

1  
2 EIGHTY-SECOND MEETING OF THE  
3 NATIONAL COUNCIL ON THE HUMANITIES  
4

5 - - -  
6

7  
8  
9 November 7, 1986  
10

11 8:30 a.m.  
12

13  
14 The Old Post Office  
15 1100 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.  
16 Washington, D.C.  
17

18  
19 EBERLIN REPORTING SERVICE  
20 12708 Valleywood Drive  
21 Wheaton, Maryland 20906  
22 (301) 933-7248  
23  
24  
25

1                                    P R O C E E D I N G S  
2                                    MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING  
3

4                                    Reports

5                                    Introductory Remarks

6                                    MR. KINGSTON: The meeting of the  
7                                    Eighty-second National Council on the Humanities will  
8                                    come to order. Council members received in the mail and  
9                                    in their packets yesterday a copy of the minutes from  
10                                   the August meeting. There are two corrections to those  
11                                   minutes. One set of corrections has been written and  
12                                   placed in front of you, the second correction simply is  
13                                   the correction of misspelling of Max Farrand's name on  
14                                   page two of the Minutes. It should be F-A-R-R-A-N-D.

15                                   Are there any other corrections or additions  
16                                   to the Minutes? Please, Rita. Excuse me, can you speak  
17                                   into the black microphone?

18                                   MRS. RICARDO-CAMPBELL: Yes, I had a  
19                                   correction on the Minutes and now since I have all these  
20                                   pieces of paper -- here they are. It is on page 16.  
21                                   The middle of the page.

22                                   By inserting what I said about the growing  
23                                   international relationship with the Pacific Rim  
24                                   specifically right after the discussion of the  
25                                   Philippines in that I believe that it gives an incorrect



1 impression, it was actually stated in connection with a  
2 -- I know this is open session and I won't name the  
3 grant, but with a grant proposal that had been turned  
4 down in the committee I was on titled the Pacific Rim  
5 and Basin was the subtitle of it. And I think that it  
6 should be -- I didn't comment on the Philippines, what I  
7 commented on, to turn down the grant of the Pacific Rim  
8 and Basin.

9 MR. KINGSTON: So you would like that  
10 separated as a separate paragraph?

11 MRS. RICARDO-CAMPBELL Well, I would like it  
12 introduced instead of saying right after the word  
13 Philippines would be: "Dr. Ricardo-Campbell commented  
14 on the growing international relationships with the  
15 Pacific Rim." That is fine, and the Endowment and  
16 suggested about the -- maybe you should put a little  
17 phrase in front of it. Because of the turn down of the  
18 grant on the Pacific Rim, commented there are growing  
19 and so forth. Because I don't want it identified with  
20 the Philippines.

21 MR. KINGSTON: I understand. All right. That  
22 will be a third correction to the Minutes. Any other  
23 corrections or additions to the Minutes? If not they  
24 will stand as corrected.

25 The next item on business are the introductory

1 remarks of the Chairman. Lynn.

2 Introductory Remarks of the Chairman

3 MS. CHENEY: Thank you, Tom. I mentioned  
4 yesterday in our informal gathering that I would talk  
5 about The Africans in a very short and simple way today.  
6 And in fact in the beginning the matter with this film  
7 series The Africans, was a very simple one. Having  
8 viewed all nine hours of the film it seemed quite clear  
9 to me that it did not abide by our media guidelines.  
10 And looking at the grant proposal that the applicant had  
11 submitted, it also seemed quite clear to me that WETA  
12 had indeed promised to abide by those guidelines.

13 In the legislation reauthorizing the Endowment  
14 which came into effect in late 1985, Congress  
15 specifically authorized the chairperson of the Endowment  
16 to disassociate the Endowment from any project which  
17 went in a direction different from the one that had been  
18 committed to in the grant application.

19 And so the course for us to follow seemed to  
20 be quite clear. We wrote to WETA and asked to have our  
21 credits removed from the film. PBS at first refused.  
22 Then when the FCC supported our stance, the credits did  
23 indeed come off of the film.

24 I was aware at the outset that there would be  
25 a misunderstanding, some of it willful, of what I had

1 done, and indeed that has been the case, so not in any  
2 large or terribly troublesome sense. We have received  
3 many letters, many phone calls at the Endowment and the  
4 overwhelming number are supportive of what we have done.

5 Even were that not the case, I think that the  
6 Endowment stand is absolutely correct on this matter.  
7 On the simplest level I fail to see how any organization  
8 can be run if the people with whom it deals are not  
9 expected to do what they say they are going to do. It  
10 seems to me that is a very simple principle that has to  
11 be at the basis of any organization, particularly a  
12 grant making organization like ours.

13 On a higher plane I also think what we did was  
14 very important. In a society like ours where free  
15 speech is valued so highly, I can't think of a more  
16 dangerous situation than to have government agencies in  
17 the business of funding propaganda of any kind.

18 I have been very pleased by the thoughtful and  
19 insightful support that our stance has been given by  
20 many people in the media. I think that one of the real  
21 pluses that follows from what the Endowment did is that  
22 we have catalized a discussion about The Africans. And  
23 that, as I say, many thoughtful and insightful people  
24 have discussed the Continent in a way that provides  
25 balance to Professor Mazrui's views. I think



1 specifically of Charles Krautheimer's piece which was  
2 syndicated nationwide, of Blaine Hardman's article in  
3 the Washington Post which made the excellent point that  
4 in nine hours of film the millions and millions of  
5 people who died in the Ethiopian famine aren't  
6 mentioned, nor are the millions and millions of people  
7 that American, that western aid saved, mentioned.

8 And I think perhaps most of all of John  
9 Corey's probing and well informed critique of the film  
10 in the New York Times. So I think that our stance is  
11 not only the correct one, but that it had this very  
12 positive effect of initiating a nationwide discussion  
13 really of this film.

14 Having done that, I think the Endowment's job  
15 is over. There are many people who will continue to  
16 talk about this film, many people who are interested in  
17 making other films about it. I think that our job here  
18 though is finished and I am very much looking forward to  
19 moving on to other things.

20 Last time that we were together I mentioned  
21 the Bicentennial Bookshelf and we have got that project  
22 under way. Is the encyclopedia down there?

23 MR. KINGSTON: Yes, it is on the table right  
24 outside.

25 MS. CHENEY: Outside you will see the

1 Encyclopedia of the American Constitution which is one  
2 of the projects that really inspired us to believe there  
3 was a need to help distribute widely the very fine  
4 scholarship that the Endowment has spurred on. That is  
5 coming on line now because of the Bicentennial of the  
6 Constitution.

7 I recently signed an emergency grant with  
8 Federation of States Humanities Councils. They are  
9 working on a series of reading programs, lectures,  
10 discussions, symposia, all of them geared toward  
11 bringing people into touch with these documents. Our  
12 vision is that in the summer leading up to the 200th  
13 anniversary of the Constitution, people from all parts  
14 of the Country will be brought into contact with the  
15 word of the founders.

16 As we move along this line over the next  
17 month, we are also going to be working on a related  
18 project. At least it all seems related if you take the  
19 large view of things. Congress mandated in our  
20 reauthorization legislation that we undertake a study of  
21 elementary and secondary humanities education.

22 How are the humanities being taught in the  
23 Nation's elementary and secondary schools? This is a  
24 large undertaking, considerable organizational effort.  
25 And next week Dr. Celeste Colgan, a scholar, with

1 considerable organizational flair, will be coming to the  
2 Endowment on a temporary basis to get our efforts on the  
3 elementary and secondary study underway.

4 It is as I say a great challenge but also a  
5 great opportunity. There has been a sense expressed by  
6 many thoughtful people ranging across the political  
7 spectrum that we as a nation are loosing our cultural  
8 memory.

9 One of my first experiences at the Endowment  
10 was listening to Lescek Kolakowski lecture last May, the  
11 Jefferson Lecture. And the phrase he used, the way he  
12 talked about it was to know the great erosion of  
13 historical consciousness that exists not just in our  
14 nation, but in the west. An erosion that makes it  
15 difficult to know what values are important. An erosion  
16 that makes it difficult to set goals. An erosion that  
17 makes it difficult for us to remember that we are all on  
18 one ship sailing into the night and that we do have  
19 cultural bonds that tie us together.

20 I recently had a long airplane trip and I  
21 managed to read a good deal of Arthur Schlesinger, Jr's  
22 new book, "The Cycles of American History." I am sure  
23 that there may not be more than three things that he and  
24 Mr. Kolakowski would agree on, but one of those three is  
25 the sense that we as Americans are becoming, the phrase



1 that Schlesinger uses is "a historyless people."

2 I think that our study of elementary and  
3 secondary education may be able to understand some of  
4 the difficulties that have brought that about, perhaps  
5 open up possibilities for full ways of remedying it. It  
6 is an undertaking that we are looking forward to and of  
7 course we would greatly welcome advice and wisdom from  
8 the National Council. I look forward to reporting to  
9 you next time our progress on that. Thank you.

10 MR. KINGSTON: Thank you, Lynne. Louise?

11 MS. KERR: This is not to prolong the  
12 discussion, but since you did invite us to view the  
13 screening of those episodes yesterday, I did take the  
14 opportunity to see both of them yesterday afternoon and  
15 in anticipation of that I asked for the proposal. And I  
16 just have a couple of comments.

17 On page one of the proposal and on page five  
18 of the proposal, it says very explicitly: First, The  
19 African will be the first major television series shown  
20 in the west which will present Africa from an African  
21 point of view. And then the objectives. First  
22 objective: To portray African civilization from an  
23 African point of view. It is not even the African point  
24 of view, but from an African point of view. And it  
25 certainly did that.

1 My own feeling is that I think that that  
2 series is certainly subject to criticism, but perhaps  
3 more on substance and quality than on perspective. I  
4 think that it definitely does, obviously does represent  
5 an African perspective that I think is shared by a good  
6 many including, according to this proposal, many African  
7 scholars. That is to say scholars of Africa whether  
8 they be African or not.

9 Because of the quality of the thing, not  
10 necessarily because of the perspective of the thing, I  
11 guess I think it might have been better not to give it  
12 -- maybe not to give it so much publicity. It has  
13 probably gotten a lot more attention as a substantive  
14 piece than it might have otherwise.

15 And I guess what puzzles me and disturbs me is  
16 not even the question of whether or not the perspective  
17 is one that we would want to encourage because that  
18 might apply to books or all kinds of things, but the  
19 question of whether or not it seems to me that much of  
20 what, not necessarily in the order that it was  
21 presented, but in the two episodes that I saw, the  
22 outlines definitely have it there. I mean we could take  
23 -- I found it interesting that the perspective is clear  
24 in here. At least it is clear to me.

25 MS. CHENEY: Well, since you are quoting

1 selectively from the proposal I am able to do that from  
2 memory having dealt with it for a number of months now.  
3 You will find repeated promises in the proposal that  
4 there will be on-camera interviews with people of  
5 diverse perspective. That there will be interviews with  
6 Africans of all points of view all across the economic  
7 and political spectrum. In order, this is a quote from  
8 the proposal: "In order to keep the film from  
9 degenerating into the idiosyncratic view of one person."  
10 And I can't think of a better description of that film  
11 then its being an idiosyncratic view of one person.

12 As far as whether or not this represents an  
13 African point of view, I haven't met to talk about the  
14 Quadafi segment too much, so indeed what one needs in  
15 nine hours of film are examples to see because it is so  
16 hard to grasp an entire nine hours. But it did occur to  
17 me that the Quadafi segment illustrates much of the  
18 problem in terms of it being an African point of view.  
19 The Quadafi segment does praise the Libyan leader. It  
20 does this in rather warm and friendly terms. I wondered  
21 to myself as I saw this, where was the interview in this  
22 film with the Egyptian leader who at a recent conference  
23 in non-aligning nations in Zimbabwe called Mumer Quadafi  
24 mentally disturbed.

25 I wondered as I saw this film where in it is



1 the interview with the leaders of the Ivory Coast and of  
2 the Cameroon who denounced Quadafi at the same  
3 conference of non-aligning nations. It disturbs me not  
4 only that the film is unremittingly anti-western in its  
5 perspective, it disturbs me that it is in fact not even  
6 an African point of view. That it is in fact  
7 idiosyncratic view of one person.

8 In so far as whether our stance has called  
9 undue attention to this film and perhaps had caused its  
10 review by more people than it would have been otherwise,  
11 I was concerned about that. I understand, I have been a  
12 journalist, I know that controversy attracts attention.  
13 And Professor Mazrui has taken particular delight in  
14 saying we asked her for \$50,000 for promotional money  
15 and she gave us so much more, meaning of course that I  
16 did so much more in terms of publicity. So I was quite  
17 ratified to see the ratings and the share that the show  
18 has gotten. In fact they have been mediocre.

19 People did turn in the first night in greater  
20 numbers than the subsequent nights. Your point is very  
21 well taken. The film is not well done, but that in  
22 itself would not be reason for the Endowment to withdraw  
23 its credits.

24 MR. KINGSTON: Fr. Schall. Jim.

25 FR. SCHALL: I was going to say that you said

1 that you wish this to be finished now and just by the  
2 symbolic act of removing the Endowment credits, this is  
3 petty, I know but, what about the \$50,000. Is that  
4 considered to be a gift?

5 MS. CHENEY: It is back in the bank.

6 FR. SCHALL: What?

7 MS. CHENEY: It is back in our bank. It did  
8 not go out.

9 FR. SCHALL: Oh, I see.

10 MS. CHENEY: It did not go out. The Council  
11 had approved the \$50,000 of promotional funding, but it  
12 was necessary for me to get final sign off before it  
13 went out. That was the occasion for my sitting down and  
14 looking and the film.

15 FR. SCHALL: So the \$50,000 doesn't get in.

16 MS. CHENEY: That is correct.

17 MR. KINGSTON: Please, Bea?

18 MS. HIMMELFARB: I just wanted to suggest that  
19 the point is not only ratings of the film, it is also  
20 the legitimacy and authority of the film. Whatever the  
21 ratings, whatever kind of publicity we gave I think is  
22 very, very important that we make the point that this  
23 film does not have the kind of authority it might well  
24 have had had we not made these negative points. It  
25 might have gone out to schools. It might have gone out

1 to the general public if it had been unchallenged. So  
2 for that reason I think it is very important to  
3 challenge it, whatever the \$50,000 worth of publicity.

4 MS. KERR: I think it has done that anyway.

5 MS. HIMMELFARB: It has given it legitimacy.

6 MS. KERR: No, it has gone out to the schools.

7 MS. HIMMELFARB: No, it has not. It has not  
8 given it legitimacy and authority. It has made points  
9 that the film --

10 MS. KERR: But, it has gone out to the  
11 schools.

12 MS. HIMMELFARB: -- is at best problematic and  
13 more probably that it is in fact has no intellectual  
14 legitimacy. And that is a very important point to make.

15 MS. CHENEY: I think it was important that  
16 parents and teachers understand that the film did not  
17 present a broad prospective on Africa. I also want to  
18 say that I sat down to view this film with the highest  
19 hopes and expectations. That I did not go into my nine  
20 hour session with any idea that I would see what I did  
21 and I was very uplifted by the wonderful music. The  
22 musical sound track of the film is quite marvelous. The  
23 opening credits are lovely. They are done with great  
24 creativity. And so it was with great disappointment  
25 that I watched it unfold and began to see that it was



1 necessary for us to withdraw our credit.

2 MR. KINGSTON: Francis?

3 MS. RHOME: I appreciate the comments that you  
4 have given us this morning having been an idster on  
5 this particular body. I can tell you that your desire  
6 that the whole discussion is finished will not be so  
7 because we suffered on the film regarding Chile for  
8 years and we were all declared monsters because of that.

9 I think an important point to make that some  
10 of us discussed at a Challenged Grants Committee  
11 yesterday and that is that in filming in that kind of a  
12 media that is going to go out to millions of persons, we  
13 do have to adduce some preliminary checking on all films  
14 before they are released with the credit. We suffer  
15 enough embarrassments with those of us who are doing  
16 workshops and conferences and anticipate that a certain  
17 professor is going to come in and give a certain view  
18 and discover that his preparedness or her preparedness  
19 may take us in other directions. And it is a recurring  
20 problem as to control from that standpoint.

21 On the other hand, you have made one very  
22 important statement. And that was that the entire issue  
23 has raised a discussion of Africa and an interest of  
24 Africa that will take us into other directions far  
25 beyond the expectancy of the film, rather than accepting

1 it as pat. Perhaps our citizenry as questioning all  
2 matters and all things that are in it. I witnessed the  
3 first segment at home and thought it was fine. I never  
4 got around to the others and it interested me in some  
5 respects. I witnessed the one yesterday and my concern  
6 was that it was so unprofessionally done for a final  
7 segment. And that it was very confusing. I couldn't  
8 follow the theme. And that disturbed me as much as  
9 anything else. Thank you for your comments.

10 MR. KINGSTON: Jo, please.

11 MS. CRESIMORE: I viewed the two episodes  
12 yesterday too, and I thank you for the opportunity to do  
13 that and I too ask for a copy of the full proposal and  
14 reviewed that last night. I did have one question in  
15 looking this proposal over.

16 It says in the proposal: "A television series  
17 on history of Africa, a highly complex continent,  
18 requires the assistance of Africans with expertise in  
19 specific areas and periods." And it goes on to say that  
20 there would be a panel of NEH consultants. Would you  
21 explain to me what that means and what role these people  
22 play, what function they play in this process?

23 MS. CHENEY: It is a misstatement. It just  
24 means the panel of scholars that we like to have  
25 involved in our media project. Don, isn't that correct?

1 MR. GIBSON: That is correct.

2 MS. CRESIMORE: Were they involved in the  
3 planning process? How involved were these people in  
4 this particular project?

5 MR. GIBSON: They were definitely involved in  
6 the planning process because we awarded -- we had a  
7 planning grant to plan the series. We are not aware at  
8 this point of how extensively they were involved in the  
9 actual viewing of rough cuts and final forms.

10 MS. CRESIMORE: Did you think they would be  
11 more involved than they were?

12 MR. GIBSON: It was our anticipation that they  
13 would be, yes.

14 MS. CRESIMORE: That is my question. Thank  
15 you.

16 MR. KINGSTON: Now, David.

17 MR. LOWENTHAL: I think the point was made  
18 over here, Ms. Kerr, that despite the public criticism  
19 and your withdrawal that this film is in fact going out  
20 to schools and might very well become a mainstay of the  
21 American view of Africa. That is not impossible. I was  
22 just wondering whether there is anything further we can  
23 do about that because I don't mean to stop it from doing  
24 that, but to put our oar in in some way as to make it  
25 just a little bit, make people hesitate a little bit



1 more before using this series.

2 I was really appalled by that final segment.  
3 It was so entirely one sided. You never did get a view  
4 of what was happening to the Africans politically. You  
5 know, to black Africa, the west was a monster. The  
6 United States was a capitalist corrupt place and you  
7 wondered how any progress could ever take place in this  
8 country. And to leave that view as the dominant view in  
9 the mind of young boys and girls, I think it is really  
10 very worrisome.

11 If it is true that in fact calls for this  
12 complicated program which we assisted in funding will  
13 actually increase and perhaps have a very marked effect,  
14 is there anything further that we can do?

15 MS. CHENEY: It is my feeling that we have  
16 done what is proper for us to do and that is call  
17 attention to the fact that it is seriously flawed. I  
18 would be happy to listen to other suggestions you might  
19 have, but having thought about it long and hard, it does  
20 seem to me that that is the proper role for the  
21 Endowment is to say that there is a problem here and you  
22 should be aware of it. The distribution is primarily,  
23 so far as I know, in colleges and universities, which is  
24 much less worrisome to me than if it were at the  
25 elementary level, for example.

1 MS. KERR: Just one, I perhaps saw this and  
2 maybe was looking at different things. I had not seen  
3 it before. I have heard its controversy, but I guess I  
4 am not quite sure that it is as single minded and one  
5 sided that you are suggesting. I heard in it very  
6 definite indictments of African self development, of  
7 local leaders who it was said had adopted western --  
8 they had taken on western -- they had become westernized  
9 without modernizing. They had adopted western  
10 consumption without adopting western skills.

11 Now it seems to me they are saying that there  
12 is an interlude of 400 years which we cannot deny took  
13 place and which admittedly there were some Africans  
14 involved. The fact of the matter is that there was a  
15 very much of a disruption. There is an indictment of  
16 local leaders. There is an indictment of local  
17 leadership. It ends with the notion that there is the  
18 day before yesterday which is forcefully bringing the  
19 day after tomorrow.

20 I think that we ourselves need to perhaps look  
21 beyond the hurt that we may feel about whatever and  
22 minimize perhaps some of the rhetoric. But there is a  
23 reality there that he is describing that we need to  
24 understanding as well.

25 MS. CHENEY: Unfortunately when Professor

1 Mazrui looked at the results of capitalism in Africa and  
2 when he looks at the results of marxism, for example,  
3 his views are not borne out by most serious scholars on  
4 the subject. When he looks at the Ivory Coast, for  
5 example, where capitalism has been very effective, and  
6 when people are relatively prosperous in relationship to  
7 the rest of Africa, he calls the country decadent. And  
8 in countries like Ethiopia where the consequences of  
9 marxism has been devastating for the people the problem  
10 is ignored.

11 So while it may well be true that capitalism  
12 has not been a universal benefit to Africa, it certainly  
13 has been a benefit sometime. What I missed in the film  
14 was any indication that it was of a benefit sometime.  
15 And in fact African leaders across the Continent are now  
16 moving increasingly in that direction.

17 MR. KINGSTON: Jeff?

18 MR. HART: David raised the question whether  
19 anything else might be done and I raise this question  
20 not specifically about The African, but when a grantee  
21 has grossly violated the terms under which the grant was  
22 given, have we ever considered the possibility of breach  
23 of contract suit to recover the grant?

24 MS. CHENEY: There is a specific remedy for  
25 this situation in our legislation, and it is the remedy



1 that I mentioned. You should disassociate yourself, the  
2 Congress says, from such a project. There is no  
3 specific remedy in the legislation that talks about  
4 getting money back.

5 Now it is true that it is possible to bring a  
6 suit even if that is not specifically authorized. It is  
7 a very messy process and as I thought about it the  
8 vision I had is a government agency with, excuse me  
9 Brent, lawyers paid for by the taxpayer, seeking to  
10 recover the taxpayer's fund from an entity that relies  
11 on a great deal of taxpayer money and would pay for  
12 their lawyers with the taxpayer's money. Looked at from  
13 that perspective it seems to me like pouring money down  
14 a rat hole.

15 MR. KINGSTON: David?

16 MR. LOWENTHAL: In response to the point about  
17 the series being critical of local African leaders, I  
18 only saw the last segment and I will only comment on  
19 that. But I would have been appreciative if having held  
20 up the west and western style countries, including South  
21 Africa, to the standard of liberty and equality, the  
22 standard that we ourselves accept from the Declaration  
23 of Independence, if Mazrui had then looked over all of  
24 Africa with that standard in mind, and never would have  
25 looked at Black nations as well as White nations in

1 Africa. And the impression that I got was totally,  
2 there is the thing I would like you to consider, Louise,  
3 and that is whether the same standard was being applied  
4 generally to all nations in Africa, Black and White.

5 And it seemed to me that it certainly was not.  
6 We didn't hear about Black despotisms in Africa. You  
7 didn't learn anything about the causing or not causing  
8 of further inequalities among Blacks in Africa, in most  
9 of the nations of Africa.

10 So if we only consider single point, it seems  
11 that in principle, far from getting an even handed look  
12 at how Africa would appear to a dispassionate person  
13 holding up the standard of liberty and equality, instead  
14 of getting that, which would have been a perfectly  
15 reasonable and admirable thing to do, you get a very one  
16 sided application of our standards in a way to us but no  
17 standards, no similar standards applied to the African  
18 nations per se.

19 MR. KINGSTON: Bill.

20 MR. ALLEN: Where is Bill Schaefer when we  
21 need him?

22 MR. KINGSTON: Bea.

23 MS. HIMMELFARB: It seems to me that the most  
24 important thing we can do, you ask what can we now do,  
25 what should we now do to follow up on Jeff, it seems to

1 me the most important thing we can do is to see to it  
2 that this doesn't happen again. And that means that  
3 reviewing the whole process and trying to set in place  
4 the kinds of procedures that will prevent a repeat of  
5 this unfortunate situation.

6 One of the main things we can do is to ask  
7 ourselves whether we inquired closely enough into the  
8 credentials of the people who request these very large  
9 public grants. And that means what was their work like  
10 before, what was their writings like, what could we  
11 expect from them by way of actual performance.

12 In the case of Mazrui, I think a very close  
13 examination would have revealed cause for very close  
14 inquiry at the very least and possibly some cause for  
15 suspicion. I don't remember exactly when his Reese  
16 lectures were delivered. Do you have any memory of that  
17 off-hand?

18 MS. CHENEY: It would have been the early  
19 '80's I think.

20 MS. HIMMELFARB: And was it before we started  
21 this grant? We should have looked closely at that. And  
22 I think many of the problems would have emerged at that  
23 point.

24 MS. KERR: That was the point that I was  
25 trying to make. That everything that there was to know

1 we knew. And I guess what disturbs me about this is it  
2 is a -- I am not a lawyer, but I guess I respect the  
3 Constitution especially in those instances when I see  
4 that when I might use it against others that they might  
5 use it against me. The kind of precedent that you  
6 suggest will of course be a precedent to be used in all  
7 kinds of ways in the future and I think it is not  
8 necessarily one that I would recommend.

9 MS. HIMMELFARB: What is it we do, Louise,  
10 when we ask for letters of reference, when we ask for  
11 publication data? We are looking at the credentials of  
12 the person to find out whether they are respectful.

13 MS. KERR: My point is that we had that. This  
14 is an outline of what to expect. We knew who was in  
15 charge. We knew what to expect at the time and we gave  
16 the grant. That is my point. And that this is sort of  
17 ex post facto and it is really not a good thing for us  
18 to do because perspective is perspective. The next time  
19 it might be a different perspective which we might like  
20 now but somebody else might not like in the future. It  
21 is a dangerous game to play is all I am trying to tell  
22 you.

23 MS. CHENEY: Louise, let me suggest that you  
24 have missed my main point and it hasn't, as I say, we  
25 can't deny I knew there was a danger of being



1 misunderstood. If you look carefully at the grant  
2 proposal you will see repeated promises that there will  
3 be on-camera interviews with people of diverse  
4 prospective. The particular guidelines under which WETA  
5 applied for this grant not only said that the Endowment  
6 finds ineligible for funding projects that portray a  
7 single political point of view, the guidelines says  
8 specifically on controversial issues a variety of points  
9 of view must be brought to bear.

10 The proposal that we looked at fit those  
11 guidelines admirably. It promised to bring many  
12 perspectives to bear on controversial issues. It did  
13 not. That is the crucial matter here.

14 MS. KERR: It seems to me, still, that this  
15 might be fudging it. This might actually be -- this  
16 might not be addressing the issue directly. I think  
17 that makes it a problem of quality. I think that  
18 results in a bad film because it is one sided. And we  
19 don't withdraw money or we don't take our name off of  
20 bad books or bad conferences and bad -- this is a bad  
21 film.

22 MS. CHENEY: That is right. And I didn't take  
23 the logo off because it was a bad film, I took it off  
24 because it violated the guidelines. There is also a  
25 fundamental difference between a project that is meant

1 to air on the public airways where specific legislation  
2 is in place that required a balanced point of view.  
3 There is a fundamental difference between that and a  
4 book.

5 MR. KINGSTON: Bob?

6 MR. LAXALT: Speaking from a journalistic  
7 background it is personal opinion after having seen only  
8 one segment, it did not even approach objectivity. Now  
9 short of censorship in the NEH process, do any of the  
10 panelists scrutinize these films and give any say or  
11 report back to the Council saying, "Hey, this is loaded,  
12 this is not conforming to guidelines."?

13 MS. HIMMELFARB: It is too late.

14 MR. LAXALT: No, for future projects.

15 MS. CHENEY: Well, we have not been unmindful  
16 of Bea's points that we need to have a more careful  
17 process. Don has instituted or is about to institute --  
18 why don't I let him describe that for you? I will  
19 describe a few other things.

20 We are now, for example, on our media projects  
21 putting as part of the grant conditions the particular  
22 guidelines that require balance.

23 MRS. RICARDO-CAMPBELL May I speak? I happen  
24 to have a handbook.

25 MS. CHENEY: Sure, just a second. We are



1 recommending and will be instituting plans to require  
2 more by way of the shooting script and full scripts  
3 before we go to funding. I think if we had seen scripts  
4 in this case, if we had funded in an intermediate stage  
5 we would have been much better off. Don, would you  
6 quickly describe the plan that you have to bring in film  
7 producers?

8 MR. GIBSON: We are going to require more  
9 detail on full scripts on any television or radio  
10 production. Secondly, we are now requesting or  
11 requiring that project directors of projects, especially  
12 new project directors with us, that they visit the  
13 Endowment and that we review with them, prior to the  
14 beginning a project, all of the conditions involving  
15 other requirements that we have for a film. We think  
16 that will go a long way toward correcting these  
17 problems.

18 MR. KINGSTON: Rita, please.

19 MRS. RICARDO-CAMPBELL Thank you. That was in  
20 answer to some of the questions I raised as a non-member  
21 of the Challenge Committee yesterday. I am in full  
22 agreement with Gertrude and Bob Laxalt that basically  
23 the thing you have to do is avoid it happening again.  
24 And I am glad to hear some of the process is going to be  
25 reviewed. I even have a thought of a particular

1 producer whom I am sure will do it. He was a White  
2 House fellow and could be involved very early. And I  
3 think that it is given of these media grants primarily  
4 to public television stations which came up in the  
5 challenged grant, which are supposed to be informative  
6 to the public, have kind of a different relationship  
7 than say even the Cosby show which spoke to the  
8 producer on that.

9 Basically they open the door because their not  
10 as Louise said as professional in some instances as are  
11 the commercial television stations which have more money  
12 to spend, if you want to be frank about it. The more  
13 money we have the better the people are that you usually  
14 get.

15 And I think that basically you just have to  
16 have, as Don said, in process continually monitoring of  
17 your media on large size grants.

18 MS. CHENEY: There is truth in what you say,  
19 but it is also true that the Endowment can never become  
20 a film producer. That the Endowment can never become a  
21 film censor. I think that what I have done has  
22 concerned people in public television because they see  
23 us hovering over their shoulders and saying, "Oh, no,  
24 you can't do that, oh, yes, you can do that." That is  
25 not our intention at all.

1           The creative process is a mysterious one that  
2 we have no desire whatsoever to dampen. We are,  
3 however, a public agency. We are entrusted with the  
4 taxpayer's funds. It is our responsibility, as I see  
5 it, to make sure that the people who come to us for  
6 applications understand the necessity for balance in  
7 media projects. And that we take whatever steps that we  
8 can up front, before our money goes out, to make sure  
9 that the project promises to be a balanced one.

10                   Introduction of New Staff

11           MR. KINGSTON: If we may we will move on in  
12 the agenda. This issue has been discussed at the will  
13 of the Council at subsequent meetings.

14           As is true in the fall quarter we have a good  
15 number of staff members who have arrived at the  
16 Endowment and I would just simply like to associate  
17 their names and faces. You have a more complete  
18 description of their backgrounds in your packet.

19           Tom Adams is in the Division of Education  
20 Programs. Tom is back over here. Bridget Bradley is  
21 with General Programs. There is Bridget over here. Pam  
22 Cardwell is in the Office of Personnel. Is Pam here?  
23 Right over here on the left. Okay. Brent Hatch, most  
24 of you met yesterday. Brent is our new General Counsel.  
25 Susie Jones, Susie is in General Programs. Kathleen



1 Mitchell, Kathleen had been in IPA and has joined the  
2 staff permanantly in Fellowships. Patrick Nolan, Pat  
3 has an IPA appointment in the Division of Research  
4 Programs. Dennis Romano, Dennis also holds an IPA  
5 appointment in Research. And Jane Rosenberg, new  
6 Program Officer in the Division of Research Programs and  
7 Marguerite Sullivan I believe you met yesterday too.  
8 Marguerite is behind me, our Director of The Office of  
9 Public Affairs.

10 Contracts Awarded in the Previous Quarter

11 MR. KINGSTON: In your Agenda Book you have a  
12 listing of two contracts that were awarded in the last  
13 quarter. I have asked if there are any questions about  
14 either of those two contracts.

15 One of them is to Mr. Carl Dolan. Carl is the  
16 coordinator of our Access to Excellence Program which  
17 was described to you six months ago. Carl, are you  
18 here? Carl is way in the back there.

19 Final Fiscal Year Reports: Applications; Matching  
20 and Obligations

21 MR. KINGSTON: All right. The next item on  
22 the agenda is the report of the fiscal year 1986. Mr.  
23 Cherrington.

24 MR. CHERRINGTON: I have three reports that  
25 summarize the Endowment grant activity in 1986. They



1 are all in your brown folder. First I will discuss the  
2 application report. The report this Council compares  
3 and summarizes the Council actions in fiscal years 1985  
4 and 1986. In brief, the application that you reviewed  
5 were up about seven percent. The applications you  
6 recommended for funding were up about four percent.

7 These increases can be traced mainly to the  
8 Younger Scholars Program, especially the highly  
9 successful Bicentennial Program for Younger Scholars  
10 that John Agresto announced last fall.

11 Actually applications were down in quite a few  
12 programs throughout the Endowment, but the increases in  
13 a few smaller grant programs somewhat masked this  
14 decrease. We think that perhaps potential applicants  
15 might have been a bit discouraged by the Gramm-Rudman  
16 Hollings Act.

17 The main point to make here is that  
18 applications in the Endowment succeeded about a one to  
19 four ratio.

20 MS. KERR: Would you repeat that line?

21 MR. CHERRINGTON: Sure. Applications succeed  
22 here about one out of four. Yes.

23 MS. KERR: Is there any chance of maybe doing  
24 a spot check to see whether it is something more than  
25 Gramm-Rudman? That is to say whether or not the

1 programs themselves are loosing attraction.

2 MR. CHERRINGTON: Well, we have done a little  
3 bit of looking into this. I mentioned before that  
4 education has come up with some new guidelines that they  
5 think would be more receptive in the field and they are  
6 scheduling a couple of conferences to try to build up  
7 applications.

8 We asked around the individual programs.  
9 There is no real sense of any real reasons that might  
10 have caused anything. There were no real changes in  
11 deadlines or guidelines that would have precipitated the  
12 decline.

13 MS. KERR: It is my suspicion that there may  
14 in some programs have reached a saturation point for  
15 certain kinds of activities. I mean there is only so  
16 much that you can with core programs. So maybe we might  
17 want to do a tiny bit of encouraging of innovation or  
18 new perspectives or something.

19 MR. CHERRINGTON: All right. We are certainly  
20 trying to do that in education.

21 MR. KINGSTON: Other comments or questions?

22 Matching Grants

23 MR. KINGSTON: All right, Steve, the fiscal  
24 1987 appropriations.

25 MR. CHERRINGTON: I have the matching part

1 first off.

2 MR. KINGSTON: I am sorry.

3 MR. CHERRINGTON: There is a memo in the  
4 folder from me describing a matching activity Endowment  
5 last year. The first report shows match is broken down  
6 by program. The second report further breaks down all  
7 matching offers that were closed during 1986.

8 Basically we did \$15.4 million in matching in  
9 1986. This excludes the Challenge Grant Program. This  
10 is down a bit from 1985, but it can be explained  
11 basically by two factors. One, State programs is now  
12 closing out all matching offers at the end of the fiscal  
13 year. Each succeeding year each State Council will  
14 begin the year with a brand new grant and a brand new  
15 matching offer. States are now able to raise more gifts  
16 than our matching offers. This is a great development  
17 and appoints to the growing fiscal stability of the  
18 Council. Margie and her staff have done some good work  
19 here.

20 In Research, the decline with matching is  
21 quite simple. The New York Public Library Grant is now  
22 done as a Challenge Grant.

23 One thing that is rather remarkable is that  
24 the percentage of all offers closed of all gifts raised  
25 is going up for the fifth year in a row. It is now 81

1 percent. The matching activity in 1987 should be strong  
2 as well. The Treasury Appropriation we have is the  
3 highest that we have ever had.

4 The final in this section is the report on  
5 obligations. There was a memo from me in the file  
6 attached to a chart that we call the Summary of Grants  
7 and Awards. This chart basically shows how we spent our  
8 money in 1986. Every Endowment grant that receives any  
9 money in 1986 is included in this chart.

10 This will include a new grant awarded in 1986  
11 plus any previously awarded grant that received an  
12 amendment of G and M funds or outright funds in 1986.

13 You will notice that the full appropriation  
14 for the National Capital Arts and Cultural Affairs  
15 Program is also obligated in 1986.

16 MR. KINGSTON: Any questions about the  
17 matching funds or obligations for fiscal 1986? Rita?

18 MRS. RICARDO-CAMPBELL Just a suggestion.  
19 Isn't it possible that these could be mailed to us, say,  
20 a week ahead? To expect one to look through ten or  
21 twelve or fifteen pages of statistics right at the  
22 moment I think is difficult.

23 MR. CHERRINGTON: We will try to do what we  
24 can. Some of these things occur right at the end of the  
25 year and it is a little difficult.



1 MRS. RICARDO-CAMPBELL I realize that the  
2 budget process is --

3 MR. CHERRINGTON: We will do what we can.

4 MR. KINGSTON: We have tried to get these  
5 materials to your packets at the Committee meetings on  
6 Thursdays so that you do have them 24 hours in advance  
7 at least.

8 MRS. RICARDO-CAMPBELL But we didn't get them.  
9 At least I didn't see them yesterday.

10 MR. KINGSTON: These materials were in the  
11 packets yesterday, I believe.

12 MRS. RICARDO-CAMPBELL Not in mine.

13 Fiscal Year 1987 Appropriations

14 MR. KINGSTON: All right. The report on 1987  
15 appropriations.

16 MR. CHERRINGTON: One report that we  
17 definitely could not have gotten to you -- yes.

18 MR. BERNS: Is this a particular tab?

19 MR. CHERRINGTON: Not a particular tab.  
20 Again, in the brown folder there will be a chart. This  
21 one is labeled FY 1987 Appropriations.

22 MR. BERNS: I put it in the tab C.

23 MR. CHERRINGTON: This is definitely one tab  
24 we could have not gotten to you in advance because we  
25 certainly had quite a few delays in getting our

1 appropriation this year. We finally got it on October  
2 18th which was a Saturday. We have been through four  
3 continuing resolutions before that point. In fact  
4 because of all this they had to close down the  
5 Government on October 17th and we all got a half day  
6 off.

7 Every year Congress and the President seem to  
8 go through this process. We now call it "budget  
9 chicken."

10 The final budget that we did get for 1987 is  
11 very similar to the '86 appropriation that we received  
12 before the Gramm-Rudman sequestration kicked in. As I  
13 said before, the Treasury funds appropriation is the  
14 highest that we have ever had. The appropriation for  
15 the National Capital Arts and Cultural Affairs Program  
16 was doubled to \$4 million dollars in 1987.

17 We don't think Gramm-Rudman will be a factor  
18 in 1987. The way it was set up the budget deficit  
19 target for '87 was supposed to be \$144 million. If the  
20 projected budget deficit was \$10 million dollars more  
21 than that then a sequestration percentage was supposed  
22 to kick in.

23 Well, at the very end of the process, the end  
24 of the budget process, they pulled a lot of smokes and  
25 mirrors out here because they sold some Federal assets.

1 They sold Conrail. There were some one time only breaks  
2 in the new tax law and a few creative bookkeeping ideas.  
3 They were able to meet this deficit target.

4 They said all along that -- Congress said all  
5 along that they didn't want to meet Gramm-Rudman in '87  
6 using the tax bill. But in the end that is what they  
7 did.

8 In 1988, the Gramm-Rudman target is \$108  
9 billion and that may be much harder to reach. It should  
10 be interesting.

11 MR. KINGSTON: Any questions about fiscal '87  
12 appropriations?

13 NEH Policy Regarding Eligibility of Institutions  
14 and Individuals with Outstanding Financial  
15 Obligations

16 MR. KINGSTON: If not, Steve, would you have  
17 the report -- no, I am sorry.

18 Council members received from me a couple  
19 weeks ago a memorandum describing the eligibility of  
20 institutions and individuals with outstanding financial  
21 obligations. Are there any questions or comments you  
22 would wish to raise about that memorandum? Louise.

23 MS. KERR: This is my fifth last meeting and  
24 it might be my last meeting so I am going to get my  
25 conversations in. I did raise this at the Committee

1 meeting yesterday and they decided to take no action and  
2 recommended that I bring it directly to floor.

3 As quoting from your circular, from your  
4 memorandum, you say that the OMB except where required  
5 by law or approved by head of agency no award of Federal  
6 funds shall be made to an applicant who is delinquent on  
7 any Federal debt presumably. The Endowment has a  
8 directive which states: "The grants office will be  
9 responsible for final budget review before final awards  
10 are made and will request credit reports and other  
11 pertinent information on potential grantees presumably  
12 all potential grantees whose credit where the necessary  
13 financial liabilities have been seriously questioned."

14 I would like to request some consideration,  
15 not necessarily openly here on I don't know how it came  
16 up, but I would like the Council or the Chairman to  
17 consider whether or not it is redundant and perhaps a  
18 little punitive to specify student loans particularly  
19 publicly on the application as one form of indebtedness  
20 or failure to make payment to the Government or lack of  
21 credit.

22 MS. CHENEY: I see no problem with expanding  
23 and to declaring eligible applicants that are delinquent  
24 in a more general way that OMB sets forth.

25 MS. KERR: And to take away the specification.



1 I would appreciate that. Thank you.

2 MS. CHENEY: And it would include student  
3 loans but also include other forms of indebtedness.

4 MS. KERR: Thank you.

5 MR. KINGSTON: Other comments or questions?

6 Committee Reports on Policy and General Matters

7 MR. KINGSTON: All right. We will move on to  
8 the Committee Reports, matters of policy and general  
9 matters.

10 Bill Allen for Education.

11 MR. ALLEN: Thank you, Tom. The Education  
12 Committee met yesterday with two of its four members  
13 present. The Committee's public session began with  
14 introductions and farewells as usual. We welcome to the  
15 Division four new program officers. Barbara Ashbrook,  
16 Exemplary Projects and Tom Adams who you have met this  
17 morning. Jean D'Amato who came over to us from General  
18 and Judy Jeffrey Howard, Central Disciples. Two new  
19 secretaries, Vivian Cook in Exemplary Projects and  
20 Cynthia Gray in General Disciples.

21 We also greeted Carl Dolan, the Endowment's  
22 new Access to Excellence Officer. Meanwhile, with great  
23 sadness we bid God's speed to Sara Chapman who will soon  
24 be leaving her post as Assistant Director for Exemplary  
25 Projects to accept a research fellowship at Princeton

1 University.

2 We then turn to Division Director Pam Menke  
3 for a report on recent Division activities. Mr. Menke  
4 pointed out that by the end of the year, she and other  
5 representatives of the Division will have had direct  
6 contact with more than three hundred institutions  
7 through activities designed to encourage new  
8 applications.

9 She described a number of regional conferences  
10 principally in the mid-west and the south. And said  
11 that during the next two month, the Division of  
12 Education Programs of the Division of Fellowship and  
13 seminars will be co-hosting technical assistance  
14 workshops and faculty and administrators from  
15 historically Black colleges and universities.

16 She also told the Committee that the Division  
17 will be sponsoring three regional meetings in the  
18 spring, one in Tampa, one in College Park and one in San  
19 Antonio. These to cultivate new applications and to  
20 provide guidance to newly funded Project Directors. We  
21 were pleased to learn about these activities.

22 We then turn to the principal item of  
23 discussion of the public session on draft version of the  
24 Education Divisions new guidelines. At its last meeting  
25 the Committee had asked the Division to consider ways of

1 revising its guidelines to encourage more creative  
2 proposals. We think that the new approach to the  
3 guidelines, as indicated in the draft that was  
4 circulated to us prior to the meeting, will help  
5 accomplish that objective and we praise the new  
6 statement for its clarity and for what Frances Rhome  
7 described as a nice spirit.

8 We noted the presence of a representative of  
9 the National Humanities Alliance in our public session  
10 and suggested that the Division obtain that and other  
11 organization's reactions to the new guidelines before  
12 making them final as well as your comments on the  
13 previous guidelines.

14 One element in the draft that elicited  
15 disagreement was a sentence indicating that quote  
16 "Because it is essential that students be firmly  
17 grounded in the culture of which they are a part, the  
18 Endowment especially welcomes applications aimed at  
19 strengthening education in western civilization," closed  
20 quotation.

21 I said that after some initial hesitation  
22 about dangers inherent, including that sentence, I was  
23 not comfortable with it. I pointed out that the  
24 sentence appears in the context of a paragraph  
25 presenting a more catholic perspective on the humanities



1 and I therefore felt that it would be useful as a way of  
2 emphasizing the kinds of projects the Endowment is  
3 particularly interested in encouraging.

4 Frances Rhome, on the other hand, described it  
5 as unnecessary and said that it was likely to be read by  
6 potential applicants as unduly restrictive. She  
7 expressed confidence that a large number of applications  
8 will continue to focus on western civilization without  
9 an explicit statement to encourage them and she said  
10 that she would be more comfortable with guidelines if  
11 they did not include this sentence. We agreed to  
12 disagreed.

13 MR. KINGSTON: Thank you. Any comments or  
14 questions?

15 MS. SILVERS: Not to prolong the discussion,  
16 very much, Bill, but I wonder, the expression western  
17 civilization, which I am sure is a product of a lot of  
18 discussion, is on the name of a standard fall back  
19 course in the Academy. And I am just wondering whether  
20 that expression might not elicit, not what we are  
21 looking for, but instead applications for standard  
22 western civ courses which often, by the way, are our  
23 survey courses and are probably not what we are aiming  
24 at since I think we are aiming at encouraging students  
25 to have more engagement with work setting the standard



1 instead of survey courses.

2 MR. ALLEN: You know, Anita, I pointed out at  
3 the outset that we were understaffed in our, that is  
4 under Counclilled in our committee yesterday. There were  
5 only two of us. And this is a very fine point which we  
6 did not in fact reflect on. I certainly agree and you  
7 have called it to the attention of the Chairman of the  
8 staff and I am sure that it will be taken note of at  
9 least so far as to lower case western.

10 MS. SILVERS: Uppercase civ.

11 (Laughter.)

12 MR. KINGSTON: Frances.

13 MS. RHOME: And I may add that we certainly do  
14 want to have a number of these kind of proposals to be  
15 coming in regardless. My concern was that because  
16 people read our guidelines very, very carefully in order  
17 to determine that the particular grant proposal that  
18 they are making will fit, that they might be more bent  
19 to leave out some of the creative aspects in other areas  
20 and stick to just that subject. And that is where I  
21 found it restrictive.

22 MR. KINGSTON: Thank you. Any other comments  
23 or questions? Fellowships, Bea Himmelfarb.

24 MS. HIMMELFARB: Our Committee opened by  
25 welcoming our two new members, Robert Howedroner (?),

1 new Council Committee member and Kathleen Mitchell the  
2 new Program Officer for Travel Collections. We then  
3 initiated our two members into one of our typically long  
4 and arduous sessions. We want it noted that we worked  
5 through lunch until well after 5:00 o'clock reviewing  
6 some 1750 applications, 63 in detail, having read the  
7 full applications.

8 As our Chairman remarked this morning, we  
9 earned our per diem. We then discussed at the last  
10 meeting the Committee had requested that staff define  
11 more fully the word "seminal text" as we use it in the  
12 summer Seminars for Secondary School Teachers' Program.  
13 And Steve Tigner responded with an admirably full and  
14 very thoughtful essay, long essay on just the subject,  
15 reviewing the way the term had been used in the past and  
16 after discussion of that we concluded that, in fact,  
17 that our guidelines required only some smallest changes  
18 in wording. The present wording will be: "At the core  
19 of the Summer Seminar and Secondary Schools Teachers'  
20 Program is the belief that the significant text of  
21 civilization form the foundation of learning in the  
22 humanities." Thank you.

23 MR. KINGSTON: Any comments or questions?

24 A report from the Preservation Committee, Dick  
25 Schall.

1 FR. SCHALL: We had two of our four members  
2 there also and we had no real public business or  
3 discussion. Mr. Cannon did wish to call to your  
4 attention and as I did too the very fine book dedicated  
5 to the notion of the and the practice of the -- it is  
6 called "Care and Identification of 19th Century  
7 Photographic Prints" by James M. Reilly of the Rochester  
8 Institute of Technology. I think I will pass this  
9 around with the encouragement that probably since we are  
10 all of the age that none of us have a baby picture in  
11 here so we don't need to worry about it, none of us have  
12 a 19th century print which would be something that our  
13 mothers took of us when we were young.

14 But in any case, one of the concerns of the  
15 Preservation Committee has always been the notion not  
16 nearly of the preservation of the documents, but the  
17 techniques and a way to do this and the knowledge of  
18 this and this book is dedicated to that so I will pass  
19 it around.

20 MR. KINGSTON: Thank you. Research Programs,  
21 Walter Berns.

22 Research Programs

23 MR. BERNs: Oh, sorry. As usual the Research  
24 Division had no members of the public present during the  
25 public session, but we did have an item of public



1 business to discuss which is a change from the past. We  
2 discussed the policy which has been in effect since 1982  
3 of allowing the gift portion of a matching gift grant to  
4 be used to support foreign fellows. And we discussed  
5 that at some length and decided that we would make the  
6 change in that policy and in the future would not allow  
7 the gift portion of that gift in the match grant to be  
8 used in that fashion although admitting the possibility  
9 of making exceptions to that policy, that new policy  
10 when the occasion demands.

11 MRS. RICARDO-CAMPBELL Can I ask for  
12 elucidation? Does this mean, precisely I am thinking of  
13 the center that is near us that they could not accept a  
14 gift of money from outside non matching to support the  
15 foreign fellows?

16 MR. BERNES: No. I probably should have  
17 mentioned that we discussed at some length the probable  
18 consequence of this. Probably in most cases Institutes  
19 of Advanced Study and of the sort that you are thinking  
20 of would indeed have ready access to all kinds of  
21 private funds and would be able to use those funds to  
22 support the fellows that would no longer be supportable  
23 under our particular program. We also looked at the  
24 possibility that it would probably be some laundering of  
25 funds. But so be it.



1 MR. KINGSTON: Any other comments or  
2 questions?

3 The report then from General Programs.  
4 Kathleen Kilpatrick.

5 General Program

6 MS. KILPATRICK: With three of our five  
7 members present, we opened the meeting by welcoming the  
8 new member to the Committee, Professor David Lowenthal,  
9 Chairman of the Political Science Department at Boston  
10 College. The Committee discussed the overall mission of  
11 the Division of General Programs and the Endowment's  
12 role in Public Education.

13 Questions were raised about the boundaries  
14 between NEH support for exhibitions and that provided by  
15 the Arts Endowment. Don Gibson explained that there are  
16 a number of gray areas but he stressed the central role  
17 of interpretation and of education of the general public  
18 and humanities projects. The Committee also discussed  
19 an issue of perennial concern to the Council and to the  
20 staff. Dr. Lowenthal opened this discussion by asking  
21 whether the Endowment's funding should reflect a more  
22 precise set of priorities among themes and topics and  
23 the Committee considered the role that special  
24 initiatives have played in focusing attention on  
25 important subjects such as the Bicentennial of the

1 Constitution.

2 Mr. Gibson also reminded the Committee that  
3 all of the Division's guidelines emphasized that three  
4 areas of particular interest. The guidelines state that  
5 all projects must focus upon the themes or ideas central  
6 to the disciplines of the humanities. They also must  
7 broaden public understanding of cultural works, explore  
8 historical figures or events or educate the public about  
9 the methods and insights of the disciplines of the  
10 humanities.

11 We received a number of current museum  
12 catalogs including several items stemming from the  
13 Festival of India and from a special exhibition in  
14 Philadelphia commemorating the Bicentennial of the  
15 Constitution.

16 Finally, we discussed the Bicentennial  
17 Bookshelf. This program is designed to pay tribute the  
18 Constitution and to call attention to several scholarly  
19 volumes. As many of you already know the Chairman  
20 announced this program a few weeks ago.

21 Under the guidelines for these grants, the  
22 Endowment will offer to match up to \$500 raised by  
23 libraries wishing to purchase references on the  
24 Constitution. Chairman, that concludes my report.

25 MR. KINGSTON: Thank you, Kathleen. Any

1 questions or comments?

2 Our report from State Programs, Jeff Hart.

3 State Programs

4 MR. HART: Thank you. The State Programs  
5 Committee will be pleased to welcome Sandra Myers,  
6 President and Jamiel Zainaldin, Executive Director of  
7 the Federation of State Humanities Councils. During the  
8 public session of the meeting, a report on the annual  
9 meeting of the Federation of the State Humanities  
10 Council by the two council members who attended, Ms.  
11 Cressimore and Fr. Schall, was very illuminating.

12 They commended the organization of the  
13 meeting, the spirit of cooperation and the high quality  
14 of the talks delivered. Jamiel Zainaldin reported on  
15 the intense effort being made by the Federation to  
16 identify successful State Bicentennial Programs and make  
17 him available to conferences, libraries, seminars,  
18 institutes and civic groups and schools. There will be  
19 available a guide to the Bicentennial Bookshelf of  
20 public programs.

21 Harash Gregorian gave an interim report on  
22 collaborative programs going forward between State  
23 Councils and other groups. The full report is due in  
24 January.

25 Margorie Berlincourt reported on the new

1 format for the orientation conferences for new State  
2 Council members.

3 The fiscal year '87 budget was discussed.  
4 Thank you.

5 MR. KINGSTON: Any comments or questions about  
6 State Programs? Then we will move to Challenge Grants.  
7 George Carey.

8 MR. CAREY: During its open session, the  
9 Challenge Grant Committee reviewed the present policies  
10 concerning second challenge grants. The sudden increase  
11 in the proportion of highly recommended second awards in  
12 this years cycle compared to the three previous cycles  
13 in which applications for second challenged grants were  
14 eligible lead the staff to prepare a special memorandum  
15 as a context for our discussion at this meeting.

16 Our current policy for second challenged  
17 grants was adopted by the Council in 1982 and allows  
18 institutions to submit proposals for a second award  
19 provided that at least two calendar years have elapsed  
20 since the successful conclusion of their first grant.  
21 Such applicants are expected to provide a full account  
22 of the programatic and financial impact of the first  
23 challenge grant and a convincing argument why a second  
24 award is needed in view of these considerations.

25 In the first three cycles this policy was in



1 effect the percentage of second grants in the entire  
2 cycle of awards ranged from 13 to 24 percent, a  
3 proportion that the Council found appropriate. During  
4 this time the Endowment followed the general policy  
5 recommended by the Council that no absolute ceiling  
6 should be placed on the proportion of second challenged  
7 grants in a given cycle, but that a lower priority  
8 should be given to proposals for second awards than  
9 those recommended for initial grants when their merits  
10 were otherwise approximate equal.

11 By the end of its discussion, the Committee  
12 decided that at this point a policy that allows for the  
13 controlled continuance of second time awards seems  
14 preferable to the alternative of simply terminating the  
15 possibility of second grants. The substantive reasons  
16 that originally influenced the Council to permit second  
17 awards are still essentially valid.

18 Providing that support for all highly  
19 meritorious first time applicants can be assured and the  
20 number of second grants controlled fairly, it seems  
21 worthwhile trying for at least one more cycle to  
22 maintain the option of making both types of challenge  
23 grant.

24 To this end the program guidelines will be  
25 amended to make clear that initial challenge grants will

1 have absolute priority and that the Endowment will offer  
2 awards to all highly meritorious proposals for a first  
3 challenge grant before making any second grants.

4 Furthermore, in establishing priorities among  
5 candidates for second challenge grants, the size of the  
6 first award would be taken into account.

7 With these changes in place the Committee  
8 believes that the Endowment will have the flexibility to  
9 implement a policy giving priority to first time  
10 challenge grants while retaining the opportunity of  
11 offering second awards in those instances where they  
12 seem merited. That is our report.

13 MR. KINGSTON: Thank you, George. Any  
14 comments or questions?

15 MR. BERNES: Yes. Good luck.

16 MR. KINGSTON: Bob Hollander.

17 MR. HOLLANDER: That is always going to be a  
18 problem with challenge grants. And now that you have  
19 been around the country once do you really want to put a  
20 dollar amount? I know you have done it, but maybe it is  
21 not too late. I am very concerned about the second part  
22 of that. Absolute dollars do not seem to me as  
23 important consideration as the comparative worth,  
24 though you would have larger institutions and smaller  
25 institutions. What you are really doing is

1 discriminating, it seems to me, probably against larger  
2 institutions which tend to ask for more money. That  
3 doesn't seem to me to be the right way to go about it.

4 MR. BLESSING: The size of the previous grant  
5 will taken into account in a relative sense. We  
6 understand the point that you are making. Some  
7 institutions are large and have large needs and others  
8 are smaller and have smaller needs. And of course that  
9 would be a consideration.

10 MR. HOLLANDER: Have we asked for distinction?

11 MR. BLESSING: No, we haven't asked.

12 MR. KINGSTON: Rita?

13 MRS. RICARDO-CAMPBELL I would just like to  
14 comment that we haven't gone around the country once. I  
15 notice, well, the geographic distribution this time is  
16 far different than what it had been in the past and that  
17 is indicative we have not gone around the country once.

18 MR. KINGSTON: Other comments or questions?

19 Even though the Jefferson Lecture Committee  
20 did not meet, we do have an internal progress report.  
21 Lawrence Chickering.

22 Jefferson Lecture

23 MR. CHICKERING: In preparing for selection  
24 for the Jefferson Lecture for 1988, the Jefferson  
25 Lecture Committee requested last spring that staff



1 solicit a new slate of nominees. Traditionally this  
2 solicitation has occurred every two or three years.  
3 Those asked to nominate candidates for the Jefferson  
4 Lecture include all present and past Council members,  
5 past Chairmen of the Endowment, the Executive Directors,  
6 Chairmen of the State Humanities Councils, former  
7 Jefferson Lecturers, Directors of major research  
8 libraries and museums, the Directors of major academic  
9 centers, the Editors of major national magazines, the  
10 heads of education and humanities related associations,  
11 major foundation presidents and the heads of scholarly  
12 societies.

13 The invitation to nominate will be mailed next  
14 and during January the staff will prepare short  
15 biographies for all nominees. At the February meeting  
16 at the Council, the Committee will meet Thursday  
17 afternoon to review and discuss the full list of  
18 nominees and to select 10 to 20 finalists from that  
19 list.

20 Prior to the May meeting of the Council, staff  
21 will prepare more extensive biographies of the finalists  
22 and will mail the information to all Council members.  
23 The Committee will present its final recommendations to  
24 the full Council at the May meeting.

25 The announcement of the Council selection of



1 the 1987 Jefferson Lecturer will be made public actually  
2 today when the Endowment is sending out a press release  
3 announcing that Forrest McDonald, noted historian of the  
4 U.S. Constitution, and Professor of History at the  
5 University of Alabama, has been selected as the 1987  
6 Jefferson Lecturer in the humanities.

7 FR. SCHALL: Can I ask you, how many responses  
8 do you get generally speaking from that initial  
9 invitation to suggest people for the award? How many  
10 people actually respond to that from the wide variety of  
11 people you have seen?

12 MR. CHICKERING: Since this is only done every  
13 two or three years, I don't have personal experience  
14 with it.

15 MR. KINGSTON: The general expectation is 25  
16 to 35 percent will respond. It is a fairly high return  
17 because it is a selected group.

18 Any other comments or questions?

19 Emergency Grants and Actions Departing From  
20 Council Recommendation - Approvals

21 MR. KINGSTON: In Tab E of the Council Agenda  
22 Book there are descriptions for eight emergency grants  
23 that were awarded in the last quarter. These are  
24 approved grants only. I will ask now if you have any  
25 comments or questions about the eight approved emergency

1 grants?

2 There are also two departures from Council  
3 Recommendations that represent approvals. They are  
4 described on the second section. Once again they are  
5 only approvals. Are there any comments or questions  
6 about either of those approvals? Louise?

7 MS. KERR: Nothing.

8 MR. KINGSTON: Is there any other business to  
9 be brought before the open session Council?

10 Before we adjourn, I would remind you that  
11 there is a display table in the antechamber over here  
12 and it does include the four volumes of the Encyclopedia  
13 of the Constitution. And during the break you may want  
14 to have an opportunity to take a look at the volumes.  
15 We will adjourn until 10:30 when we will resume in  
16 closed session.

17 (Whereupon at 10:21 a.m. the Open Session was  
18 adjourned.)  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

C L O S E D   S E S S I O NEmergency Grants and Actions Departing from  
Council Recommendation - Disapprovals

MR. KINGSTON: We are now in closed session.  
If Council members would turn to Tab E of the Agenda Book. There are descriptions of six emergency grant requests which were rejected. I will ask if there are any questions about any of those six rejections?

Also in that section, if I could have that section, there is a description of three rejections which represent departures from the Council recommendation. I will ask if there are any comments on any of those three rejections?

OMB Hearing on Fiscal Year 1988 Budget

MR. KINGSTON: There being none, I will ask Steve Cherrington to report on the hearing we had with OMB.

MR. CHERRINGTON: Okay. I promised the last memo that you have from me in the brown folder, it is Tab F. And this memo concerns the recent hearing we had with Office of Management Budget on our 1988 budget request.

The hearing lasted about an hour and a half, OMB had given us 20 questions before the hearing that formed the basis of discussion. Basically we just

1 emphasized that our budget request of \$132.678 million  
2 fiscal 1988 is sufficient to fund all projects that  
3 really should be supported by Federal funds, that is  
4 also a fiscally responsible budget considering the  
5 current deficit problems and it is a realistic budget,  
6 one that we can work with with the Congress.

7 In my memo I outlined the main topics of  
8 conversation that were actually discussed at the  
9 hearing. Some of the questions we submitted for the  
10 record concerned discussions of the Access to Excellence  
11 Program, the amounts of the stipends in the Fellowships  
12 Division, some cost savings that we have been able to  
13 make in Administrative Funds and how IPA's are involved  
14 here at the Endowment.

15 The OMB examiner stressed that 1988 really  
16 will be a difficult year, especially because of  
17 Gramm-Rudman. As I said earlier, the Gramm-Rudman  
18 target, budget deficit target for 1988 is \$108 billion  
19 and in 1988 we won't have all these quick fixes to  
20 enable Congress to reach that level.

21 We originally were supposed to hear from OMB  
22 on what our budget pass back figure would be. This is  
23 the figure for NEH that is included in the President's  
24 budget. We were supposed to initially hear what that  
25 figure would be next week. Now it looks like it won't



1 happen until Thanksgiving.

2 The Gramm-Rudman Act also says that the budget  
3 is to go to the Congress a month earlier than it had  
4 been in the past. Usually it goes up on February 1st.  
5 This year they wanted to send it up on my birthday,  
6 which is January 5th.

7 James Miller, however, had other problems with  
8 that. He said on Tuesday that his staff was just worn  
9 out and plagued by attrition and can't make the date.

10 MS. GRIEST: All because of your birthday?

11 MR. CHERRINGTON: I think it is my birthday  
12 that gets the Government going. Anyway, we have also  
13 heard that OMB does not want to undercut the President's  
14 State of the Union Address. In other words, they don't  
15 want the budget to be up on the Hill before the  
16 President talks about it. So actually I think we will  
17 be seeing the budget around February 1st.

18 MR. KINGSTON: Any questions about the OMB  
19 Hearing? Thank you, Steve.

20 EDUCATION PROGRAMS

21 Action on Applications

22 MR. KINGSTON: We will move to the review of  
23 the applications before the respective committees. The  
24 recommendations of the Education Committee are contained  
25 on the green motion which was distributed during the

1 break. I will ask Bill Allen to report.

2 MR. ALLEN: Thank you, Tom. Let me pull it  
3 all together. And I promise no more Phil Schaefer  
4 jokes.

5 During its closed session the Committee raised  
6 substantive budgetary or technical questions about some  
7 15 proposals. In 12 of those instances the Committee  
8 has concurred with the staff's recommendations. I will  
9 speak about the 3 where the Committee recommends a  
10 different result.

11 The first such application was ES21429, a  
12 Bicentennial proposal for California State University at  
13 Los Angeles.

14 MRS. RICARDO-CAMPBELL Could you tell us what  
15 page number, please?

16 MR. KINGSTON: Page 4.

17 MR. ALLEN: Thank you.

18 The applicant requests support for a two week  
19 Institute on the U.S. Constitution in eighth grade  
20 history, in the eighth grade history curriculum. It is  
21 a two week Institute plus meetings and seminars  
22 throughout the year.

23 Despite high ratings by four of the proposal's  
24 five reviewers, that is two E's and two BG's with one  
25 not recommended, the Bicentennial staff recommended

1 against funding for it. Mr. Pheland explained to the  
2 Committee that although the staff felt that the idea of  
3 the project was excellent, they nevertheless agreed with  
4 the one reviewer who judged the application itself to be  
5 deficient in intellectual rigor. Mr. Pheland said that  
6 the proposed Institute would deal with too many topics  
7 to give full justice to any of them.

8 He went on to observe that despite a heavy  
9 load of reading, participants in the Institute would be  
10 devoting little time to primary documents as the  
11 "Federalist Pages."

12 I point out after reading the proposal myself  
13 that I found it more substantive than did the reviewer.  
14 Also noted that the Institute will be conducted by  
15 scholars of solid reputation and work with more primary  
16 documents than indicated.

17 At this point perhaps Frances Rhome asked  
18 whether it would be advisable to defer the proposal to  
19 find out whether the staff's concerns about could be  
20 satisfactorily addressed by the applicant. Mr. Pheland  
21 and I agreed that it would better either to reject or  
22 accept the proposal. The Committee eventually decided  
23 to recommend approval with the condition of  
24 communication staff concerns.

25 The second staff recommendation to be

1 overturned by the Committee was a drop motion to fund  
2 application ES21388, Harvard Graduate School of  
3 Education and that is at page 8. It is a proposal for  
4 support to establish a fifth year training program in  
5 the humanities. Because this proposal has sharply  
6 divided the panel, three excellent ratings, one some  
7 merit and one not recommended. The staff sent it to  
8 three external reviewers. The reviewers supported it  
9 unanimously giving it one excellent and two BG's.

10 Concurring with the majority of the panelists  
11 and all of the external reviewers, the staff argued that  
12 funding the Harvard Project would facilitate the  
13 development of a rigorous new teacher preparation  
14 program and in the process stimulate constructive  
15 changes of a similar nature of other schools of  
16 education around the nation.

17 Perhaps Ms. Rhome and I both had questions  
18 about how new the proposed program would be. It seemed  
19 to us to differ only slightly from programs already  
20 placed elsewhere around the country.

21 We also raised questions about the size  
22 of the budget and the uses to which NEH funds would be  
23 put. Carol Reed Wallace responded by saying a) to her  
24 knowledge the Harvard plan would integrate the study of  
25 the humanities more fully and comparatively than any



1 existing teacher preparation programs; and b) the staff  
2 already had some discussions with the Grants Office  
3 about ways of trimming the budget.

4 In response to a question from Ms. Rhome, Mrs.  
5 Reed Wallace said that around \$27,000 a year could  
6 probably be eliminated from the budget without  
7 endangering the integrity of the project. She went on  
8 to assure the Committee Harvard was planning to assume  
9 all the costs of the program after the three years of  
10 the NEH start up support.

11 Ms. Rhome says that she was still not  
12 satisfied, that Harvard appeared to her to be seeking  
13 Endowment funding for costs and other institutions  
14 regardless their own responsibility. I was persuaded by  
15 her arguments of the Committee therefore placed this  
16 proposal in the not recommended category.

17 The third proposal for which the Committee  
18 decided to forward a recommendation departing from that  
19 of staff was ES21378 on page 1, St. John's College's  
20 application for two Summer Institutes of Classic Texts  
21 in Literature and Political Science.

22 Three panelists have rated this proposal very  
23 good, two had rated it some merit. Concurring with the  
24 panelists who found the proposal weak, staff recommended  
25 against their support. They pointed out although the

1 text to be studied in the Institute would be excellent  
2 there was little in the proposal to indicate how they  
3 would be approached or to specify what themes would  
4 unify the summer's study. The staff also noted the  
5 applicant had offered insufficient details about follow  
6 up and evaluation of activities.

7 I refer to having taught in the St. John's  
8 summer program in recent years and observed that because  
9 of the intensity of the relationships developed through  
10 the summer's work, there is always a good deal of  
11 follow-up activity, some of it instigated by the  
12 participants themselves, some of it planned by the  
13 college in connection with the seminars it routinely  
14 conducts at various locations and that these procedures  
15 were referred to in the proposal.

16 I also commented with reference to unifying  
17 themes that St. John's makes an argument for its  
18 approach based on the intrinsic worth of the materials  
19 to be read and discussed.

20 Further, the reviewers revealed a  
21 contradiction in their appraisal on the one hand  
22 spurning the proposal as a template for the existing  
23 graduate Institute curriculum. While on the other hand  
24 insisting that it lacked intellectual coherence.

25 Jamie Sokolow reminded the Committee that it

1 is the burden of the applicant to make its case through  
2 a fully articulated proposal. We argued that it was  
3 more articulated than had been perceived. The staff and  
4 the Committee agreed that St. John's has provided less  
5 than detail than it could have, but they also agreed  
6 based on the college's proven record of success in prior  
7 NEH supported Institutes that the deficiencies in the  
8 proposal could probably be remedied as a result of staff  
9 conversations with the Project Director. Committee  
10 decided to recommend support on the condition that St.  
11 John's satisfactorily addressed staff concerns about  
12 themes to be emphasized and follow up activities  
13 scheduled.

14 This concludes my report and I now move with  
15 opting the motion you have before you.

16 MR. KINGSTON: Staff has been moved this set  
17 of recommendations. Is there a second? All right, it  
18 has been seconded. Discussion, Louise.

19 MS. KERR: Could you give me examples of the  
20 programs across the country that emphasize fifth year  
21 teaching in the humanities as opposed to teaching or  
22 courses in education?

23 MS. RHOME: That wasn't a direct question,  
24 Louise, although they were including some courses in the  
25 humanities along with the education courses and I can



1 cite my own university and Indiana University in which  
2 we do indeed have humanities courses involved in this  
3 kind of a program. We found that there were other  
4 instances from that standpoint.

5 I think our major objection was that they were  
6 asking for around \$380,000 that they would cut down a  
7 certain amount for the period of time that it appeared  
8 to be that Harvard wanted to add an additional master's  
9 degree program and we were funding it. So we had some  
10 difficulties with that particular problem.

11 MR. ALLEN: I think the best thing to do would  
12 be to describe to you what they have proposed. The  
13 essence of the proposal apart from the teaching practice  
14 and the summer orientation is an eight course load which  
15 will have three required courses in the humanities, and,  
16 of course, practical teaching as a required course. And  
17 then the remaining courses would be in education with  
18 one of them being an elective either in education or  
19 humanities. That is the structure which we compared  
20 with other structures elsewhere. Some of which do not  
21 have the required aspect, or I would say most of which  
22 do not have the required aspect that many of which do in  
23 fact open up courses in the range of two or three that  
24 can in fact be courses devoted to the humanities.

25 The question was not whether the other



1 programs were identical but how far removed from other  
2 programs this program was.

3 MS. KERR: Just out of curiosity, is this a  
4 master's degree in education or in humanities or what?

5 MR. ALLEN: Master of Arts in Education, same  
6 sort of program was proposed to us.

7 MS. KERR: Okay.

8 MR. KINGSTON: David?

9 MR. LOWENTHAL: This is just a question of  
10 information. I notice that although the general rubrick  
11 is in instruction in elementary and secondary education,  
12 very few schools at that level seem to apply. Is there  
13 any necessity in that or could their role in direct  
14 applications be in line.

15 MR. ALLEN: That is music to my ears, David,  
16 and we are short one person on our committee. I bring  
17 this to the notice of the Chairman and I have asked that  
18 question in previous meetings. It is something we are  
19 continuing to discuss and during the period of revision  
20 of guidelines we will be looking at ways in which that  
21 can be facilitated.

22 MR. KINGSTON: We want to add too though,  
23 David, that most of the programs that are addressed to  
24 elementary and secondary schools will be lead by a  
25 higher education institution. They will be the

1 sponsoring cooperative institution. The primary  
2 audience will be school teachers. In other words,  
3 universities might proposed Summer Institute to their  
4 coordinated year long program which will involve a  
5 number of scholars in cooperation with the school  
6 teachers.

7 MR. LOWENTHAL: The reason I asked is I get  
8 the impression in Massachusetts that with very tight  
9 budgets run by the various towns and cities the music  
10 and arts programs suffered badly along with other things  
11 that are considered to be fringe. For that reason even  
12 without the help of universities around I think a lot of  
13 these teachers really know some of the things they would  
14 like to do in this area. I don't have a chance to do  
15 them quite often under their ordinary budgets and the  
16 National Endowment could make a very remarkable  
17 significant contribution even working directly with  
18 those school systems.

19 MR. KINGSTON: We do have direct applicant  
20 programs. Our Summer Seminars for secondary school  
21 teachers, for example, the Council for Basic Education  
22 Regrant Program for individual fellowships, for example.  
23 We are discussing, as a matter of fact, some other  
24 options right now about which we will keep you apprised.  
25 Yes, Bob?

1 MR. HOLLANDER: May I inquire about ES21437,  
2 the Council for Basic Education? It is a large amount  
3 of money. It is an innocent question, not a loaded one.  
4 I would just like to know a little bit about the  
5 \$472,000.

6 MS. MENKE: Carolyn Reed Wallace, the  
7 Assistant Director for the program will give some of  
8 those details.

9 MR. KINGSTON: Carol, please try and tell just  
10 what the grant involves.

11 MS. REED WALLACE: This is --

12 MR. KINGSTON: Could you come up to the table  
13 and speak into one of the microphones otherwise it  
14 doesn't pick up on the transcript?

15 MS. REED WALLACE: This is the Regrant Program  
16 that Tom Kingston just referred to. And basically the  
17 Council for Education, the Council for Basic Education  
18 runs a series of summer fellowship program for teachers  
19 of humanities courses.

20 We support these projects and these are summer  
21 study opportunities that are offered to high school  
22 teachers in the humanities. And basically they conduct  
23 research in one central discipline of the humanities  
24 with the idea of providing them an opportunity to  
25 enhance their intellectual knowledge.

1 MR. HOLLANDER: Could you give me an example  
2 of some of the projects sponsored?

3 MS. REED WALLACE: Yes. One example is a  
4 teacher from the State of Virginia received a fellowship  
5 to examine more fully the study of Robert Frost's  
6 Poetry. This person did research at several libraries  
7 including the Library of Congress, prepared a paper as a  
8 part of that summer activity, worked with an imminent  
9 scholar from the University of Virginia in terms of  
10 identifying sources primary and secondary. The idea is  
11 simply to provide intellectual reinvigoration for the  
12 individual teacher. The expectation of course is that  
13 that teacher will go back into her classroom, teach the  
14 poetry of Frost better and share her new knowledge with  
15 her colleagues.

16 MR. HOLLANDER: One last question: How many  
17 teachers are involved each summer?

18 MS. REED WALLACE: 125 teachers have an  
19 opportunity to participate. This has been the pattern  
20 of the last two years. I might mention also that over  
21 and above the support that we have offered, the Mellon  
22 Foundation, being impressed with their work, also  
23 supported a number of fellowships. And so their funds  
24 along with our funds, which our funds which were much  
25 more significant provided for over 125 teachers during



this last summer study.

MR. KINGSTON: Close to that would be the Stipends Program which, of course, is for college and university teachers. But this program is a regrant program for secondary teachers. Louise?

MS. KERR: In terms of the recipient, this is its second or third year. I forget.

MS. REED WALLACE: This is going into the fourth year.

MS. KERR: Going into the fourth year. As I recall the first year they had advertised extensively but the audience that they received was less universal than we would have expected and we were going to look into that, but I -- could you tell me?

MS. REED WALLACE: Yes. We have looked into that. I am serving on the Advisory Board of the CBE and it is a question that we have asked them to examine. They still have not been able to address that question satisfactorily, but they are making every effort at this very moment to get a larger number of applications from a wider cross section of states in the United States.

1 a wider cross section of states in the United States.

2 MR. KINGSTON: Louise, try to be of some help with  
3 that as well. Carl Dolan speaks about the CBE Program when  
4 he is talking to various groups.

5 MS. KERR: It is my impression that this is a  
6 difficult nut to crack as we know that in the future, if  
7 we could get some program or some way to address that specific  
8 area of teaching of the inner city or the rural schools, or  
9 those who have less opportunity, that I suspect would be  
10 our greatest deed. For example, I know, in my school, my  
11 children's school, has had, I think, 10 or 12 of the summer  
12 fellowships, which is a very good school. But there are  
13 schools in the City of Chicago that have never had any and  
14 will likely have none at the current pace.

15 MS. MENKE: To re-emphasize what Tom has said,  
16 Carl is working, very, very closely with the Division of  
17 Education programs in outreach efforts in rural communities  
18 and in urban communities, and I think you will see some ---

19 MS. KERR: We need mainly specific programs is  
20 my point.

21 MS. MENKE: One of the things that he is alert to  
22 are kinds of structures and opportunities that we can respond  
23 to.

24 CHAIRMAN KINGSTON: Thank you. Frances?

25 MS. RHOME: Just one comment, David, on this

1 response to your immediate question. I just went through  
2 the Education programs that we approved in the motion just  
3 now, and of the 22 approved, 10 of them are directly charged  
4 to teachers who would be in the elementary and secondary  
5 schools.

6 CHAIRMAN KINGSTON: I might add one other thing.  
7 The schools must -- the university or college applying must  
8 show that it has the commitment of a school or school system  
9 with which it is working. They must be part of the applica-  
10 tion process. Other comments or questions?

11 You have a motion before you. I will ask for a  
12 voice vote. All those in favor?

13 (A chorus of "ayes" was heard.)

14 CHAIRMAN KINGSTON: Any opposed?

15 (No response.)

16 CHAIRMAN KINGSTON: The motion is approved. The  
17 next report is from the Division of Fellowships and Seminars.  
18 It is the lighter yellow motion of the three programs. Bea  
19 Himmelfarb?

20 FELLOWSHIP PROGRAMS

21 MS. HIMMELFARB: The committee reviewed 931 appli-  
22 cations for the College Teachers and Independent Scholars  
23 Program, including 26 in the special initiative for the  
24 bicentennial of the Constitution. Of these, we discussed 25  
25 in detail. We reviewed 622 applications for Fellowships for



1 university teachers, of which 26 were in the special com-  
2 petition for Constitutional fellowships, discussing 25 in  
3 detail. And we reviewed 199 applications in the Travel to  
4 Collections Program of which we discussed 13 in detail. I  
5 now move the adoption of the motion contained in this light  
6 yellow packet.

7 Fellowships for College Teachers and Independent  
8 Scholars, we are recommending the approval of 129 applica-  
9 tions, the deferral of 14 applications, and the disapproval  
10 of 788 remaining applications under Tab I in the Council  
11 agenda book.

12 Under Fellowships for University Teachers, we are  
13 recommending 105 applications, disapproval of the remaining  
14 applications under Tab H of the Council book. And, in this  
15 category, I call to your attention FA27068 on page 5, an  
16 application by Reinhart Strohm, who was 1 month short of the  
17 3-year U.S. residency requirement when he submitted his  
18 application. And I believe that this application will, there-  
19 fore, require specific Council approval.

20 Finally, under Travel to Collections Program, we  
21 are recommending the approval of 83 applications and the  
22 disapproval of the remaining applications on the attached  
23 list.

24 CHAIRMAN KINGSTON: Thank you, Bea. I take it you  
25 mean the specific application that the specific application



1 that you are citing is an exception to policy, because there  
2 is usually a three-year period of residence that we require.

3 MS. HIMMELFARB: That is right. I should add the  
4 committee recommended a waiver of this particular requirement  
5 in this particular instance.

6 CHAIRMAN KINGSTON: The full Council is aware that  
7 it is a recommendation of an exception to policy. Is there  
8 a second to the motion?

9 VOICE: Second.

10 CHAIRMAN KINGSTON: Any discussion of the motion?  
11 Yes, please, Leon.

12 MR. KASS: This speaks not precisely to the recom-  
13 mendations that are being made, but I notice that the list  
14 of recommendations does not include at least a couple of  
15 proposals in which I had a special interest and both of  
16 which I have read and which are now before the second insti-  
17 tutions that awards fellowships in the humanities unsucces-  
18 fully.

19 Without trying to make an argument for either of  
20 them in particular, which I wouldn't presume to do, not being  
21 party to the deliberations, I am wondering about -- in both  
22 cases, they have certain features in common. One of them is  
23 a proposal by a person from engineering with rather humanistic  
24 interest in the human meaning of the activity of engineering.  
25 The proposal came in here identified as a proposal in the area

1 of history, science, and technology for which there is no  
2 special panel in the fellowships area.

3 I assume it was reviewed by the historians. I  
4 assume that, on its merits, they would find it, however good,  
5 of low priority relative to the other things that they would  
6 consider. So, my question with respect to that is whether  
7 we ought to think about removing applications in this very  
8 specialized area and perhaps having it reviewed over in  
9 Research Division or with the panels that review the Research  
10 grants as I think we now do with archaeology.

11 The other case is a proposal which is philosophical  
12 in scope but very much out of the mainstream. I am struck  
13 by the question of whether certain kinds of proposals will  
14 get a fair review, not in terms of particular prejudice of  
15 readers, but whether the kinds of things that they are are  
16 the sorts of things that our review process is equipped to  
17 deal with properly in the fellowship area.

18 This is probably not the appropriate time to raise  
19 the question about the form of the review, but I was wonder-  
20 ing whether we couldn't give some thought to maybe modifying  
21 present procedures so that these eccentric things, both of  
22 which I think are really extraordinary people and extra-  
23 ordinary projects, would fare better before us. The other  
24 place where these applications came in was the National  
25 Humanities Center, and both of them fell afoul, I think, of

1 the same kind of things.

2 CHAIRMAN KINGSTON: John?

3 MR. AGRESTO: I think that is an excellent point,  
4 Leon. If I could ask, not only Leon, but all other Council  
5 members -- we try very hard to put together as fine a set of  
6 panelists to review these as we can. But we need some help  
7 sometimes, especially in the area of history of science,  
8 perhaps in the area of philosophy. We are experts in some  
9 areas here in the Endowment but not in all.

10 If you have names of people you would like to  
11 submit to us as potential panelists or potential reviewers,  
12 please -- I made the request in the past and I can make it  
13 again -- send me lists of names and we will put them in the  
14 process.

15 CHAIRMAN KINGSTON: Yes, Leon.

16 MR. KASS: May I respond? This isn't the right  
17 suggestion, but it is not so much a question of expert  
18 reviewers or disciplines. What if one had a category for  
19 review of eccentric proposals?

20 (Laughter.)

21 MR. KASS: In which you picked people who had a  
22 certain taste for non-catholic things.

23 MS. HIMMELFARB: There used to be such an institu-  
24 tional mechanism for that. It is called Chairman's Grants,  
25 and it was precisely for that purpose, to encourage work



1 which would not fall under the normal purview of the normal  
2 panelists. It is assumed that they are exceptional and don't  
3 occur often and so on, but there should be some room for  
4 leeway in these cases. I wonder if we couldn't revive -- to  
5 my knowledge, that hasn't been used for that purpose for a  
6 long time -- whether we couldn't revive that idea with the  
7 understanding that this would be a very unusual kind of  
8 procedure.

9 CHAIRMAN KINGSTON: It is true that occasionally  
10 the emergency grant requests are for activities that do not  
11 fall into our funding categories.

12 MS. HIMMELFARB: But it is not quite an emergency,  
13 is it? There isn't a time problem. It is a problem of a  
14 different intellectual quality, something that has very high  
15 intellectual quality but no panel, John, that would be  
16 conceivably constituted would be sufficiently amenable to  
17 something that falls out of the usual round of the discourse  
18 of that discipline.

19 MR. AGRESTO: There is no way that I can disagree  
20 with that. We receive, my guess is, two dozen, or at least  
21 a dozen, such proposals each year in Fellowships and surely  
22 the same number in Research.

23 We do try, both at the senior staff and staff level  
24 in those divisions, to find those out, especially if we  
25 think they have been given short shrift by panels. We do try



1 to bring them to your attention. We will continue to try to  
2 do that and any other mechanisms that we can. Emergency  
3 grants can be used for this.

4 MS. HIMMELFARB: Oh, can they?

5 MR. AGRESTO: They can. Even though we call them  
6 emergency grants and they do seem to be time bound, the rule  
7 has been, and has always been, that emergency grants can also  
8 be used for those things that don't fit, that fall between  
9 stools. We don't want to make that a broad and general  
10 announcement. Send us, send us every eccentric proposal  
11 direct to the Chairman. That we wouldn't want to see, but  
12 if we see something that really can't be done within the  
13 divisions, within the panel process, it is doable at the  
14 Chairman's level.

15 MR. CHICKERING. I would expect, though, that if  
16 the only rubric under which the Chairman could make a grant  
17 is in something called an "emergency Grant," it might con-  
18 strain far more than Bea is proposing the discretion to make  
19 grants of this sort. I wonder if one shouldn't think about  
20 the possibility of creating some other category which would  
21 allow the Chairman, without resorting to something like an  
22 emergency grant, to make grants of this sort.

23 CHAIRMAN KINGSTON: Let me have Anita first.

24 MS. SILVERS: I wanted to respond to Leon's comment.  
25 I think he is quite right. In the first case, which was

1 brought to our attention, what was proposed was the production  
2 of a document which was quite different from the usual result  
3 of a fellowship study. Judged on the basis of the criteria  
4 for the kind of studies we ordinarily fund, it was not even  
5 in the ballpark.

6 But I don't recall a second proposal being drawn  
7 to our attention, and I am wondering if you could give us a  
8 little -- this is a closed session -- you could help us by  
9 identifying it a little bit.

10 MR. KASS: The second proposal? The first was  
11 the Petroski proposal. The second is a proposal by Eva Brand  
12 for a major study on the imagination. I have read that  
13 proposal; I know her work. It seems to me remarkable that  
14 a woman of this quality and breadth and depth cannot succeed  
15 at the National Endowment for the Humanities.

16 MR. AGRESTO: It may be one of the deferred pro-  
17 posals.

18 MS. SILVERS: If I would not be ruled out of order  
19 by making a motion -- I have spoken. Could I be recognized  
20 again so I could make a motion?

21 CHAIRMAN KINGSTON: There is a motion on the table.

22 MS. SILVERS: But it is an amendment.

23 CHAIRMAN KINGSTON: So, you wish to amend the motion  
24 on the table. Certainly, you are eligible.

25 MS. SILVERS: If I could be recognized again so that

1 I could ---

2 CHAIRMAN KINGSTON: Yes.

3 MS. SILVERS: I move to amend the motion that is  
4 on the table to add that proposal to the group of other  
5 proposals that are going out for special review.

6 MS. RICARDO-CAMPBELL: May we ask the number and  
7 the page?

8 MR. KASS: I think it was ---

9 CHAIRMAN KINGSTON: Now, that proposal will not be  
10 on the yellow pages.

11 MR. KASS: Page 25 under Tab I.

12 CHAIRMAN KINGSTON: Its number, Leon, is ---

13 MR. KASS: FB24441.

14 CHAIRMAN KINGSTON: FB24441. That would be placed  
15 on deferral for additional external review.

16 MS. HIMMELFARB: Are you talking about external  
17 review or a new panel?

18 CHAIRMAN KINGSTON: We have a set of five external  
19 reviewers for these applications on deferral, I understand.

20 MS. HIMMELFARB: Yes.

21 CHAIRMAN KINGSTON: This particular proposal Anita  
22 has moved to place on that deferral list.

23 MS. HIMMELFARB: Yes. With a regular panel.

24 CHAIRMAN KINGSTON: Yes.

25 MS. HIMMELFARB: You said exteranl review, and I



1 thought that you were thinking of sending it out for special  
2 review.

3 CHAIRMAN KINGSTON: Yes. It is a mail panel, a  
4 mail-out panel.

5 MS. SILVERS: I also, though, would like to urge  
6 that there be some external review -- proposal. We do some-  
7 times get additional external review and then the external  
8 reviews are sent to the panel.

9 CHAIRMAN KINGSTON: All right. The motion is to  
10 take application FB24441 and place it on the list of deferred  
11 applications. This is an amendment to the prior motion,  
12 so I will ask for a second to the amendment first.

13 VOICE: Second.

14 CHAIRMAN KINGSTON: Is there any discussion of the  
15 amendment? I will ask the Council's vote on the amendment  
16 by voice. All those in favor of the amendment?

17 (A chorus of "ayes" was heard.)

18 CHAIRMAN KINGSTON: Opposed?

19 (No response.)

20 CHAIRMAN KINGSTON: Now, we are back to the full  
21 motion.

22 MR. BERNS: I found on page 7, under Tab I, a  
23 misspelled name. The first name is Herman Beltz -- it is  
24 B-E-L.

25 CHAIRMAN KINGSTON: Other comments or questions



1 about the fellowships? I will then ask for a vote for the  
2 amended motion. All those in favor, signify by saying "aye."

3 (A chorus of "ayes" was heard.)

4 CHAIRMAN KINGSTON: Opposed?

5 (No response.)

6 CHAIRMAN KINGSTON: And the motion carries as  
7 amended. The report next is from the Preservation Committee.  
8 That is this dark orange document -- salmon.

9 PRESERVATION GRANTS

10 MR. SCHALL: In the Preservation Committee, we had  
11 some 40 proposals of which 16 were rejected and 4 were  
12 deferred and 20 were accepted.

13 The only one I call your attention to for special  
14 comment is the second one, PS20072, the New York State  
15 Education Department, having to do with the New York State  
16 newspaper project. The reason that is important is that the --  
17 New York pulls something like 10 per cent of all of the  
18 newspaper titled. With them pretty much on track, this  
19 represents a major step in this major project about news-  
20 papers.

21 In any case, I move the adoption of the request on  
22 the salmon colored document.

23 CHAIRMAN KINGSTON: May I have a second to the  
24 motion? Are there any comments or questions? All Council  
25 members in favor of the motion, signify by saying "aye."

1 (A chorus of "ayes" was heard.)

2 CHAIRMAN KINGSTON: Opposed?

3 (No response.)

4 CHAIRMAN KINGSTON: And that motion is approved.

5 The report from the Committee for Research Programs. This  
6 is the dark yellow motion. Walter?

7 RESEARCH PROGRAMS

8 MR. BERNS: We were at full strength yesterday in  
9 the Council and had very little work to do. Our motion asks  
10 you to approve three grants in the category of text addition,  
11 three in the category of reference materials access, and one,  
12 a regrant. These were leftovers from previous Council  
13 sessions.

14 Most of our time yesterday was spent discussing  
15 the one category, conferences, and three of these were flagged  
16 for our special attention. In each of those cases, we are  
17 recommending approval where staff had recommended disapproval.  
18 These are on page 4, RX20848, Georgetown University. I have  
19 to disqualify myself on that one because of my affiliation  
20 with that institution. But that was approved after dis-  
21 cussion, whereas staff had recommended that it not be approved.

22 The last one on page 5, RX20874, Elizabethtown  
23 College, having to do with Amish studies, and two of them  
24 on page 6, the one in the center of the page, RX20886,  
25 National Humanities Center, we recommended approval after that

1 had been brought to our attention, flagged by the Chairman.  
2 Then the one at the top of the page had not been flagged by  
3 the Chairman but again had not received staff recommendation  
4 for approval. Council member Sandoz brought this to our  
5 attention. We had a spirited discussion and ended up divided  
6 but recommending that we reject the staff recommendation and  
7 recommend that it be approved.

8 So, what we are asking you to do when I move the  
9 adoption of this report is to spend more money than the staff  
10 recommends. With insouciance and irresponsibility typical  
11 of Council members, we recommend that you spend the money  
12 and ask you to worry about where you are going to find it.

13 CHAIRMAN KINGSTON: Thank you, Walter. Anita?

14 MS. SILVERS: Could you help me out by giving me  
15 the reasons for rejecting the Conference for Editing  
16 Philosophical Works?

17 MS. HIMMELFARB: What number?

18 MS. SILVERS: It is RX208881.

19 MS. HIMMELFARB: What page?

20 MS. SILVERS: 11.

21 CHAIRMAN KINGSTON: Page 11. I think I will call on  
22 -- Hopkins, the Program Officer for this category.

23 MR. HOPKINS: The panel found the goal of this  
24 laudable but did not think that the Conference had designed to  
25 achieve it. In part, it called for certain editors to be



1 brought before the Conference and quizzed and criticized about  
2 their editorial procedures. The panel overall did not think  
3 it would address one of the main problems of translations,  
4 which they thought to be poor selections by publishers of  
5 translators.

6 CHAIRMAN KINGSTON: Other comments or questions?  
7 Walter?

8 MR. BERN: I ask your indulgence. I should have  
9 something that I had intended to say and forgot about it.  
10 I think all of us on the Council are aware of the difficulty  
11 that we face with these conferences, for example. Staff  
12 has before it the whole list of recommendations, and it makes  
13 its recommendations in the light of everything there and  
14 obviously ranks these. For us to come along later and to  
15 find a conference that we think has merit ought not really in  
16 itself to distinguish this from others and ought not in  
17 itself allow us to reverse staff recommendation.

18 After all, the staff, I am sure, finds these to  
19 have merit too but finds, for some reason, less merit.  
20 Nevertheless, here we are and we have to justify our existence.  
21 We do so in this particular way.

22 (Laughter.)

23 CHAIRMAN KINGSTON: And the burdon of judgment  
24 cannot -- the onus of judgment cannot be shirked. Louise?

25 MS. KERR: I would like to record a dissent. As a



1 committee member, I would like to record a dissent on two  
2 votes, one of them RX20848. I concurred with the staff that  
3 the conference, as outlined, would not fulfill the goals that  
4 it stated it wished to obtain.

5 VOICE: What page?

6 MS. KERR: Page 4. I am sorry.

7 CHAIRMAN KINGSTON: That is the English 18th  
8 Century ---

9 MS. KERR: That is the 18th century -- correct.  
10 And, secondly, on page 5, RX20874, the Elizabethtown College,  
11 I dissented.

12 CHAIRMAN KINGSTON: Therefore, out of four changes,  
13 there are three instances of some division among the vote  
14 of the committee.

15 MR. BERNS: As a matter of fact, when we announced,  
16 it was only with respect to one. What we would have done  
17 had we faced the situation faced in Education with only two  
18 members of Council, I ---

19 MR. ALLEN: You would have agreed to disagree.

20 CHAIRMAN KINGSTON: Any other comments or questions?  
21 I will ask then for the vote on the motion. All Council  
22 members in favor of the motion?

23 (A chorus of "ayes" was heard.)

24 CHAIRMAN KINGSTON: Any opposed?

25 MS. KERR: Yes, but only in part.

1 CHAIRMAN KINGSTON: All right. There is one "no."

2 MR. BERNIS: "Every little breeze seems to whisper  
3 Louise."

4 (Laughter.)

5 MS. KERR: You will miss me, Walt; you will miss  
6 me.

7 CHAIRMAN KINGSTON: We will have the report from  
8 the Division of General Programs. Kathleen? This is the  
9 motion in light blue.

10 GENERAL PROGRAMS

11 MS. KILPATRICK: The committee looked at applica-  
12 tions from only one program, Museums and Historical Organiza-  
13 tions. We reviewed a total of 132 applications, requesting  
14 approximately \$13 million. We recommend to the Board 46  
15 applications for a total of \$3 million.

16 These applications represent a broad spectrum of  
17 subjects and approaches, including U.S. pre-history and  
18 history, the Enlightenment Period, Chinese and Carthaginian  
19 archaeology, oceanic and African art, Southwest ethnology,  
20 and hispanic art and history.

21 I call your attention to several applications of  
22 particular interest: GM23233, page 1 of the motion, Goya  
23 and the Spirit of Enlightenment. We believe it to be an  
24 exemplary model project on an important period of intellectual  
25 and art history that will provide major interpretative programs

1 for large audiences.

2 GM23249, page 5 of the motion, The Glory that was  
3 Carthage, will be an exhibition that makes use of striking  
4 objects from 800 B.C. to 600 A.D. and will educate the public  
5 on the history of this legendary city.

6 GM23260, page 5 of the motion, Amerca in the Age  
7 of Lincoln, 1820-1865, is a permanent exhibition synthesizing  
8 the best of current historical scholarship in interpreting  
9 for a general audience the history of that period while  
10 focusing on a major figure.

11 Several applications were given special and lengthy  
12 attention by the committee. GM23241, page 3 of the motion,  
13 The Oral History of Dolls, 1910-1940, was accepted by the  
14 committee as a project that is innovative in its approach  
15 to U.S. material culture using successful anthropological  
16 methods. The final vote was 2 to 1 in support of the appli-  
17 cation.

18 GM23296, page 19, Cataloguing the Collection of  
19 Valley Forge Historical Society. The committee agreed with  
20 the staff that the proposal needs more substance and the  
21 project is not ready for support. We asked that the staff  
22 strongly recommend to the applicant that they resubmit the  
23 proposal.

24 GM23319, page 21, 300 Years of Polish Jewish Art.  
25 The committee agreed with the staff that the project has



1 considerable potential but needs more interpretative aspects  
2 and a more detailed discussion of proposed objects and the  
3 intellectual themes that might be explored.

4 Finally, we discussed GM23252, page 14, The Flag  
5 Paintings of Childe Hassam, An Artist's Response to World  
6 War I. We agreed unanimously that this is a superb topic  
7 but the application fails to develop an interpretative theme.  
8 We strongly recommend that the staff work with the applicant  
9 in developing a revised proposal.

10 That concludes my report and I move the adoption  
11 of the motion.

12 CHAIRMAN KINGSTON: Are there any -- the chairman  
13 has moved the set of recommendations. Is there a second?

14 VOICE: Second.

15 CHAIRMAN KINGSTON: There is a second. Discussion?  
16 Rita?

17 MS. RICARDO-CAMPBELL: I feel that I should explain  
18 the two items on which I disagree, well, not fully disagreed  
19 on. Let's take Childe Hassam first. The proposal for the  
20 display of 21 paintings --this was the last item that Kathleen  
21 mentioned -- of the flag paintings of Childe Hassam. I believe  
22 that she very correctly and well presented the summary that  
23 it would not be dropped. That it should be pursued.

24 I just want to emphasize that I thought it should  
25 be expanded from the original proposal; that is, more of his

1 paintings should be sought to make it the major kind of art  
2 show, in a sense, with the bicentennial thrust of the Endow-  
3 ment. I don't know if that came through.

4 The other item was on the oral history documentation  
5 of dolls. I still find it very difficult to believe to  
6 actually cover the period when I was playing with dolls that  
7 this would further in some fashion or other culture and  
8 the humanities. I just felt very strongly -- it was a split  
9 vote -- may I say that there were only three members of the  
10 committee present. This was not exactly the type of project  
11 the Endowment should engage in.

12 I noticed in another -- I don't remember where --  
13 there was an approved grant that sounded much better to my  
14 mind even just in the one-line summary. It wasn't on oral  
15 history. It was an interpretative exhibit on objects. I  
16 know it is a small amount of money, and I don't want to make  
17 a big issue of it. But I just couldn't envision myself  
18 presenting my recollection of doll playing as having any  
19 much to do with humanities.

20 CHAIRMAN KINGSTON: Anita?

21 MS. SILVERS: This is just a request for informa-  
22 tion, because the committee has exhibited such stringent  
23 principles. In what sense of culture is George Herman Ruth  
24 a hero of culture?

25 CHAIRMAN KINGSTON: She is talking about Babe Ruth.

1 MR. AGRESTO: Them's fighting words.

2 (Laughter.)

3 MS. KILPATRICK: We had a long discussion about  
4 this topic. The project really attempts to get at the way in  
5 which ideas about heroes and heroism change. Whether we  
6 agree with the fact that Babe Ruth was a hero or not, he  
7 was, or is. We felt that it was a project that ought to be  
8 supported.

9 MS. SILVERS: You recognize that I asked that only  
10 because I was sure you had a good answer.

11 CHAIRMAN KINGSTON: Other comments?

12 MS. CHENEY: Tom, I would like to say one thing.  
13 I very much appreciate the chairman of the General Programs  
14 Committee pointing out to us the very finest grants that are  
15 in the proposal package. We do sometimes, I think, tend  
16 to look only at those that are troublesome, problematic in  
17 one way or another, and I think it is very healthy that  
18 we remind ourselves that the Endowment is responsible for  
19 many projects being undertaken that are enlightening, that  
20 are excellent, that wouldn't happen without it.

21 MS. KILPATRICK: Thank you.

22 CHAIRMAN KINGSTON: Ohter comments or questions  
23 about General Programs? If there are none, I will ask for the  
24 vote. All those in favor of the motion?

25 (A chorus of "ayes" was heard.)



1 CHAIRMAN KINGSTON: Any opposed?

2 (No response.)

3 CHAIRMAN KINGSTON: The motion passes. Although  
4 the State Programs Committee did not review any applications,  
5 part of its report is to be submitted in the closed session.  
6 Jeff?

7 STATE PROGRAMS

8 MR. HART: This will be brief. In its closed  
9 session, the State Programs Committee first discussed the  
10 allocation formulas for Treasury funds, which was explained  
11 and discussed. Much of the closed session was devoted to  
12 reports on the review and guidance and/or oversight process.

13 Clearly, there is some tension between the State  
14 Councils' desire to independence and the responsibilities of  
15 NEH. Strategies for ameliorating such tensions were  
16 described and analyzed with application to particular state  
17 cases. It emerged that an earlier problem, the absence  
18 of humanities content and inadequate humanities content at  
19 the state level, has been, to a great degree, overcome.

20 Some particular state problems were extensively  
21 analyzed and discussed. A film, sponsored by the Puerto Rico  
22 Council, about the black history collector and archivist,  
23 Arthur Schaumberg, was viewed in part. This extremely valua-  
24 ble film is available only with a narration in Spanish.  
25 Council members unanimously thought that it would be much more

1 valuable for educational purposes if funds could be made  
2 available for a voice-over in English or at least for English  
3 captions. I repeat this is a remarkable film. Thank you.

4 CHAIRMAN KINGSTON: Any comments or questions about  
5 the complete state report? If there are none, we will move  
6 to the motion from the Challenge Grants Committee. It is  
7 the gray motion. George Carey.

8 CHALLENGE GRANTS

9 MR. CAREY: A few observations and comments are  
10 in order. First, of the 209 challenge grant applications  
11 submitted, the committee is recommending 42 for fiscal year  
12 1987 awards. The applicants submitted included a broad  
13 range of educational and cultural institutions: colleges  
14 universities, 45 per cent; museums and historical societies,  
15 33 per cent; public libraries, 6 per cent; and other cate-  
16 gories, constituting 16 per cent, would fall professional  
17 associations, media -- study centers.

18 Second is the matter of reduced offers for second  
19 awards. In the public session, I reported the policy  
20 problem posed by this year's sharply increased number of  
21 high rated applications for second awards. In the three  
22 years during which the program has been open to applications  
23 for second awards, the percentage recommended has ranged  
24 between 13 per cent and 24 per cent. This year, 18 of the  
25 42 recommended applications, 43 per cent, are for second

1 awards.

2 The average amounts requested and recommended for  
3 second awards are typically much larger than those of first  
4 awards, and this year was no exception. Thus, although the  
5 number of highest priority recommendations was about the  
6 same as last year, the total amount recommended was con-  
7 siderably above the program's budgetary capacity.

8 The committee is recommending support for all of  
9 these recommended applications, but in line with the program's  
10 announced policy of giving lower priority to applications  
11 for second awards, we are recommending that first awards  
12 remain at their full recommended levels and that the necessary  
13 reductions be made among the second awards.

14 The method we recommend for making these reductions  
15 is to establish a ceiling of \$400,000 for second award offers  
16 as opposed to the program's \$1 million maximum and to offer  
17 either the ceiling amount or the amount originally recom-  
18 mended, whichever is lower. This formula seems to us to  
19 provide a more efficacious and beneficial distribution of  
20 the funds available than the alternative, an across-the-  
21 board 60 per cent reduction.

22 Third, one application deserves our attention, our  
23 particular attention. The committee would like to call your  
24 attention to the application from the American Council of  
25 Learned Societies, C020774, on page 9 of the motion. The goal



1 of this application is to help the ACLS to at last achieve  
2 financial independence for its nationally important fellow-  
3 ship and grant programs after many years of reliance upon  
4 NEH and foundation support. The challenge grant will be used  
5 as leverage with major foundations to accumulate the final  
6 \$4 million in endowment needed for independent continuation  
7 of the council's programs.

8 Finally, I need to call your attention to two  
9 applications which are proposing to use more than \$250,000  
10 of federal funds for renovation or construction. By law,  
11 such requests must be approved by a two-thirds majority vote  
12 of the Council. The committee recommends that these requests  
13 be approved. The two applications are the Valentine Museum,  
14 CA21332, page 2, which proposes to restore the adjacent 1812  
15 Wychom Valentine house so that it will accurately reflect  
16 the era in which it was constructed, and two, Providence  
17 Public Library, CQ20086, page 10, which proposes to renovate  
18 its central library by aligning the floors of the adjacent  
19 building for better utilization of available space and  
20 accessibility to the collections.

21 These are our recommendations, and I so move.

22 CHAIRMAN KINGSTON: There is a motion before the  
23 floor. Do I have a second? I have a second. Any discussion  
24 about the challenge recommendations. Bill?

25 MR. ALLEN: I wanted to hear a bit more discussion,

1 George, about the recommendation with respect to second grants.  
2 It is not clear to me why the \$400,000 ceiling would be  
3 adopted since it operates differentially. What is the justi-  
4 fication for that as opposed to either an ad hoc principle or  
5 a pro rata principle?

6 MR. CAREY: Initially, if we use the \$400,000 as  
7 the cap, we felt that we could help each one of the appli-  
8 cants meet their needs more fully if we adopted the \$400,000  
9 cap. If we used any percentage reduction, such as the 60  
10 per cent reduction, it would have been absolutely devastating.  
11 I do not have the numbers here, but it would have been  
12 devastating for a majority of the applicants.

13 By using \$400,000, in other words, it would be  
14 sort of a utilitarian things here. We could help the vast  
15 majority of the applicants meet their needs. So that is why  
16 the \$400,000 cap.

17 MR. ALLEN: Let me interpret. You are saying that  
18 there are a number of applications sufficiently close to  
19 \$400,000 that that cap allows us to make a significant contri-  
20 bution to them and to pay for it from a relatively small  
21 number which are very much large requests.

22 MR. CAREY: Yes, there is. It is obviously harder  
23 on the ones that were \$1 million.

24 MR. ALLEN: Okay.

25 MR. CAREY: Yes. They obviously suffer the most.

1 The point is somebody is going to have to suffer this and a  
2 number are going to have to suffer. We tried to minimize,  
3 as far as possible, the suffering. This is what we came up  
4 with, the \$400,000 cap. One thing to keep in mind, when you  
5 are talking about \$400,000, you are talking about \$1.6  
6 million total.

7 CHAIRMAN KINGSTON: Louise?

8 MS. KERR: Three very brief questions. First, on  
9 page 2, CA21341, Cranbrook Institute of Science, is that  
10 associated with the Cranbrook Prep School? What is Cranbrook?

11 CHAIRMAN KINGSTON: George, the Cranbrook Institute  
12 of Science.

13 MS. KERR: Is that associated with the prep  
14 school or is that something separate from the prep school?

15 MR. CAREY: Cranbrook Institute of Science?

16 MS. KERR: Yes. Is the Institute of Science associ-  
17 ated with the prep school or is it something separate.

18 CHAIRMAN KINGSTON: Come to the table and speak in  
19 the mike. Peggy Cutter is the (inaudible).

20 MS. CUTTER: It is not a -- museum. This particu-  
21 lar museum has a very strong anthropology collection.

22 MS. KERR: But it is part of the prep school or not?

23 MS. CUTTER: Not to my knowledge.

24 MS. KERR: Separate. Okay. That is all. The  
25 second question, on page 13, CX20039, what is the Oberlin



1 Shancey Memorial Association, just out of curiosity?

2 CHAIRMAN KINGSTON: George, is that the one that  
3 you had? For the Oberlin Shancey Memorial. Is that yours,  
4 Jim?

5 MS. KERR: What is it?

6 CHAIRMAN KINGSTON: Do you want to speak into the  
7 microphone, please, Jim.

8 MR. BLESSING: It is a small organization located  
9 at Oberlin College but not connected, independent of Oberlin  
10 College, which has for years been running an exchange program  
11 with Asian countries. They primarily -- the same people over  
12 there to teach in affiliated Asian colleges and universities  
13 and they bring Asian scholars here to Oberlin or to other  
14 campuses.

15 MS. KERR: Okay. Just out of curiosity, there was  
16 a request from the University of California, San Diego, for  
17 \$1 million and a request from Stanford for \$1 million. The  
18 University of California, San Diego, got \$875,000 and Stanford  
19 \$400,000. I was curious if you could tell me briefly ---

20 MR. CAREY: San Diego is a first time.

21 MS. KERR: Stanford didn't know they couldn't --  
22 were they aware of these guidelines?

23 CHAIRMAN KINGSTON: Rita?

24 MS. RICARDO-CAMPBELL: I would like to speak, as  
25 Bill Allen did, to the impact of the \$400,000 limit. I

1 attended the first part of the Challenge Committee session  
2 even though I am not a member. I did not think at that time  
3 that all members of the committee -- I don't know precisely  
4 how many were present -- agreed on that approach. As I  
5 mentioned earlier -- let me preface.

6 First, I believe that grants should be given on  
7 the basis of merit of each individual application. As I  
8 mentioned earlier, the geographic distribution of this round  
9 of grants, there is amazingly a large number from the West,  
10 which I think has just woken up to the challenge grants  
11 existence.

12 It is extraordinary to me, as you well know, that  
13 \$13 million plus was given to the New York Public Library  
14 spread over a period of years. That is water under the dam,  
15 but all of a sudden, the UC campuses, which contain huge  
16 numbers of people, come in and you are cutting them off at  
17 \$400,000. Basically, I think that I would like the commission  
18 as a whole, the National Endowment, the Council, to consider  
19 what we are doing.

20 Are you saying, really, basically, that you think  
21 that only the second round of grants should be cut to less  
22 than half in order to save some other grant proposals. I  
23 just personally think that per capita might be another way of  
24 looking at it. What are the enrollments of some of these  
25 institutions in the university group? It is a general, broad

1 question that I think the Council should debate.

2 CHAIRMAN KINGSTON: Other comments or questions?  
3 George?

4 MR. CAREY: Well, I would like to say to Rita that  
5 one thing we did try to do, and we did do, is we went through  
6 each one of the proposals to see where -- if somehow -- we  
7 had \$4.5 million to try to make up here. So, we went through  
8 the approved proposals and tried to see which ones could  
9 we perhaps eliminate, where could we cut back? When we  
10 finished, we just found, talking of merit, that we just  
11 simply couldn't find the money and certainly not anywhere  
12 in the vicinity of \$4.5 million. That was one approach that  
13 we did try at the beginning. That just didn't work out.

14 I don't know what other formula one would come up  
15 with. It struck me, at least, and I think it did strike  
16 other members of the panel, that, obviously, as I said, some-  
17 body is going to have to pay a price in this and it is going  
18 to hurt. It seems to us that this would hurt the least and  
19 that is all I can say.

20 CHAIRMAN KINGSTON: David?

21 MR. LOWENTHAL: There is another possibility that  
22 we ought to at least consider for the future. I think the  
23 present policy is probably the best we can do under these  
24 circumstances. But we might want to ask the staff to rank  
25 the various proposals, particularly the big money proposals,



1 sort of make a suggested ranking to us as to their importance.  
2 So that if we are ever in a real bind, we can go to the lower  
3 rungs of that recommendation and simply knock them off just  
4 on the grounds that we can't afford it. That way you might  
5 end up being able to not to place such limits on the second  
6 grants.

7 CHAIRMAN KINGSTON: Bill and then Frances.

8 MR. ALLEN: I just wanted to clarify the action.  
9 The policy is, if I understand it correctly, an ad hoc rule  
10 of thumb for the committee. It is not something that we are  
11 imposing as an ongoing ---

12 MR. CAREY: No. It is not ongoing. No.

13 MR. ALLEN: Okay. I have no problem then.

14 CHAIRMAN KINGSTON: Frances?

15 MS. RHOME: You are only addressing it to those  
16 persons who are making a second grant, not a first grant.  
17 The ranking might help, but what we were faced with was the  
18 fact that we had so many challenge grants, all of whom were  
19 rated excellent straight across the board. They were first  
20 grants. We think that, from the standpoint of what we were  
21 giving, we were addressing those proposals that we had in a  
22 way that we were covering both the small institution and  
23 the larger institution.

24 CHAIRMAN KINGSTON: Rita?

25 MS. RICARDO-CAMPBELL: I don't want to make too much

1 of this issue -- but it would seem to me that there is a  
2 possibility, instead of cutting 60 per cent out of these  
3 grants -- of giving them some type of priority in the next  
4 round of challenge grants and saying, in this one, you are  
5 only getting \$400,000 and we will give a certain amount, --  
6 I don't know, maybe an additional \$200,000 -- in the next  
7 round.

8 What you are doing is penalizing a select group  
9 of proposals in this round maybe only by the way it was done.  
10 And may I say this was the staff proposal. It was true that  
11 it was said, if you are interested, you could get all the  
12 little sheets of policy paper ahead of time. Most people,  
13 I presume, did not and did not realize the significance of  
14 this. Basically, I can't -- it is a change in policy.

15 MR. CHICKERING: Another implication of trying  
16 to find a principle by which to cut is that, if the principle  
17 that you use is to keep the number of institutions hurt at  
18 all to the minimum number, what is implied by that is the  
19 amount you have to take out of them is vastly increased over  
20 a situation where you make everyone share the burden.

21 What, in effect, you are saying is that the dollars  
22 spent at the margin for large institutions are vastly less  
23 valuable than they are in small institutions. I mean, that  
24 is what is implied by the principle you adopted. I think that  
25 is rather hard to believe.

1 MS. RHOME: Do you understand that this is a second  
2 grant as opposed to a first grant?

3 MR. CHICKERING: Yes.

4 MS. RHOME: That they have already received a con-  
5 siderable sum of money in their first grant.

6 MR. CHICKERING: My point is going, though, to the  
7 adoption of a principle among the second grantee group that,  
8 in choosing this principle among the second grantee group,  
9 in order to limit the number of people who have to make any  
10 sacrifice, you make them all make enormous sacrifices rather  
11 than among the second grantee group, say, spreading it  
12 across all second grantees, which would much reduce -- but  
13 the key thing is that what is implied by it is that at the  
14 margin you are saying you think that the dollars spent for  
15 second grantee grants are spent in far more wasteful ways  
16 on large institutions than on small institutions. That is  
17 what implied by the principle you have adopted.

18 CHAIRMAN KINGSTON: David and then Walter.

19 MR. LOWENTHAL: Just a question to Mark. Are you  
20 implying, Mark -- I think I get your point -- that it would  
21 have been fairer, with respect to the second grant institu-  
22 tions, simply to take 10 per cent, or whatever ---

23 MR. CHICKERING: Yes.

24 MR. LOWENTHAL: Would have been necessary to get the  
25 budget into alignment rather than to put this kind of ---



1 MR. CHICKERING: And that principle would have  
2 implied that you thought that at the margin the value of  
3 extra dollars was the same for all projects, which is the  
4 principle, I take it, we use across all other proposals in  
5 the conduct of all other business we do.

6 CHAIRMAN KINGSTON: Walter?

7 MR. BERNES: Question for George. How much of the  
8 Endowment's money could you have spent yesterday on excellent  
9 projects? Or to turn it around, had you fully funded all  
10 excellent projects, could you have spent all of our money?

11 MR. CAREY: Yes. We were about \$4.3 million short.  
12 What do we appropriate -- 14, whatever, 14.6 -- so, 19, some-  
13 thing like that -- yes, 19.5.

14 MS. CHENEY: I think there is a point here Steve  
15 Cherrington needs to make. I would like him to please make it.

16 MR. CHERRINGTON: All right. Second time challenge  
17 grants were an experiment here. It was done for two or three  
18 years. It has turned out that the applications for these are  
19 much greater than we anticipated and the amounts requested  
20 by the large institutions are much, much higher than we  
21 thought.

22 Consequently, I think we need to put a lid on these  
23 second timers in relation to the overall budget at NEH and  
24 in relation to the federal deficit as a whole. Our priorities  
25 aren't for these second timers. That is what we are trying to

1 deal with here. I think they have come up with an equitable  
2 solution to this, especially since it seems as if the larger  
3 institutions are asking for more and more money.

4 MS. CHENEY: They have seen how well first time  
5 challenge grants work. They have seen that the money is not  
6 that -- well, it is always difficult -- but it is not impossi-  
7 ble, that it can be done. They consequently become hungrier  
8 and hungrier. I understand that. I would too. But we  
9 have got limited resources and that, I think, has to be the  
10 overarching factor here.

11 MR. CHICKERING: Do you think that our large insti-  
12 tutions are hungrier than smaller ones, because you didn't  
13 apply the principle across all of them, only to the large  
14 ones. If large ones are basically padding their proposals  
15 to us ---

16 MS. CHENEY: No, no, no. I am sure they can use  
17 the money. I am sure they can. I don't mean to suggest  
18 that they are asking for money that they don't actually need.  
19 It is just that, having seen how useful this particular  
20 resource is, they want more and more of it. I don't mean to  
21 cast blame at all. It is a fact of economic life.

22 CHAIRMAN KINGSTON: David and then ---

23 MR. LOWENTHAL: Since this question affects many  
24 institutions in an important way, I was wondering what George  
25 and Jim would think of Lawrence's proposals, because I don't

1 recall that we considered that as an alternative in the  
2 committee. It does strike me, while the \$400,000 is sort of  
3 a simple way of doing it, nonetheless, it does have the effect  
4 that Lawrence pointed to. I was wondering whether the heads  
5 of the committee -- what they really thought about it.  
6 Because if they thought it had merit and if it would achieve  
7 the same results, and set a certain percentage and just go  
8 through all the second time grants, and just take out that  
9 percentage necessary to balance the budget, why, then, I  
10 would favor that really rather than the limit that we decided  
11 on.

12 CHAIRMAN KINGSTON: That is an option that the staff  
13 looked into. George, if I am not incorrect, it would be  
14 funding the second time grantees at 60 per cent of their  
15 request level across the board with that option.

16 MS. CHENEY: But let me ask you, if you were a  
17 second time grantee, and you knew this was the rule, what  
18 would you do? If you knew that you were only going to get  
19 60 per cent of what you asked for.

20 MS. KERR: But did they know when they applied?  
21 That is the problem.

22 MR. ALLEN: That is the reason I asked the question  
23 earlier about what we were doing. It seems to me there is  
24 no sense to announce that we are going to fund at 60 per cent,  
25 or even at a cap of \$400,000, second time grants. I think the



1 problem is, if I judge by the figures you have given me, 60  
2 per cent or \$400,000, we have, in fact, had a bumper crop of  
3 second time proposals from small institutions. Otherwise,  
4 you couldn't have the effect you are describing there. You  
5 can't take it out of the large institutions. There  
6 aren't enough of them. That is why we are in a bind.

7 It seems to me that we need to have a temporary  
8 solution to this problem and a new policy. The policy we  
9 are talking about now isn't really a policy. It is an ad hoc  
10 thing we are doing at this Council meeting to get over the  
11 hurdle.

12 VOICE: One time only.

13 MR. ALLEN: Yes. Then we have to go back to it,  
14 because this clearly can't work long term.

15 CHAIRMAN KINGSTON: Let me go to Walter first.

16 MR. BERNs: George, did I hear you correctly when  
17 you said, or did you, in fact, say, that all these projects,  
18 or a large number of these projects, had all excellent across  
19 the board?

20 MR. CAREY: Now, I can't -- the second, yes.

21 MR. BERNs: But you were pretty much. Some of these  
22 projects you are not funding even though they have that kind  
23 of ranking or rating.

24 MR. CAREY: No ---

25 MR. BERNs: I would suggest ---

1 MR. CAREY: We are funding at this reduced level all  
2 of the second applications here that are meritorious.

3 MR. BERNES: One solution to this problem that strikes  
4 me, if it is a problem that we will face meeting after meet-  
5 ing, session after session, is to get a more severe review  
6 of these things and to make sharp distinctions between --  
7 well, to go outside your particular thing -- I wonder about  
8 the oral history documentation for dolls, for example. I  
9 don't know what that is. But I am not going to say much.

10 MS. KERR: Bill says it is talking dolls.

11 MR. BERNES: But if it is \$100,000, I want to know  
12 what it is. At any rate, my point, George, is ---

13 VOICE: It is Charlie McCarthy.

14 MR. BERNES: You may have too many E's. There is  
15 grade inflation here.

16 CHAIRMAN KINGSTON: That is probably true. Maybe  
17 it would help if we knew the percentage of applications that --  
18 percentages of applications in the second time class that are  
19 being recommended. It might give us a sense of whether there  
20 is genuine inflation.

21 MR. CHERRINGTON: I think it is about 30 per cent.

22 CHAIRMAN KINGSTON: Is it that high? The number  
23 of second time applicants that you are recommending is what  
24 per cent of the number of second time applicants? George,  
25 do you ---

(Pause.)

CHAIRMAN KINGSTON: Yes. What percentage ---

MR. FARR: Thirty per cent.

CHAIRMAN KINGSTON: Thirty per cent of the second time applicants are being recommended for funding. So, it is a higher percentage than the overall percentage of challenge grants.

MR. CAREY: Well, the obviously know the game and they know what they are doing so that is why the applications are good.

CHAIRMAN KINGSTON: The overall -- percentage is 20 per cent, which would mean that you are about 15 per cent the first time.

MR. CAREY: Might I answer -- go to Bill's question over here about the grants? There were three in the \$1 million category, and then reading down, \$650,000, \$500,000, \$500,000, \$750,000, \$350,000, \$400,000, \$750,000, \$500,000, \$545,000, \$750,000, \$875,000, \$500,000, \$500,000, \$56,000, \$79,800, \$8,000, \$30,000.

What? There were a number of \$500,000.

CHAIRMAN KINGSTON: George Kennedy?

MR. KENNEDY: I support the temporary policy that they adopted, and I think I differ with Mr. Chickering on the matter of support of the smaller institutions. It seems to me that one of our desires is to try to encourage the



1 wider dissemination of the humanities and the emergence of  
2 the smaller institutions -- survival. I think we should indeed  
3 give them an advantage.

4 MR. BLESSING: May I make just another point about  
5 -- what we were -- this was a choice, I think -- you are  
6 right -- between a percentage reduction across the board and  
7 a selective reduction of some kind. The reason we came up  
8 with the latter is that, of the 19 recommended second awards,  
9 11 would do better by this formula than they would have done  
10 by an across the board average reduction, percentage reduction.

11 The ones that would have done better by a Gramm-  
12 Rudman approach, a percentage reduction, would have been the  
13 8 institutions that were being recommended for \$750,000 or  
14 more, the large ones getting large amounts. It seemed to us  
15 that the impact -- let me add one other thing. With this  
16 formulaic approach, 4 institutions are getting their full  
17 grant amounts and 5 are getting 80 per cent of their full  
18 grant amounts.

19 It seemed to us that the benefit impact was greater  
20 by this method than it would have been by an across the board  
21 percentage reduction. More institutions were getting more  
22 benefit, a more beneficial grant, than would have been the  
23 case otherwise.

24 CHAIRMAN KINGSTON: Are there other comments?

25 MR. CHICKERING: Well, I just wanted to say to

1 George I appreciate what you said about wanting to help  
2 smaller institutions, but it seems to me to the extent that  
3 is a fundamental value of the Endowment that value should  
4 animate all of what we do, considering all proposals at all  
5 levels, and that the oversubscription of second time grantees  
6 for this particular proposal, it doesn't make sense to me  
7 that that should provide an occasion to introduce that value.  
8 That value should animate all of what we do, if that is what  
9 we want to do.

10 MS. HIMMELFARB: No. Not all proposals are insti-  
11 tutional proposals. Some are individual applicants.

12 MR. CHICKERING: Okay. To the extent -- but the  
13 same principle does apply to individuals associated with  
14 smaller institutions. It animates the discussions of fellow-  
15 ships and research proposals. I have listened to this. It  
16 is really -- the main point is, if this is a value wherever  
17 you want to emphasize it, it should be emphasized all through  
18 the process and not ad hoc because, on a particular occasion,  
19 you get more proposals than you expect. I think rationing  
20 the limited funds of the Endowment is something all divisions --  
21 we have to do all the time.

22 MR. KENNEDY: I think it does exist, though, in  
23 different ways in different grants. That is, it has often  
24 been the case that we have said -- responded positively to  
25 a request for a small grant and we would like to help them out

1 to the extent of \$5,000 or \$6,000. I think there is at least  
2 subtle and indirect effort to try to see that faculty members,  
3 community colleges, smaller institutions have at least an  
4 equal chance. The very fact that we divided the major fellow-  
5 ship program into two halves is a part of that kind of thing.

6 MR. CHICKERING: Well, I am not disagreeing with  
7 the principle. I just say it should be applied all the way  
8 through the process.

9 CHAIRMAN KINGSTON: Anita and then Steve.

10 MS. SILVERS: I think we are -- into the very  
11 difficult issue of criteria for just distribution, and I am  
12 not sure we are going to solve this problem in time to give  
13 out the challenge grants.

14 Let me observe that some of the criteria that are  
15 being proposed -- in which the small/large notion -- because,  
16 in fact, mere smallness, while perhaps seductive, does not  
17 necessarily justly demand greater support. Some small  
18 institutions are quite wealthy and provide a large number  
19 of dollars per student -- large institutions are not wealthy  
20 and do require more support.

21 The division that George referred in the fellowship  
22 grants is not one between small and large but between research  
23 institutions and institutions that do not provide their  
24 faculty with support for research. So, we have actually  
25 struggled with ways of making -- small and large -- I noticed



1 that while some of the institutions asking for \$1 million --  
2 are large, they include -- the institutions include St. Olaf's  
3 College, which I do not believe is a large institution. So,  
4 unless we can get focused on what the difference is that we  
5 are really trying to make, maybe we could avoid the easy --  
6 like small and large and even beautiful and ugly.

7 CHAIRMAN KINGSTON: Steve and then Lynne.

8 MR. CHERRINGTON: Small and large isn't usually an  
9 issue we get into here, but it may be appropriate with  
10 challenge grants, especially with the second timers. At our  
11 Senate appropriations hearing two years ago, Senator McClure  
12 noted with alarm the growing number of second time challenge  
13 grants being approved. One of his quotes was something like  
14 he was concerned about the rich getting richer and the poor  
15 getting poorer. In other words, these second timers were  
16 just that.

17 So, while we usually don't look at that in Endow-  
18 ment programs, in challenge grants, it is appropriate,  
19 especially since we are trying to follow Congressional intent  
20 here with the Challenge Grant Program as they began.

21 MS. CHENEY: I would just like to thank those of you  
22 who have participated in this discussion for being informative  
23 and you can be sure that your advice will be taken into account  
24 as we decide what to do this time. I think a more important  
25 problem is what we do long term, and I would certainly

1 recommend that the Challenge Committee begin to think long  
2 term. That, in some ways, is a much more difficult problem,  
3 because I think what we need to have is a public policy.  
4 And making a policy public adds dimensions to it that don't  
5 exist in terms of this particular decision. I very much  
6 appreciate your observations.

7 CHAIRMAN KINGSTON: All right. Louise?

8 MS. KERR: I just want to say that in formulating  
9 that public policy for the future and making decisions for  
10 this moment the public policy at the time these institutions  
11 applied was one thing. I think that is another thing to take  
12 into account as you make the decision, and I think that is  
13 another reason that I would support -- approach, because,  
14 although I am no great defender of Stanford, I think it is  
15 unfortunate that that institution, those two institutions,  
16 or whoever they are that have the \$1 million grant that are  
17 excellent, would need to pay the price for the others, having  
18 applied under certain rules.

19 CHAIRMAN KINGSTON: It is within certainly -- the  
20 policies are published for us to reduce the offer. That is  
21 not inconsistent with the policies that are published at all.

22 MR. CHERRINGTON: All second timers also are aware  
23 of the fact that they do come in under harsher scrutiny.  
24 It is something we always stress that second timers do have to  
25 respond to a higher standard.

1 MS. RICARDO-CAMPBELL: I just want -- for the  
2 record, for the legal thing -- I have nothing to do or to  
3 say about Stanford. Basically, it is in one of the grants --  
4 I have no connection with it. I did not, on record -- as  
5 supporting Stanford in that respect. Thank you.

6 CHAIRMAN KINGSTON: May I ask for the question,  
7 on the motion, with the understanding that, of course, we  
8 will be taking a close look at the way that the second time  
9 funds are distributed. All those in favor of the motion,  
10 as presented, signify by saying "aye."

11 (A chorus of "ayes" was heard.)

12 CHAIRMAN KINGSTON: Any opposed?

13 MS. RICARDO-CAMPBELL: I would like to abstain.

14 CHAIRMAN KINGSTON: And we have one abstention.

15 MR. HART: I would like to abstain.

16 CHAIRMAN KINGSTON: All right, two abstentions.  
17 Walter? Okay, fine. So, the motion does carry with two  
18 abstentions. Is there any other business that needs to be  
19 presented before the closed session of the Council? Walter?

20 MR. BERNS: This just reminds me that the change in  
21 tax laws might seriously affect the challenge grant category  
22 and something ought to be done by way of anticipating it.  
23 This has to do with the effect of appreciated property gifts  
24 and so forth. One has to be aware of that.

25 CHAIRMAN KINGSTON: As a matter of fact, we have



1 been aware of it. But it is very hard to predict what the  
2 consequences will be. We don't know what they will be. Leon,  
3 please.

4 MR. KASS: Well, I think Jim wants to respond to  
5 this.

6 CHAIRMAN KINGSTON: Leon, please.

7 MS. KASS: Yes. I just wanted to say that the  
8 general points that I had raised in connection with the report  
9 from the Fellowships Committee were not, I think, disposed  
10 of by the specific change in the motion. In fact, I wasn't  
11 speaking really to effect any change in the motion.

12 I would like to ask whether staff and Fellowships  
13 might look into the question of whether there aren't certain  
14 systemic problems with the panel review process. I am not  
15 talking about prejudices, but whether there aren't certain  
16 categories of applications for which the traditional subject  
17 matter approach to selecting panels is inadequate. Maybe  
18 we could find some way of improving that process, in particu-  
19 lar with things in the humanities, science, and technology,  
20 but also with the things I called eccentric. Maybe we can  
21 look at this sometime down the way.

22 MS. HIMMELFARB: Well, we cannot, in fact, ask for  
23 a review of just this panel process -- I must say, with  
24 this in mind, but we will be happy to include that in our  
25 review.

1 MR. KASS: Thank you very much.

2 CHAIRMAN KINGSTON: Any other comments or questions  
3 to bring before the Council at this time? I will entertain  
4 a motion for adjournment.

5 VOICE: So moved.

6 CHAIRMAN KINGSTON: All right. Council is adjourned.

7 (Whereupon, at 12:11 p.m., the meeting was  
8 adjourned.)

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25