR. TASHDINIAN: Well, we often do that for our
19 internal use. We have not been requested that by any of
20 the Congressional Committees.

21 Is that information going to be
22 available? I'd really like to see it.

23 MR. TASHDINIAN: It could become available
24 depending upon the priority of the Council--wants to give
25 it for this year. We haven't prepared it thus far, but we

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1330 VERMONT AVENUE, NW
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

1 normally at least do a distribution by the major types;
2 that is, two-year colleges, four-year colleges, universities,
3 and we usually have that sometime in the Spring.

4 Yes, Rita?

5 You mentioned--

6 (Off the record for tape change.)

7 MR. TASHDINIAN: Yes, Rita?

8 You mentioned 250 personnel in
9 skimming around material, and somewhere I read that a 250
10 personnel limit, skimming a memo which was just handed out,
11 on Page 110, --

12 MR. TASHDINIAN: Yes, yes?

13 It has Fiscal Year Estimate of
14 261. This was the year 83.

15 Is that out of date, or--

16 MR. TASHDINIAN: No, this year we have a ceiling
17 of 261 fulltime equivalent positions. For 1984, as I said,
18 there is a reduction down to 250.

19 250, and what was it--

20 MR. TASHDINIAN: For next year.

21 --the fiscal year last given?

22 It was about 261 as well, was it
23 not? Yes--

24 MR. TASHDINIAN: I think so, I think it's been--

25 --261.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

MR. TASHDINIAN: --about that.

There's been an increase at the--
approximately?

No, a decrease.

MR. TASHDINIAN: No, no, it'll be a decrease from
83 to 84.

Yeah, but from 82 to 83--

No, it was the same. It's been no
change. 82 to 83 was no change I believe.

MR. TASHDINIAN: No, I'm not--

Well, it says 251.8.

MR. TASHDINIAN: I think it's around that, see.

That was your actual level.

MR. TASHDINIAN: Oh, okay. All right. OMB has
helped us out. The figure that you have for 1982 was the
actual--what we actually had--

Right. I think the ceiling was
about the same I believe, but what was actually used--we
had a number of vacancies throughout the year last year so
that we really did not work at our ceiling.

So that the vacancy rate--

MR. TASHDINIAN: Yes.

And 261 is now being moved down
to 250 by Fiscal Year 84?

That's right.

1 MR. TASHDINIAN: That's right.

2 MR. BENNETT: Okay, any other questions? I would
3 just comment on the 84 Appropriations Request. Again, the
4 House Hearings are April 13th, the Senate April 14th. That
5 ACLS Meeting I mentioned is April 15th. It's too bad that's
6 not April 12th, but then maybe they changed my mind so I'd
7 be all confused for April 13th, so maybe it's just as well.

8 But I think that our request that we are
9 presenting is a sound and rational one, I think it's
10 eminently defensible and we'll see what happens.

11 Let's move on.

12 Mr. Chairman?

13 MR. BENNETT: Jeff, you wanted to insert--

14 MR. MARSHALL: I did. In the course of my doing
15 things ad-lib at the end of changes within the Endowment
16 and I mentioned Jan Gilmore and Dorothy Whartenberg, I
17 omitted one person and I apologize for this because I
18 remember introducing the individual in our last Council
19 Meeting, but since then she's had a change of responsibility
20 too. I'd like to ask Carolyn Reed Wallace to stand for
21 a moment, who has recently accepted the assignment as
22 Assistant Director in Education for Elementary and
23 Secondary Programs. I think that completes the changes
24 that have happened recently and I apologize.

25 MR. BENNETT: All right, let's keep moving.

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1330 VERMONT AVENUE, NW
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

1 Humanities and Social Science, Doctor Agresto--Mr. Agresto.

2 MR. AGRESTO: Thank you. At the last Council
3 Meeting, George Kennedy quite sweetly made a motion that
4 the paper I wrote become official Council policy. I think
5 also, maybe not sweetly but rightly, it was said that the
6 Council should have more time to digest the contents of
7 that paper.

8 I would like to suggest, since Council has never
9 had official policy on this matter, that it might be wise
10 not to make official policy on the topic of this paper, but
11 consider the paper I wrote as a continuing working paper
12 of this Agency.

13 Already the paper has been distributed to the
14 staff members and to Division Directors. Parts of it have
15 found its way into guidelines. It has gotten around, to a
16 degree, on the outside. I recognize in some way the limita-
17 tions of this approach, as I think I recognize limitations
18 of almost any other possible approach to the intersection
19 of the humanities and social science. We're dealing in an
20 area where not only is the intersection fuzzy, but the two
21 sets themselves; the humanities and social sciences are
22 fuzzy. The intersection of two fuzzy sets is not ever
23 clear.

24 What I, therefore, would like to do is just
25 leave this time, this 10 minutes that we have, for any

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1330 VERMONT AVENUE, NW

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

1 of our Office on Bicentennial Programs. He started this
2 office from the bottom up when he came here and now has put
3 together a wide range, wide series of activities. I think
4 I can do nothing better than ask Jeff to talk about these
5 activities and tell you where we're going in them.

6 MR. WALLIN: You'll notice that I've been allotted
7 an entire five minutes to expatiate upon the nature of
8 constitutional government, its relation to the humanities,
9 and to the National Endowment for the Humanities.

10 But, in fact, I intend to take even less than
11 five minutes, for I've noticed a certain apprehension upon
12 part of my new colleagues who seem to believe that someone
13 so recently removed from teaching in the academic world
14 could be capable of any restraint whatsoever when placed in
15 the situation that at least looked like a classroom. So,
16 I shall indeed be brief.

17 The Special Initiative for the Bicentennial
18 extends throughout the Endowment, although it is best known
19 in General Programs for the moment. But there are a number
20 of things we are doing. We're going to be supporting some
21 major research. We already are supporting for example, the
22 Encyclopedia of the Constitution. We hope to support more
23 things of that sort.

24 We're hoping to be able to reissue some out-of-
25 print and hard-to-find seminal works on the American

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1330 VERMONT AVENUE, NW
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

1 Constitutional experience. We are going to announce a new
2 program of Constitutional fellowships. We will have
3 institutes for secondary school teachers, so as to both
4 broaden and deepen their understanding of these matters in
5 the hope that they will be able to do the same in a class-
6 room.

7 We have special grants from the Challenge Program
8 to institutes and to organizations which deal with the
9 humanities aspects of the Constitution. And we have a wide
10 variety of programs that we hope to support in General
11 Programs.

12 I might add that although this is obviously some-
13 thing of importance to lawyers and to political scientists,
14 we do not by any means intend to limit our initiative to
15 those fields. And we're already getting quite a bit of
16 interest from philosophers, historians of various sorts,
17 and we hope to go much beyond that and interest all of the
18 disciplines or many that are relevant in dealing with the
19 Bicentennial.

20 So far we've gotten a very good response in
21 General Programs which has the only part of the initiative
22 that's well known, or reasonably well known outside the
23 Endowment. And we're receiving quite a few preliminary
24 applications everyday in anticipation of our March 14th
25 deadline. But the announcement of fellowships we made

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1330 VERMONT AVENUE, NW
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

1 quite shortly and we do have a brochure that we're trying
2 to get out to let people know all of these programs.

3 MR. BENNETT: Yes, Mr. Knudson?

4 MR. KNUDSON: Okay. Now, are the various divi-
5 sions then going to say, we especially solicit applications,
6 for instance, in research, group research on this theme,
7 secondary school institutes on this theme? In other words,
8 we're now making as a matter of policy that this is a
9 favority subject, which I would agree with, but is that
10 what we're doing?

11 MR. WALLIN: Yes.

12 MR. KNUDSON: Okay, I think that--have we in the
13 past selected areas of special interest which, of necessity,
14 limits funds available for other areas?

15 I can answer--

16 MR. KNUDSON: I think we did in the 76 thing.

17 That's right, and we did with, at
18 one point, with science technology when we made it clear
19 that we were supporting that. Also some other issues as
20 well, other topics.

21 MR. KNUDSON: Okay, but in 76 and before that
22 time, you will recall, we got a lot more money to do this
23 with. We're not getting anymore money for this that I know
24 about or that you've referred to. We're simply saying to
25 all the Divisions, here's a theme we want you to give

1 emphasis to so far as you can, but your office is adminis-
2 tering no budgets that you've referred to. It's just kind
3 of a thematic office, like affirmative action for the
4 Constitution at the moment.

5 MR. BENNETT: I think it would be a mistake, Jack,
6 to think of it though as all, if you will, all new money or
7 all new grants. We would get in any, as you know, in any
8 given year, certain projects in research and fellowships
9 and other areas which touch upon these areas anyway and
10 these applications and proposals obviously will be looked
11 at next to others.

12 It's a kind of target, it's euristic I think in
13 a way. It's a way--it's interesting that this kind of thing
14 can attract a great deal of attention. We are asked by
15 people on the Hill, here's this Bicentennial, the Consti-
16 tution, what's the Endowment doing about it. It's a target.

17 MR. KNUDSON: It sounds like a public relations
18 operation covering existing things and maybe to generate
19 a new one. I'd like to see funds targeted out of that
20 office and against its budget if we're going to be serious
21 about the matter, which I think we should.

22 MR. BENNETT: We are targeting some funds out of
23 the office--out of Special Projects.

24 MR. KNUDSON: That's a new program.
25 Special Projects.

1 MR. BENNETT: Well, Special Projects is always
2 a new program in the sense that it's always open for
3 initiatives that the Endowment undertakes.

4 MR. KNUDSON: We haven't been talking to each
5 other. You said one thing and I heard something else. I
6 meant, you spoke of Special Projects.

7 MR. BENNETT: Right.

8 MR. KNUDSON: And I was thinking, that particular
9 office that is represented by this report, I think that they
10 oughta have a program separate from others.

11 MR. BENNETT: John, do you want to--

12 The only thing I could add in
13 response to what Bill just said is, this first year on an
14 experimental basis, we can see what the response is from
15 the field, so we can in fact see how much we might in the
16 end need, if in fact we did carve out a special office. If
17 you're asking me now how much money should the Office of
18 the Bicentennial have to carry out these functions, I say
19 honestly I have no idea. But we can now see approximately
20 how many fellowship applications did we get, how many
21 applications did we get for this type research project, or
22 for republication of seminal works. So that, if in the
23 end we do feel that it's a burden on the Divisions that
24 now exist and it's necessary to carve it out, we can do so.
25 We'll do that on the basis of some prior evidence.

1 MR. KNUDSON: Are there new things that we're not
2 now doing that we could bring into being for this particular
3 thing? Are there things that we're not doing under other
4 conditions that we might do because this celebration is
5 coming to us?

6 MR. BENNETT: Again, I don't think so generically.
7 When you say to the people who know about the existence of
8 the Endowment, here's the Bicentennial, people should apply
9 to the Endowment if they're interested in the proper commem-
10 oration of this Bicentennial. What ways then, what forms
11 might this take? We expect it will be the usual forms

12 MR. KNUDSON: So, I'll give you an example.

13 MR. BENNETT: Right, okay.

14 MR. KNUDSON: We could generate events. We can,
15 for instance, do something like a Jefferson lecture, but
16 Constitutional lectures for a five-year period. There are
17 lots of things you can do over and above things we're now
18 doing which are not simply saying, well, this is coming
19 upon us, we'd like to encourage applications.

20 MR. BENNETT: Okay, okay, well I think--

21 MR. KNUDSON: There are positive initiatives.

22 MR. BENNETT: Yes, I think that sort of thing will
23 occur. I guess, again, we missed each other. I didn't
24 regard that so much as a distinctly different kind of thing
25 in Special Projects where we take up initiatives. The fact

1 that we are saying we are interested in projects in the
2 Bicentennial will, I think, stimulate -- and Jeff is getting
3 word of people who are interested -- forums in communities,
4 towns, and cities, libraries, on the Constitution; its
5 legacy, where did it come from, where's it going, that
6 otherwise wouldn't take place because of our announcement
7 of this kind of thing. Is that fair, Jeff?

8 MR. WALLIN: Quite so.

9 MR. BENNETT: Mary Beth?

10 MS. NORTON: Yeah, I have a couple comments.

11 One is that I think this initiative is starting to work
12 among the historical community because in the last, oh I'd
13 say, month or two, I've gotten several different form
14 letters from different groups who are putting together a
15 variety of programs. The most recent one was a really
16 concerted effort on the part of the AHA to work with high
17 school teachers in the teaching of the Constitution and I
18 think that's really important.

19 I would like to see this whole effort remain a
20 flexible as possible, partly because--and maybe Jeff, who
21 was around at the time of the Bicentennial Initiative could
22 say this--but I remember that when I first came on the
23 Council, which wasn't all that long past the Bicentennial
24 Initiative, a lot of people had said that there was a kind
25 of a oral history that perhaps it had been too rigid, the

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1330 VERMONT AVENUE, NW

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

1 Revolution Bicentennial Initiative had been handled and
2 that, in fact, funds had been targeted in two specific ways
3 that had left the Endowment with less flexibility than it
4 should have had. And I wonder if my memory of that is
5 correct, Jeff?

6 MR. WALLIN: I think that was our feeling.

7 MS. NORTON: Yeah.

8 MR. WALLIN: We didn't feel that what we had done
9 was a failure, but that we might have approached it a
10 different way and I think that is informing the judgment
11 of how we're proceeding now. Very much.

12 MS. NORTON: Yeah, that was my question, which is,
13 are we learning from what happened with the Revolution
14 Bicentennial for this? Okay, and I have a suggestion, Jeff.
15 Jeff, I have a suggestion for a book which we should re-
16 print--

17 MR. WALLIN: Oh?

18 MS. NORTON: --because it's out of print. I tried
19 to get it for my class this semester, Madison's Notes on
20 the Federal Convention is not in print in paperback.

21 MR. WALLIN: No, it is in print--

22 MS. NORTON: It's out of print in paperback.

23 MR. WALLIN: The Farand (phonetic) edition is not
24 in print, but it is available.

25 MS. NORTON: It's not in paperback.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1330 VERMONT AVENUE, NW

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

1 MR. WALLIN: Are you quite sure? I used it just
2 last year.

3 MS. NORTON: It's out of print now. It's not in
4 print right now. I tried to get it this semester, it's out
5 of print.

6 MR. BENNETT: Your class wasn't big enough, you
7 might have used-- We are, Mary Beth, we are in part fact-
8 finding here. Jeff is going out, he's talking to people.

9 MS. NORTON: Yeah.

10 MR. BENNETT: We're going to have a little bro-
11 chure on this. We'll see the kind of response we get. I
12 think we are heeding your advice to be flexible. We antici-
13 pate that a lot of the kinds of requests and inquiries and
14 applications that come will fit into our existing structure,
15 but we're open to other suggestions and ideas.

16 Bear in mind that some of the new suggestions
17 that have been made for General Programs about publications,
18 this is a possibility too along the lines you just suggested.

19 Mr. Stanlis I think, and then Rita.

20 MR. STANLIS: Yeah, I was just going to say, I
21 don't think we should regard the Bicentennial Celebration
22 as simply a kind of a fad or anything of that sort, it's
23 really quite a special event in American history and I don't
24 think it needs to be defended on grounds of a special kind
25 of thesis which requires some rationale or to defend a,

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1330 VERMONT AVENUE, NW

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

1 it?

2 MR. WALLIN: Right. I, myself, am from California
3 and recently have been teaching in Dallas, Texas. And
4 moreover, although I wasn't here at the Endowment at the
5 time of the 76 Bicentennial, I was in Arkansas at the time
6 and I remember that the Arkansas Endowment, or the National
7 Endowment, or some combination paid me to go around to
8 little towns and give a lecture on the Declaration of
9 Independence, so evidently something of that sort did
10 happen. And yes, we are trying to get the word out as
11 much as we can. It'll take a little time, we'll do it.

12 MR. BENNETT: Have I mentioned, Rita, I have had
13 one conversation in some detail with the State Committee
14 about work in this area for the next couple of years, and
15 that was the Alaska Committee which--

16 MS. CAMPBELL: Well, they're always so
17 20 hours a day, you know.

18 MR. BENNETT: Right. But I think it means that
19 we have to be, you know, imaginative and flexible. You
20 don't want to say, take the role of your State and consider
21 it in the context of its role in the forming of the
22 Constitution; the Alaskans.

23 MS. CAMPBELL: You know, I travel monthly between
24 Boston and California, and Boston was agog

25 MR. BENNETT: I know.

1 MS. CAMPBELL: --excitement and so forth and in
2 California nobody had really heard about it.

3 MR. BENNETT: Right. I can't remember order.

4 Anita was--

5 MR. BENNETT: Leon, Anita, Jack.

6 MR. STEIN: Well, I don't take a regional position
7 or even a continental one here. Every individual and
8 institution in this country is either being deprived of
9 Constitutional rights or benefiting by it, and I do hope
10 that we reach beyond academia to get that message across to
11 the different groupings in our society.

12 When I'm asked to address a trade union meeting,
13 very often they want to know the title. I say I'm going to
14 speak on the First Amendment to the Bill of Rights. And you
15 can go down the line with different parts of the Constitu-
16 tion or the Amendments and find them directly applicable;
17 the unions, religious groups, political groups, or whatever.
18 And I think Jack is correct that this ought to be made a
19 very special occasion and one of the ways in which it
20 should be special is to reach out and tell people who don't
21 even know clearly in their minds what the Constitution is
22 that they are living under and that what they are able to
23 do for themselves or for their own groups, has its roots in
24 the Constitution. It is a unique occasion and it should
25 not be confined to scholarly papers, although those should

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1330 VERMONT AVENUE, NW

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

1 be encouraged too, but we should reach beyond the walls of
2 academia for once and get a fundamental message across to
3 people who have a lot to learn about this thing and be
4 thankful for it.

5 MR. BENNETT: I wonder if we can accept applica-
6 tion from Council members? Is that all right?

7 MR. STEIN: --on the Bill of Rights.

8 MR. BENNETT: Okay, Anita?

9 MS. SILVERS: In this reaching across continents
10 and through walls vein, we did have a competition for
11 Planning Grants for the BiConstitutional. Maybe we could
12 just look over them, see where the regional representation
13 and applications is; a way of checking about interest and
14 the word getting out, and then take a look at what was
15 dunded in the regional distribution there.

16 MR. BENNETT: Fine.

17 MS. SILVERS: I think you'll find it somewhat
18 less in the West.

19 MR. BENNETT: All right, Jack?

20 MR. NEUSNER: Yeah, I detect in remarks others
21 have made, the feeling I tried to express earlier, which
22 is that I don't think we're doing enough and I'd like to
23 see the NEH the lead Federal Agency on this particular
24 event because I think it's natural to us. And I think that
25 we should ask for more money and develop programs that

1 otherwise wouldn't exist and make this an event through
2 which the NEH makes an enormous impact on public conscious-
3 ness through its public service. That's why I said earlier
4 I thought that what we were doing is essentially more of
5 the same, though on another topic. And I think there should
6 be something quantitatively different in what we do for the
7 --the next decade, which is what we're talking about.

8 I heard this from Peter Stanlis and I hear this
9 from Leon also, and I think that we ought to reconsider
10 the dimensions of our engagement.

11 MR. BENNETT: Well we will, but I would like to
12 first see what kind of response and see what comes in. And
13 there are some risks, frankly Jack, in announcing yourself
14 as lead Agency. It then means you might be identified as
15 the lead Agency and be given a whole set of tasks in
16 connection with this that the Agency simply might not want
17 to handle.

18 There was a lot going on at the time of the
19 Bicentennial in 76. Only some of it, I would say in my
20 view, -- I wasn't here obviously -- would the Endowment
21 particularly want to be associated with. Some of it was
22 very serious and very good, some of it wasn't, and I think
23 that's generally stipulated. You identify yourself as the
24 lead Agency, we could be buried in this.

25 MR. NEUSNER: But this is an intellectual event

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1330 VERMONT AVENUE, NW
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

1 that flows right out of the things that we do professionally.

2 MR. BENNETT: Yes. And, therefore, I think we
3 should do our part consistent with the intellectual purpose
4 of the Agency and not say, we are information central. I
5 know, but there are risks when one waves the flag saying we
6 are the central point.

7 MR. NEUSNER: Nobody at this table is saying we
8 should put up yellow and white tents on the Mall and give
9 out little mementos, and nobody is suggesting that we be
10 responsible for the fireworks or whatever, but I think that
11 this is a major event. I think it's an event in the
12 humanities and I think that we can give it intellectual
13 substance which no other Federal Agency can offer.

14 MR. BENNETT: That--I certainly think we can give
15 it intellectual substance that few could rival and I think,
16 therefore, the Council, SEL, that I'm taking is that some
17 degree of self-limitation here, at least at this stage, is
18 warranted. We're still a few years away.

19 The other thing I should mention is we are not
20 begging the question about what the relevant year is,
21 whether it's 87 or 89. We'll get into this for a while and
22 get out after a while.

23 Bill, I'm not suggesting setting
24 up a separate division for Bicentennial, but is there any
25 opportunity at all of going back for additional.

1 appropriations for this particular event?

2 MR. BENNETT: Well, I would not feel comfortable
3 in present circumstances asking for additional appropria-
4 tions for this while we still don't know what kind of
5 response we're going to get and how our available funds
6 would be able to respond to it.

7 Yes, sir?

8 I don't want to beat this to death,
9 but I will say that I second Jack Neusner's sentiments. We
10 had a rather spirited discussion in the Fellowship
11 Committee on this topic in connection with the Constitutional
12 Fellowship Initiative which we thought was absolutely
13 splendid, except for the detail that no money in particular
14 had been targeted to pay such Fellows and the question then
15 was, would Jane Austin suffer because we're having a
16 Bicentennial, something of that sort.

17 It seems to me it would be prudent to at least
18 think in terms of some targeting of funds, even if in this
19 first year you don't do it because I suspect that there
20 will be a good outpouring of interest in this and I do think
21 that we should be prepared to respond. And if our friends
22 on the Hill are not prepared to support our emphasis of
23 this sort, I don't think they'll ever support anything that
24 we try to do. So, I would hope without going to bizarre
25 lengths, which none of us wants to do, we do take some

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1330 VERMONT AVENUE, NW
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

1 prudent consideration that we will get a response. The
2 response is likely to be quite good and very multifaceted
3 and we need to have some money to pay for it.

4 MR. BENNETT: Fine. Again, I'd like to see--I'd
5 like to consider that at the point where the number of
6 requests and the quality of the requests is so good, and
7 our money is gone, that we then need to make a response of
8 that sort.

9 Jeff Wallin can explain to any of you, in detail,
10 who are interested that the funds--we have not earmarked a
11 special amount, but there is money in our Division of
12 Special Projects. It is not as if all that money is gone
13 already or that we think it's all going to be gone very
14 soon, that we need to make a case for replacement. I'd
15 like to see what the response is, see what the quality of
16 things is; and go to consideration of this only when we've
17 reached that point. Is that fair, Jeff?

18 MR. WALLIN: Yeah.

19 Bill?

20 MR. BENNETT: Yeah?

21 Would it be feasible, Jeff, to
22 perhaps think through a working calendar by this time these
23 kinds of things would have to be done and not even begging
24 the question of whether it's 87 or 89, or 87 to 89, what
25 you think are target dates for having some things

1 accomplished? For example, if there were to be some kinds
2 of special initiative, they might have special kinds of
3 lead time. If you could work through hypothetical calendars,
4 starting backwards from the time when you would think such
5 a thing would have to be in place, by when would we have to
6 make decisions, and make requests, or whatever?

7 MR. WALLIN: Yeah.

8 So, we would know what it is that
9 we're weighing at any given point in time.

10 MR. WALLIN: Well, if we were to initiate some-
11 thing, like a series of lectures at the Endowment or some-
12 thing of that sort, then obviously we would want to have
13 a timetable, but of course the position we're really in is
14 eliciting responses from others who have their own time-
15 tables in mind and we've tried to stay quite open to their
16 own interest in it.

17 Well, just using that as an example,
18 suppose that a time would come when the kind of lecture
19 series that we would like to have has not been initiated.
20 Is there a deadline beyond which we could not go, at which
21 point we would have to take that step? That's the kind of
22 thing that I'm asking.

23 MR. WALLIN: Certainly, although down the line a
24 bit I think.

25 Well, whatever it is.

1 MR. BENNETT: Another area in which I think we
2 ought to look--I don't know how much we have--is again the
3 suggestion to our colleagues in the State Programs to take
4 a look at this. I know a number of them are thinking, as I
5 mentioned, Alaska, but this may be something we talk about.
6 Don, anything on that?

7 There is significant interest on
8 the part of the States in doing a variety of projects under
9 the Constitution. Some are considering separate grant lines
10 for the Constitution, and our Texax Committee has a grant
11 line on the Constitution.

12 As Jeff knows, the Special Projects Division did
13 give a Planning Grant to the Federation in order to compile
14 information and share that information with the States re-
15 garding the Constitutional Initiative and we anticipate some
16 very good things will come out of that. I think you'll be
17 seeing quite a bit of information in a number of projects
18 under the Constitution coming from the States.

19 MR. BENNETT: Jack, last comment, if I--

20 MR. NEUSNER: Yeah sure. No, I just wanted to
21 say I recognize the wisdom of how you want to proceed and
22 I think you recognize the urgency of the Council members on
23 the matter and I think that's all we can accomplish in one
24 day.

25 MR. BENNETT: Sure, that's fine. What will be

1 most impressive is the proposals themselves, not the hope of
2 them.

3 Okay, I think we oughta take our coffee break,
4 since it's 10:15 and we're right on target. Thank you.
5 Five minutes.

6 (Off the record for brief break.)

7 MR. BENNETT: I was reminded at the break--my
8 thanks to Lee Bramson (phonetic) Assistant Director in
9 General Programs that a number of the concerns raised about
10 getting the word out about our Bicentennial Initiative
11 have already been satisfied.

12 We are preparing a special brochure which Jeff
13 Wallin will be distributing broadly, widely soon, but in
14 late December a Program Development Announcement went out
15 far and wide to about 35,000 institutions, organizations
16 all over the country explaining our interest in this area.
17 We expect to see applications from that announcement in
18 March and the results of our attempt to inform and invite
19 will be presented to you in August. So, we will see some
20 sense then of what the response has been.

21 I could also mention that Julie
22 Van Camp (phonetic), who has recently transferred from
23 State Programs to Special Projects and General Programs
24 now has--Julie, is it 100 projects?

25 MS. VAN CAMP: At least 100, we are inundated.

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1330 VERMONT AVENUE, NW
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

Okay, if there are no further comments, recognizing of course that there may be inconveniences in certain instances, I need a motion to ratify and adopt these dates.

So moved.

MR. WILLKIE: A second?

Second.

MR. WILLKIE: All in favor say, I.

GROUP VOTE: I.

MR. WILLKIE: Any opposed?

I'll oppose. I can't make it.

MR. WILLKIE: I will note that for the record.

MR. BENNETT: Half opposed or fully opposed? One day or--

One day I may try to make it, it's Friday. It is an effort to come down cross-country Wednesday, down from Boston on Thursday night to be here Friday.

MR. BENNETT: Okay, thank you. NEH Plan, Mr. Marshall.

MR. MARSHALL: I think the members of the Council have -- if they'll turn to Tab I in the book -- copies of a cover memorandum from me and also a description in some detail of the plan that we intend to announce.

I know that there's been some discussion in various of the Committees yesterday of aspects of this

1 program. The was a discussion in Fellowships and I would
2 say in that connection that while representatives of all
3 aspects of all parts of the Endowment were at work on the
4 Committees forming this, a sort of special word of commenda-
5 tion should go to Maven Herring (phonetic) who worked
6 particularly hard on aspects of this which affect Fellow-
7 ships and two of the major programs do.

8 I think that the context of this is familiar to
9 everyone. The President signed an Executive Order asking
10 each Federal Agency to take special steps to increase the
11 availability of Federal programs to historically black
12 colleges and universities and these programs are--and this
13 is what I would like to emphasize -- four special initia-
14 tives we intend to take. They, by no means, are an accurate
15 cross-section of what the Endowment has done and I think
16 there are many things more we can do. But we have, for
17 the moment, this particular proposal before you.

18 If this meets with Council approval, the inten-
19 tion would be to put a brochure together and an announce-
20 ment of these immediately. Now, they would be sent to all
21 the historically black colleges and universities in the
22 United States followed by some other efforts on our part
23 to make the colleges and universities aware. We would be-
24 gin to recruit immediately for an IPA to serve in this one
25 function, one special function that we've mentioned here to

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1330 VERMONT AVENUE, NW

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

1 work with us on this project.

2 Now, our intention is to use funds in this fiscal
3 year and the next and, therefore, we would try to bring
4 proposals through the process and before you for August
5 Council of this year, for the first round.

6 Now, I'd be glad to answer questions about this.
7 The outline that we have before you is essentially the out-
8 line as we would present it to the field in a brochure.
9 The specifics of application we have, in fact, worked out
10 so that if someone were to be interested in this, they
11 would write back. This is not sufficient to tell someone
12 how to make an application, but just simply announcing that
13 there is a program and its general characteristics.

14 I don't know if it's appropriate for
15 your motion at this time, but I have read this report and
16 I've seen what it is and I heartily approve and I'd like to
17 move its adoption.

18 MR. MARSHALL: Thank you.

19 Seconded.

20 MR. MARSHALL: It's been moved and seconded. Yes?

21 Before we do that, I wonder if I
22 could ask a few questions--

23 MR. MARSHALL: Sure.

24 --about the details and the
25 language? Has there been some thought given about why

1 you're calling these sabbatical awards rather than some-
2 thing more euphemistic like leaves. The reason that I'm
3 concerned about that is the Endowment has not funded pre-
4 viously anything called a sabbatical and I'm wondering--
5 because sabbatical has a very special meaning -- whether
6 this was intentional, and if it was, why, and whether it's
7 wise?

8 MR. MARSHALL: Yeah. Well, let me take the part
9 about intention and we'll let the Council talk about the
10 wisdom.

11 The intention was as follows: This was one of the
12 programs which came to us as an idea largely through con-
13 versations with executives in historically black colleges
14 and universities. It's a frequently lamented reality that
15 significant numbers of faculty at those institutions have
16 been unable to complete their graduate work and we've often
17 been asked, isn't there something we can do.

18 The term sabbatical--and I know that it has this
19 quality and hence the quotes and so on--was designed de-
20 liberately in order to emphasize the fact that we were not
21 proposing a program with had the potention, at least, of
22 qualifying people to then move on out of an institution.
23 And one of the qualifications you'll notice is that each
24 applicant institution must have an agreement with the
25 individual who has--is being nominated that that individual

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1330 VERMONT AVENUE, NW
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

1 will return to teach on the campus for two years. It's
2 that feature which we were trying to emphasize with the
3 term sabbatical. But you're quite right to point out that
4 it has a resonance that we've got to acknowledge.

5 Well, Jeff, I think you'll find
6 that there are many institutions that call things leaves,
7 but have this provision about returning to the institution
8 and I just have a little bit of concern about the tradition-
9 al notion of sabbatical and about our seeming to be funding
10 institutions doing what they -- ought to be doing anyway
11 in providing sabbaticals.

12 MR. MARSHALL: All right.

13 I have one other quick question.

14 MR. MARSHALL: Yes.

15 For the high school humanities
16 institutes you're say you're going to give the high school
17 juniors a stipend?

18 MR. MARSHALL: Yes.

19 Have you addressed the issue of
20 travel because I presume that many of them will be coming
21 from some distance, and they'll be coming from different
22 distances, and this is often a problem with these kinds
23 of things.

24 MR. MARSHALL: Yes.

25 That you end up having --

1 advantaging people who live quite close, particularly I
2 would think for high school juniors, some of their families
3 are not -- for travel.

4 MR. MARSHALL: Sure. Well, I think partly the
5 question of close, we felt, was a reality we were going to
6 contend with. And the second thing was, I think our general
7 thinking -- and I could be corrected about this by the
8 participants in the Committee -- was that we would approach
9 it roughly as we do the Summer Seminar Program; that is,
10 the stipend that we offered was not tied to any specific
11 cost. It simply was a recognition that there are costs,
12 the most important probably which is deferred income. It
13 is one thing that inhibits young people as well as faculty
14 from participating in summer programs, is that it means
15 that you defer the chance to work part-time or full-time
16 in the summer.

17 We did not address, as a Committee, the question
18 of bringing the large-scale transportation of people from
19 place to place into account and it's a good question.

20 I would just like to say that I
21 think that youngsters who are close enough to these
22 colleges at least may have some access and we ought to be
23 trying to reach out to youngsters who have no secondary
24 institution anywhere near them.

25 MR. MARSHALL: That's well taken. George?

1 I'm hearing: We think that this strengthens the institu-
2 tion.

3 MR. MARSHALL: That's right.

4 MR. NEUSNER: It's not that we're helping some-
5 one finish a degree in particular, but this is an initiative
6 explicitly to help the institution upgrade its faculty in
7 ways which it has chosen.

8 MR. MARSHALL: That's correct.

9 MR. NEUSNER: Could I ask a question --

10 MR. MARSHALL: Yes, please. And then I know Sam,
11 and then Phil.

12 MR. NEUSNER: Okay. The high school humanities
13 institutes, are these to be administered by Youth Programs?

14 MR. MARSHALL: No, by the Division of Education
15 Programs in the Elementary and Secondary Program.

16 MR. NEUSNER: Do they run other institutes for
17 high school students?

18 MR. MARSHALL: No, this is the first time I think
19 we will have done something directly for students of this
20 kind. There are parallels to this program, but not at the
21 NEH.

22 (Off the record for tape change.)

23 MR. NEUSNER: --by Youth Programs?

24 MR. MARSHALL: No, by the Division of Education
25 Programs in the Elementary and Secondary Program.

1 MR. NEUSNER: Do they run other institutes for
2 high school students?

3 MR. MARSHALL: No, this is the first time I think
4 we will have done something directly for students of this
5 kind. There are parallels to this program, but not at the
6 NEH.

7 MR. NEUSNER: Understood, but does the Youth
8 Programs of General Programs have equivalent programs--I
9 don't know any other word but program.

10 MR. MARSHALL: I would let Steve answer. I think
11 the answer is no. There are programs in museums and so on
12 designed to involve young people, but usually that's not
13 this kind of residential, intense, directly pedagogical
14 programs. Is that correct, Steve?

15 Yeah, that's correct.

16 MR. NEUSNER: I didn't get the answer.

17 MR. MARSHALL: No, there are programs in General
18 Programs in Youth Programs that -- art museums and other
19 institutions which involve young people, but they are not
20 the kind of residential pedagogical programs that these
21 are.

22 MR. NEUSNER: So this is, in fact, a first?

23 MR. MARSHALL: Yes.

24 MR. NEUSNER: Do you think that we might do better
25 --how are the black colleges helped by this kind of program

1 as against a program where they would run summer seminars
2 for high school teachers?

3 MR. MARSHALL: Well, that's--

4 MR. NEUSNER: What good will this do them?

5 MR. MARSHALL: There are several things. One is
6 that, first, I wouldn't want to make that distinction.
7 There is no restriction that an HBCU could not do a high
8 school teacher seminar.

9 MR. NEUSNER: I understand that.

10 MR. MARSHALL: Okay. The --

11 MR. NEUSNER: But this is a set aside.

12 MR. MARSHALL: Yes, and the recognition here is,
13 our hope was for this program that the institution would
14 benefit in several ways. One is, they would have a new
15 program on their campus involving their faculty, making a
16 link between themselves and the schools. An effort which
17 is, of course, broad spread within our programs. We think
18 that kind of increased linkage between colleges and univer-
19 sities and the schools is an extremely important one and
20 most of our programs in Elementary and Secondary are
21 designed to do that.

22 MR. NEUSNER: So it would help them recruit
23 students?

24 MR. MARSHALL: It has that secondary affect I am
25 sure, frankly. It helps also, I think, the students of

1 course to be introduced in a more intense way to the
2 humanities themselves. We want these to be quite rigorous
3 and substantial; there would be writing components in them
4 and so on, so that that's our major focus.

5 MR. NEUSNER: What made you feel that this would
6 do more good for the colleges than asking them--than a set
7 aside of high school humanities institutes to be taught for
8 high school teachers, let us say, from schools that --

9 MR. MARSHALL: You've couched the question in an
10 awkward way.

11 MR. NEUSNER: I didn't mean to, I'm just trying
12 to get on the record--

13 MR. MARSHALL: Well no, it's awkward for us only
14 because the institutions can apply now for exactly the kind
15 of program you're describing.

16 MR. NEUSNER: Understood, but this would be a
17 set aside that would--

18 MR. MARSHALL: That's right.

19 MR. NEUSNER: --that I'm thinking of.

20 MR. MARSHALL: Okay. We ran through a list of
21 about 10 or 11 things that we could do, or 12, that we had
22 discussed and our feeling was that in this area a new
23 initiative was an appropriate step for us to take. This
24 probably is a program that, by the way we feel, once done
25 several times, if done successfully, institutions will find

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1330 VERMONT AVENUE, NW
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

1 is, in effect, almost self-sustaining. We're hoping that
2 this--what we will do by two years of grants here is indi-
3 cate to institutions this is a very fine idea indeed, and
4 in their interest to do and that the Endowment will not
5 continue to support, or need to support, such programs for
6 very long in the future. We don't know how in immediate
7 terms.

8 MR. NEUSNER: So you're talking about a two to a
9 three-year program?

10 MR. MARSHALL: That's correct.

11 MR. NEUSNER: Does that apply to the first and
12 the third, or just to the second?

13 MR. MARSHALL: This entire package is a two-year
14 experimental package.

15 MR. NEUSNER: Did I miss that?

16 MR. MARSHALL: Yes, I think so. It says in the
17 first page of the plan itself its purpose.

18 MR. NEUSNER: This will be in effect for two
19 years?

20 MR. MARSHALL: Yes.

21 MR. NEUSNER: Sorry, okay.

22 MR. MARSHALL: That's okay.

23 MR. NEUSNER: Thank you.

24 MR. BENNETT: Sam.

25 MR. MARSHALL: Sam?

1 has a tremendous fellowship program for many

2 . So, we have fairly well taken care of them.

3 I know there's a need, but the deeper need is to provide
4 some kind of an opportunity for distinguished members of
5 the black college faculties to engage in serious inquiry
6 over a year or two.

7 MR. MARSHALL: I think--first, the fundamental
8 point is absolutely sound and our biggest obligation I
9 think we feel is to be sure that the faculty at institutions
10 of the kind you've named are aware of our existing programs
11 because we, of course, can do exactly what you've described
12 now.

13 Our Fellowships for Independent Study in Research,
14 the Fellowship for College Teacher Programs are exactly the
15 kind of thing you're describing. Our responsibility is to
16 be sure that the faculty at these institutions are aware,
17 are aware of what kind of thing we wouldn't support and so
18 on, and there's where we've got to make some particular
19 efforts.

20 The second point I think I'd make is that this
21 plan has a special wrinkle in it that I think you recognize
22 as well, and that is that the President's specific refer-
23 ence is to the institutions rather than individuals and so
24 we addressed in this case institutions rather than indivi-
25 duals.

1 And the third thing is that we're hoping that by
2 having the individual assigned to the Endowment staff
3 permanently and with the responsibility of doing the visits
4 that we've described so that every institution is visited
5 in the course of the next couple of years. We will learn
6 back exactly the kind of thing you're describing, which
7 will help us shape new initiatives as well. So, I think
8 your fundamental point is absolutely right. I think we
9 have a program now which can speak in large measure to that
10 concern, but we need to make it better understood, more
11 widely understood, its nature and specifics understood, and
12 we will hope, in the course of the next year or so through
13 this, to learn more about what it is that we need to do.

14 UNCF was very helpful to us, by the way, in
15 reading this plan and giving us some advice about it at the
16 stage when we were drafting, so I hope we can speak exactly
17 to what you're describing immediately.

18 Phil?

19 Jeff, I just want to congratulate
20 you and Maven and the staff for putting this program to-
21 gether. I think it's absolutely terrific and it's really
22 an attempt to communicate, not to cerebrate, and if this
23 really has the effects and potential that it can have, it
24 will do more, it will be a real contribution to the true
25 celebration of the Bicentennial..

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1330 VERMONT AVENUE, NW
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

1 I'd like to ask though, the link, the catalyst in
2 this program seems to be the liaison officer, and the uni-
3 verse, the number of institutions is so large that I wonder
4 if not more than \$50,000 should be spent for liaison?

5 MR. MARSHALL: Oh.

6 Can one person really cover all
7 these institutions, do his or her job, and visit each
8 institution, and be accessible?

9 MR. MARSHALL: Yeah. Well, I don't--the answer,
10 of course, is no. I mean, not in the continuing sense, but
11 this is the tip of the iceberg as much as anything else.
12 We feel by having someone in the field traveling and so
13 on, what we intend intentionally to do is simply to stimu-
14 late connections with the rest of the Agency. We want
15 historically black colleges and universities, their faculty
16 and administrators to be dealing with every part of the
17 NEH, and the effort of the liaison person is to be a stimu-
18 lus, to be someone out there carrying our message and
19 telling who to call and making references and so on. The
20 amount is an estimate because we're simply trying to
21 estimate a salary cost and attendant ones.

22 What I'm asking, is there room for
23 two liaison people?

24 MR. MARSHALL: We'd like to do, I think, in this
25 case is very much what the Chairman said with Bicentennial.

1 We need, we think, one year's experience with this in order
2 to know. It may be that the answer is we will need more
3 help than we've got, but at the moment we don't know for
4 sure.

5 MS. KERR: Jeff?

6 MR. MARSHALL: Yes?

7 MS. KERR: I would like to ask Wendell a two-
8 part question. What is the precedent--what precedent do
9 we follow in the requirement for a two-year contract and
10 legally, what relationship do we have to that contract if
11 anything at all? I mean, is a person really bound by that
12 kind of contract?

13 I'm not sure I--

14 MS. KERR: When we give an institute --
15 another institution a grant, have we ever stipulated that
16 the program officer or anybody related to that has to sign
17 on for two years, and even were we to do that, legally can--
18 I mean what--what relationship do we have to that contract?
19 Is that person, in fact, bound by law to honor that con-
20 tract? I'm just--it's a question of curiosity to me.

21 Are we speaking in the context of
22 the liaison person that was mentioned here?

23 MS. KERR: No, we're speaking in context of
24 sabbatical?

25 Oh, I'm sorry. I can answer just

1 part of it; the legal question I can't. But the two-year
2 selection is a choice of ours because we think it parallels
3 the practice at most institutions which have programs
4 like this. It's arbitrary, we could make it another number,
5 but we that's essentially what--

6 MS. KERR: Have we done this in any instance
7 in the past?

8 No, because we've never--remember
9 Anita's question is, have we ever done--or someone's
10 question about whether we've ever done sabbatical leaves
11 in the past, and the answer is no, we've never done that.

12 MS. KERR: But we've given institutional
13 grants?

14 Yes, but not for sabbatical
15 purposes except through the virtue of Challenge Grants
16 which is a kind of second way around. My guess is that,
17 from institutional experience, I do not believe it is
18 possible for someone to be required to fulfill a contract
19 signed in that way, but I'm not sure.

20 Louise, I think you raise a good
21 point here, and the only practical way that you can really
22 expect to implement that kind of requirement is to rely on
23 the good faith of the individuals involved because they're
24 making their own personal representation. Certainly, we're
25 not going to get into the business of enforcing contracts

1 for personal services.

2 MS. KERR: But we are, in this case; this is a
3 stipulation and not a recommendation for the grant?

4 Yeah, I think it obviously has
5 greater effect on the individuals involved and I think it's
6 clearly to the best interest of the institutions, who are
7 obviously the object of this program if we do make that a
8 requirement, but that's a quite separate issue from whether
9 that's something in any individual instance we would deem
10 to be enforceable should the individual choose not to go
11 back to the institution.

12 MS. KERR: I just didn't want us to get involved
13 in this.

14 We won't, you know, that's just
15 not going to happen.

16 Well, there's of
17 doing this for sabbaticals and that is, of course you can't
18 force the individual back to the institution, but the con-
19 tract that's signed requires the individual to repay the
20 institution if the person does not provide the services
21 over the next year or two years. You know, in that case,
22 presumably you're going to have to be making the grant to
23 the institution and having them then award it to the indivi-
24 dual and I think Louise brought up a good point about how
25 you do it. But it certainly is possible to be done.

1 I think what we were trying to do
2 was distinguish between what the institution can do with
3 relationship to the individual they nominate for this pro-
4 gram and our relationship to that individual and the insti-
5 tution.

6 MR. BENNETT: Okay.

7 May I?

8 MR. BENNETT: Yes.

9 I'll just say we've had experience
10 with that in the Western Interstate Commission for Higher
11 Education. There was no way to force people--

12 That's right.

13 to stay or do--picking at things
14 to which they signed, even legally.

15 Yeah, that's my understanding.

16 MR. BENNETT: Yes?

17 A few things. First of all, I
18 want to commend you on this kind of creative response. As
19 president of a black college--predominantly black anyway--
20 I'm inundated with all kinds of responses to the President's
21 Executive Order, most of which are really unworth the paper
22 they're written on. They're insulting, demeaning, irrele-
23 vant -- This program listened to our priorities,
24 our needs, our fundamental vision
25 is the best response I've seen of any Governmental Agency,

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1330 VERMONT AVENUE, NW

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

1 so I want to commend

2 MR. BENNETT: Thank you.

3 Question?

4 Certainly I--

5 MR. BENNETT: Oh.

6 --want to--

7 MR. BENNETT: A great place to--

8 No, the generosity to 25,000,
9 that's great, but I would much prefer seeing you give more
10 fellowships at, say, 20,000 at 1750 for these doctorate
11 candidates than 25,000.

12 MR. MARSHALL: That's an important--

13 At UNCF--I'm on the Committee, the
14 Selective Committee at UNCF, and this is about twice the
15 size that UNCF, you know, doctoral fellowship.

16 was two --

17 MR. MARSHALL: Yes.

18 So, I think I would very much be
19 in favor of getting more.

20 MR. MARSHALL: That's a very important suggestion
21 and it is the single recurring--if there is a recurring
22 theme in the responses we've had externally from presidents,
23 chancellors, and so on, it's been on that issue with speci-
24 fically that point, and I think we do have to look at that
25 again. Our motive was twofold and I think it needs

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1330 VERMONT AVENUE, NW

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

1 re-examination. I think you're just underlining something
2 for us. We choose to stick at 25 because it paralleled the
3 Independent Fellowship Program and because we recognized
4 that there are probably relocation costs involved here, as
5 well as simply sets of salary replacement. But because the
6 point you just made has been made several times to us, it
7 was on my agenda to take up subsequent, to look at again
8 within the Endowment. I think we must look at that again.

9 After all, even within the Fellowship programs,
10 we don't simply send a \$25,000 stipend, we do tie it to the
11 person's salary and so on, and it's been several times
12 pointed out, you're clinching it for me at least, that we
13 ought to look at whether using the same dollar amount we
14 couldn't offer rather more if we tied it more directly to
15 existing salary and perhaps some travel costs associated
16 with it. So, I think we'll do that, that's a--thank you.

17 MR. BENNETT: Thank you. And thank you very
18 much, Sam. Again, we are--we think this is a very intelli-
19 gent report and the intention was not to just come up with
20 something to satisfy some in general, but to target and to
21 be intelligent and specific about it. Jeff deserves a lot
22 of credit and so does the rest of the staff. One thing we
23 did was talk widely and with the staff about this. And
24 that speaks a little bit, I think Phil, to your point, what
25 we'll see how we do on this liaison, but one should not

1 think from this that this represents the first time that
2 members of this staff are going to have communication with
3 historically black colleges and universities. The first
4 think I asked Jeff to do was to determine how much we
5 already do by way of attending meetings, talking to people,
6 and the like, and you'd be very impressed with the laundry
7 list of what we actually do--all the people in this Agency
8 in their individual offices.

9 Okay.

10 Are we moving to vote?

11 MR. BENNETT: Well yeah, we had a motion to
12 adopt. Is there a second?

13 Yes.

14 There was a second.

15 MR. BENNETT: All in favor?

16 GROUP VOTE: I.

17 MR. BENNETT: Opposed? Thank you.

18 /

19 /

20 /

21 /

22 /

23 /

24 /

25 /

C E R T I F I C A T E

This is to certify that the foregoing transcript

In the matter of : Sixty-Seventh Meeting of the
National Council on the Humanities

Before: National Endowment for the Humanities

Date: February 18, 1983

Place: Washington, D.C.

represents the full and complete proceedings of the
aforementioned matter, as reported and reduced to
typewriting.



NEAL R. GROSS

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1330 VERMONT AVENUE, NW
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

NATIONAL ENDOWMENT FOR THE HUMANITIES

Washington, D. C. 20506

SIXTY-SEVENTH MEETING OF THE
NATIONAL COUNCIL ON THE HUMANITIES

Friday,
February 18, 1983

Shoreham Building, 806 Fifteenth Street, N.W.
Washington, D. C.

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1330 VERMONT AVENUE, NW
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

I N D E X

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

IV. REPORTS (Continued)

- L. Committee Reports on Policy and General Matters
 - a. State Programs
 - Ms. Kerr Page 84
 - b. General Programs
 - Mr. Cohn Page 97
 - c. Research Programs
 - Mr. Kennedy. Page 103
 - d. Planning and Assessment Studies
 - Ms. Silvers Page 107
 - e. Fellowship Programs
 - Mr. Hamilton Page 120
 - f. Education Programs
 - Ms. Norton Page 136
 - g. Challenge Grants
 - Mr. Dille Page 140
- M. Jefferson Lecture Discussion
 - Ms. Kerr Page 143
- N. Emergency Grants (Tab J)
 - Mr. Willkei Page 158

V. STATE PROGRAMS

- A Action on Applications (Tab K)
 - Ms. Kerr Page 158

VI. GENERAL PROGRAMS

- A. Action on Applications - Media (Tab L)
- B. Action on Applications - Special Projects (Tab M)
 - Mr. Cohn Page 159

VII. RESEARCH PROGRAMS

- A Action on Applications (Tab N)
 - Mr. Kennedy. Page 160

NEAL R. GROSS
 COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
 1330 VERMONT AVENUE, NW
 WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

I N D E X

VIII. PLANNING AND ASSESSMENT STUDIES

A. Action on Applications (Tab O)
Ms. Silvers Page 185

IX. FELLOWSHIP PROGRAMS

A. Action on Applications - Summer Stipends (Tab P)
Mr. Hamilton Page 186

X. EDUCATION PROGRAMS

A. Action on Applications - Elementary and
Secondary Education Program (Tab Q)
Ms. Norton Page 189

B. Action on Applications - Higher Education/
Individual Institutions (Tab R)
Ms. Norton Page 192

C. Action on Applications - Higher Education/
Regional & National (Tab S)
Ms. Norton Page 193

XI. CHALLENGE GRANTS

A. Action on Applications (Tab T)
Mr. Dille Page 194

1 MR. BENNETT: All right, let's move to Committee
2 Reports on Policy and General Matters, State Programs,
3 Louise Kerr.

4 MS. KERR: As you all know, State Committee is
5 now reviewing the program only once a year, but I want to
6 begin with the commendation of staff because despite that
7 fact and despite the fact that we only did the policy
8 yesterday, they have spent the last several months, since
9 November, formulating, communicating, and implementing that
10 policy which is no small task. And they've done it quite
11 well.

12 Our meeting began with a report on those activi-
13 ties, including conferences and workshops in which the
14 Criteria for Review that the Council passed last week, were
15 communicated to the various States, and the Federation, and
16 so on.

17 The report was followed by a report from Jack
18 Neuhouse (phonetic) of the Federation, a very good report.
19 He told us what his impressions of the State response and
20 the Federation response had been to those criteria and to
21 the revisions in those criteria. He talked about the
22 meeting in November and I just briefly want to say some-
23 thing about that meeting.

24 The Endowment was very well represented, most
25 especially and from the top, I would say the Chairman did

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1330 VERMONT AVENUE, NW
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

1 it and there were many, many staff members who participated
2 in the program and several Council members. It was received
3 very well, especially because I think that it was noted by
4 the participants that this was the first time--I think this
5 was the first time that the Chairman had been, I'm not sure.

6 --that length of time.

7 MS. KERR: --and had spent an entire--in fact,
8 two days I think had been spent there and I wanted to re-
9 port that to the Council and to encourage that kind of par-
10 ticipation in the future.

11 Based partly on the remarks that had been made
12 by the Federation Chairman and by the communications given
13 to us by the staff, we then proceeded to consider refine-
14 ments in the Criteria for Review; refinements which will
15 be used by us in the future to formulate--they were, in
16 fact, refinements in the guidelines which will be used by
17 reviewers, panelists, and the Council at the next meeting
18 to review the programs that are given to us.

19 These refinements, which you will be able to look
20 at--anybody who wants to look at them, I'm sure Don would
21 be willing to give you those reams of paper. They're
22 intended to be given to the reviewers and the panelists
23 and the Council, but also to the States themselves so that
24 they can be very clear about what we will be expecting from
25 them.

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1330 VERMONT AVENUE, NW
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

1 We were then informed by the staff that they will
2 be reviewing the administrative procedures used by staff.
3 That has not been done, I understand, for several years and
4 we don't know whether changes will be recommended, but we
5 have been prepared and I will prepare you for the possi-
6 bility that some recommendations may be given to us at the
7 next meeting.

8 Finally, we discussed our--and next to last we
9 discussed--funding of the procedures that we will use for
10 funding the project. You will remember last time that
11 there was some concern expressed for how we will respond
12 to the progress or lack of progress of States. The funding
13 procedures that we were given will have given us more in-
14 formation about how we will reward exemplary projects or
15 projects which have fulfilled the guidelines very well and
16 how we will, in fact, encourage other States who have not
17 fulfilled the guidelines well to come closer to fulfilling
18 the guidelines.

19 Finally, we approved -- gave final approval to
20 the new special incentive awards that will be given and
21 they have first been retitled--how have they been retitled--
22 Grants for Exemplary Projects in the States. We have re-
23 affirmed the advice that we gave the Council last time,
24 which is that those projects will be limited to Council-
25 initiated projects rather than re-grant projects.

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1330 VERMONT AVENUE, NW
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

1 And we also stated that this time around we will,
2 in fact, welcome projects from the States which are multi-
3 state projects as distinguished from regional state pro-
4 jects.

5 I think that was the essence of our Committee.
6 If anybody has anything to add you may.

7 MR. BENNETT: Yes, Miss Silvers?

8 MS. SILVERS: Yeah, I guess I'm a little bit un-
9 clear or confused about the status and existence of various
10 documents. I take it now that the revised Criteria--are
11 we going to have a chance as a full Council to take a look
12 at them?

13 MS. KERR: You mean--yes, I suggested that if
14 you wish, we can get you copies of them.

15 MS. SILVERS: I think that's not the point that
16 I'm making. I think it would be useful if, as a matter of
17 course rather than having to make special requests, we
18 could get a chance to see some of these revisions in guide-
19 lines and criteria for all the Divisions.

20 MS. KERR: We'd be happy to send them to all
21 Council members.

22 MS. SILVERS: And that I presume after we take a
23 look at them, we would have some chance of commenting. I
24 have no reason to believe that there's anything I want to
25 say, but I do know that on the basis of only having heard

1 about them at the November meeting, that they looked awfully
2 different when I read a draft. And so I wonder whether--

3 MS. KERR: The criteria, except for language
4 changes which were, in fact, recommended by the States,
5 they're the same. Correct me if I'm wrong.

6 MS. SILVERS: I think that this is just a differ-
7 ence in modes of expression, Louise. Language differences
8 can be very important when you're laying out criteria that
9 are going to be used to judge and that's what I--

10 MS. KERR: I'm not sure what the question is that
11 you're asking. Are you asking us to delay? I will be
12 moving that our recommendations be -- I mean, I don't even
13 think we need to move because these were simply refinements
14 on something we passed in November --

15 MS. SILVERS: All right.

16 MS. KERR: --and we'd be happy to send them to
17 you. We did not send them to you ahead of time because we
18 had not approved the refinements, but we didn't see them as
19 so major and so different that--I'm not sure what the
20 question is, maybe you can clarify it?

21 MS. SILVERS: I'm just asking, as a general
22 practice for the Council, not particularly about State
23 Programs, but whenever criteria are being revised--and
24 these criteria are going to be used to judge applicatons
25 and assess project proposals--I wonder if we simply could

1 get copies of them before the full Council is asked to
2 approve them? It has nothing to do with this particular
3 case, although in this case I don't recall that we actually
4 saw the pieces of paper before we apparently approved them.

5 MS. KERR: Well, certainly State Committee would
6 be happy to do that, but you're asking a larger question
7 than States then.

8 MR. BENNETT: Okay, Mary Beth, do you want to--

9 MS. NORTON: Anita, I think maybe perhaps you
10 misunderstand what went on yesterday; that all of us at
11 the Committee meeting agreed that in fact what we were
12 adopting wasn't necessarily any sort of revision of past
13 practice, it was merely codifying what we understood to be
14 a past practice and writing it down. We didn't see it as
15 a change and that was--everyone around the table agreed
16 with that.

17 Now if--the other thing I would say is that it
18 has not, in fact, been past practice for the entire Council
19 to review decisions made by individual committees with
20 respect to the guidelines of their divisions. And is that
21 what you're raising, that you want to change that?

22 MS. SILVERS: Well, I guess I am because there's
23 obviously a difference of opinion about whether codifica-
24 tion made changes or not. And I think that if the full
25 Council is asked to approve it--

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1330 VERMONT AVENUE, NW
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

1 MS. KERR: Well, I will defer to the Chairman in
2 this case because I think it's a question I can't answer.

3 MS. SILVERS: All right, I think my point is just
4 a general one. The full Council is asked to approve changes
5 in guidelines, codifications, or documents and it would be
6 sort of useful if we could take a look at them.

7 MS. KERR: The full Council has not been asked
8 to do that in the past.

9 If I could, I think the practice--
10 and I'd be corrected by other senior people--senior by
11 I'm talking now about age--the Endowment. I believe our
12 practice has been that usually guidelines and so on are
13 approved by the committess with respect to the programs,
14 but I think that the more general point of distributing
15 those widely is something that I think we all understand
16 and have heard and I think we can take care of that. But
17 just to clarify the practice, I believe Mary Beth is
18 correct that, we have traditionally had those judgments
19 made within the committee. Fellowships was talking about
20 that yesterday, for example.

21 I have a different memory altogether
22 and I think Anita is to be praised for taking initiatives
23 and responsibilities which aren't necessarily assigned. I
24 have not comments on the issue at hand, but I think that
25 the -- I've always understood that our -- all of our actions

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1330 VERMONT AVENUE, NW
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

1 --all of our action constitute recommendations to the
2 Council and go to the Council. Now, I don't mean to
3 suggest we have to adopt them by a motion and all the rest,
4 but it seems to me that all of the Council should be
5 equally interested in everything that every Division does
6 so far as it's humanly possible.

7 Well, I guess maybe I missed
8 speaking myself. I don't think we're counter with one
9 another.

10 Jack, what does all of our actions
11 mean in this context, and you said, "Are we all interested?"
12 Sure, but to what extent is that transferred to therefore
13 passing on guidelines for--I don't understand how you

14 Passing on guidelines, but dis-
15 cussing them at a general Council meeting, which Anita
16 wanted to do and it seems to me that that's a good thing.

17 MR. BENNETT: I have a suggestion. Excuse me,
18 go ahead.

19 Well, you'd better go ahead.

20 MR. BENNETT: No, no.

21 Because I'm going to make a report
22 and it's going to cover some of these things.

23 I have a suggestion too, Mr.
24 Chairman.

25 Go ahead.

1 MR. BENNETT: I'm torn between trying to make a
2 suggestion to end and enjoying the discussion, so you want
3 to--Okay, Mary Beth?

4 MS. NORTON: I have a suggestion too, Mr. Chair-
5 man. Why don't we send out these new Criteria for Review
6 to all Council members--

7 MR. BENNETT: Right.

8 MS. NORTON: --and if anyone has some significant
9 objection we can always have a discussion of it at the
10 next Council meeting. And I would ask that Council members
11 say--ask Mr. Gibson not to do anything with these guide-
12 lines within the next couple of weeks and--

13 MS. KERR: I beg you not to do this to these
14 guidelines. If there were problems they would have to be
15 implemented for the following year because the proposals
16 will be coming in at about the time that the Council meets.

17 MS. NORTON: No, I'm not saying necessarily hold
18 this up until the next Council meeting.

19 MS. KERR: Okay.

20 MS. NORTON: What I'm saying is, let's send it
21 out to the Council members. If anyone has significant
22 objections, then it will have to be discussed again at a
23 Council meeting, but at this stage just send it out for
24 comment and if anyone has any significant objections to
25 call Don with them or let us know. You can even call me.

1 MR. BENNETT: Could we say that any objections,
2 if it could be worked out between the objecting party and
3 the Committee in a satisfactory way, we could then go ahead?

4 MS. KERR: Yeah.

5 Mr. Chairman, that does not inform
6 the rest of us.

7 MS. KERR: No.

8 MR. BENNETT: Well yeah, as I understand it the
9 suggestion is that everyone receive a copy of this and
10 that those who have concerns, we try to raise them so that
11 Don and the Chairman--

12 MS. KERR: They can be discussed at the next
13 Council meeting.

14 MR. BENNETT: --of the Committee can discuss it.

15 MS. KERR: If there are significant concerns,
16 they could be discussed at the next Council meeting.

17 Before the guidelines become
18 effective.

19 MR. BENNETT: I have to say, my guess is that the
20 kind of codification which took place following full dis-
21 cussion before is not going to cause, it's my guess, any
22 significant disagreement. There may be minor disagreements
23 which we could work out and then--

24 Forget about the particular one,
25 what about the procedure on this thing? What about the

1 other committees?

2 MR. BENNETT: Well, the procedure that--I'm
3 sorry, maybe I don't--

4 Whatever guidelines any committee
5 establishes becomes the guidelines for this entire Council.

6 MR. BENNETT: Right.

7 In the case of the States, I am
8 not a member of a State Committee.

9 MR. BENNETT: Right.

10 But I have to tell you, I get many
11 inquiries. I once was a member of a Committee and I would
12 like to know, as soon as possible, even if it's only a
13 matter of codification. I don't know what subtleties creep
14 in with codification, but I suspect there are some.

15 MR. BENNETT: May we inform you of what's gone on
16 and ask for your response?

17 Now you're doing exactly what we're
18 asking for, we're opening this thing up.

19 MR. BENNETT: That's right. Yes?

20 MS. SILVERS: I just wanted to comment, I have no
21 reason to believe there are any problems with these now and
22 I don't see any reason why they can't be used, but just as
23 a matter of procedure, I guess I do have concerns when
24 you're writing criteria I think language sometimes does
25 make a difference and it's hard to read it in an adhoc way;

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1330 VERMONT AVENUE, NW
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

1 listening to pieces over the telephone.

2 MR. BENNETT: Okay. Don?

3 I'd like to make a brief comment
4 more as a background rather than as a entry into the dis-
5 cussion on one side or the other. The Criteria for Review,
6 or guidelines, or whatever we call them, that were passed
7 by the Committee yesterday were discussed in detail with
8 the Council Committee in November, following which time
9 they were mailed to all States' Chairs and Directors for
10 comment as well as to members of the Federation Board, as
11 well as to all reviewers and panelists that the Division
12 used last year in reviewing those applications. The comments
13 from all of those sources were incorporated into the docu-
14 ment that we presented to the full Committee yesterday, and
15 had I thought a thorough discussion of the various criteria
16 in it. That was my understanding of the procedures we
17 should follow in making guideline revisions.

18 MR. BENNETT: Yes, Mr. Neusner? Jack?

19 MR. NEUSNER: Whichever. I'd like to ask now,
20 is it now established that guidelines coming out of
21 Committees do get brought to the attention of the Council
22 for such discussion as people may want to have because that
23 is the point that we have intervened on. I think it's a very
24 important point for future Council members cause otherwise
25 what I'm hearing is, well, that's our Committee, it's none

1 of your business.

2 MR. BENNETT: No, I don't think anybody is saying
3 it's none of your business.

4 MR. NEUSNER: But then, if it's our business, we
5 should have a chance to be informed and to contribute when
6 it goes to the 50 State Committees.

7 MR. BENNETT: There's nothing hidden about these
8 documents. I think they should be sent to you. If you
9 have any comment, then let's get the comment. We have to
10 be able to do business.

11 MR. NEUSNER: I'm not referring to the specific
12 matter at hand.

13 MR. BENNETT: Sure.

14 MR. NEUSNER: I'm just saying that when people
15 are consulted on guidelines, I think it should go to all
16 Council members who should have a chance to comment--

17 MR. KERR: We're sending them right now.

18 MR. NEUSNER: Yep, you got em.

19 MR. NEUSNER: I'd also--excuse me, I think it's
20 a very serious point. I also think that -- I call atten-
21 tion when the Education Council was redoing--Committee I
22 mean--was redoing their whole thing, I saw all of these
23 documents, I studied them, I had very minor comments, and
24 I thought it was for my education and others a very con-
25 structive act. I don't think that there should be any

1 reservations about this.

2 MS. KERR: Mr. Chairman?

3 MR. NEUSNER: I think it should be routinely
4 done.

5 MR. BENNETT: Yes?

6 MS. KERR: I really do appreciate the comments
7 that are being made because, as Mary Beth pointed out, these
8 are codifications of guidelines that have been followed by
9 the State and by the National Endowment for years. I urged
10 you the first--when I first became Chairman of this
11 Committee I urged you to become interested in the States
12 and I really do appreciate that at this point.

13 In fact, what happened with the Education
14 Division was that those were brand new guidelines that were
15 having to be reviewed for more substance as well as language.

16 We apologize for not having realized that most
17 of you were not aware of the guidelines of the States and
18 we will be informed by that in the future.

19 MR. BENNETT: Okay. Okay, it's your report, Miss
20 Kerr? Right. Okay.

21 Let's move on to General Programs. Mr. Cohn,
22 yes.

23 MR. COHN: Harriet Zimmerman is not here. We
24 anticipated some of the dialogue which has now gone on as
25 far as General Programs is concerned and there has been

1 distributed to you--

2 MR. BENNETT: Closer.

3 MR. COHN: We anticipated some of the discussion we app
 4 which has gone on as far as the State Program is concerned
 5 and we have distributed to you the draft of the Statement
 6 of Purpose of General Programming which grew out of a Division
 7 special meeting on December 9 of last year. All of the
 8 Council members, I have been advised, have received a copy
 9 of this particular document.

10 Basically, there's an emphasis on aims and sub-
 11 stance rather than on the methods which might be involved.
 12 There was unanimous approval that this Statement of Purpose
 13 be included in all the guidelines of the Division's current
 14 program.

15 The Committee now wishes to ask that the full
 16 Council, of course, approve this recommendation. Thank you.

17 With regard to the possible restructuring of the
 18 Division's existing program, the Committee discussed it's
 19 advantages and possible disadvantages. There were some few words
 20 members of the Committee who generally favored the plan
 21 believing that it clarifies the work of the Division and
 22 encourages projects involving multiple ways of reaching
 23 general audiences.

24 On the other hand, there were some members of the
 25 Committee who raised the question of whether the change

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1330 VERMONT AVENUE, NW

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

1 and also from the staff on the Committee how we're going
2 to proceed toward guidelines to put this policy into effect
3 and when we'll see the guidelines or some Committee will
4 see the guidelines. And I'd like to urge them to do so as
5 soon as they possibly can and as decisively as they possibly
6 can so that the policy makes some difference and not just
7 be a veneer over pretty much what we were doing anyways.
8 I don't think it's--

9 MR. STEIN: It's not intended as a veneer.

10 MR. NEUSNER: I was there, Leon, I'm on your
11 side.

12 MR. STEIN: Well, it's not a veneer, it's sub-
13 stantive.

14 MR. NEUSNER: I agree, but I'd like to see it
15 put in--

16 MR. STEIN: It's only a semblance of veneer.

17 MR. NEUSNER: I'd like to see it put into con-
18 crete guidelines as soon as possible.

19 MR. BENNETT: Steve, excuse me.

20 --how it's implemented and Steve
21 is going to reply to your question.

22 MR. NEUSNER: Great.

23 We intend to do just that, Jack. We
24 were just waiting for the vote of the Council today and we
25 shall proceed immediately.

1 MR. NEUSNER: Does that mean in February we'll
2 be seeing the proposed new guidelines?

3 Which February?

4 This is February. We have to--

5 MR. BENNETT: Not that fast.

6 MR. NEUSNER: I meant next February.

7 MR. BENNETT: Faster than that.

8 MR. NEUSNER: I was being sarcastic, not dumb.

9 In May?

10 MR. BENNETT: May?

11 MR. NEUSNER: Is May the next meeting?

12 --as quickly as we can, consistent
13 with the processing of the hundreds of applications we have,
14 but we will try to have these guidelines to the Committee,
15 if possible, by May.

16 MR. NEUSNER: And then to the Council in May
17 also?

18 MR. BENNETT: Sure.

19 MR. NEUSNER: Which would mean that we could see
20 them and generally give a consent or approve it or whatever?

21 MR. BENNETT: I take it we at least have advice
22 to try our best to get these guidelines ready for May
23 Council.

24 We certainly are going to try.

25 MR. BENNETT: Good. Okay. Do our best.

1 It would be better than not.
2 Chairman?

3 MR. BENNETT: Yes.

4 There is a suggestion in the
5 covering memorandum of January 3rd that these guidelines
6 be incorporated in each of the Divisions' Guidelines.

7 MR. BENNETT: Program, program.

8 Programs. While they seem very
9 appropriate for General Programs, they're going to need
10 substantial modification for some of the other programs.
11 Are we voting now on the approval only for the General
12 Programs or voting on the broader programs?

13 MR. BENNETT: Yes. It's for each of the indivi-
14 dual programs of the Division of General Programs. It's
15 only for that Division.

16 We can lend them to you for others.

17 MR. BENNETT: Yes, that's right. We will contain
18 the Committee's imperialism for the moment. If other
19 Divisions are interested in copying these, we will of
20 course pass them around to the full Council for discussion.
21 Okay?

22 You mean we don't have any copy-
23 right rights in this?

24 MR. BENNETT: Well no, not on good ideas. Mr.
25 Cohn, did you have more.

1 MR. COHN: No, thank you.

2 MR. BENNETT: Thank you very much. Research
3 Programs, Mr. Kennedy.

4 MR. KENNEDY: The Research Committee also engaged
5 in a discussion of guidelines. At a preliminary stage I'll
6 adapt Louise's word, refinement, to describe them since,
7 in my judgment, there really were no significant changes
8 in the guidelines proposed. We gave the staff some advice
9 about their refinements and these will come back to us at
10 the May meeting. Harold will then have to translate them
11 into Latin for circulation to you at the next Council
12 meeting.

13 The major subject of discussion at the Committee
14 meeting related to the program in humanities, science,
15 and technology, which is newly assigned to the Research
16 Division.

17 It is, in large part, a joint program with the
18 National Science Foundation and at present it is in an
19 interim status until new guidelines go into effect,
20 new guidelines which are of course not yet totally
21 stated, not to say approved.

22 I think the most important outcome of that
23 discussion related to our hope --

24 (Off the record for tape change.)

25 /

1 MR. BENNETT: If you're interested in copying
2 these, we will, of course, pass them around to the full
3 council for a discussion. Okay.

4 MR. COHN: You mean we don't have any copyright
5 rights in this?

6 MR. BENNETT: No, not on good ideas. Mr. Cohn,
7 did you have more?

8 MR. COHN: That's all. Thank you.

9 MR. BENNETT: Thank you very much. Research
10 Programs, Mr. Kennedy.

11 MR. KENNEDY: The Research Committee also en-
12 gaged in a discussion of guidelines at a preliminary
13 stage. I'll adapt Louise's word, refinements to describe
14 them, since in my judgment, there are really no signifi-
15 cant changes in the guidelines proposed. We gave the
16 staff some advice about their refinements and these will
17 come back to us at the May meeting. However, we will
18 then have to translate them into Latin for circulation
19 to you at the next Council meeting. The major subject
20 of discussion at the committee meeting related to the
21 program in humanities, science and technology, which is
22 newly assigned to the research division. It is, in large
23 part, a joint program with the National Science Founda-
24 tion and, at present, it is in an interim status until
25 new guidelines go into effect. New guidelines which are,

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1330 VERMONT AVENUE, NW
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

1 of course, not yet totally stated, not to say approved.
2 I think the most important outcome of that discussion re-
3 lated to our hope that NEH might participate with NSF at
4 the stage of the advisory committee, which reviews and
5 recommends guidelines in the joint program. At present,
6 the panels which reviews specific proposals are joint
7 panels, but the advisory committee that NSF sets up in
8 the preparation of their guidelines, including the guide-
9 lines for the joint program, is entirely an NSF commit-
10 tee, and we have instructed the chairman of the division
11 to explore with vigor the possibility of NEH partici-
12 pating at the stage of the advisory committee.

13 MR. BENNETT: Thank you. Any discussion?
14 Thank you very much. Is that it? Yes, Ms. Campbell?

15 DR. CAMPBELL: Dr. Campbell.

16 MR. BENNETT: Dr. Campbell.

17 DR. CAMPBELL: Or Rita.

18 MR. BENNETT: Rita.

19 DR. CAMPBELL: I very much regret that I could
20 not attend that meeting on value of science and technolo-
21 gy and I did read with care before I came the NSF guide-
22 lines. I've had grants proposed to me that I didn't par-
23 take from NSF. I have had grants from NEH and I was in-
24 volved in the origination of this program origin. It
25 seemed to me the role of the economist was kind of knocked

1 out here and there by the use of the word engineering
2 and science consistently, as I recall. And I would like
3 to have reinserted either the social sciences, which is
4 broader than economist, but I do not see where in this
5 very important area where you have to measure in some
6 form or other or have a pure value judgement with no
7 anchoring points, why you don't at least have to defend
8 whether there is any relative benefits. It is the mere
9 fact that you get a benefit from expenditures plus you
10 get a benefit from an expenditure. It's ridiculous to
11 assume you don't. The big question is related to what
12 other benefits you might get. Thank you.

13 MR. BENNETT: Anita?

14 MS. SILVERS: I think Rita's brought up a very
15 important point. The Edis Program under NSF specifically
16 rules out consideration of proposals, for instance, about
17 risk benefit and cost benefit analysis and that is proba-
18 bly because of internal reasons within NSF, but because
19 we do not have, at this point, a conjoined advisory group
20 which is designing the guidelines and the appropriate
21 subject matter, we haven't, as it were, been able to put
22 our two cents in and there's a great deal of extremely
23 interesting and, I think, very well informed work by
24 humanists and by economists working together in this
25 area and it would be extremely appropriate for this

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1330 VERMONT AVENUE, NW
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

1 program to deal with that.

2 MR. BENNETT: Okay. George do you want to re-
3 spond to it? Thank you. Planning and Assessment Stu-
4 dies, Ms. Silvers. Dr. Silvers. Anita? State your
5 preference.

6 MS. SILVERS: Usually they say the one over
7 there. I'd like to begin by drawing your attention to
8 the report that you have in the Council books under tab,
9 I believe it's at The Study of Treasury Fund Use. This
10 is the first congressionally mandated study which was
11 executed by the Office of Planning and Policy Assessment.
12 The Congress posed two questions: How effectively do
13 treasury funds function as in centers for fund raising
14 and to what extent might this benefit be mitigated by the
15 imposition of administration burdens on recipient insti-
16 tutions? As you will see, having read the report, the
17 study concludes that treasury funds have been more suc-
18 cessful than originally anticipated when the practice of
19 making match and grants began. However, the study also
20 revealed the number of problems which require further
21 consideration and probably would benefit from policy for-
22 mulation. The Council committee members examined unedited
23 comments from 40 project directors, nearly three-quarters
24 of whom had directed research division grants. This ap-
25 proximately represents the proportion of research division

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1330 VERMONT AVENUE, NW
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

1 grants in the total group grantees who receive treasury
2 fund offers during the years under study. Now, of course,
3 the group of project directors who chose to write long
4 comments may be skewed to include unrepresentatively high
5 proportion of directors who had something to lament about.
6 Nevertheless, the committee believes the Council ought
7 to develop some policy guidelines to distinguish those
8 projects likely to benefit from the incentives of treasury
9 offers from those projects which might be harmed. The
10 LPPA staff already is examining how each divisional
11 staff actually deals with decisions about treasury fund
12 offers. The committee requested that staff use the ex-
13 isting data base to formulate some hypotheses on which
14 we can distinguish instances in which treasury offers
15 will be beneficial from those in which search for addi-
16 tional funding detracts from the project. These hypo-
17 theses might be tested by making predictions to be con-
18 firmed or disconfirmed by a survey of the most recent
19 group with matching grant projects. We hope to bring you
20 policy recommendations derived from these studies and
21 while the committee does not want to burden Council mem-
22 bers with more pieces of paper, we feel we were enlight-
23 ened by reading these comments from project directors and
24 we think that reading the comments provides insight into
25 the experience of running projects and we would like to

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1330 VERMONT AVENUE, NW
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

1 know whether or not-- We would like to know which Council
2 members want to read these comments. There is a problem
3 about confidentiality because these are comments that
4 were made in the study and the comments are to remain
5 confidential, but if you could indicate during the Council
6 meeting, we've asked Mary Beth if she would look at these
7 because of her experience in the research division and
8 because she probably remembers some of the discussion
9 that occurred when some of these offers were made. We
10 will be back to you with some policy recommendations. I
11 do want to talk now about the higher education panel
12 study on financial support for the humanities. This is
13 a study which will be mailed to you.

14 MR. BENNETT: Here it is.

15 MS. SILVERS: Oh, good.

16 MR. BENNETT: We have it.

17 MS. SILVERS: Any agency assembling data on the
18 financial base for the humanities in response to Presi-
19 dent Reagan's interest in increasing private sector sup-
20 port, we should know how much is expended, on what it is
21 expended and the source of the funds. The higher educa-
22 tion panel study, which this is published in January
23 1983, attempted to answer some of these questions. We
24 did learn that educational institutions apparently spend
25 between \$9 and \$10 in unrestricted funds on the humanities

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1330 VERMONT AVENUE, NW
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

1 for every dollar of income they receive restricted to the
2 humanity. But only 52 percent of those in the HEP survey
3 group returned the survey compared to a typical 85 per-
4 cent response. The best response rate were from doctoral
5 granting institutions, public institutions and large in-
6 stitutions. Small institutions, private institutions
7 and liberal arts institutions had a lower than average
8 response rates. In fact, according the the classifica-
9 tion, liberal arts institutions, I believe, had the poor-
10 est response rate even though we think that they are en-
11 gaged in the humanities. During the next year, the LPPA
12 staff will give priority to the development of data re-
13 lating to the financing of the humanities in this country.
14 Attention will be given particularly to devising new ways
15 of getting information from the various types of institu-
16 tions, particularly from those which had a poor response
17 rate in the HEP study. In addition, since the November
18 Council, OPPA has launched two studies using the HEP re-
19 spondents. One on student quality in the humanities eli-
20 cits opinions of senior academic officers responsible for
21 undergraduate and graduate instruction and it asks about
22 their views of the quality of students who are now in the
23 humanities. We'll find out whether they are optimistic
24 or pessimistic. The second, while selected characteris-
25 tics of full time humanities faculty updates the 1979

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1330 VERMONT AVENUE, NW
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

1 study which provides data on the numbers and status of
2 humanities faculty, these reports should be ready for
3 the Council in three to four months. We do want to make
4 a comment about budget. This year the OPPA budget sup-
5 ports three ongoing projects involving the AC higher
6 education panel and the National Academy of Science, one
7 special competition into open cycles. It appears that
8 in 1984, the funds identified in the congressional ap-
9 propriation request for planning and assessment studies
10 will reduce the open cycles to one. The Council commit-
11 tee notes that demand for the work which OPPA does is
12 increasing and that, in particular, congressional and
13 press request for data have increased. Funds to support
14 the most necessary projects will be available, but the
15 committee asked me to convey to the full Council our view
16 that consideration should be given to increasing OPPA's
17 capacity to fulfill its mission by providing increased
18 budgetary support.

19 MR. BENNETT: Thank you. Comments? Questions?
20 Yes, Rita?

21 MS. RICARDO-CAMPBELL: Do I understand correct-
22 ly that the money is to do a resurvey of the group, the
23 liberal-- Let me put it to you this way. There was a
24 refusal rate of 48 percent is another way of saying that
25 there was a 52 percent response. And in the refusal

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1330 VERMONT AVENUE, NW
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

1 group, there were private liberal colleges heavily repre-
2 sented and the proposal is to take the group that did
3 respond and ask a lot of other questions?

4 MS. SILVERS: No. That's not the proposal.

5 MS. RICARDO-CAMPBELL: I didn't understand.

6 MS. SILVERS: We want to get more information
7 on this subject in general. The HEP vehicle is not going
8 to be used to do that. It hasn't worked apparently too
9 well in this case. The staff is now thinking about how
10 it will do other studies and I think that special atten-
11 tion is going to be paid to how to get information from
12 the group which apparently gave us the least information
13 under the HEP study.

14 MS. RICARDO-CAMPBELL: Well, one would assume
15 they didn't give the information because they don't have
16 the staff or the interest, or both combined, or time to
17 do this or-- I'm a little puzzled quite what they're
18 aiming at in the--

19 The resurvey which Anita was
20 talking about was of a different study, one specifically
21 of humanities faculty in the four major fields. This was
22 a study which was completed about two years ago and it
23 covered, I believe, 1979. So we want to do an update of
24 that study. That's separate from this financial support
25 study which is--

1 MS. RICARDO-CAMPBELL: This is just dropped
2 where it is. Am I right?

3 Well, yes. In the discussion
4 with the committee, the committee members felt that there
5 were certain sectors which were involved in this particu-
6 lar survey in which we did not receive sufficient informa-
7 tion and so we discussed with the committee our own ex-
8 pectation of attempting in various ways in the future of
9 trying to get better information on those particular sec-
10 tors. We do not have, at this particular point, any spe-
11 cific research design or research study in mind. It's
12 just that the committee and we too felt that we should
13 attempt to get better information from those particular
14 sectors. As to how we will do that will depend upon con-
15 versations that we have with a number of people over the
16 next--during this year.

17 MS. RICARDO-CAMPBELL: The first project you
18 mentioned, I'm in favor of and the latter, I have con-
19 siderable reservations about since this one was, in my
20 opinion, statistically not worth much beyond telling you
21 that it's 10 percent or less. But you have no way of
22 really knowing anything else in this support.

23 MS. SILVERS: Rita, I've heard a variety of
24 hypotheses about why the poor response rate occurred. I
25 don't see, at this point, that it would be very costly

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1330 VERMONT AVENUE, NW
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

1 and that it would be worthless to try and investigate
2 why the poor response rate occurred and whether we have
3 some vehicles that we could use in a cost effective mat-
4 ter to get some information. I think it's very important.
5 We have all sorts of hypotheses when we make policy about
6 these particular kinds of institutions. They are very
7 important education division grants and I think that
8 there may be ways that we can get this information.

9 Let me just also comment on one
10 other matter and that is that we are dwelling here on the
11 information from particular sectors of higher education.
12 This particular study did give us for the very first time
13 some pretty good figures about the minimum amount of fi-
14 nancing for the humanities which we've never had. Also,
15 some fairly good information about the distribution of
16 the monies which are available among various categories
17 of activities in the institution.

18 MS. RICARDO-CAMPBELL: Not with a 48 percent
19 refusal rate in the response.

20 No, but that's just it. What the
21 study does is to show both the minimum based upon the
22 responses.

23 MS. RICARDO-CAMPBELL: All right.

24 The minimum as well as using
25 their normal waiting procedures, what is the possible or

1 probable. So we have a minimum here and that's fairly
2 firm. That's fairly firm even taking into consideration
3 the actual responses we got. This minimum is very good
4 for us to have.

5 MR. BENNETT: Excuse me. We have a couple peo-
6 ple who want to speak. Richard Eckman and then Jack
7 Neusner.

8 MR. ECKMAN: It doesn't surprise me to learn
9 that there was a low response rate from private liberal
10 arts and small institutions. The burden of paper work
11 and requests to fill out surveys that fall on any college
12 or university's administration is just enormous. And in
13 the case of small institutions, they're not very many
14 people to comply with all those requests for information.
15 It may be that there was nothing in the way in which
16 this project was framed, that made it stand out from all
17 the other requests that a college's central administra-
18 tive offices would normally receive and it may be working
19 together, we could find ways to have the follow-up re-
20 quest rise to the top of the pile in the academic dean's
21 office in a small institution.

22 MR. BENNETT: Mr. Neusner.

23 MR. NEUSNER: I'd like to direct attention to
24 an earlier part of Anita's statement because it's going
25 to come back to the Council, namely, the problems that

1 people have in raising the matching grants. We were very
2 deeply troubled by the reports that we read. Since we
3 are also the research committee, which makes the most
4 ample use of that mechanism, we were doubly troubled.
5 The staff has proposed very good means of finding out
6 just who is having trouble and where we have to take re-
7 medial action to make sure that people can get their
8 work done and are not discouraged from applying for funds
9 because they are not professional fundraisers or don't
10 have access to help. And this will come back to the
11 Council, I hope, in May.

12 MR. BENNETT: Thank you. Yes?

13 MS. SILVERS: One quick comment to Rich. That's
14 the hypothesis that I've heard most often. However,
15 these same institutions do respond to other HEP surveys.
16 I have another hypothesis which is the way that their
17 budgets are set up made it harder for them to respond
18 than for public institutions who have other budget for-
19 mats and that we might be able to do something about.

20 MR. BENNETT: Mary Beth.

21 MS. NORTON: Speaking as an ex-member of the
22 research division committee, I was very interested in the
23 matching and the report on fate of matching funds and so
24 forth. And it seems to me, it's something we have to
25 take very seriously. I mean I was delighted that matching

1 had worked as well as it has, but I was also very con-
2 cerned about the problem with, in particular, the study
3 that I identified with, those people who had not origi-
4 nally planned matching as a part of the their project and
5 who usually had, it seems from the report at least, an
6 enormous amount of difficulty in raising those matching
7 funds. I mean, I think this is very important for us to
8 consider at a time when we are trying to increase private
9 sector contributions to the humanities. It's something
10 we have to take very seriously so I just want to encour-
11 age the committee and the staff and their working out a
12 potential policy for dealing with these questions and I,
13 for one, would like to be perhaps even apprised of it
14 before the May meeting so I can have a chance to think
15 about it.

16 Could I just make one comment
17 about that. This is a very complicated matter. That's
18 why we're going to spend a great deal of time trying to
19 break down the data as well as discuss it with the pro-
20 gram officers. I think that one particular table on
21 page 14 of the study, I think will point out how--well,
22 frankly they're ambiguous. Some of our initial findings
23 might have been or our own assumptions on that table, for
24 example, what it shows is that taking the projects for
25 which only out right had been requested initially, still

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1330 VERMONT AVENUE, NW
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

1 58 percent of those projects, 58 percent of those pro-
2 jects were able to raise over 90 percent of the gifts
3 for which we had offered to match. So that at this
4 particular point, there doesn't seem to be any clear
5 pattern, either by institutional type or by whether they
6 had originally requested matching or not, so that's a
7 very significant success rate as we saw it for people
8 who did not originally request it. What it meant that
9 there were 135 projects there that the Endowment was
10 able to support through gifts in matching that otherwise
11 we would not have raised private sector support for.

12 MS. NORTON: In this breakdown that's going to
13 be done, Armand, is it going to be broken down by type
14 very specifically by type of project?

15 The extent to which projects can
16 equate with programs. We're taking a program by program
17 look.

18 MS. NORTON: Okay. It may very well be that
19 an archaeology project, for example, is somewhat more
20 sexy, to use that term, than a research tool and it just
21 strikes me that there may be differences in the types of
22 projects and their ability to raise money in that sense.

23 I do hope that the Council mem-
24 bers will read this report and please do pass on to us
25 any kind of data that you would like to have or any kinds

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1330 VERMONT AVENUE, NW
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

1 of hypotheses you might have that we could test with the
2 data. We have a rich, rich gold mine here of data and
3 we very much would like to get any suggestions from the
4 Council members themselves as to what further information
5 they like and how we can analyze this data.

6 If you could do that during the
7 next two weeks, it would be very helpful, I mean welcome.

8 I may not have another chance.
9 I may take it now as a former fundraiser and, I suppose,
10 fundraiser to be, and I don't know if it's beyond the
11 capacity of our calipers to measure initiative and enter-
12 prise. To me, that would strike me as the most relevant
13 factor. I have seen people raise money for all sorts of
14 obscure things if they exercise a great deal of initia-
15 tive and they are good at it. And I've seen people who
16 are not able to raise a penny for anything. I know
17 you're looking into that to the degree we can.

18 Yes, we're looking at personality
19 traits, right?

20 It does have something to do with
21 success.

22 May we have a handbook on that?

23 Huh?

24 A handbook.

25 It's a problem, you know. I don't

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1330 VERMONT AVENUE, NW
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

1 want to get into a long philosophical discussion. One
2 wants to make a study when therefore restricts the study
3 to what one can measure and one that assumes that what
4 one measures is the answer. But OPPA is aware of those
5 humanistic dimensions to the problem. Anita, are you
6 done? Thank you. We're moving close back to schedule.
7 Fellowship Programs, Mr. Hamilton.

8 MR. HAMILTON: Speaking of schedule, I notice
9 that Ms. Norton is due at 11:45. I shall see that she
10 is called on at that time. We're passing around a docu-
11 ment that concerned most of our attention yesterday
12 morning. I will report on it. But before we get to
13 that--there were three basic items in our policy and gen-
14 eral matters agenda. But before I get to that, I'd like
15 to say that it was the view of the committee that the
16 materials that were presented to us by the staff was
17 superbly organized in a committee book that is a substan-
18 tial improvement over what has gone before, exceptionally
19 well organized, easy references, rating sheet, summary of
20 panel discussions, much more information now in an excel-
21 lent coherent manner. This is not an inconsequential
22 point because it's been a concern of those of us on this
23 committee and this division about the amount of informa-
24 tion we can get and so forth whether we have time to read
25 it or not. So I think that the new format of the

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1330 VERMONT AVENUE, NW
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

1 committee book is absolutely excellent. The staff is to
2 be commended. There were three items. One, we discussed
3 the relationship of the division to the programs being
4 proposed for the historically black colleges and universi-
5 ties. We've gone over that here this morning. We talked
6 about the sabbatical program, of course, which will be
7 conducted by the division. In addition, the division
8 will conduct four summer seminars for college teachers
9 which will be held on the campuses of the historically
10 black colleges. Those items we have dealt with. Second-
11 ly, we dealt with our discussions here. We discussed
12 constitutional fellowships which we've talked about.
13 There was, as was indicated earlier in our discussion, a
14 concern about the budget implications of this new emphasis
15 but, again, we've, I think, exhausted that discussion
16 here this morning. And that brings me to the third basic
17 issue, which faced us and that was the recommendation of
18 the special committee on application review system and I
19 might add, as a function of the Neusner-Silvers interven-
20 tion this morning, we passed out-- See you can make
21 policy right away. Speak and things happen. I was not
22 going to hand out this report. I was just simply going
23 to summarize it, but the background of this is simple.
24 We've been concerned about the review process of applica-
25 tions in the division. A special committee listed there

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1330 VERMONT AVENUE, NW
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

1 met, I understand, in January on a Saturday at this place
2 and came up with this report. The concern, of course,
3 was that some applications which received support from
4 the first level of review, the disciplinary panels, those
5 applications were not surviving beyond the stage of the
6 final interdisciplinary panel. And there was some cor-
7 respondence over the month of January into February be-
8 tween the staff and the committee members and there was
9 considerable discussion in our session yesterday. Some-
10 one characterized the discussion as spirited and indeed,
11 it was and I think very good. What came out of that was
12 a compromise. Good American political process way. And
13 we, as a group-- First of all, it was very important
14 for us to decide. This is why I question you Jack
15 whether the committee on its own set certain procedural
16 guidelines and then proceed to implement them or whether
17 we had to bring that before this body for approval. That
18 was important to us. Not that we didn't want to bring
19 it before you for discussion, which we're doing now, but
20 we were concerned that we didn't want to have to wait for
21 final approval. But at any rate, we can pursue that.
22 The final decision was a compromise in this form. We
23 said that if the preliminary disciplinary panel is unani-
24 mously in favor of an application or a proposal, then
25 that application will go to the next stage, that is to

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1330 VERMONT AVENUE, NW
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

1 say, the interdisciplinary panel with a strong presump-
2 tion that it will be passed and recommended to the Council
3 committee for approval. Now if, however, the interdisci-
4 plinary panel goes against the application and, therefore,
5 against the unanimous judgment of the first stage pre-
6 liminary panel, then the application must come before
7 the Council committee with the proviso that the burden of
8 proof is on the interdisciplinary panel to show that the
9 application should be rejected. Now, obviously we'll
10 reread that. But this represented a compromise as I say
11 between those, namely the special committee, the Council
12 committee, that wanted no further review beyond a unani-
13 mous decision by the preliminary panel. If the applica-
14 tion got a unanimous approval by the disciplinary panel,
15 then it should go right to us and not be reviewed any
16 more. A compromise between that view and the view that
17 the application was to be given no extra weight per se
18 before the next panel. Now we understood that this new
19 practice, which we adopted, we agreed to yesterday, would
20 be an experimental, incremental change aimed at improving
21 a situation that was now perceived as not particularly
22 fair for the applications given unanimous support at the
23 disciplinary level and then being knocked out later. We
24 see this, in other words, as a--to use the language that
25 you used earlier, nothing is carved in stone. We see

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1330 VERMONT AVENUE, NW
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

1 this as an experiment. Now, in addition, there was
2 rather substantial agreement that something should and
3 could be done about the rather inadequate evaluate the
4 comments made by too many panelists. Peter Stanlis was
5 very keen on this and presented us with a document. We
6 suggested that panelists be required to provide a more
7 precise substantitive brief paragraph of their views of
8 the proposal before them avoiding generally motive non-
9 substantitive comments and Peter was quite good in pick-
10 ing out some examples of that and I'm sure when I finish
11 here, my colleagues will tell you what they mean. Now,
12 essentially then, in this regard, we spent time talking
13 about ways to improve the quality of the peer review
14 process or the peer review system and that discussion
15 proceeded. We asked the staff to provide the committee
16 a document at the May meeting which would attempt to out-
17 line in a more concrete form, the criteria expected from
18 panelists in evaluating proposals. The reference there
19 was a particular document that Peter Stanlis had submit-
20 ted to the staff and to us earlier specifying such things
21 as the weight to be given to applicants' scholarly achieve-
22 ments, letters of reference, their electoral merits of
23 the proposal and so forth. All in all, it was a discus-
24 sion that I think was most useful and we, as I say, re-
25 solved to the point of revising ever so slightly, that is

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1330 VERMONT AVENUE, NW
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

1 to say as they use the language in a disjointed incre-
2 mental way, the process by which we review applications
3 in the fellowship program came to that point.

4 May I just ask for one clarifica-
5 tion?

6 MR. HAMILTON: Yes.

7 What you said about-- This re-
8 port is not what you said.

9 MR. HAMILTON: This report is not what we agreed
10 to. That's right. What we agreed to, I read. Had you
11 spoken-- Had Anita and Jack spoken much earlier, I would
12 have had time to write this out.

13 MR. BENNETT: Thank you. Comments? Questions?
14 Supplement? May I deal with members of the committee
15 first who wish to supplement, one, two, three.

16 There was one final thing that
17 we did suggest to the staff besides giving us a criteria
18 and that was to provide for us a model type statement on
19 various applications so that we could give this to panel-
20 ists so they could understand what we're talking about.
21 Too frequently the references went into great length
22 about the wonderful character of the individual who was
23 making the proposal and his tremendous work on various
24 committees at the institution and that they were certain
25 on this proposal, that they would do a superb intellectual

1 job, but they failed to address the issue as to whether
2 the proposal itself was valid.

3 MR. BENNETT: Yes, Ellis.

4 MR. SANDOZ: In response to your question,
5 Louise, I think my understanding was that what was circu-
6 lated to you was the basis of our discussion. And the
7 changes that were made were in the form of amendments to
8 it.

9 MS. KERR: Substantial?

10 MR. SANDOZ: Well, not so terribly substantial,
11 because the shift is instead of having no review at all
12 from discipline to Council, you do indeed cause the unani-
13 mously supported applications from the disciplinary com-
14 mittee to go to interdisciplinary with strong presumption
15 of approval, unless they can prove it should not be ap-
16 proved.

17 MS. KERR: Isn't this kind of contradictory?

18 MR. SANDOZ: We've had the compromise.

19 MS. KERR: It seems to me to be something of a
20 contradiction.

21 MR. SANDOZ: Well, some compromises do appear
22 to be contradictory unless you're metaphysically attuned
23 to them. The burden--

24 MS. KERR: I think this should be dealt with in
25 the committee.

1 MR. SANDOZ: It probably should not be dealt
2 with at all. Let's put it this way. If a unanimously
3 supported application at the disciplinary level is re-
4 jected at the second panel, at the screening panel level,
5 then the burden of proof lies on them to explain to the
6 committee, the Council committee, why it should be re=
7 jected. There's a presumption. The presumption is that
8 if you get approved unanimously in your disciplinary
9 committee, then you will be awarded unless there's really
10 some good reason why not. That's not in the document.
11 That's the way I would paraphrase it. So that's the only
12 clarification I would made in the official report and the
13 other matter, which is not in the report, which I would
14 simply mention is that the impetus to do this was more
15 or less confirmed by the fact that the extra panels that
16 we agreed to have review the 118 rejected proposals at
17 our last meeting found 33 to be meritorious enough to be
18 supported which is an error factor or a divergence factor
19 of 20 percent, roughly, which seems to lend credence to
20 the notion that something needed to be done to improve
21 our procedures and might usefully be done, so that's the--
22 There was some empirical basis for proceeding to make some
23 changes. These changes were not simply whimsically done
24 by other members of the committee and so forth and so on.
25 And the last thing I would say is that I do hope that

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1330 VERMONT AVENUE, NW
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

1 somewhere in the distant reaches of our agency, funds can
2 be found to support these chaps who have now been found
3 worthy since 10 of them are alternates, it will take on
4 the order of a quarter million dollars to be sure that
5 these additional fellowships are, indeed, awarded.

6 MR. BENNETT: Peter.

7 MR. STANLIS: Frances really made my point ex-
8 cept I'd like to make it a little more concrete than she
9 presented it and that is that the model critique, which
10 the staff is going to present, is going to be both nega-
11 tive and positive, a directive on what not to do and
12 what to aim at for each of the panelist reviewers, what
13 they should strive for. Now, also I think it was agreed
14 among the members of the committee that, since this is
15 an experimental improvement we hope, that the whole
16 method of revised procedure will be monitored over the
17 next several rounds of applications to see whether or
18 not we have, in fact, sharpened our instruments for
19 screening out the best possibly humanistic projects.

20 MR. BENNETT: Mr. Neusner or Ms. Norton.

21 MR. NEUSNER: My question's been answered.

22 Thank you.

23 I think that compromise is very
24 good and I think you do solve problems a lot of us have
25 been troubled by. I do think that a discipline itself

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1330 VERMONT AVENUE, NW
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

1 has to be under judgment and when everybody within a
2 discipline agrees that a project is great, that still
3 doesn't settle all questions. There are disciplines
4 which-- Well, the emperor is not always well clothed.

5 MR. BENNETT: Mary Beth, yes.

6 MS. NORTON: Yes. In closed session this after-
7 noon, are we going to see the list of those, the 33 or
8 whatever proposals?

9 MR. HAMILTON: Sure. Yeah.

10 MS. NORTON: Okay. Fine.

11 MR. BENNETT: Anita and then Leon.

12 MS. SILVERS: I'm just a little bit-- I heard
13 Dr. Hamilton say that the compromise was virtuous because
14 it was American.

15 MR. HAMILTON: Because it was American?

16 MS. SILVERS: You said this was a good American
17 political solution--

18 MR. HAMILTON: After the fashion of American
19 political--

20 MR. BENNETT: Characterized as such, not justi-
21 fied, I don't think.

22 Direct an analogy here to the con-
23 stitutional convention, Anita. This is in accordance
24 with the bicentennial.

25 MS. SILVERS: I'm never going to try to make a

1 joke again in this Council. What I'm a little bit con-
2 fused about as a result of this compromise, I have been
3 under the impression that part of the problem was that
4 the two panels had different concerns and criteria. If
5 that is the case, and you get a division of opinion be-
6 tween the two groups, on what set of criteria is the
7 Council committee going to judge?

8 If I could speak to that. That
9 was expressly discussed at the meeting, the special meet-
10 ing in January it was described and at that meeting, I
11 think there was an agreement. Those in attendance can
12 correct me. I think there was an agreement that there
13 were, in fact, no difference in criteria between the
14 two panels. The difference between the two panels was
15 their make-up, not the criteria. The same questions of
16 intellectual substance and the capacity of the individual
17 to carry out the work, is going to be asked at both
18 levels so that was a-- Am I not right about that, the
19 discussion in January?

20 We did discuss this matter and
21 agreed that we would have to do is read the reason and
22 evaluate the best ones and make our judgments based on
23 those.

24 MR. BENNETT: Leon.

25 MR. STEIN: I can't be concerned with a scholarly

1 manner. I'm not properly equipped, but I am concerned
2 about procedure that advertises itself as compromised by
3 wiping out one side. Now we have different levels of
4 review in this organization and I thought there were well
5 established reasons for these different levels. They are
6 not meant to coincide. Each level is a different kind
7 of review and the totality of these reviews constitute
8 the very heart of this Council. I am most reluctant to
9 monkey or to modify or whatever term you want to use
10 this procedure. Now, I suspect that there have been some
11 committees in this Council that have already done what
12 you recommend. When they get a proposal that is endorsed
13 by the first level of scholars and it comes to the commit-
14 tee of the Council. I think many of us, as committee
15 members, have recognized the redundancy of reviewing it
16 all over again especially half the people are much better
17 equipped than we are have already done so. And I think,
18 in respect, we do pass through the whole Council such
19 proposals. But there are credices in this procedure
20 which we ought to respect, not the unanimity. I sat on
21 this Council when I first came on and there was a proposal
22 that was very close to my heart that came up and was
23 voted down. And when I asked the chairman of that commit-
24 tee, may I know by what vote he said two to one. I said
25 in actual numbers. He said two to one. And when I track

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1330 VERMONT AVENUE, NW

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

1 back through the two proceeding levels, it became clear
2 or stated so that both proceeding levels in one case,
3 unanimously endorsed the project and it was mixed on the
4 very first level where you get individual reports. And
5 I asked at that time and I would repeat the request if
6 we continue this way, that when the Council committee
7 reports to the Council as a whole and reverses, I'm now
8 concerned about the other one, and reverses the opinions
9 collectively and individually of those who reviewed it
10 preceding.

11 (Off the record for tape change.)

12 MR. STEIN: This Council should know that the
13 committee, which is us, is one of our creatures is re-
14 versing the scholar. I was concerned about the scholars
15 who had reviewed this thing and might even feel put out
16 so that we must have some respect. Now, if we get pro-
17 posals that are already unanimously approved, I don't see
18 where any committee has a problem really of taking a look
19 at that thing, but at least knowing what is being done
20 and moving it on to the entire Council. And, in this
21 case, I am a rock bound conservative. I would preserve
22 the procedure. And, perhaps, in the future we ought to
23 refine it, but if we do so, we should not make compro-
24 mises that eliminate. This would eliminate one of the
25 review levels.

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1330 VERMONT AVENUE, NW
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

1 MR. BENNETT: I don't think so. Mr. Hamilton.

2 MR. STEIN: Well, Peter--

3 MR. HAMILTON: I was just going to say I think
4 Leon has misunderstood what we've done.

5 MR. STEIN: I do that very often so you better
6 be patient with me.

7 MR. HAMILTON: Because it was not the Council
8 and the committee that reversed the first panelist. It
9 was the second panelist that reversed the first panelist,
10 and then it was passed on to us and we have the problem
11 of which to go by. And, I think, the solution has been
12 offered here today that we're going to go by the first
13 one unless the second one has a very good reason for re-
14 versing the first panel.

15 MR. STEIN: How would you know?

16 MR. HAMILTON: We're going to have to look at
17 the criterion that they've applied and the comments that
18 we're asking each panel to submit will have to also be
19 examined, I am sure. But the burden of proof, as Mr.
20 Hamilton said, is on the second committee. If they re-
21 verse the first committee, that is, the interdisciplinary
22 committee reverses the scholars who were specialists in
23 any subject area, then the burden of proof rests with
24 them and not with the other. So, I think you're actually
25 endorsing what we've done.

1 MR. STEIN: Well, I'm happy to hear that.

2 In a very quick and real sense,
3 this will make more sense, if we are able also to tighten
4 up the evaluations from the panelists you see. So see
5 this as a whole. We're talking here essentially about
6 improving the quality of the entire review process.
7 We're not just talking about activity between one panel
8 and another. This will make better sense if we can im-
9 plement some of the other things that we're concerned
10 about.

11 Incidentally, conservative pre-
12 serve the procedures, I assume you mean all past proce-
13 dures.

14 I never talked about all. I
15 talked about some.

16 I don't think any conservatives
17 would either. I just thought that they would be a little
18 selective.

19 MR. BENNETT: Are there any other comments?
20 Let me just-- I don't know how the thing is going to
21 read. Just a small point what the Council committee will
22 do when panel and reviewers disagree is will recommend,
23 make its own judgment to recommend for award. There was
24 emphasis on award. There's still one more level. So I'm
25 sorry. But we may have a brew ha ha with panels and

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1330 VERMONT AVENUE, NW
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

1 Council all going in different directions. Also, I must
2 say that in thinking about advice to panelists and re-
3 viewers, one wants to address the project, but I do think
4 it's relevant at some times to get an assessment about
5 whether this individual on the basis of performance has
6 the wherewithal to carry through and, I thought, toying
7 very close with certain doctrines of emotivism yesterday,
8 which I would not subscribe. I'm not sure the word ex-
9 cellent only means someone-- I know it doesn't mean only
10 someone's emotions or else we're all out of business on
11 that basis of justification. We can talk about that
12 later, Peter. Excellent does not mean I like it or the
13 humanities are in very serious trouble. Is that it?
14 Thanks. I want to thank the committee, the special com-
15 mittee and the committee that met yesterday, the Council
16 committee, for its long and serious and, I think, very
17 fruitful liberations. In effect, what I see going on
18 here is the proper exercise of responsibility on the part
19 of committee where it needs to be exercised. I'm de-
20 lighted the committee is willing to do that because, in
21 effect, if the committee warrant, I would have to and it
22 would just be, in some of these cases, my lights rather
23 than the Council committee's lights. One has to take
24 seriously when there is disagreement in a review process
25 and I'm finally responsible and I would all the advice

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1330 VERMONT AVENUE, NW
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

1 and guidance I can get. So, personally, I thank you for
2 this particular solution or recommendation. All right,
3 let's move on then to Education Programs, Ms. Norton.

4 MS. NORTON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. We had
5 a brief public session with respect to education yester-
6 day, so my report will not be very long. Most of our
7 time in the public session was spent on the state's pro-
8 grams. I do want to commend the education division staff
9 for an absolutely superb job of work in putting together
10 the committee book at this time. We were especially
11 pleased by the number of unresolved cases that were re-
12 solved satisfactorily by the time of the Council meeting
13 and it was especially useful for us to receive about a
14 week in advance a whole new packet of material with adden-
15 da and so forth, so the staff had been working prodigious-
16 ly hard, it was clear to all of us to clear up a number
17 of questionable grants before we got to the Council stage
18 and that was especially pleasing to all of us and we
19 really thought that the staff went all out in particular
20 on this occasion. The chief business of the education
21 public session and the policy discussion had to do with
22 reports on the transition, on how the staffing of the
23 division will--how the staff assignments will be changed
24 under the new guidelines. Also, reports on conferences,
25 the division sponsored conferences on the teaching of

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1330 VERMONT AVENUE, NW
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

1 Asian studies, which have had enormous numbers of appli-
2 cants for the two conferences that we are planning and
3 the conference which was held recently on the uses of
4 the computer in teaching the humanities, which identified
5 to the great interest of all concerned, the tremendous
6 lack of software in the area so that, although there are
7 a number of things now available for teaching the humani-
8 ties on sort of the basic skills level in the elementary
9 schools, there isn't much above that and we think that
10 it will have--we think, therefore, that the conference
11 will help to generate some interesting ideas in this
12 area. Also, we received a report on the continuing
13 series of workshops being held by the staff at institu-
14 tions around the country with respect to the new educa-
15 tion guidelines and we were pleased to see that or
16 pleased to receive the report that over the past months,
17 over 550 institutions of higher education have attended
18 these conferences to a total of 1,700 to 1,800 individu-
19 als, so that, therefore, there is nobody out there who
20 can say that they don't know about what the education
21 division is doing. We also received a paper prepared by
22 the staff about the conditions under which and the pro-
23 cedures for the staff giving assistance to applicants
24 during the course of the application process. This was
25 simply to clarify what the division's practices have been

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1330 VERMONT AVENUE, NW
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

1 in the past and we appreciated having that written down.
2 We also discussed, not at great length, but did discuss
3 a report prepared by Jeff Marshall at the request of
4 Louise Kerr on the issue of the relationship between film
5 and television grants in the division of general programs
6 and in the division of education programs and how the
7 distinction has been made in the past. I don't know,
8 perhaps Louise might want to say something further on
9 that. We did not have a very extensive discussion of it
10 yesterday, but we found the statement very useful for our
11 purposes. And then finally, we received a report on
12 what's happening with the first series of deadlines under
13 the new guidelines. We have had some of those deadlines
14 already. More are coming up this spring. There are many
15 inquiries and preliminary applications coming in especi-
16 ally against the March and April deadlines and we are
17 anticipating having a busy spring with panels meeting for
18 the first time under the new guidelines. I should also
19 add that the staff has informed us that regardless of all
20 of the collective wisdom of the Council and the staff on
21 the new guidelines, there were certain things that were
22 left out and certain things that could have been said
23 differently and so they are having to say to each indi-
24 vidual applicant, things that should have been said in
25 the guidelines and those will very quickly be revised to

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1330 VERMONT AVENUE, NW
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

1 reflect those changes.

2 MR. BENNETT: Thank you. Comments? Louise?
3 Anita?

4 MS. KERR: I just want to add a word on behalf
5 and for my appreciation to the staff, because this is a
6 transitional period, it was reflected very clearly in
7 the book, in addition to computer problems where numbers
8 had to be changed, that they have done a remarkable job,
9 I think, in handling what, in effect, seemed to me to be
10 three sets of things at one time with changes in staff,
11 I think they have done a remarkable job. I would also
12 just briefly like to thank Jeff for preparing that docu-
13 ment. I really did not intend for him to go to so much
14 trouble, but I would suggest that the Council members
15 read that. I think that's a very good and helpful de-
16 scription of the procedures and the rationale that have
17 been followed in the past and I do think, however, that
18 the continuing question that we would want to consider,
19 especially as we're going through the revision of the
20 general program guidelines.

21 Just for your information, that
22 report is in the brown folder in front of everyone.

23 MR. BENNETT: Anita.

24 MS. SILVERS: I just want to convey to Rich the
25 personal gratitude of my colleagues across the various

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1330 VERMONT AVENUE, NW
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

1 institutions in California. He's been out making presen-
2 tations in California and people who have no notion that
3 I have ever heard of NEH keep saying to me, we didn't
4 see you there. You really missed something. It was
5 great. I did want to get that into the record and, par-
6 ticularly, say thanks to Rich because at these various
7 presentations, he's had a great knowledge the Endowment's
8 past relations with the institutions with persons there
9 and people really appreciate that.

10 MR. BENNETT: I'm going to take advantage of
11 my privileges and rule out of order any more praise for
12 the staff of the education division because of lunch and
13 the risk of corrupting their character. Any other com-
14 ments?

15 MS. SILVERS: Point of personal privilege.

16 MR. BENNETT: Yes. Okay. Challenge Grants
17 then, Mr. Dille.

18 MR. DILLE: This makes no judgment of your au-
19 thority but I wanted to say that we were terribly im-
20 pressed with our work. We talked about a great deal, the
21 quality of our presentation, the way in which our atten-
22 tion was drawn to issues that we ought--

23 MR. BENNETT: You mean in the challenge grant
24 staff?

25 MR. DILLE: Yeah, the challenge grant staff.

1 MR. BENNETT: Sure, they're terrific.

2 MR. DILLE: I am, of course, trying to divert
3 attention from the fact that we revised our guidelines.
4 That's hard to do since the only thing that I have to
5 report on. There was an attempt made to simplify the
6 guidelines and to do something else, to make it clearer
7 to the casual reader, if you will, that we were respon-
8 sive in this division to a wide range of institutions in
9 the many levels of the court. I think many people have
10 looked at challenge grants that these are not for us and
11 sometimes they are. These changes were more rhetorical
12 than substantory. I was going to say something about
13 veneer, but I couldn't make an adjective out of it with-
14 out getting into trouble. These changes were made on the
15 advise of panelists and members of the committees and
16 other as well and they will be prepared for distribution
17 after March 1st for the June 1st deadline and everybody
18 on the Council will get a copy. Let me remind you the
19 substantial change was the one that now allows for second
20 time awards and that came before you as our recommendation
21 which you adopted at the November meeting. We moved
22 ahead with that and we will allow second time awards
23 within certain limits. Also in the guidelines, are the
24 possibilities for short funding with the division and
25 short funding with the office of the bicentennial. Not

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1330 VERMONT AVENUE, NW
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

1 quite a part of the guidelines, but certainly a part to
2 pay attention to are people who either do not apply or
3 are rejected. We did look at and agree upon letters of
4 encouragement to applicants who were rejected but who
5 the panelist thought had applications that held promise.
6 We also recommended that letters, not only of encourage-
7 ment, but useful letters be addressed to those black col-
8 leges and universities which had made unsuccessful appli-
9 cations. That's our report.

10 MR. BENNETT: Thank you. Comments? Yes, Peter.

11 MR. STANLIS: You may have noticed, Mr. Chair-
12 man, there was no praise of the committee on the fellow-
13 ship staff because we just took for granted they were
14 going to do a good job and they did.

15 Charles did.

16 MR. STANLIS: Well, I must have missed that.

17 Perhaps, it was so subtle that--
18 It's entirely a motive though so
19 it--

20 There was no praise for general
21 either and I just assumed that every member knew of our
22 praises for them.

23 MR. BENNETT: Right.

24 See you prolong the meeting now.

25 MR. BENNETT: Aren't you all forgetting some

1 part of the staff?

2 The general Council does a won-
3 derful job.

4 MR. BENNETT: I was thinking about ADP. Any
5 other comments on Mr. Dille's? Fine. Thank you. Thank
6 you all very much. Let's move then to the Jefferson Lec-
7 ture Discussion. Jeff, do you want to make an announce-
8 ment first?

9 MR. HART: I can. Just to alert people and
10 staff and Council, we said something about this briefly
11 at breakfast, we made public announcement yesterday and
12 it is in the Washington Post and I'm sure it will be
13 other places of the 1983 Jefferson Lecturer of Yale Uni-
14 versity. The lecture in Washington will be May 4th,
15 that's the Wednesday before our May Council meeting and,
16 of course, the Council and staff will be invited. It
17 will be held at the National Academy of Sciences and on
18 May 9th, the following Monday, at the University of
19 Chicago. It's not the same lecture. Mr. Pellikan has
20 two parts to his theme this year and he's going to de-
21 liver the two parts, Washington on Wednesday and the fol-
22 lowing Monday at the University of Chicago.

23 MR. BENNETT: Thank you. Louise.

24 MS. KERR: I think you have all received the
25 report of the Jefferson Lecture Committee and I will not

1 read it for you. If you have not seen it, it is in your
2 brown folder. I would, however, like to make a few, I
3 hope, clarifying comments, informing comments. The com-
4 mittee met on January 17th with the very able help and
5 cooperation and organization of Mark Kingston. We appre-
6 ciated that. The committee consisted of Jack Neusner,
7 Leon Stein, Joel Read, Anita Silvers, Ellis Sandoz and
8 myself. It also considered very carefully, and we hope
9 we have incorporated suggestions from various Council
10 members, I think there were about 8 or 10 and staff mem-
11 bers who had taken the time who had given us information.
12 If you want their names, I can give those to you as well.
13 I'd like to go to that committee report and suggest to
14 you or clarify for you that the overall thrust of our
15 report is to recognize the diversity of our audiences and
16 to attempt to serve all of them and at the same time to
17 have the most substantive and informed lecture that we
18 can. It was decided or recommended. therefore, that the
19 name of the event be changed to Jefferson Award and Ad-
20 dress from Jefferson Lecture and that, in fact, there be
21 several different kinds of, I suppose, events would be a
22 good way to put it. Number one would be on the model of
23 the lecture that we now have. I want to point out to you
24 that the quotation, the quotes in that-- This is a quo-
25 tation from Ellis Sandoz. We decided that his language

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1330 VERMONT AVENUE, NW
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

1 was perfect for that. I decided. I did that so we used
2 it there. I want to point out to you in number one that
3 there is a written or oral discourse, which you need to
4 be aware of because it was our hope that that would pro-
5 vide some flexibility for us in the selection of a speaker.
6 The second event, which we see as the scholar's event to
7 recognize that audience, the quote in that is from a re-
8 port given to us by Armand Tashdininian from the last Jef-
9 ferson committee and we thought this-- As a historian,
10 I thought this was important for us to link ourselves to
11 the past. The third event, I might point out to you, is
12 a recommendation which was heartily approved, unanimously
13 approved I think, by all members of the committee and
14 that is the TV event, that is, a TV interview. We recog-
15 nize that this is not something that we can initiate
16 alone and it would take a great deal of effort, but we
17 would recommend that every effort be made to have that
18 event come to fruition. The last item, number four, that
19 we are recommending we also recognize, or we have been
20 told, that this might be a change in policy. Nonetheless,
21 the language is chosen very carefully. We do mean that
22 we think that Council or the Endowment should commission
23 a work which we would then be responsible for finding an
24 outlet for it. Finally, on that page, on page number one,
25 the criteria were selected with an eye to providing some

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1330 VERMONT AVENUE, NW
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

1 flexibility. I will point out to you that we neither
2 saw or charged to consider selection procedures, proce-
3 dures for selection of the candidate, nor did we have
4 time, but these were an effort to show what kinds of
5 candidates we would like to be considered. On page two,
6 you will see-- Page one reflected our morning session
7 when we were very much in agreement. Page two reflected
8 the afternoon session of the committee when we were not
9 quite so unanimous and you will see there the list of
10 possible formats that have been suggested. There may be
11 others. The essence of our recommendation is one, that
12 we adopt the format of criteria listed on page one to be
13 applied to lectures 1984 and thereafter. Two, that next
14 year's lecture follow along lines similar to that of the
15 past with the stipulation that three, in 1985 and there-
16 after, a new or revised format or a reaffirmed format be
17 instituted for the address itself, for the initial or
18 pivotal event. Let me conclude these remarks by saying
19 that after our committee meeting, I received two letters.
20 Apparently at the prompting of a newsletter from the
21 National Humanities Alliance and I understand it said
22 there were carbon copies to the chairman, there was a
23 comment theme in the two letters, it seemed to me, they
24 seemed to appreciate and to think the event as it has
25 been in the past was very good. The only recommendation

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1330 VERMONT AVENUE, NW
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

1 that I saw that I would pass on to you was that we need
2 to make it more public, not only more accessible to the
3 public, but more widely known and more widely distributed
4 to the public in a variety of ways. And I hope that you
5 will say whatever you what now for the Council too.

6 MR. BENNETT: Yes. Sam.

7 MR. COOK: I'm really not sure of the problems
8 you're trying to address.

9 MS. KERR: I have to say I've only been to one
10 Jefferson Lecture and I have not been on the selection
11 committee, but it was our understanding, on the basis of
12 the letters that we received and the discussions that I've
13 heard, that there have been mixed reactions to the lec-
14 ture and to the lecturer, him or herself. There has been
15 some misgiving about whether or not, how substantive and
16 how permanent an impact the Jefferson lecture has had.
17 That is reflected in the variety of the formats that we
18 have recommended. There are some and I hope that they
19 will speak up. Many of them are not here. But there are
20 some who said they would like to see the book come out
21 of this, something that is a permanent record. There are
22 others who say that it is limited too much to the East
23 and, specifically, I would say from Chicago to east of
24 the Hudson River, both in terms of the people who are
25 selected and the audience for it. There are those who

1 say that a scholarly audience is fairly limited. There
2 were a variety of misgivings about the lecture and we
3 tried to incorporate most people's concerns. At the same
4 time, there is a belief that the lecture, as it has been
5 in the past, has served our purposes in the sense of gain-
6 ing some favorable response from the Washington community
7 and that it has served, as well, in a public relation
8 sense and many people actually think that it has been sub-
9 stantive for a general audience. I think that's a sum-
10 mary of the various reasons that this committee came to-
11 gether and I would hope that certain other committee
12 members will respond and those who have had feelings. I
13 know that Harold wrote to us. I would encourage staff
14 as well to respond.

15 MR. BENNETT: Yes, Leon.

16 MR. STEIN: We had several problems. The prob-
17 lem with the lecture was to find a scholar who, by nature,
18 tends to be a specialist who is also able to be a gen-
19 eralist on this one occasion to give us a very special
20 general kind of talk. That is, deal with his specialty
21 and yet be able to address an audience that has a range
22 of background to it, both scholar and non-scholar and
23 then the different discipline. That's rather difficult
24 and it's one reason why we made a rather lengthy attempt
25 to identify the audiences that we could pick out on that

1 one evening. They are all in the audience. The scholars
2 are there. The better educated general citizen is there.
3 Some young people are there and there are a couple of
4 old fogies like myself. Now, our compromise was to sep-
5 arate the audiences and we added events so that the
6 scholar could be a public speaker in one of these events.
7 He could be a scholarly speaker at the other. This im-
8 plies a conclusion that you can't be both simultaneously
9 and that was one of the difficult conclusions at which
10 we arrived. The other side of that is in terms of the
11 audience. By identifying the constituent audiences and
12 by separating them, we hope we can get a good general
13 speech, a good scholarly speech and then go on and talk
14 to the nation and convey reciprocal related messages, but
15 different ones in terms of level to these different au-
16 diences. I don't know if it's workable or not.

17 MR. BENNETT: Yes. Frances.

18 MS. RHOME: I was one that had trouble with
19 just the award lecture series as we had currently have
20 it and was recommending some changes on it. It seems to
21 me that the problems I had in mind have been taken by
22 this report and brought together very well. My difficulty
23 was that we were, indeed, alerting Washington, D.C. to
24 what humanities was doing, but that we were missing it
25 in other portions of the country as far as being able to

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1330 VERMONT AVENUE, NW
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

1 get the work out. And also, that the person would re-
2 ceive the appropriate recognition throughout our country
3 in various areas. And I think you've done this with the
4 notion of the TV award. Whether it's a book or a mono-
5 graph or whatever comes from this particular publication,
6 my recommendation was that it be printed and submitted
7 to the various libraries, educational libraries, through-
8 out the country as the documentary evidence of the su-
9 preme work of this particular individual.

10 MR. BENNETT: Thank you. Phil and then George.
11 Peter.

12 MR. STANLIS: I just want to reiterate that I
13 think unless you're a scholar, I don't think the Jeffer-
14 son Lecture really has wide dissemination. First, of
15 all I'd like to extend some praises too. I don't want
16 to intrude upon the lunch hour. I'd like to praise all
17 of the people sitting behind us who don't have to be here
18 and who have endured all these things today. As far as
19 the Jefferson Lecture, so much importance has been placed
20 on it that the idea of wider dissemination is necessary.
21 I like the idea of interviews, or published materials, or
22 things in the public broadcasting and it's really impor-
23 tant to go. I know that someone once said that the
24 greatest intellectual happening took place when Jefferson
25 dined alone. I don't think that if anyone really thinks

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1330 VERMONT AVENUE, NW

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

1 that this, the Jefferson Lecture, that's far in its
2 history has had the kind of impact it should have, if
3 anyone really believes that, I would say to this person
4 you might as well keep the landing lights on for Amelia
5 Earhart. It really is not the case though I employed
6 any effort to broaden the constituencies to combine the
7 scholarly with the public and to fulfill one of the
8 functions of the Endowment.

9 MR. BENNETT: George then Peter.

10 MR. CAREY: I support the committee's report.
11 I would, however, like to quibble with two words in it
12 which, I think, might cause some problems in the future.
13 In the criteria at the bottom of page one, criterion
14 number two, the second line "an original and substantive
15 address relating broad public issues to the central per-
16 spectives." I would like to delete public because it
17 seems to me that it conceivably might be given a narrow
18 interpretation in the future, relating broad issues or
19 general issues rather than public issues. They might not
20 be issues that were of public concern but might become
21 issues of public concern. And the same word public oc-
22 curs on the last line of page two "and of the insights
23 they offer to broad, I would prefer to delete public
24 concerns. Otherwise, I support it.

25 MR. BENNETT: All right. Peter.

1 MR. STANLIS: I take it that the giving of the
2 Jefferson Lecture in Chicago is an attempt to broaden the
3 base and have a larger appeal to the public. Is it going
4 to be the same lecture in Chicago?

5 No.

6 MR. STANLIS: Two separate lectures. Is it
7 going to be the same lecturer?

8 Same lecturer, yes.

9 MR. STANLIS: But two different lectures.

10 Yes.

11 Could I clarify one thing about
12 publication because there are a number of new people on
13 the Council. I believe that all but the last two of
14 the Jefferson Lectures have, in fact, been published as
15 either books or monographs, but the key point is that
16 they have been published under the auspices and with the
17 sole prerogative of the lecturer, so there's no common
18 format and occasionally, there's no credit. We've been
19 disappointed, for example, to note the publication
20 of a Jefferson Lecture without reference to the Endowment
21 or the lecture. But it's just so there isn't a confusion
22 about that point. All but the last two and the last two
23 are being prepared for publication now.

24 MS. KERR: This, I think, at least the essence
25 of our discussion and I would like to be corrected if I'm

1 wrong is that there was a perception on the committee that
2 because of the disparate nature of the audience, it fell
3 between stools and we would like to encourage the person
4 to have an opportunity to have something broader. We
5 don't stipulate what that is, but the essence is a sub-
6 stantive method.

7 MR. BENNETT: Let me say something, if I can.
8 I'll tell you what I think I'm going to do because we
9 have to act on this and there's not consensus on all
10 pieces. There's consensus on certain objections and let
11 me come clean on what I think we ought to do. I would
12 like to suggest, because time now is important. Normally,
13 this is the meeting which we talk about our selection. I
14 think that we should go ahead for '84 following the lines
15 that we have followed or laid down up to this time, that
16 is, select a lecturer and try to incorporate as much as
17 what you have suggested here and the committee agreed on
18 as possible for the '84 lecture, but looks toward some
19 more, perhaps, dramatic change as Council expresses it-
20 self for '85. We've got to do something soon and I guess
21 I'm pretty much deciding that's what we ought to do.

22 I will for purposes of moving
23 along, that that is the essence of the committee report
24 so I will move the committee report and, of course, dis-
25 cussion can continue.

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1330 VERMONT AVENUE, NW
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

1 MR. BENNETT: Okay.

2 I second it.

3 MR. BENNETT: Ellis.

4 MR. SANDOZ: I just want to say at the center of
5 the committee's whole deliberations which were surprising-
6 ly protracted. I mean we went on the whole day believe
7 it or not. You can believe it. What was the line that's
8 included in the public affairs release on Professor Pelli-
9 kan, which is that we bear in mind that this is indeed
10 understood to be the highest honor conferred by the Federal
11 Government for outstanding achievement in the humanities,
12 so the preeminent requirement that we held before our-
13 selves, even as we tried to think of ways of improving
14 this as a public relations event or as a happening of
15 some kind, that we even began talking of some people being
16 more inspirational and communication vision. We tried to
17 restrain these emotive things with Mr. Stanlis in a corner
18 of our thoughts is that we have a scholar of great distinc-
19 tion and then provide, perhaps, through the splitting of
20 the audiences, as Leon has said, an occasion whereby he
21 can speak to different audiences knowing that if you have
22 a memorable lecture from a great scholar, it will not
23 necessarily play very well in Peoria. These are different
24 orders of communication, so this was, I think, the way in
25 which we went at it and tried to solve the problem, not to

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1330 VERMONT AVENUE, NW
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

1 everyone's satisfaction, but with some spirited exchanges.

2 MR. BENNETT: Yes. Anita.

3 MS. SILVERS: As I recall, there are various
4 elements that have been proposed, publication facet, the
5 television facet, all of that stuff. Some of those would
6 be compatible with in the next year retaining the same
7 kind of decision we make for the Jefferson Lecture. For
8 instance, the publication part and I wonder if you might
9 be able to explore that a little bit and it might be bene-
10 ficial to try it out.

11 MR. BENNETT: Yeah. We're going to go with one
12 lecturer for '84 as we've done in the past, but try to
13 incorporate as much of the sentiment and the conviction
14 of the committee report as possible as a way of transition.
15 Mary Beth.

16 MS. NORTON: I just want to say that I'm all in
17 favor of this kind of flexibility that is being proposed.
18 I think, after all, it does go in the direction that we
19 have been going over the last few years. I think it was
20 two years ago that after the panel to talk about the lec-
21 turer's work in various areas was added to the program and
22 I think that's a very good idea. I have been selecting
23 for Jefferson Lectures and I've heard four different Jef-
24 ferson Lectures and I think that those lectures have been
25 of good quality. Although I do want to say one thing

1 which is that I do not like the idea of being so flexible
2 that we end up really dividing wholly the public implica-
3 tion or a public performance from the scholarly perfor-
4 mance. I mean, after all, that's precisely what our divi-
5 sion of general programs are supposed to be designed to
6 prevent, that is, that somehow there isn't a world of
7 scholarship and the world of the public and those two
8 things are separate and they can never be brought together.
9 I think, at least in my own discipline of history, one of
10 the things historians are very concerned about right now
11 is historians have, in recent years, been writing too much
12 for historians and not enough for other people who need to
13 know about history. And I would hate to see the Endowment
14 in the interest of adding flexibility to the Jefferson
15 Lecture format separate itself off from what, I think, has
16 been our commendable desire in the past in the Jefferson
17 Lecture to try, even though we don't always succeed, to
18 have a great scholar say interesting things to both a
19 scholarly and a general audience. I would hate to see us
20 abandon that goal.

21 MR. BENNETT: I agree. In the interest of time,
22 may I make a request. Jeff I'm going to take your part
23 here. If the select committee would remain as a committee
24 for two purposes. A, to advise and act in the manner of
25 selection for 1984, to advise how we can incorporate

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1330 VERMONT AVENUE, NW
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

1 elements of this into 1984 and then three, C, to continue
2 discussion about changes for past 1984. Would that be
3 agreeable to you?

4 MS. NORTON: That's fine. We would still have
5 Margaret?

6 MR. BENNETT: Yes, you'll still have Margaret.
7 There are some other factors. I think there's much greater
8 agreement on underlying principles that there is on speci-
9 fic details. I sense that. Also, there are some other
10 factors here that we would like to look at to see how they
11 should weigh in the balance. Moving to the old post of-
12 fice, does that provide us or inhibit us in any particular
13 way in terms of opportunities. Second, work of the presi-
14 dent's committee on arts and humanities which has a special
15 recognition committee which may tie into especially the
16 honoring or a special event character. I don't feel that
17 there's need really to do anything else if the committee
18 is willing to stay as a committee and work closely with
19 us on '84 and beyond. Is that agreement?

20 That includes the fact that the
21 process of selection will then proceed.

22 MR. BENNETT: Yes. Almost immediately. Good.
23 Thank you. I think we should skip the next item and go to
24 lunch. Can we try to be gack at 1:30. A number of people
25 have to catch planes.

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1330 VERMONT AVENUE, NW
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

1 (Off the record for lunch break.)

2 MR. BENNETT: Let's begin with the report on
3 Emergency Grants, formerly known as Chairman's Grants.
4 Mr. Willkie.

5 MR. WILLKIE: Okay. The item is Emergency
6 Grants if Council members would please turn to Tab J in
7 the agenda book. They will find reported there the emer-
8 gency grants which were made in the last quarter as well
9 as the statement justification for those grants. Are
10 there any comments or questions? If there are no comments
11 or questions, we'll proceed. I note that at this time
12 there is no announcement as to chairman's awards which
13 departed from Council recommendation because there weren't
14 any such actions in the last quarter.

15 Mr. Chairman, before we go to
16 motions, could I just point to the members of the Council
17 that in the lunch break the Office of Public Affairs has
18 put on your chair an item that I think you're accustomed
19 to getting at the quarterly meetings of the Council which
20 is a kind of compendium of clippings and so on about the
21 Endowment. I'm pointing out that that was added to your
22 burden of paper while you went away.

23 MR. BENNETT: Thank you. Let's move along then
24 with Action on Applications, state programs, Louise Kerr.

25 MS. KERR: The motion you have before you

1 indicates that the previously approved funding levels for
2 state humanities councils was based upon the assumption
3 that NEH would receive a \$96 million appropriation in
4 fiscal year 1983. The recommended adjustments on the
5 following pages reflect the higher appropriation which we,
6 in fact received. I move the motion.

7 MR. BENNETT: We don't need a motion. We don't
8 need a second. All right. All in favor? Opposed?

9 (The record shows that the motion was carried.)

10 MR. BENNETT: Okay. Thank you. General Pro-
11 grams, Mr. Cohn.

12 MR. COHN: This is an unusually light session
13 for the committee of general programs. We were warned
14 however that the May and August meetings will more than
15 make up for the absence of proposals this time. We heard
16 reports on the status of progress of each of the three
17 principal programs in the division, media, museums and
18 historical organizations and special projects. We are
19 recommending for Council approval four projects. They
20 are on this blue sheet. Two projects previously deferred
21 on program development and two projects on media. One
22 project previously on the deferred list in media is now
23 being recommended for funding. With regard to the major
24 grant, the project GN 21667 Heritage: Civilization of the
25 Jews, the committee viewed the completed six films of the

1 projected 10 part series. We found it visually beautiful,
2 historically informative for a general audience. We
3 therefore support the staff's recommendation. As is the
4 usual practice of the division, the staff will pass on to
5 the applicant a number of comments received during the
6 course of the project's evaluation. I move, Mr. Chairman,
7 the adoption.

8 I second the motion.

9 MR. BENNETT: All in favor--

10 Any discussion?

11 MR. BENNETT: Sorry. Any discussion? All in
12 favor? Opposed?

13 (The record shows that the motion was carried.)

14 MR. BENNETT: Thank you. Do you have a second
15 part Mr. Cohn? That's it. Good. Thank you very much.
16 We're moving right along. Research Programs, Mr. Kennedy.

17 MR. KENNEDY: Yes.

18 I second it.

19 MR. BENNETT: No second yet. Not that fast.

20 MR. KENNEDY: The gold colored motion-- First
21 of all, I believe it's pages one to 30 on research re-
22 sources. I have no comments to make and move approval of
23 the actions on pages 1 to 30. There may, however, be
24 others.

25 I'm not sure if this is in page 1

1 to 30, but there is a proposal and I have these on the
2 whites that I pulled out of my book where I objected.
3 There's an RV 218. Is that in there?

4 MR. KENNEDY: These are RC.

5 Well, I have some. I have five
6 in all.

7 What's the first one you have?

8 The first one is RC 20493. I will
9 read you the panelist comment before I tell you what it
10 is and I just couldn't understand why it was granted.
11 Panelist reiterated the specialist's review lack of confi-
12 dence in the professionalism of the interviewers and also
13 I'm convinced that the right topics would be pursued dur-
14 ing the taping sessions. Nonetheless, they did fell
15 strongly that a guide to existing interviews, hence,
16 descriptions of oral histories should be worth doing. They
17 believed that further interviewing should be delayed un-
18 til the existing body of oral history documentation is
19 evaluated. Hence, they recommended reduced support, limited
20 to completing the survey and compiling a guide with some
21 additional funds. And actually, this one was reduced from
22 \$149,000 plus to \$50,000, I presume, in line with that.
23 I felt that it was a very strong panelist suggestion de-
24 spite. Should I do the 2 RC's together or separately?

25 Yes, do it together.

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1330 VERMONT AVENUE, NW
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

1 The other RC is the processing of
2 the archives of Kurt Wile and Laymond Engle.

3 What's the number, Rita?

4 MS. RICARDO-CAMPBELL: 20544. Again, along the
5 same lines and I feel much more strongly about this one
6 than the previous one. In this case it was the staff that
7 was generally satisfied with previously granted supported
8 work. That's not in my mind a recommendation, especially
9 in view of the fact from the--

10 (Off the record for tape change.)

11 MS. RICARDO-CAMPBELL: along the
12 same lines and I feel much more strongly about this one
13 that the previously one. In this case, it was the staff
14 that was generally satisfied with previous granted sup-
15 ported work. That's not in my mind a recommendation, es-
16 pecially in view of the fact from the university involved,
17 we had a very poor follow-up letter in which, if I were
18 giving money in respect to several other grants, I would
19 hold up all their grants until I got some decent types of
20 responses rather than that follow-up letter. Now, maybe
21 there's an explanation of that. Those were the only--
22 Oh, there's one more I see. The third one is the one I
23 feel the most strongly about. It's RC 20598. It was a
24 grant for \$616,500. It was substantial and in the course
25 of it, there was a protest that the travel budget was too

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1330 VERMONT AVENUE, NW
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

1 high because it was stated it was cut back in accordance
2 with that and in a \$616,500 grant, the cutback was \$168.
3 Now, maybe there's a typo on that one.

4 MR. BENNETT: I can't find that one.

5 Could that be deferred? It's not
6 on either--

7 MR. BENNETT: Yes. Yes.

8 Since that grant is a matching
9 grant on over a five to one basis and most of the travel
10 for that grant is in the matching component, the actual
11 reduction is about \$2,500 of the travel budget or \$4,500
12 so it doesn't show up in the Endowment portion of the
13 grant, but it shows up in the total cost.

14 MR. BENNETT: Where does it appear? I'm still
15 having trouble finding it.

16 Page 60. The number's are at the
17 bottom of the page. Ignore the ones at the top.

18 MR. BENNETT: Rita, I'm sorry. Maybe it's just
19 for my benefit, would you repeat your objection to that.

20 MS. RICARDO-CAMPBELL: On the last one?

21 MR. BENNETT: Yes.

22 MS. RICARDO-CAMPBELL: The request is for \$616,500.
23 If you read the thing you saw there was an objection that
24 the travel was felt to be too high and then it's cut by
25 \$168. \$168 against that size sum and even may I state,

1 \$2,000 is a little bit of a ridiculous cut.

2 Yes, if I could. It is in propor-
3 tion to the total grant, but what Jeff Field reported was
4 the total travel budget, which was questioned here, the
5 total is \$4,000 so the cut has been half. There was no
6 question in the discussion, I think, reported about the
7 total amount being asked here and in matching funds. So
8 that to be specific about this, our figure doesn't show
9 much change, because we were not paying for the travel
10 amount, therefore, the adjustment that was required of
11 the grantee wouldn't show in this figure but it has, in
12 fact, been cut in half.

13 The travel figures were cut in
14 half.

15 MS. RICARDO-CAMPBELL: You mean the total travel
16 was only \$400.

17 \$4,000. And was cut \$2,000.

18 MS. RICARDO-CAMPBELL: Oh, I see and this was
19 the matching five to one.

20 That's correct. What you show
21 here does not include the travel.

22 MS. RICARDO-CAMPBELL: Okay. That's difficult
23 for a board member to guess at when you read it.

24 MR. BENNETT: But, you're not saying you're op-
25 posed to the award of \$616,500?

1 MS. RICARDO-CAMPBELL: No, I'm opposed to the
2 belief in my mind that that was covering travel.

3 MR. BENNETT: Okay. I guess we should have an
4 opportunity for further discussion of these RC motions.

5 The other issues that she raised,
6 I don't know whether they addressed those yet.

7 That's right. They haven't been.

8 MS. RICARDO-CAMPBELL: I think the problem
9 basically is that you have a set of panelists and a set
10 of reviewers and the Council member gets a very brief
11 summary that tells them nothing. Basically, you've got
12 two sets of opinions and when they don't agree, then you
13 have a problem because you don't have everything in front
14 of you and busy people don't have time to say send me the
15 whole set of material and I'll go through it. I think the
16 purpose of a member of the Council is just to raise a
17 warning flag and say here. It hasn't already been ably
18 as the compliments raised by Ms. Buchanan to my right,
19 then maybe the members might have noticed some of these
20 two.

21 Mr. Chairman, Dr. Ricardo-Campbell
22 wasn't able to be at the committee meeting yesterday, but
23 we did have some notes that she transmitted to us. These
24 particular proposals were discussed and I think these con-
25 siderations were appreciated by the committee and after

1 the discussion, we were satisfied and voted to recommend
2 the project. Howard, may wish to amplify on this.

3 What it sounds like is the relation
4 to the first two, the panel recommendations are being ex-
5 pedited because the WPA archives at George Mason University.
6 The recommendation was against the old history component
7 before the formation of a guide for existing materials
8 and that is what the staff recommended. I didn't follow.
9 I must have missed the Yale one except for the gain,
10 there was a reduction since the preceding It was
11 only the papers that we were dealing with in any
12 case.

13 MS. RICARDO-CAMPBELL: But it was also, in a
14 sense, the protest to the very poor follow-up letter sup-
15 plied by Yale University for umpteen things they were in-
16 volved, which I think Anita wants to speak to.

17 MS. SILVERS: I think the issue here is that
18 there is another project in another discipline at Yale
19 and they were asked for a progress report and the progress
20 report was, I'm not sure terse is the right word, but it
21 was very brief.

22 Are we talking about the Yale today?

23 MS. SILVERS: Yes we are. And I think that
24 Rita's point is that the Yale administration ought to be
25 encouraged by action on one proposal to pull the reins in

1 on another proposal. I am not sure how these are connected.
2 I'm not sure how efficient the Yale administration can be
3 expected to be in disciplining its various--

4 The music department versus the--

5 MS. SILVERS: Yes. Quite.

6 This appears to be irrelevant.

7 MS. RICARDO-CAMPBELL: Well, I don't think it
8 is irrelevant. The umbrella arm is Yale University.
9 There is a letter here of January 14th I finally found and
10 if I was giving grant money, I would not expect this as
11 a progress report. Somebody's returned from his trip to
12 Israel. That must be the Jewish product and reports good
13 progress in his work and can be expected to be completed
14 approximately on schedule. There are five of these, at
15 least. Then there's another man on the samaritanian an-
16 thologies progressing steadily. Then there's a third per-
17 son on commentary and it's most likely that the
18 next work will be ready for admission probably in the
19 course of '83. Then there's another man, he's continuing
20 his work. There's a fifth man who says he got a new job.
21 I gather that is going to interfere with his and this type
22 of progress report and the last page, the second page over,
23 it says in the book of love and the book of knowledge, I
24 guess the code of is still in the Hebrew area
25 or something are coming along. Now, I don't think that

1 those are the kind of progress reports that anybody would
2 take and my objection is that if you have a university,
3 you are running all departments of that university and if
4 you're president of it, you ought to know that that's the
5 kind of progress reports that you're giving out to people
6 who give you research money.

7 I'd like to speak to that one.

8 Jack Neusner requested this progress report on this cur-
9 rent Yale We reproduced the list
10 that we received back from who is the Yale
11 project director. None of the funds will be expended to
12 any of the seven projects What he has
13 given us, I would agree that something at the head of my
14 letter saying my impression is We discussed it
15 with him and it's not worth pursuing the matter to get
16 more information. Since these people are at
17 Yale, by any means, there are other scholars, in
18 some cases full of them, it's extremely difficult. But
19 you need to check swiftly on these people on how these
20 people. Whether you give them two months or two years for
21 their various chores, but we'll certainly be sure that in-
22 dividuals respond to our request. But Jack, who was the
23 principal involved here, raised the matter. This is a
24 current award by the I don't know if any-
25 thing unsatisfactory is good. We just don't have enough

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1330 VERMONT AVENUE, NW
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

1 information. It's not satisfactory.

2 We've had comment now on a couple
3 of applications within the RC category. I think I'd like
4 judgment on this. We can either treat RC separately and
5 take a vote or we can go forward with the other sections
6 and make one vote on the research division. I'd prefer
7 that. I think perhaps, but I'll take advice from others,
8 if they feel differently. Would you like to move on to
9 the other sections within this and then we'll take one
10 motion for the division.

11 MR. COHN: All right. The next section would
12 be the RVs, that's conservation and preservation starting
13 on page 31 and continuing only to page 34. Are there any
14 questions? As far as I know. There is a question on RV
15 20021 on page 32, I believe Dr. Ricardo-Campbell.

16 MS. RICARDO-CAMPBELL: My RV number on the torn
17 out sheet is slightly different than what you gave. It's
18 RV 20018.

19 MR. COHN: Okay. That's from the previous page.

20 MS. RICARDO-CAMPBELL: It's American Library
21 Association of which I was once a member so I'll say there's
22 nothing that way. It's a nondestructive, so it says. I
23 don't know if that means nuclear bomb nondestructive or
24 what it means book copy. I have two objections and I don't
25 thing they were both brought up at your meeting. One is

1 there is a copyright law in the United States and a fairly
2 strong enough one that people stick those labels on things
3 you copy. If you are giving money to a private manufac-
4 turer, which is part of my objection, it can handle vol-
5 umes up to 8½ by 11 inches that are three inches thick
6 to copy, if I were a publisher, would raise are you going
7 to infringe my copyright. That's a very substantial copy-
8 right law. The other one is in the course of this it is
9 to display and to develop and display a device of copying
10 at four different conferences the initial phototype, I
11 believe, and then they travel to three conferences to
12 display the device. I just thought that we ought to let
13 the private marketplace take care of it and not worry and
14 get involved.

15 MR. BENNETT: To respond to the concern about
16 the copyright law, the vast majority of the books that
17 are intended for copy under this process are medieval
18 manuscripts and renaissance editions. Almost anything
19 else can be copied pretty easily but these are books with
20 very valuable artistic bindings which cannot be held flat
21 open. I find it difficult to imagine that any of this
22 material, most of it 500 years old or older, is not in
23 the public domain. As far as the-- Your other objection
24 was which one?

25 MS. RICARDO-CAMPBELL: Well, let me answer that

1 one. Intention may only be to use it for that but will it
2 be. I don't know of any copier that can do it as well as
3 it seems to comply.

4 MR. BENNETT: The other matter of allowing by
5 the initiative to develop the technology or appliance to
6 do this. We have at least on one previous occasion, under-
7 written the development of a coptic typewriter ball.
8 That's the principal precedent for doing that. The reason
9 for doing that was that no manufacturing perceived the
10 coptic industry could be worth investing in. Now, the
11 inquiries seem to indicate that no private corporation is
12 willing to invest the money in this device. The device
13 is badly needed. I, myself, would greatly like to have
14 copies of some things in the Morgan Library. They are un-
15 copiable unless I go there and write them out by hand.

16 This issue about the need and the
17 possibility of some private manufacturer to do the work
18 was discussed and we did, I think, point out that people
19 in George's situation are likely to be applying to us for
20 travel funds to go to the Morgan Library and for funds to
21 preserve books and we might think of this as our dealing
22 with a problem in one way rather than being asked con-
23 stantly for funds to deal with it in another way. I think
24 on the travel I did ask Jeff about that. Is that still
25 in there?

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1330 VERMONT AVENUE, NW
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

1 projects, we hope during the next 10 to 20 years, will
2 accomplish the preservation of the large majority of U.S.
3 newspapers in this country. No, this copier can only ac-
4 commodate items of a given size. That's one of the points
5 of criticism in the view of the proposed budget. Really,
6 the only thing going is a marvelous contraption of lenses
7 and prisms which seems to be so far that's been able to
8 be developed.

9 MS. RICARDO-CAMPBELL: But that size limitation
10 in our book department, and I haven't been in it for a
11 long while, the folio size is the all, outsize is the
12 little ones and it's the big ones. There are going to
13 be very few of the precisely 8½ by 11.

14 If I could just clarify, I believe
15 that's the outer limit of the size. Any size smaller than
16 that can be accommodated and, of course, I think most--
17 Apart from folio, almost every other size of old books
18 would be accommodated by that dimension. However,--

19 MS. RICARDO-CAMPBELL: I'll withdraw my objec-
20 tion but let me say I think it illustrates why such brief
21 summaries are inadequate to make a decision.

22 MR. BENNETT: Thank you, Mr. Stein.

23 MR. STEIN: I use a great deal of Xeroxing be-
24 cause it reduces my need to move around among libraries
25 and the one thing I've been impressed with is exactly

1 this subject. I would have retitled this the development
2 of a preservation reserving book copier. This is not just
3 another Xerox type machine. I have seen too many instances
4 where rare material is first injured and then destroyed
5 virtually by the manner in which it is copied and you have
6 to get very literal here. You slap the book down, you
7 break its back and you fold up some pages and that book
8 is on the way to ruin after that. If they have a machine
9 that will preserve, that's what this should have been
10 called, not nondestructive but preservation. I think it
11 merits support and close study. It cannot be looked upon
12 as just another copier.

13 Does't nondestructive modify the
14 word book rather than the word copier. That is a very
15 fragile device.

16 MS. RICARDO-CAMPBELL: I have a question.

17 MR. BENNETT: Thank you. Yes?

18 MS. RICARDO-CAMPBELL: I was just going to ask
19 how the committee voted on this. We have one member bring-
20 ing in some reports to us, but how was the committee--

21 MR. COHN: We discussed the issue and voted
22 unanimously to favor the project.

23 MS. RICARDO-CAMPBELL: Thank you very much.

24 MR. COHN: I'll continue with the next section.

25 The next section are the publication recommendations.

1 They start on page 35 and run through page 46. There are
2 at least two that require your special attention. They
3 are grants to publishers in Canada. The first of these is
4 on page 36 at the top of the page. My page numbers are
5 those at the bottom, remember. RP 20409, Pontifical In-
6 stitute of Medieval Studies. There is precedent for giving
7 publication grants to non-U.S. publishers. In this par-
8 ticular case, the author of the book is a United States
9 citizen and the publisher is a very suitable suitable for
10 this particular work on medieval studies. Therefore, it
11 did not seem as though there were any likely U.S. publi-
12 sher for it and the committee recommends it. The second
13 one is also in Canada and that is on page 40, in the mid-
14 dle of page 40, RP 20446, University of Toronto Press. In
15 this case the author, Anthony K. Castle, is a Canadian
16 citizen. He's been resident in the United States since I
17 believe 1971 and is a member of the faculty of the Univer-
18 sity of Illinois. The question here is slightly different
19 since both publisher and author are not U.S. citizens.
20 Mr. Castle is in a difficult situation in that under Cana-
21 dian procedures at the moment, he is not eligible for any
22 kind of publication subsidy since he is not resident in
23 Canada and he's caught between the restrictive rules of
24 two different countries. In the committee discussions, I
25 personally opposed this grant on the ground an important

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1330 VERMONT AVENUE, NW
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

1 book on Dante is publishable by any number of American
2 university presses and that he could well have submitted
3 it elsewhere without creating this situation of our pro-
4 posing a grant to a non-U.S. institution for a non-U.S.
5 institution author. However, the other members of the
6 committee unanimously voted in favor of this. One consi-
7 deration was the thought that NEH should show generosity
8 toward Canada which has become increasingly restrictive
9 about its own grants to Americans or to Canādians outside
10 of Canada. In any event, it was recommended unanimously
11 by the committee without my voting.

12 We did have a foreign policy dis-
13 cussion and we're not unanimous about that. This is a
14 serious issue, by the way. I took a hawkish position.
15 We had two doves both of whom seem to have flown to coup
16 this afternoon and--

17 Watch that metaphor.

18 But I do think, as a matter of
19 fact, this is a serious matter. It may not be fair to
20 catch one person in the net before we really deal with it.
21 I'm not sure they're putting pressure on this one person
22 is going to help resolve the problem about Canadian
23 scholars who have no place to go. I do, however, believe
24 that there is a certain amount of double dipping going on,
25 if you'll pardon the expression. And I think that somebody

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1330 VERMONT AVENUE, NW
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

1 in this country ought to show some leadership in negoti-
2 ating some of the financial matters and funding matters
3 out and I would urge, although we don't do a major amount
4 of this, I would urge somebody in the Endowment to look
5 into it because the Canada Council has been getting more
6 and more restrictive and Canadians do, under various cir-
7 cumstances, come to us and what they want to do will
8 contribute to scholarship that our scholars will use but
9 our scholars can't go to them.

10 It's even a muddier situation
11 than that because although a professor at the University
12 of Illinois is ineligible for a grant, the Toronto Uni-
13 versity Press is eligible for a grant. This is difficult.
14 The panel in question concerned itself with what might
15 be caused the primary reason for having precedent broke
16 in the first place. That is, make quality books accessi-
17 ble to American scholars. From that point of view, if
18 you take it into perspective, University of Toronto Press
19 publications are just as significant as any American press.

20 MR. BENNETT: Yes. Mary Beth.

21 MS. NORTON: I have two questions. One is was
22 the original work of either of these scholars supported
23 by our fellowships or research or whatever grants?

24 The first one was. The second one
25 was not.

1 MS. NORTON: This Castle one is not but the
2 pontifical one is.

3 Yes.

4 MS. NORTON: And then the second question is,
5 George said that there was precedent to making a
6 to a non-U.S. press. What is that precedent?

7 In August 1982, we had to approve
8 for a U.S. citizen

9 But, it was at that time that the
10 Council made it the requirement that when such cases came
11 up, they should be brought to both the committee
12 and the full Council.

13 It was earlier than 1982.

14 I think it was too.

15 I thought there was one to Brill.

16 I thought there was, yeah.

17 First of all, we get very few of
18 these. Secondly, we fund very few of these. It might
19 well be the simplest way since we are reprocessing our
20 guidelines to say that we are only going to support Ameri-
21 can companies.

22 MR. BENNETT: Let's look at that, but let's
23 follow Anita's advice too. Jeff informs me that he knows
24 well the director of the Canadian Council so we'll have
25 conversations about this and report back. May we proceed?

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1330 VERMONT AVENUE, NW
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

1 MS. NORTON: The recommendation at this point
2 is to fund both, right?

3 MR. BENNETT: Right. Except Mr. Kennedy is
4 voting against on the second.

5 MR. KENNEDY: I'm voting against the second one.

6 I will join him.

7 I have to ask once more. What
8 commitment do we make when we approve the request for
9 volume two of a chronological edition of Charles Sanders
10 Perser's work? Are we committed now in any way to volume
11 three?

12 No.

13 Volume one?

14 Only to the publication costs ex-
15 pended on volume two. If they submit a request for vol-
16 ume three, we would immediately ask what happened to vol-
17 umes one and two.

18 MR. BENNETT: Yes.

19 MS. RICARDO-CAMPBELL: As I understand it, I've
20 been here about a year, a kind of a moral commitment.
21 Once volume one and two is finished, we will approve three.

22 They're separate.

23 They are two separate things.

24 These are for publications. This is strictly
25 book production. I think you're thinking, Rita, of the

1 preparation--

2 MS. RICARDO-CAMPBELL: Encyclopedias are--

3 But it has to be a satisfactory
4 program. I think it's so, that most reviewers
5 and panelists will recommend the project for further
6 funding if satisfactory progress has been made in the
7 first two. There is a moral--

8 MR. BENNETT: Yes. Anita.

9 MS. SILVERS: We may not have to worry about
10 the rest of the volumes. When I was an undergraduate, I
11 worked on the preparation of these volumes and, if the
12 same amount of time elapses before-- They're 10 volumes
13 in the old series. If the same amount of time elapses,
14 we may not have to worry Leon.

15 It may have well been the subject
16 of the letter the Chairman read initially.

17 MR. BENNETT: That's right. Someone will right,
18 first chairman of NEH, William Bennett. That's right.

19 Mr. Chairman, I do have a question.

20 MR. BENNETT: Yes.

21 The question pertains to two re-
22 jects in the publication category on page 46. Wesleyan
23 University Press for serving women household service in
24 19th century America by Faye Dudden and then Johns Hopkins
25 University Press, Domestic Enemies, Masters and Servants

1 in Old Regime France by Cissie Fairchilds. I wondered if
2 the committee had some prejudice against domestic servants?
3 And if not, why were these rejected?

4 20461, since the reader's ques-
5 tions are serious, criticism is not well taken but

6 I think this is probably one that we'll come
7 back to when the reader's reports are acknowledged. Part
8 of the problem is the reader's reports that part of the
9 proposal very often grades the points about the manuscript
10 that needs to be addressed and there's nothing in the pro-
11 posal to indicate that I have seen this or the manuscript's
12 going to be changed. So we're really dealing with an un-
13 finished manuscript. It might be truer to say these are
14 deferrals, until we more or less get them. Now, what
15 was the other one?

16 MS. NORTON: Wesleyan Press, RP 20455, Serving
17 Women.

18 The estimate of the panel was
19 that a good paperback marketed should at least break even.

20 MS. NORTON: I suspected that that was probably
21 the judgment on that book. Thank you.

22 MR. BENNETT: Thank you. We'll move on.

23 MR. COHN: The next section are translations
24 starting on page 47 and continuing to page 69. As far
25 as I know there are no objections about these.

1 MR. BENNETT: All right.

2 MR. COHN: The next section--

3 MR. BENNETT: Wait a minute. There may be.

4 Someone ought to be congratulated
5 for not funding a translation of Dante translated loosely
6 Dante's teenage love.

7 This was caught only at the last
8 minute by the evil eyes of the chairman.

9 Really?

10 No.

11 MR. BENNETT: Sounds like a song I might like.

12 MR. COHN: After translations, I believe there
13 are two proposals in research too on page 70. As far as
14 I know, noncontroversial. Basic research starts on page
15 71 and continues how far? To page 82. Did you have any-
16 thing in there, in any RO numbers? We examined a number
17 of them with considerable chair. Then an RS on page 83
18 and 84, state, local and regional studies. Then conferen-
19 ces starting on page 85. These are RD's and continue al-
20 most to the end, to page 95. The committee did reverse
21 the staff recommendation on one conference, that is,
22 Howard can you help me find the number?

23 Page 95, RD 20378, the conference
24 on the meeting of dual organization.

25 MR. COHN: Two members of the committee read the

1 file on this and after some discussion, it was decided
2 not to approve on substantive grounds.

3 MS. SILVERS: I'm sure that's not another one
4 that we wanted to.

5 This is a deferral.

6 MR. COHN: I'm thinking of pug wash.

7 MS. SILVERS: We haven't gotten to pug wash
8 yet. On this one, however, the entire committee looked
9 at it--

10 MR. COHN: It's a conference that's not a con-
11 ference.

12 MS. SILVERS: I thought we thought it was a sub-
13 ject that wasn't a subject.

14 MR. COHN: I'll take this last section then
15 which are the humanities, science and technology ones on
16 the last two pages. It is there that the committee re-
17 versed the decision. The very last thing in the motion
18 on page 97 after reading the file and deciding that the
19 substance was not satisfactory. On behalf of the commit-
20 tee, I move the entire motion.

21 The motion's been moved. Could
22 I ask if the Council feel they, if a member of the Council
23 feels that any of these specifics that we've discussed
24 should be considered separately because we could take
25 those two or three applications and set those aside for a

1 moment and vote the entire application, then look speci-
2 fically at the individual ones.

3 MS. RICARDO-CAMPBELL: I definitely feel that
4 the two Canadian ones should be taken out.

5 MR. BENNETT: All right. Can we then, if that's
6 agreeable to the Council, can we then consider the motion
7 excluding the two publications applications from Canada.
8 We'll take them up the next. Okay. Those in favor of
9 the motion excluding those two items please say aye.
10 Those opposed?

11 (The record shows that the motion was carried.)

12 MR. BENNETT: Now if we could take the two
13 Canadian ones. Can we take them as a group because I
14 think they raise the same question?

15 No, they don't raise the same
16 question.

17 MR. BENNETT: Then I need a specific reference
18 if I could, Harold.

19 MR. COHN: They're pages 36 and 40.

20 MR. One is at the top of page 36,
21 RP 20409 is the one where the author, if you were, is an
22 American citizen. The issue is the publishing entity is
23 not.

24 MR. BENNETT: On that item then at the top of
25 page 36, of those in favor please say aye. Those opposed?

1 The motion carries. The second item, Harold.

2 MR. COHN: Page 40, 20446.

3 And this is 20446 on page 40.

4 This is the case where the author is a Canadian citizen
5 resident in the United States.

6 MR. KENNEDY: All right. The item on the middle
7 of page 40 then, those in favor please signify by saying
8 aye. Those opposed? I believe the nos have it. Is there
9 a question about that. I believe that one has been turned
10 down, defeated and that takes care of research.

11 MR. BENNETT: Thank you. Fellowships, Mr.
12 Hamilton.

13 MR. HAMILTON: Okay. You skipped planning and
14 assessment.

15 MR. BENNETT: Excuse me. I'm sorry.

16 MR. HAMILTON: That's all right.

17 MR. BENNETT: Planning and Assessment Studies.

18 MS. SILVERS: I think we'll be very quick. The
19 motion for planning and assessment studies is on the con-
20 vention white paper. I would like to move this motion.
21 We did not have any doubts about any of those that are
22 recommended. We didn't have any doubts about the ones
23 that aren't recommended.

24 Are there discussions of the items
25 of LPPA, Mary Beth?

1 MS. NORTON: Yes, I'd like to ask a question
2 about the second one from the bottom on the first page.
3 The one to ETS, students of the humanities in the seven-
4 ties and eighties. Have you consulted with the education
5 division about that one.

6 I believe that the proposal was
7 circulated-- Is Anita Jones here?

8 MS. JONES: I'm here. ~~proposal been circulated?~~

9 Was the proposal been circulated?

10 MS. JONES: I believe this is one that was cir-
11 culated. It's our normal practice to do that?

12 Are there other questions about
13 the LPPA motion, excuse me, the planning and policy assess-
14 ment motion? If not, will those in favor, please signify
15 by saying aye. Those opposed. Thank you.

16 (The record shows that the motion was carried.)

17 MR. BENNETT: Mr. Hamilton.

18 MR. HAMILTON: This motion includes only the
19 program, Summer Stipends, but I want to call your attention
20 to the 23 independent study of research fellowships at
21 the end of the motion which were approved in November if
22 money became available. Money became available so those
23 23 and the 10 alternates are being submitted, but as I
24 say, no vote is necessary on that one. The motion in-
25 cludes 233 applications for summer stipends. I want to

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1330 VERMONT AVENUE, NW
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

1 call your attention to one on page 32, which we considered
2 especially or specifically, Geoffrey Pullen, 23922, of
3 page 32. The question there of U.S. residency. This is
4 non-U.S. citizen who had not been in the country for the
5 full three years and Endowment policy is that kind of
6 application must receive specific Council attention and
7 approval so the committee looked at that and considered
8 it. He's a British citizen who's resided in the United
9 States since September of 1980. He's been in and out of
10 the country. He's now here on a permanent resident status
11 and we are recommending Mr. Pullen and I guess the motion
12 also approves disapprovals listed under Tab P in the book.
13 That's it, Mr. Chairman.

14 Mr. Hamilton, the rule that you're
15 referring to is that three years from the time of award
16 or three years from time of taking up the fellowship?

17 What is that rule?

18 The rule is that applicant who has
19 resided in the United States for three consecutive years
20 just prior to the application.

21 He has not but-- How long's he
22 been here?

23 September 8th. For six months.

24 MR. HAMILTON: He'd been here long enough.

25 He had been over here as a visiting

1 professor on three different occasions in '64 and '67 and
2 '78.

3 '78, '77 and '74, visiting lec-
4 turer in various capacities.

5 MR. HAMILTON: Well, look how well he's picked
6 up American popular usage in the title of his project,
7 Psychological Implications of Generalized Structured
8 Grammar. Slang and everything. He's one of us.

9 He should be one of me.

10 MR. HAMILTON: One of me? Speak for himself.
11 Okay. May we consider the motion as a whole or does any-
12 one wish to take any of these out? All right. Let's
13 consider it as a whole then. All in favor? Opposed?
14 Is there a no?

15 I think the psychological impli-
16 cations of generalized structured grammar

17 MR. HAMILTON: Okay. By Englishmen or Americans
18 or anybody? Okay. Yes. Go ahead.

19 This is a democratic committee.
20 We share the comments here.

21 I was hopeful that we might be
22 again reminded of the plight of our 10 alternate fellows
23 languishing there without funds and would respectfully
24 implore the treasurer to find some treasure so as to sup-
25 port these chaps if at all possible.

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1330 VERMONT AVENUE, NW
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

1 MR. BENNETT: Okay. So noted. Thank you.
2 Education Programs, Ms. Norton.

3 MS. NORTON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. We are
4 on the green pages. Color coordination. This cycle in
5 the education division, I have several comments to make
6 first and then I'll go through the motion and explain
7 what we did with it. You should know that in all these
8 education recommendations, the total recommended figure
9 is always up to that amount. It may in the end be less.
10 There are still some staff work to be done on these recom-
11 mendations so that this may not-- This is the top figure
12 rather than the absolute figure. This time we were clear-
13 ing up the old cycles and starting on the new. We have
14 with us this time the last cycle of a number of projects
15 or number of categories that have been with the education
16 division for some time. There are also two sets of defers
17 from the November Council meeting with a final decision
18 on implementation grants and higher educational regional
19 and national. So this was a time of firsts and lasts.
20 We have the last set of consultant grants in their present
21 form and the first set of feasibility grants and our major
22 business this time was in elementary and secondary and
23 pilots. And it was in particular in the area of the pilot
24 grants the staff did a large amount of work to--because
25 we didn't want to defer anything, obviously, at this time

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1330 VERMONT AVENUE, NW
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

1 and therefore, we wanted to reach a final decision and a
2 good deal of the staff work went into the pilot grants to
3 determine whether or not these could be fundable by the
4 time of the Council meeting. The motion begins with ele-
5 mentary and secondary proposals which run from page 1 to
6 page 7 on the recommends and deferrals. I would call your
7 attention specifically, if you turn to pages 6 and 7, to
8 two proposals. The one on the top of page 6, we're all
9 in a free society, an inquiry into the fundamental princi-
10 ples and assumptions of American political philosophy was
11 extensively discussed by the Council committee especially
12 with reference to the budget. If you will notice the
13 original request was \$462,000 plus which we regarded as
14 scandalously high and although we rather liked the idea of
15 this proposal which is to run sessions for public school
16 teachers on the basic ideas of American political thought,
17 we also thought that the title was incorrect. It is not,
18 in fact, an inquiry into the fundamental principles and
19 assumptions of American political philosophy and this is
20 going to be retitled in our official lists. But, in any
21 event, we did get the budget down or the staff worked very
22 hard to get the budget down and that is up to \$200,000.

23 This new title, do you have it?

24 MS. NORTON: 'No, we have not yet drafted the new
25 title, but it is not this because that's not what this

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1330 VERMONT AVENUE, NW
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

1 project is about. It is about political thought, but it's
2 not about political philosophy and it's not about funda-
3 mental principles. On page 7, I point out the first, I
4 am under deferral to Princeton University, Thomas Roche,
5 English heritage from Chaucer to Polk. This came to the
6 committee as recommended. The committee decided to defer
7 it on the-- We liked the idea, but the proposal seemed to
8 us to be very sketchy and since the project in question,
9 which is a summer institute for high school teachers, was
10 not to occur until the summer of '84 anyway, we saw no
11 reason not to defer it until the proposal was sufficiently
12 fleshed out so we could decide what we wanted to do about
13 it definitely. And then also in elementary and secondary,
14 in the rejects, I would draw your attention to page 15
15 where the second one from the bottom, Loyola University
16 of Chicago, Frank Mulca, teaching Polish with a purpose
17 in America, Chicago Pilot Project. The Council committee
18 in the absence of Ms. Kerr who is, of course, from this
19 institution decided to change this from a recommended fund
20 to a reject. We found the, again, the project very sketchi-
21 ly described although the person who proposed it was clear-
22 ly an enthusiast for teaching Polish in the schools. Mr.
23 Chairman, should I go ahead with the entire motion or
24 should I stop here if anyone has any questions about ele-
25 mentary and secondary?

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1330 VERMONT AVENUE, NW
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

1 MR. BENNETT: Should we go ahead? Why don't
2 we go ahead and then come back with all questions.

3 MS. NORTON: Okay. Then, continuing on, you see
4 on page 18, the beginnings of a section which is entitled
5 Central Disciplines in Undergraduate Education. This is
6 somewhat incorrect since this is the new title and these
7 are, in fact, old proposals. We start off with the four
8 implementation grants that were deferred from the November
9 Council and then at the bottom, we move on to the last
10 set of consultant grants in the present form. We will,
11 of course, still continue to supply consultants to col-
12 leges that need them under the new guideline, but they
13 will be under a different heading than a particular set
14 of-- They will be under specific headings with respect
15 to the individual categories rather than a separate cate-
16 gory entirely of consultant grants. All of these consul-
17 tant grants, you will notice, are \$7,000. Those are all
18 up to figures, all still to be negotiated and all dependent
19 really on the travel expenses of the particular consultant
20 and so forth, but that's just the average. We then, on the
21 bottom of page 22, come to the beginning of the last set
22 of pilot grant recommendations with the Butler University
23 grant and continue on through page 25 for those. And then
24 the rejects begin on page 26 and continue from that point.
25 In this group, I would call your particular attention on

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1330 VERMONT AVENUE, NW
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

1 page 28 to the item on the top of page 28. This is the
2 College of Idaho, EB 20543, a humanities approach to ex-
3 amination of a region's culture. This was a resubmitted
4 application. It had been rejected at an earlier Council
5 meeting and I, in particular, had not liked it the first
6 time around. This time I liked it but no one else on the
7 committee did. I did my best to persuade the committee
8 to adopt this one, but it didn't work, so I'm just calling
9 this to your attention, Mr. Chairman, as a split vote in
10 the committee, but it was 3 to 1. I couldn't, unfortunat-
11 ly, prevail. And that's it. No, I'm sorry. On page 32,
12 there are another set of-- This is the deferred from the
13 old higher educational regional and national which is now
14 called exemplary projects and nontraditional programs.
15 These are the first three are those funding recommendations
16 and then the last two recommendations on that page are
17 really the beginnings of the new feasibility grant cate-
18 gory. And I will be happy to answer any questions about
19 any of these.

20 MR. BENNETT: Thank you. Any questions? Dis-
21 cussion about particulars? All right. The motion is on
22 the table. All in favor? Opposed?

23 (The record shows that the motion was carried.)

24 MR. BENNETT: Thank you very much. We'll take
25 another look at Idaho. You know the story about Jallod

1 and the curriculum committee when they voted 26 to 1
2 against and he said, ladies and gentlemen we're at an
3 impasse.

4 MS. NORTON: That's the way I felt yesterday.

5 MR. BENNETT: Challenge Grants, Mr. Dille.

6 MR. DILLE: In addition to dealing with grants,
7 we were asked to make a recommendation to the Council,
8 which will in turn make a recommendation to determine on
9 the question of the eligibility of Harvard University for
10 a second time application. The policy requires that two
11 full years elapse from the time of the submission of ac-
12 ceptable final report and the submission of the second
13 application. Harvard filed only a partial final report
14 and in response to many letters from the Endowment was
15 silent, however, giving a stiff final letter as it turned
16 out, they then asked if we would recognize June 1980 as
17 the official closing date, since that was the date they
18 should have responded by and therefore, allow application
19 in June 1983. We decided we shouldn't set aside the rule
20 and recommend then to the Council that the Endowment
21 recognize that December 11, 1982 as the official closing
22 date of their talent grant, making them eligible to
23 apply sometime after December 11, 1982. I move that.
24 1984. Sorry.

25 MR. BENNETT: Discussion? All in favor of that

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1330 VERMONT AVENUE, NW
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

1 particular motion? Anyone opposed?

2 (The record shows that the motion was carried.)

3 MR. BENNETT: I don't know what Yale will do.

4 I got the feeling it was Yale
5 just voting.

6 MR. DILLE: Then, you have before you the '84
7 applications for which we propose funding. I may say
8 that two of these, that two of the recommendations came
9 to us we set aside. We added one and took one out. De-
10 tails are available upon request. We encouraged besides
11 the '84, 61 resubmission, 102 were rejected out of hand.
12 The total of new offers was \$26, 670,438.

13 Say that again, please.

14 MR. DILLE: \$26,670,438. All right. Those
15 statistics, I don't think, are important. 12 universities
16 and 25 colleges and a variety of other institutions. The
17 highest grant is for \$1 million. I move then the accep-
18 tance of these recommendations of the 84 that you have
19 before you.

20 MR. BENNETT: Any questions or discussions?

21 Who got the \$1 million?

22 MR. DILLE: The \$1 million went to the Univer-
23 sity of Kansas. \$850,000 went to Amherst. Bucknell got
24 \$500,000.

25 Temple got--

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1330 VERMONT AVENUE, NW
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

1 MR. DILLE: About \$300,000.

2 MR. BENNETT: Discussion? Questions? All in
3 favor? Opposed?

4 (The record shows that the motion was carried.)

5 MR. BENNETT: I'm sorry. Armand would--why
6 don't you make it publicly? This is my first time on a
7 challenge grant.

8 I was just going to say, it is
9 customary in a challenge grant and for other divisions
10 of the committee to note--

11 MR. BENNETT: Okay, we're going to do that.

12 They are important for our

13 Council.

14 Why did the staff recommended
15 that we not fund the Virginia Museum of Art? It's on
16 page 1 of the motion that you have before you, CA 20600
17 at the bottom of the page.

18 MR. DILLE: I can say in general that we were
19 less apprehensive and were those two bodies at the lack
20 of a director at the moment. It appears to indicate the
21 fund raising of a body with a good record of fund raising
22 and with a very fine board, an active board.
23 of further evidence, in fact, more money was coming down
24 the road, so we moved that is the funded.

25 MR. BENNETT: Yes. Rita.

1 MS. RICARDO-CAMPBELL: I don't know if I missed
2 this, but I tore out of the agenda book that was sent to
3 me pages of summary listings by institutions that chal-
4 lenge grants and there were several million dollars ones
5 listed. Did they get thrown out?

6 MR. DILLE: No. Some were reduced to \$750,000
7 or \$850,000. Eseentially-- Well, I can't generalize it.
8 Many of them were reduced because they were proposing to
9 use some of the money for scholarships and thought that
10 is not absolutely forbidden, we are not required to give
11 that kind of money either. If you'll check the motion
12 itself, you'll see on the third line the original and
13 the bottom line shows the offer line.

14 MS. RICARDO-CAMPBELL: But on this print-out--

15 MR. DILLE: That's just a list of all the ap-
16 plications.

17 MS. RICARDO-CAMPBELL: So they're a lot of
18 pending million dollar ones?

19 No, there were some rejected.
20 The list you have is both accepted and rejected.

21 MR. DILLE: You have the list of what they all
22 asked for when they came in.

23 MS. RICARDO-CAMPBELL: Right. Thank you.

24 MR. BENNETT: Excuse me. 30 percent were re-
25 duced offers?

1 MR. BENNETT: It's a bad idea. All in favor of
2 adjourning say aye. Opposed?

3 (The record shows that the motion was carried.)

4 I want to bring up the matter of
5 rolls for lunch.

6 MR. BENNETT: Rolls for lunch. Maybe we should
7 adjourn.

8 MR. SANDOZ: I have a question.

9 MR. BENNETT: Ellis Sandoz has a question.

10 MR. SANDOZ: At the last Council meeting, we
11 discussed the role of classics in the media as a possible
12 series of television films and due to the reorganization
13 of the particular division, this was set aside for a time.
14 Do you have some feeling about how this might proceed or
15 not proceed between now and the May Council meeting?

16 MR. BENNETT: I'm going to ask Steve to talk to
17 it in a minute, but let me say that I did think it was
18 appropriate to have this particular discussion that we've
19 had now for several months concluding in the Council com-
20 mittee's recommendation, the Council's adoption on the
21 statement of purpose of suggestion of new guidelines.
22 This now gives us a framework. It seems a sensible frame-
23 work in which enlightens a variety of kinds of projects by
24 its very statement. More specifically though, maybe
25 Steve would speak to it.

1 that if you moved to the post office, we could certainly
2 attract a lot of men of letters.

3 That's what I said. I said when
4 we move to the post office, we'll attract men of letters.

5 MR. BENNETT: Maybe you should have the last
6 two words. The note that was passed to me, I think this
7 came from you. I can't think of anyone else that it
8 would come from. It said all this discussion of publish-
9 ing in Canada is simply an attempt to avoid the draft
10 motion. Okay. I think we should most certainly adjourn.
11 Thank you very much ladies and gentlemen of the Council.

12 /
13 /
14 /
15 /
16 /
17 /
18 /
19 /
20 /
21 /
22 /
23 /
24 /
25 /

C E R T I F I C A T E

This is to certify that the foregoing transcript

In the matter of : Sixty-Seventh Meeting of the National
Council on the Humanities

Before: National Endowment for the Humanities

Date: February 18, 1983

Place: Washington, D.C.

represents the full and complete proceedings of the
aforementioned matter, as reported and reduced to
typewriting.



NEAL R. GROSS

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1330 VERMONT AVENUE, NW
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005