

NATIONAL ENDOWMENT FOR THE HUMANITIES

GENERAL PROGRAMS COMMITTEE MEETING

December 9, 1982

Shoreham Building
First Floor
Conference Room

This transcription done from tapes provided by the agency.

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

Participants at the Meeting Included the Following:

William Bennett
Steven Cahn
Marcus Cohn
George Farr
A. Lawrence Chickering
Louise Kerr
Gertrude Himmelfarb
Jacob Neusner
Mary Beth Norton
Geoffrey Marshall
Francis Rhome
Anita Silvers
Wendell Willkie
Harriet Zimmerman

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

P R O C E E D I N G S

MS. ZIMMERMAN: I think we are going to call the meeting to order. I understand that the chairman will be down in a few minutes and I also understand that Carl Holman, for whom we had left a place at the table, has informed us that he will unfortunately not be able to join us.

I would like to express my own personal thanks to the members of the counsel who have made this effort to come, to Mary Beth who came from a blizzard, and Anita who came from California, and to all the rest of you who, I feel that at this very busy time of the year, it was wonderful of you to make the effort to come to this meeting. The Division feels that it is extremely important.

I'd like to begin by asking everyone around the table, and then all the non-NEH staff people in the audience, to identify themselves.

I am Harriet Zimmerman, chairman of the General Committee.

MR. CAHN: Steven Cahn, director.

MR. FARR: George Farr, deputy director of the Division of General Programs.

MS. HIMMELFARB: Gertrude Himmelfarb.

MR. COHN: Marcus Cohn.

MS. KERR: Louise Kerr.

MR. NEUSNER: Jack Neusner, interested bystander.

MS. NORTON: Mary Beth Norton, counsel member.

MS. SILVERS: Anita Silvers.

MS. RHOME: Frances Rhome.

MR. CHICKERING: Lawrence Chickering.

MR. WILKIE: Wendell Wilkie, general counsel.

MR. MARSHALL: Geoffrey Marshall, deputy chairman.

MS. ZIMMERMAN: Now, anyone who is out there who is not an NEH staff member, would you please stand up and identify yourself.

MR. REAGER: I'm Larry Reager.

(Whereupon, the remainder of the attendees identified themselves.)

MS. ZIMMERMAN: Thank you all very much.

Just a very brief opening statement. I told Mary Beth on the phone that my aim, and I believe the aim of the Division, is to end up somewhere down the line in her enviable position, that is having produced absolutely excellent new guidelines that everybody can be as enthusiastic about as we are, about the guidelines that were produced by the Division of Education, and the guidelines and

policies that have been as carefully thought through and as carefully planned, and also guidelines and policies that will be clearly perceptible to our constituency out there so that they will understand exactly what kinds of applications and proposals we are looking for, what kinds of things we wish to fund, and guidelines which will encourage the submission of those very high quality proposals with which we wish to go.

Having said that, we are prepared to take as much time as necessary and consult with as many people and groups as is necessary to ensure that we do come up with those kinds of guidelines.

Now, having said that, I would like to personally thank Steven Cahn and George Farr for the very thoughtful and provocative work that they have done to prepare the initial memorandum and for the subsequent work that they have done and for meeting with as many different representatives of various groups that they have. I would then like to ask Steve to tell us about the memorandum and George to talk about the meetings.

MR. CAHN: Thank you, Harriet.

You will remember that at the last counsel meeting we were urged to do, that which we were planning to do,

which was to rethink the structure of General Program and to try to develop the most coherent logical plan for the Division.

We have been working on this since that meeting, having done some thinking before, of course, but intensely since that time. What I want to do today is go over some of the reasoning that led us to the plan that you have in front of you, and after I present some of that reasoning I am going to ask that George talk to you a bit about some of the meetings that we have had between the time that the plan was structured and now, with some of the interested parties, and tell you something about the reactions that we have received.

In our thinking there were two axioms that we took as self evident. First, the importance of the work of the Division of General Programs. We are committed, the endowment is committed, to doing the finest possible work that will reach the public and provide that appreciation and understanding of these matters that is called for in the legislation.

The second axiom we recognize is that if we are going to reach out to those 175 million or so Americans who are not officially connected with schools, either as

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

teachers or students, that we were certainly going to call upon the resources of television and radio. We were going to work with those museums and historical organizations and libraries that have it as their mission to reach people, and that this was not something that was being questioned. This is something that is being assumed.

The question was how best to structure the Division to achieve the aim.

Now, let me say a word about where we started in our thinking, which is the present structure of the Division. Let me just remind you that we have a division with three sections: humanities projects in media, humanities projects in museums and historical organizations and special projects which have two components, youth programs and program development.

Now, the first thing that struck us in looking at the present structure is that there are certain disanalogies in the categories themselves. These have by no means prevented the Division from doing all sorts of good things, but when one is trying to make the structure as clear to follow as possible, the disanalogies do come to light.

What I mean by those disanalogies is the following.

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

First, we have the Division's humanities projects in media, where media is clearly a means to achieve certain ends. Then we have humanities projects in museums and historical organizations. Museums and historical organizations are clearly institutions. They have programs that serve the interests of humanities. They are not themselves so much means as institutions that then put certain means into effect.

We have youth programs. There we have neither a means nor an institution. We have a group that we want to reach out to. Then we have special projects, which is a kind of actual phrase, followed by program development, another phrase of that kind. So, what we are looking at is a structure in which we have a means, we have an institution, we have a group to be served and several actual phrases.

Well, if one was looking for a certain symmetry here, clarity of structure, what other directions would be possible.

Well, one might say, and this possibility that we can obtain, what about dividing the Division in accordance with organizations. That's one possibility. So one might have museums and historical organizations categorial,

libraries categorized, then as you start to think about it, you realize that there are a great many organizations.

One of the characteristics of the Division of General Programs is how many organizations there are to be called upon, how many different methods are used, and so forth.

So, we have an addition to the one's name, we have universities, we have various kinds of service organizations, YMCA, Boy Scouts, and so forth, and the list goes on. But one of the problems of dividing by organizations is that we have too many categories and it is not feasible to achieve that.

Well, another possibility is to divide in accordance with means, so we have, for example, television and radio programs, exhibitions, lectures, discussion groups, conferences, audio visual aids. So, what begins to happen here is, again, there are a great many means. The other thing that division by means has as a difficulty is that we encourage people where possible to use several means. That is one of the advantages in a good project is that you have not only a lecture or an exhibition, you have a video tape, and so forth.

If you divide in accordance with means, you are encouraging people to think only in terms of one approach,

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

whereas we actually are looking for other modes wherever possible.

So, the question, the challenge, is to find a structure which will be reasonably simple to follow and which will have a logic to it where the categories are analogous and which cut across the large number of groups that we deal with, the large number of grantees, types of grantees for which projects are done, the large number of means that can be employed to reach the group.

Well, with this as the problem, what occurred to us as the solution was to structure the Division in accordance with the ends to be achieved, the general overall aims of the Division of General Programs. And as we thought about those, it seemed that we could divide into three parts the basic aims of the Division. On the sheet that you received, those three are the three proposed parts of a new configuration for the Division.

The first, the interpreting and appreciating works where we refer, of course, to literature, works of art, works of music, et cetera; illuminating historical ideas, figures and events; and finally, the third, the understanding the disciplines of humanities, and much of what we do is in this category, in trying to give to the public a

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

sense of what it means to engage in philosophical argument, what it is that an archaeologist does, and how the various disciplines of the humanities relate to the contemporary world and what their value is for the citizens of the country.

Now, the rest of the document that we prepared essentially spells out very briefly how such a divisional structure might be put into effect, some of the practical problems, how we might go about solving them. There are others, of course, and they would need to be solved as we moved along, but the document seeks to present at least the outline of the plan how we might move with further questions to be taken up and answered as we go along.

Now, that then is the plan that we developed and the reasoning behind it, and I think now I will ask George Farr if he would tell you a little bit about some of the conversations that we had with different parties, with whom we discussed the outline of the plan. Not this document, which wasn't unfortunately ready by that time, but the essence of the document that we presented.

MR. FARR: Last week Steven Cahn and I had the opportunity then to talk with Larry Grossman, the president of the Public Broadcasting Service, and Suzanne Weil, the

vice president of programming, Edward Pfister, the president of the Corporation of Public Broadcasting, Larry Reager, the director of the American Association of Museums, along with Harold Scromstead, the president of the Henry Ford Museum and Greenfield Village. We also spoke to the director and the deputy director for the American Library Association, Eileen Cook and Carol Henderson. Also, to Morrie Egan, a director of the National Humanities Alliance, and to Gerald George, the director for the American Association for State and Local History.

Our conversations lasted, I would say, from one to two hours, and we found them extremely useful and informative, because in discussing the elements of this proposal, we were also able to discuss the work and the mission of the Division of General Programs in its broadest context.

As you might imagine, each of these conversations had their own character, their own emphasis, but it seemed to me, to all of us, in view of the time at our disposal that it might be most helpful if I simply summarized three or four of the major themes that emerged from these meetings.

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

First, the idea of clarifying and focusing clearly on the intellectual purposes and aims for the Division of General Programs was thought to be excellent. It was something that was needed, that was important to do and that would be useful to the field and to the National Endowment.

Further, I think it's fair to say that the goals themselves as they were articulated in the document that we had for them and as they were clarified then in subsequent conversation, seemed entirely appropriate to the mission of the Division and to the Endowment. It seemed that they were built on what was best in the Endowment's previous work, and that they could enhance the quality of applications that we would receive in the future.

Thirdly, about the notion contained in the plan whereby the aims of the Division would become its funding category. Now, on this notion I think it's also fair to say that there was a more mixed response. Everyone, I believe, appreciated the logic of this possibility and some felt, I think, that it would confer some very real benefits.

However, others thought, I think, that there could be some problems and they expressed some doubts and some

questions at this time. Mr. Reager, speaking for the American Association of Museums, for instance, thought that the field would feel keenly the loss of a program specifically identified as museums and historical organizations, that this might tend to discourage applications, and that it might suggest to the field that the Endowment had lessened its commitment, the kind of support that it was ready to give to these institutions.

It was feared by some that the plan of turning the aims into the funding category might preclude the possibility of bringing to the Endowment staff at a high level people with first rate professional experience in museums, historical organizations, radio and television, which could be of great help to the agency and be of great help to the field.

Finally, both Mr. Reager and Mr. George urged that the Endowment take sufficient time in thinking about reorganizing the Division of General Programs, and later in implementing whatever plan it sought, so that institutions in the field would have the opportunity to contribute broadly to this effort, and later, after a plan is implemented, to understand its implication.

I should say, to this end, they and everyone else

whom we spoke last week offered to contribute their help, and for this offer and for all the very good advice that we received last week, the staff is most grateful.

MS. ZIMMERMAN: Dr. Bennett, would you like to address the group.

DR. BENNETT: I'm sorry I was late and that I didn't hear the -- how Steve began, but I would just remind everyone present that the context, the larger context of this, I think, arises from the committee's suggestion at the last meeting of the counsel that we look at the programs that work and review what enables to do our work most effectively, that is that we looked at General Programs as to how we can best achieve the purpose that was set for us, that we look at it the same way that we look at other programs.

The proposal that George and Steve gave to me I thought was very interesting.

MS. ZIMMERMAN: In that case, I suggest that we just begin. We will go around the table and I ask my fellow counsel members for their comments.

Would you like to begin?

MS. : I'd be happy to. Steve and George have done so well in their presentations that they've

documented for us, so satisfactory that it is difficult for me to know what to say; however, I can reaffirm what they have said and I say that this is such a coherent and principled statement and a practical one, as well.

(At this point the speaker moved away from the microphone and her presentation was inaudible.)

MR. COHN: They have quite a limited program. One, I am pleased to see that both categories, one and two, radio and television, are important, and therefore, I assume that the media still plays an important role.

I have some difficulty understanding the difference between categories one and two. Let me explain what I mean.

Category two is described as providing understanding, while category one emphasizes interpretation. How can you understand if you don't interpret? I'm just confused at these two words.

The understanding of category two, and the interpretation of category one, these are interrelated, these two ideas, and I would like for you to spend a moment trying to help me out on this.

MR. The intention here was not to suggest that in category one we would do no illumination and

in category two no appreciation and interpretation, and so forth. It is a short hand way of referring to some of the activities that go on. I think the emphasis here in category one is on the cultural works themselves, understanding, appreciating, interpreting, illuminating. We will take all of the proper verbs there.

And in category two, on illuminating, appreciating, interpreting and understanding historical ideas, figures and events, those first verbs are intended to suggest some major activity that will go on but we are very comfortable with putting the emphasis on the second part of that major different theme between the emphasis on cultural works themselves and the emphasis on historical figures and events.

MR. COHN: Thank you.

MS. ZIMMERMAN: Are you finished, sir?

MR. COHN: The comment I raised first, I have --

MR. : Let me just assure you that in response to your comment that absolutely there is no question whatever that radio and television programming would be a critical part of our activities and it's not only mentioned, as it happened in one and two. It's mentioned in one, two and three, and I can assure you it would be

mentioned in any statement of --

MR. COHN: Okay. As long as I have that assurance.

MR. : -- no question at all.

MS. ZIMMERMAN: Louise?

MS. KERR: Well, I want to apologize because I didn't receive these until late and I just looked at them this morning and I quickly read them and therefore, may have missed some things, but I will comment because I did read it.

I have a couple of questions. Obviously, I think that the concept is very good, but I have some trouble understanding some of the premises and how it would work out.

I wonder if we will be given today, or some time during the discussion of the materials, some sense of what relationship this has to the history of the program. That is to say, these categories are extracted in some way from your -- as you described from your sense of what has happened in the past. You have stated explicitly that you want -- you think that there is going to be an improvement in the quality. Now, I have a feeling of what that implied, but to me I infer some criteria that you have in mind that would be somewhat different or more, and I'm not

sure what those are.

Let me just list the questions. I think they may all fit together. A second question which is only slightly related, but I think related, is that it seems -- I am very pleased that we have done a little bit of computation. I think we will do more computation with the people that have served or should be serving, or whatever, in the category. But it appears to me that thus far that the groups are very organized and they are institutional in Maryland, the state and local history societies and the Library Association of Jim Thorn.

You get sort of a historical questions. What are the constituencies that have been served in the past? You mentioned that one of the categories we couldn't possibly serve because there were so many, it was like an inundation. I gathered that that was organizations beyond ---- and I wondered to what extent, at least in our consultations if not in our future service ----, how are we going to serve them and how are we going to consult them. That is something that I think we need to address.

And lastly, this I think may result in my very quick reading of this, and that is I am not sure of the extent to which we will unevenly serve ---- by this program.

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

It is not clear to me, for example, how some of the fields will be served, and how it will be clear to them that they are invited to participate in this process. So, that seems to me that it would have to be thought through very clearly, from our point of view, in order to let them know that, whether there be institutions, museums, or libraries or whatever.

And finally, I guess this is more a strategic implementation problem. It is not basically clear to me how in a given category, any one of these given categories, we would be able to judge the value or the goodness of a project -- of two projects, one of which is the media and one of which is in museums and another of which is in something else entirely, we may not even think of, against each other.

I presume that within any category you make, it seems that we have a media panel and so on and so on, which in a sense takes us back to where we were to begin with, but how then within a category are we going to say that an interpretation of the constitution is done, assuming that they all have very good people and they have good strategies and they're qualified in whatever criteria you will have established for this purpose.

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

How are we going to say that this is, given our limited funds, going to be the one that we should fund. That last question may be the least clear, but I am troubled by how we would set up the review procedures for this.

MR. : Yes, I will try to respond to these questions. I was making notes quickly.

We do intend within the categories, where possible, to group proposals together and detect a way that they can be evaluated most clearly. Where there are a large number of media proposals we obviously need the same kind of mix of media specialists and scholars that we presently have.

The question about quality, in a sense that any proposal or structuring division will run up against the question of how you will judge something in one category against something in another, regardless of which category is picked --

MS. KERR: For example, fellowships, since everybody is going to be essentially writing for them. At least you have a sense of where it's going to go, of what it is going to end up being, so you are really limited to the qualifications of the people involved and the soundness of the proposal. I mean, if you're going to have to choose

between doing it in a TV program as opposed to a museum format, how do we -- what do we as a counsel?

MR. : Well, as I say, in a sense you have that problem and once you recognize that you will have various means being employed, we employ them right now and any structure we'll employ them. The question will arise, how will we judge them one against the other.

Let me say that if we have outstanding proposals, whether they are television programs or museums, exhibits, we are going to recommend that those outstanding proposals be funded. I will be at the chairman's door urging him to fund them, and I have every reason to believe from him that he is going to make it possible for us to fund all of the outstanding projects that we get.

With regard to the question of fields, we have tried to set up the categories into disciplinary ways so that, in fact, all of the fields of the humanities as listed in the enabling legislation have plenty of place here to come in with projects. We have taken pains to be sure that no area of the humanities as listed in the legislation would be in any way cut out or prevented from doing its best work.

In fact, one of the categories specifically aims at

providing an understanding of the various fields of the humanities, to give each the opportunity to present itself and display its importance.

The matter of consulting, we will welcome as much consultation as possible. In some sense it is more difficult to consult with individuals in the country, but we are certainly prepared to present these ideas and make every effort that we can and we would appreciate suggestions that you have, every effort to talk with and respond to and try to adapt what we are doing to the concerns of all interested parties.

MS. KERR: Well, just with regard to that, it seems to me that I don't have a clear understanding of what this category -- what constituency ----, but whom has this category served in the past that is not part of this organization.

It is my impression that there have been lot of various kinds of community organizations that you, yourself, listed. I don't know what -- I don't know how we will extend them, but it seems to me that we may have an obligation not just to wait and receive their solicitation. We need to define a mechanism to go out and find out whether they would continue to apply because implicit in

this, as it seems to me, even on the basis of what we have done up to this point, is going to be that that is part of the selling job that we have to do. And it seems to me that to the greater extent that we go out and ask people what is it that they are interested in applying for, what is it that would serve them best. That active effort is going to enhance our ability to carry out whatever program ----.

MR. : I think every effort that could be made --

MR. : Listen, if I could. There is an easy suggestion for one way to do a quick survey, and that is to mail a recent critique for the last four years to people and simply let them know ----.

MS. KERR: Well, that is something that I would appreciate. That leads to the first question that --

MR. : Let me go back to that question. The -- this scheme does not suppose that all hard questions will have been dissolved by its acceptance. I don't think that there is any structure which will take care of the difficult cases, that we will be arguing about the merits of individual proposals regardless of what structure we have.

What the value of a structure by aim is that you at least argue it in terms of the purposes of the Endowment Divisions, so that it gives you a framework in which to put the argument. One can say about a proposal to what extent does this provide for the public an illumination of a historical event. Let's ask that question and then debate the individual cases in terms of those aims. At least then the debate is focused and focused, I think, properly on what it is that we are trying to do.

MS. KERR: I understand that and I certainly appreciate it and the current support of the aims that you have outlined here. However, I do have some understanding, I think, of what is implicit in the comments that you have reported from the American Association of Museums. It's implicit in that kind of category support for certain kinds of institutions, and we need to explain very clearly why it is that we're changing, because it would appear, it seems, that our aims are no longer that. It could be construed in that way.

MR. : There is a misinterpretation and I think we would want to make every effort to avoid that the new structure, as proposed, in some way reduces our interests or commitment to making the most appropriate and effective

use of the resources of museums, libraries, television and radio, and so forth, and since that is not at all the case, we are just as strongly committed to those as we ever have been.

I think we just need to state this clearly and go out in the field and explain it, and it seems to me that once we do explain it the interested parties would understand and be glad to join with us in helping to achieve the ends of the Division and the Endowment.

MS. KERR: I just want to say, and this is the last thing that I'm going to say, that in the statement of our aims, quite clearly we are replacing emphasis, and we are changing emphasis, that would be interpreted in the ways that ----.

MR. : I think that, of course, it's true in a historical perspective. I think, however, that in the Division of General Programs the, what should I say, the official or standard part of our programs, for instance, is humanities projects in media, humanities projects at museums and historical organizations, so that the conception, I think, for quite a while has been the way in which we are helping a given organization, the way in which we are helping that splendid process called

television and radio is through humanities projects in this particular division. And I think that then begins to put into perspective the degree of change that really perhaps is implied in this new proposal.

MS. : I would like to suggest this procedure, if it's agreeable to you all, that we go once around the table and give each counsel member a chance, and then if someone wants to comment on things that other people have said, they may. But let's let everybody speak once.

Is that agreeable to everybody?

MR. : Thank you. I think the basic proposal is first rate and I would like to say why.

The problem of that division, as I experienced it for two years, was that we never really knew good from bad or why we were doing a certain project. And so the relationship of the humanities or a specific humanistic interest to a given project never became entirely clear, or rarely so. So we were on the road to creating a new category of the humanities over and above specific humanistic disciplines, and a humanities program would then encompass things which nobody who actually practiced the humanities would grasp and understand.

Now, what I think you've accomplished is a revolution in our thinking of what we can accomplish by providing a clearer definition, in fact, a clear definition of what we understand by the humanities in the very context of public audiences. What do we mean to do the humanities out there? I never knew before. Now I think I know and I think it is an enormous step forward.

Let me point to two ranges of problems which I think the staff is going to -- You never have to take notes for anything I say. My students are asked not to take notes. If I'm not clear enough to come across without notes, notes will be no help to you.

The one range of problems which the Counsel members can't solve but can point to, is the whole administrative area. How a program officer is going to set up panels is a lot more complicated. You need a media specialist who also understands history or philosophy or literature, and the people in the media themselves may not immediately present themselves to you under these categories. I think it's a soluble problem, but we're going to have to be very fuzzy around some edges. Okay, that's the internal side.

The external side, which other people do recognize,

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

is the problem of a shift for the people that we really need and want to work with. We can't do the work of this agency without the museums and the colleges and universities and the TV industry and so forth. We are here to work with those people. We can't make them over into our image. As you've made clear, can we be made over into theirs.

There is an enormous work of explanation and outreach which you will do, I think, very very well. But we are asking these groups to understand that the things they want to do have to be generated by the subject matter of the humanities rather than, as Bea put extremely well, the way in which we are delivering them.

And it does create problems for them and we can't deny that the problems are there nor will we claim that we can solve all the problems. We can only say that in an imperfect world we're going to do our best to work within their problems and to understand that we can't achieve perfection, and to recognize, as I believe you have in your remarks, and as your committee recognizes, that we are going to do our best in the real world and we are going to be very deeply concerned that the museums or the TV or the radio people with whom we work feel that we are

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

people they want to work with, because if they feel otherwise, the Endowment no longer serves.

Within this framework, we recognize problems and we deal with them. Essentially, we're not saying that there will be no more youth programs, media programs, museum programs, and so forth. We're saying that we want these things and we want them to be good and strong. But we are saying, and I think we admit it, that we are not here in particular to strengthen museums. We're not the Institute of Museum Services. We're here, as I've said, to work with them.

I remember in discussion on labor unions, that the issue came up of power strengthening labor unions by giving them this money and this is something that we're supposed to do.

I think what you solved with that, the moral majority, the communist party, for any type of organization, is that that is no longer a criterion for work with this Endowment. That we're talking about history or literature or philosophy, through programs, that anybody can set up. You have freed the Endowment of an albatross. We no longer have to worry and people can say, well, if a good proposal came from the moral majority, would you support it, and

our answer would be, yes, and also from the communist party, and if they want to work together, that's all to the good.

Just a final comment, that's the tradeoff. The tradeoff is greater definition on the one side, freedom from the organizational grid on the one side. The tradeoff on the other side is that we are asking organizations to do things they haven't done and to think in ways they haven't thought. I don't think that museums, for instance, are going to have staff people whose specialty is essentially academic. I mean, that's why they're in museums and they are not in departments of universities. But that doesn't mean that they haven't got an enormous amount of knowledge, specific knowledge, to communicate. That's why they're doing the things that they're doing, so if I had to weigh in the balance, I think the balance very much favors the new proposal and we've got to do everything we can to work with the people most affected by it.

MS. : Thanks. I've been rapidly making notes here so I have scribbles all over this page and I don't know how coherent this is going to be.

Let me start by talking about what I like about it, and then some questions. It's not that I dislike it so

much as that I have questions about it.

First, I like a number of things. It strikes me that when Louise asked the question about the relationship of these categories to the history of the program, it struck me that, of course, the reason that we had the current structure that we had, that Steve outlined so well at the beginning, was that the Division of General Programs just sort of grew. There was no -- I suspect, perhaps, when the Division was set up originally as the Division of Public Programs, there was some system behind it, but that system left -- was destroyed over the years as new programs were added, as others were subtracted, and most recently as the Division of Special Programs was combined into public to make the Division of General Programs.

I happen to be very please with symmetry and not so pleased with asymmetry, so I have a great attraction for the idea of having a symmetrical structure.

I like, in addition, the rethinking that has gone into this. I mean, I really am, after five years of being on the Counsel, it's useful and very helpful to me to start thinking about categories and the Division of General Programs in a way from which I have thought about them in the past. I must admit that I've never served on

the general programs committee so I never really thought very systematically about why those things were there and what other ways we might cut up the pie. Just the very act of reading this and thinking about it has certainly generated a lot of other ideas in my head about possible alternatives or the benefits of rethinking.

I especially like in the new scheme the possibility of supporting popular print projects and lectures and conferences for the general public, which is something that we have never done systematically before, and I think this certainly relates very much to my experience of four years in the research division, where we supported print projects for scholars and conferences for scholars but were never able, really, to deal with anything else. And I think that's a great benefit of this new idea, that we would have the ability to do that.

I don't know if some of you, maybe some of the historians around the table will know, and some of the others may not, but in history recently there has been a lot of talk about the need for historians and scholars to begin to communicate, not just with other historians but to begin to communicate with the general public in a very systematic way and much more clearly than we have been

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

doing in recent years. There's a lot of concern in the profession about that and I think this would allow the Endowment to answer that concern, and certainly, perhaps, if there are similar concerns in other learned professions, that that would also be useful and helpful. So that I like.

I also like the notion that we should generate projects via concepts rather than via structures. I think it is very useful indeed to put our conceptions of what is important in the humanities forward in the guidelines and to get applicants to think about ways in which their projects relate to specific aims for understanding, rather than simply to a particular medium of expression or than to humanities in general.

I entirely agree with what Jack said about humanities as an idea being just too broad for people to relate to specifically.

And finally, I like the flexibility that the new idea would give us with respect to combined grants. It always struck me as crazy that people were going to have to come into different sections of the Endowment and different guidelines for different things to support basically the same project. I never -- I thought that was

putting applicants through things that they didn't need to go through.

However, I have some questions.

I see difficulties, or I foresee difficulties, in two areas, and perhaps this comes out of the process that Harriet alluded to in the beginning, and that is our process in the education division of recently revising our guidelines significantly. It struck me, as I thought about that process in comparison to the process that is going on here, with respect to the rethinking of the Division of General Programs that in education we didn't do something quite as drastic as being proposed here.

That is, in education we kept basically the same broad divisions of the same broad program categories, but then redefined things within those program categories, that is, we kept elementary and secondary education, we kept individual institutions, and we kept national projects. Although we defined those categories slightly differently, nevertheless, we didn't totally break down the division and redo it. And one of the things that strikes me is that, had we done that, I thought about, well, what if we had done this sort of thing with respect to education of projects. It strikes me that we would

have had a lot of difficulty comparing apples and oranges within those divisions, and I recognize what Steve said a minute ago about, regardless of what your categories are, you're always going to be talking about the relative merit of something in one category as opposed to something in the other category.

Nevertheless, it does strike me that, and this is really my first general comment about it, we may perhaps here be going to much too complex an administrative system. Given the way the applications are likely to break down and the fact that we expect different applications - we expect applications in radio, TV and museums and so forth, to come in in each of the categories, that we may be getting ourselves into an unnecessarily complex administrative structure. A structure that could really cause a good deal of difficulty, just in the implementation of it.

It's not to say that I can't be convinced otherwise, but it's just that I have a lot of questions about what kind of administrative structure that is going to result from this.

The second major difficulty that I have, or the second major difficulty that I see on the horizon in

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

addition to the administrative difficult, is a difficulty which has been alluded to by several other people here, and that is the difficulty of the definitions of program categories.

I even see it in the document itself that we have in front of us. For example, on page two, there is an extended parenthesis about a project in category two might of course use cultural works, however, the primary emphasis of the project is interpretation of the cultural works themselves, then the project would be considered in category one.

It strikes me that these categories are fuzzy enough around the edges that they're going to cause our constituencies a lot of difficulty, and they may also cause us a lot of difficulty about where to put things. I guess maybe my sense here is that getting together an application to the Endowment is difficult enough for somebody. We make people jump through lots of hoops with twelve copies and documents signed by everybody under the sun and detailed budgets and so forth, especially in the Division of General Programs where we're talking about large amounts of money.

Also, for them having to make a decision about, and being fuzzy about where your project is going to go if it

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

falls sort of in the gray area that in fact is mentioned on page two, strikes me as perhaps more than we want people to do, or more than we want people to think about. So, I'm a little worried, although I'm wonderfully in favor of articulating these aims, and I have no problem with that at all. I am a little worried about them as program categories.

It strikes me -- Two other things I'd like to comment about.

Historians, I don't know. Maybe I'm over-stating this, but I think historians in general tend to be conservative types and especially conservative in terms of structures and institutions. My own general feeling is that simplicity is better than complexity, and that when you can accomplish something without totally revamping an administrative structure or an institutional structure, you're probably better off. That's just my own sense of it.

I don't know that I have any necessary alternative to present , but let me suggest two things. If I say I am totally in agreement with the aims of the proposals, and I am. There is no question about that. I ask myself the question, how can -- or could we accomplish the same

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

thing with a less dramatic change in structure of the Division of General Programs, and I came up with two observations.

Now, in this document, the chief aims that are expressed, and I may be incorrect in that, but the way I read it, the chief benefits that are expressed in the document for which we will achieve from this reorganization are two things. One, that we will get the applicants to argue in terms of these aims, and two, it will have a lot more flexibility in dealing with combined categories. It seems to me that those are the two chief benefits of this.

So, I ask myself can those be achieved in other ways. Well, the first one can be achieved, it seems to me, by simply instructing applicants in whatever categories we finally set up that they have to argue in terms of those aims. We don't have to have program categories to make people argue in terms of those aims. We can say, you must address these particular issues in your proposals, regardless of the categories they come in under.

And the second thing that struck me was that the flexibility, the key issue on the flexibility seems to me to be the deadlines. With this new proposal here, I

suggest that we should have what I think is a wonderful idea, although the committee on general programs may not appreciate it the two times in the year that they are overworked, to have the deadlines be the same for all projects.

It seems to me that you can achieve the flexibility that you want because of the combinations of the deadlines. That is, people who are proposing combined projects, that is, there could be a separate category which says, combined projects. This can also be considered and you could do a long thing in the guidelines about how we would like to consider combined projects, so why not set up a panel for combined projects. That is, projects that came in a particular category. I think I'd better explain what categories I think they might be divided up into.

It seems to me that instead of using -- I'm in entirely agreement with the let's dump the current structure, which as I say, I agree with Steve entirely as a symmetrical, but what if the four categories were something that were sort of roughly congruent with things now, but not quite.

For example, what if we had category one that was basically media, that is, radio, TV, et cetera; category

two, which was exhibitions under which you could have museums and historical organizations and anybody else who wants to do an exhibition; and a third category, which could be a catch-all for print and lectures and conferences or set that up as two separate categories. I haven't really thought that out. It really depends, since those are both new, we don't know how many people are going to apply in those and you might start out with those as combined and then change it.

But, I mean, in a way that's going back to means, yet the -- it wouldn't upset certain organizational constituencies as much as I think the proposal might, in the sense that museums would still probably go to exhibitions and so forth. And if you played up the idea of combined projects being fully acceptable and then throw those combined projects into a separate panel or panels that would deal specifically only with projects that combine what more than one of these things, then it seems to me that we might get to the same goals without doing something which might be going too far and causing the difficulties that I outlined at the beginning.

MR. :

(Because this speaker is not situated near the micro-

phone, parts of his presentation are inaudible and, therefore, cannot be transcribed.)

And the evaluations will come later and I applaud you for that. Let's be careful that we don't have hidden evaluations.

Now, whenever I look, however, at a descriptive account that I take as definitive, the first question I would want to ask is are there things that used to qualify in the extension of the old guidelines that do not qualify ----. I think, perhaps, that is the best way of getting at the difference between the old guidelines and these guidelines.

Are there projects that used to qualify but don't now, and I thought through the kinds of projects that have been funded, and actually there was only one that I could come up with, that I had no questions about. Maybe I could raise that now and you might think about it.

We've done a number of projects for the deaf community and those have been very special, in the sense that they have been trying to build a culture out of what is available, that is they have used basically literary and the images ---- people go from their own literature if possible, the culture, and have been addressing how the

images of the deaf have been used.

I've seen some very very interesting work grow out of projects we've funded. I'm not sure that that sort of thing would fit under any one of the current categories because the current categories presuppose a cultural ---- structure, and I'm not sure that these do. But that is a question we'll be more familiar on ----.

The second thing has to do with one aim that I always thought general programs had, especially programs of old, out of school public programs, that I'm not sure has been addressed yet, and that is the aim of building an out of school humanities constituency. That is, both the sciences and the arts have as a group members of the public who are not professionally involved and not in school, who identify themselves in some way with that general area which they are working at.

I always thought actually that the youth grant program was directed toward that. Now, I've heard a lot of things about how there have been terrible youth grants. I also hear that there have been marvelous youth grants that have been good, not merely of the kind of ---- but have been good against of any other kind of ----, and certainly have been a lot more cost effective.

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

I am not sure how youth grants, in that very small -- there are very small amounts of money, would get any. I think it is worthwhile continuing to urge young people who are not professionals, who are not doing this as part of an educational program, to begin working ----. I think it's worthwhile to try to build a group of the public to look upon these matters as something they can do. They might find that they enjoy what they are doing.

These projects generally are directed by professionals.

MS. RHOME: Thank you very much.

My comment is this. I want to congratulate the Endowment for pursuing a self evaluation project. I think there was nothing better from an administrative role that can be done from the evaluating and looking back at a historical project, and also than bringing it up to date.

Because you are not necessarily changing for changes sake, but you are adapting to a changing issue, when from a historical standpoint we did not have the growth in telecommunications that we currently have today. Some things have grown like topsy, and do need to be resolved.

I also wish to congratulate you for an open solicitation for comments from other groups and from constitu-

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

encies served. I think this is very healthy and I am appreciative of it.

I think that the fact that you are shifting the focus has clarified the entire problem. I agree with Jack, and I didn't even write it down, Jack, but I do agree with you in that, with the shifted focus, I can now counsel persons who are asking me about the appropriateness of trying to submit proposals in a much more enlightened way than I ever could before, and I think always that the philosophy and the purpose of an organization should come first and the means should come second. That's just a good administrative practice in that respect.

I see this as expansive, not just flexible, but expansive, and although it does bring some administrative problems, I am also confident that we have a good administrative staff that would pursue a self evaluation and that would face, then, the problems that are here and current. I see it, then, in this policy, as Gertrude has worded it, as coherent, principled and practical. It is indeed all of those things.

It does not overlook the current proposed group but it does give an opportunity to extend to others, as has been mentioned before. We are mandated a careful explana-

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

nation, but my goodness, haven't we been mandated all along, a careful explanation and elucidation to our public as to what our means and purposes and philosophies are concerned. And to take it away from the media and from the method into the philosophy is, to me, much more advantageous.

There are changing issues. We are in a changing society. I do question and will want an explanation at the time that it comes -- on page three, where there is an emphasis upon applications for children and family activities which would be strongly encouraged within all three basic categories.

I belong to the 22 percent of the nation that is a single householder, and so I am concerned, and I won't mention that other senior citizen groups that people always throw me into. But nevertheless, these are categories and changing things within the family that I would like to -- I want a clarification of that and I want an understanding of that.

I do not fear the complexity. I think complexity does come as a part of the growth and I think this is much more profound than we've had before.

The one element that has not been addressed that is

an administrative issue that must be addressed, is that a coherent explanation of the funding within the various categories, how that is proposed to be budgeted within an all over budget.

I tried to look back and see how we had done it previously, and I was unable to fit it in the categories, but I welcome the change and I see some exciting projects now that will come from the description that Mary Beth just gave us of those that are coming into a joint kind of a project with explanations, interpretations and understanding all in one bag. This sounds excellent to me.

MR. : I have this problem, that other people have said almost all the things that I was going to say.

I think one of the -- I'll just refine a couple of the ideas. I think one of the most important aspects of this is that the Division of General Programs, with this change, is making a broad symbolic statement to the public that hereafter the Division is going to emphasis substance and not processes, not instrumentalities. I think that is valuable.

There is concern expressed by some of the constituencies about this change, and I think in a way that that

concern comes from the old saying that people will frequently prefer a known evil to an unknown good, namely that there is a lot of uncertainty about when things are thrown up in the air where all of this is going to fall.

This proposal does not affect the general funding levels of the Endowment. It may, because of the changed emphasis, affect how funds are allocated between various constituency groups, and since there is uncertainty -- any group that loses by hypothesis results in increases for someone else, the concern is uncertainty about how these changes might affect various groups.

I thought that -- I'm not sure if this will increase agitation or encourage people to relax. If I may take just a few seconds to talk about some of the changes I think it will bring for the constituencies, which Jack mentioned in general terms.

The most basic change that it will bring is that it will force potential grantees to think first of content and second, about the media they will use, and that in a sense will affect different constituencies differentially, since different constituencies have substantive people and others don't. I mean, they're not evenly distributed across all media.

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

I would think, for instance, as between museums and mass media, television, that, well -- Let me go back.

I think that this burden of having to think first of content may have an effect in changing the identity of people who initiate projects to some extent. The initiators in the past have been instrumental people representing the constituents. Under the new system, initiators will tend more to come from people who are more substantive, who can emphasis the content and then will go to the process people.

Since the substantive people are not distributed equally across all the media, it will affect some of the constituency groups, I think, in terms of their ability to initiate projects. I would expect, for instance, that museums as a group have more substantive people than television, and that one affect that that would have is that museums will probably initiate more projects than television. Television will be a secondary institution to whom the initiators will go.

I would expect that one affect it will have on the broad humanities environment is that since they're more substantive people in universities than they're are in museums or anywhere else, that it will encourage all the

constituency groups, television, museums, historical associations and so on, to maintain closer ties and work more closely with people in universities. And I think that there may be reason to believe that more -- a higher proportion of grants, successful grants, may be initiated in universities than is true under the current system.

One final thing, several people made comments about whether this change won't dissipate the messages that the Endowment gives about -- the phrase used was something like, serving fields of the humanities, that the Endowment is supporting museums or historical associations and so on. I think this problem may be able to be taken care of ----, that is to say, at the end of the year, the funds will all be expended and the same amount of funds will be expended, and a lot of funds may be -- Conceivably, exactly the same amount of funds will go to each of the constituencies that it does now.

It would be very simple at the end of the year to simply say that in the course of promoting these substantive areas that we want to promote, the Endowment encouraged and helped these various constituencies to various amounts of money.

Sorry to air the political thing in public, but I

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

think that the uncertainty that people are feeling is really what is underlying a lot of the comments that people are making.

MS. ZIMMERMAN: The nice thing about being the chairman and going last is that by the time you get to speak everybody really has said almost everything you wanted to say.

I would just like to make a few brief comments in my turn before we go around again and open the discussion up.

Some of them are my own personal views and some are comments that I feel I have to make to reflect things that other people who could not be here have said to me. I feel that is the responsibility as the chairman.

I think you said something very profound. I think that, in fact, there will be the perception out there that that is exactly the way in which this whole change is going.

I am not sure that the perception is necessarily going to be accurate, but if it is so perceived, I am not sure, also, that it keeps us in this particular way committed in accord with the law as the Congress intended us to carry it out. That is the problem. I am now being

what I suppose you might say is practical and political.

The final step after all of our work is done is that we must take our work to the Congress and it must get funded. That is, simply we've all lived through it. Year after year after year, it's simply that is the last thing that happens, and at that time the Congress comes line by line and that is also simply the way the legislative process works.

They also in their wisdom as they wrote the law, have a view of who shall be served by that law that they wrote, and I think that if they suspect or if they believe that in fact what is to happen is that all projects or many or most projects will now initiate in the pattern proposed.

---- but I am trying to construct for you what I can see as a possible scenario in this Division, as opposed to being initiated from more public institutions, shall we say, which then in turn, relies on academicians or putting in the humanities contents, which I believe all of us have felt strongly needs to be there. It certainly needs to be strengthened.

But if that is the perception, then we will find ourselves, Congressionally speaking, in very difficult straits.

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

I also think another thing, and this has been pointed out to me. The analogy is not mine. It was given to me by a fellow counsel member who could not be here. That when one goes to the Congress and asks them to fund, the categories present some difficulties as they are currently laid out. Because they are very general and philosophical and it's -- the analogy he used was that it is like asking the Congress to fund the defense of the continent of the United States. It does it all the time, but the Congress, in its wisdom or lack of it, tends to do it in specific ways by funding missiles, bombers and so forth. That is the custom, and we simply have to deal with it. It is a reality and we may find that, unless we think carefully how we express our categories, they will simply tell us to go back and do our work again, because our work will be -- they will not perceive that these philosophically driven, substantively driven categories are categories to which they can respond by funding dollars.

I think that it is my obligation as the chairman to simply point that out without saying whether I think it is right or wrong, and I have explored this somewhat with the members of Congress and it is, I think, a pretty fair assessment of the situation as we would find it, and I

think it is just simply that we need to take into consideration when we do our format.

MR. : The problem is, essentially, that in the vocabulary, substantive quality is an actuality. You can't organize political constituencies around it to support --

MS. ZIMMERMAN : That --

MR. : -- no, no -- that all of the categories' funding is by constituency.

MS. ZIMMERMAN: But I think that what you will see if you look at the other divisions, for example, take the education ----, and clearly understanding Jack's very well taken point, that our job is not here to strengthen labor unions. In fact, the education division still is broken down into categories which represent, to a certain extent, institutions. That is, universities are institutions different in kind than secondary schools, and that is simply fact, and I think it was a very wise decision that the Education Division made and I think that this is an advantage when one gets to do one's job after some other people have done theirs, you can learn from the things that they did.

I think that is something we need to take clearly

into consideration, that, in fact, a point very well made to us, every other division in the Endowment do in fact divide by institutions in certain respects. Or, for example, even in fellowships, we have divided the fellowships by kind, that is, people coming from different kinds of institutions are divided in certain respects, if my memory serves me, although I have not in fact served on that committee, but I certainly remember the discussions we've had.

So, this Endowment has, in fact, understood that institutions are different in kind and that those are fundable categories, although they have done other kinds of works.

So, I just think we need to keep those things clearly in our minds. I thought I should simply bring them up as things to probe.

I'd like to make another general comment. Part of the work of this division has been, what I think Congress intends that it should be, the involvement of the public in the process of translating the humanities in an active, not passive, role. The Congress, I don't believe, the intent of the law, and I think we should be law abiding, it was not that the public should simply be the passive

respecters of humanities, but that the purpose of this division was that in this division, among many other good purposes, they should be involved in the active participation in the humanities.

There is some question whether or not the guidelines as now defined, were clearly stated and could be translated to the public as to how that public would continue to participate actively, not simply passively.

MS. : When you say now -- there's a confusion in terms. When you say now defined, the things that are currently in place or the proposed?

MS. ZIMMERMAN: No, I'm talking about the proposed.

MS. : All right.

MS. ZIMMERMAN: The proposed changes, I think, need to be clarified. I should have done what everyone else has done, and that is to say that the categories, the three new goals of the program ---- admirable, unacceptable, they are truly wonderful.

The question, I believe, is how do we implement them in such a way that, in fact, in reality, we get the results that we wish. That is really the important thing.

There is one other thing that I would like to simply ask about, because this has been raised and I think it's

a good question.

On page two, under categories, there is something that struck me and that is projects submitted in category two would be expected to provide an understanding of significance.

The word significance -- I would believe that we would have to do a very very good job of defining what we mean by significant. Words like that need definition. It needs to be clear. What do we mean by what we consider a significant, as opposed to insignificant, which is a word I hear around here a lot lately, meaning a trivial idea.

I think it's important that, because I am being a public member of a public group of the public, we be aware of our use of words. It is very very important and that the work that we will have to do to interpret whatever changes we make to that constituency out there, which in a lower sense is called public relations or public explanation, but whatever that is, we need to be very very clear as to what we really mean by the things we say.

Significance, just thrown out there, is subject to a lot of different interpretations. One man's significance

is another woman's trivial, and that, I think, is the thing that we need to be very careful about and clearly state what we mean by it, and who will be making the definition as to what the distinctions will be.

---- bring them to your attention and consideration.

MR. : Just one comment, not on the merits of the proposal but on a couple of things you've said.

I essentially agree with you. I just wanted to comment.

One, I wouldn't want to go too far. I will preface it by saying what I said when I first got here, that an agency that exists to stimulate imagination and critical inquiry in others must first possess these qualities themselves. Our discussion, I think, shows ----the merits of the proposal.

I don't want to adopt or give anyone a false impression that I'm understating the merits. ---- too cynical notion of the Congress ----. My dealings with the Congress have been great, very high minded, and there is great concern with the substance of this agency and how it operates. I have found that my experience with Congress takes the counsel of others and it takes its own counsel.

(Because the speaker is not situated near the micro-

phone, some of his comments are inaudible, and therefore, cannot be transcribed.)

But second, even if one would adopt such a position, which I don't think my experience has known, is nevertheless, I think, our responsibility to do our duty to express to the public and to the Congress our best judgment. We owe them our best judgment in a substantially driven program, a statement of high intellectual purposes, aimed at promoting a better public understanding of the humanities. This is what we owe them.

Nobody how anyone responds to it, so I don't -- What I'm saying is I don't want to try to second guess those who have already told us what they liked or not ---- is a statement of our purpose.

I stipulate that no agency in Washington can. I think we have to remember that.

MS. ZIMMERMAN : I hope I made myself clear. I did not mean to imply any ---- motives to Congress. And I certainly didn't mean at all to imply that they were not substantive, that they would not welcome from us a substantive proposal. I simply was -- I think you understand what I was trying to say.

MR. : I do. I do.

MS. ZIMMERMAN: I thought I made myself -- I hope I made myself very clear, in my concern that this division should be substantively driven. That is, that the goals should be clearly the goals of this Division. I have no quarrel with that at all. I think they are excellent. I hope I said that in the strongest possible terms.

My concern, I think, like Jack's for example, is how that shall be translated into administrative categories and how that shall be translated to the public, to the Congress, in ways in which goals, very excellent substantive goals can be best carried out.

MR. : Can I ask a question please?

MS. ZIMMERMAN: Sure.

MR. : At what point ----?

MR. : I don't know. I mean, I don't have a particular time frame. I was hoping we could move on it when the Counsel made its recommendations to me. The Counsel advises me, I take my own counsel and what anyone else has to say and have discussions ----.

MR. : Excuse me. In some sense I think we could begin that today. ----.

MS. : I want a clarification. Do you report to Congress or do you seek the approval? That is,

you have a purpose that has been given you and a charge that is given you by Congress and certain administrative directives as to how you are to pursue that. But do you take every proposal that ---- administrative role for their approval or reporting of the difference?

MR. : We're going to do both. Reporting and then non-approving, it could make a difference. That is, we could say we -- there are lots of possible scenarios, but that's fine, we think your statement is very good, here's your budget, make sure you spend it, that's a possible response.

I think it's more a matter of giving the Congress a sense of what it is that we're doing ----.

MR. : Well, it depends on how it's perceived.

(At this point, some of the comments of the speakers are inaudible and cannot be transcribed.)

MR. : That's correct, but they don't have to. Again, they have funded in that way in recent years, but for many years they did not.

MS. : But that was implicit approval.

MR. : I'm sorry?

MS. : That was implicit approval. That

is to say, it was not simply reporting.

MR. : No, perhaps.

MS. ZIMMERMAN: Would it be agreeable to all of you now to go back and gave everybody a chance to comment.

MS. : How do we, in fact, evaluate one application ----.

(Because the speaker is situated away from the microphone, parts of her presentation cannot be transcribed.)

Those of you who haven't been in this field don't realize how utterly different in method, in language, in rhetoric, in substance, if you will, those four ----.

The analogy from our present system would be if we set up a distinctive program that would deal with ---- analytical methods, quantitative methods ----, and yet we make them, yet we make those comparative concepts.

MS. : I may be wrong but I think the grant is on another level. It seems to me that I would anticipate the possibility that within one of these categories interpreting the ----, but not only dealing with the various interpretations. You are adding one more dimension in which you say a movie, an exhibit or a lecture --

MS. : What I'm saying is exactly how is

it possible. That is, media and TV are limited -- TV and museums or publications are no more different from each structure than the quantitative method ----.

MS. : Well, I really think that there is a difference, because I think that in a professional you need much more in the -- I sat on the fellowship committee and I know that at least you know what is going to count and it is likely to be a written source, so you have a ----.

When you're going to a movie, in addition to the sound of the movie, the historical interpretation, or whatever, you're talking about is this going to translate, or are you talking about movie professionals, as well. You're talking about, to me, another whole dimension of the --

MS. : If produced, enough people will be ----, but that is built into the proposals that we have now. But all I'm suggesting is that the programs will be ----.

(Portions of the speaker's comments are inaudible.)

So, the question is, how do you put together this complement.

We're talking about a program -- General Programs

itself came into being, what? Six months ago? The full Endowment came to being 15 or 16 years ago. The whole thing has been in General Programs ----, so nothing is chiseled in concrete here.

But there is nothing here new about the use of ----.

MS. : I don't object to the use. I did not make myself clear. I said that we must be very careful to define it.

MS. : Well, we've always had this problem, so in that sense, this creates no problem. We are engaged in the same qualitative enterprise we've always been engaged in, in which one of the primary characteristics is significance. What is significance?

MS. : But it is a problem, and I think we --

MS. : And it always has been, but not more so now.

MS. : But my hope is that part of what will happen in this process is that we will come to grips with that problem.

MS : That's right. But that is the advantage of this program. It permits us to focus precisely on that issue. What is significant and what is not, in terms of substance, rather than in terms of the

ethics.

MR. : May I ask the question, why twice a year? Why only twice a year do we bid a grant?

MR. : As opposed to more often?

MR. : Yes.

MR. : Just the difficulty of the review process. If we have a review process that has two deadlines then we will busy every day of the year with proposals, but if there is a six month turn-around when proposals come in from the time they come in until the time we can report them to the company.

MR. : How many times a year do we now make grants?

MR. : Each of the categories has two.

MR. : Only two?

MR. : Yes.

MS. : (Portions of the speaker's comments are inaudible.)

If I can for one moment focus upon the last thing that Harriet said with regard to Congress. I think that it simply focuses what we must do. ----.

That's wonderful, but how do you do it? How do you go about doing it? I think that's the problem that we're

all trying to grasp here, what are the best ways of us expressing ourselves. But then we get to the next layers. How do we make sure ahead of time?

I'm also a historian in some respect and it seems to me rather foolish for us to -- that the best laid plans to have something that, in fact, is at best not understood by our constituents and secondly, not needed, by their own terms. I mean, that they can not respond. I'm struck by -- I'm struck by what ---- said, that he anticipates that these projects will now be brought to us and will be driven by the ideas.

Well, I have not been here all that long and I grant you that in this category as in the others, ----. My suspicion is that most of them are driven by ideas. The people come in and try to find ways of getting them done and they go to the institutions and so on. So I don't think that that will be particularly new. I think what you said about us -- if our intention, whether we say it or not, if our intention is to go in the direction of ----, then I think we may very well be in trouble with our own constituents and with people that we're trying to serve, wherever they may be, whatever it is that they're trying to do.

It seems to me that one of the outcomes of this program is that there have been some very interesting new things. We have new ways of, not necessarily brand new media, but new ways of ----, which I think is a new way of putting things together. I don't have any idea of how that would fit into this category but as far as I understand that was brought in, not from any institution in particular, but people had an idea, they went to an institution and they brought a whole bunch of things together.

The next layer up is what I think Harriet was trying to say, and I think it is a reality that I would like to think a positive, that in anticipating questions from everyone out there, including Congress, we would have to be very clear in our own minds as to how it's going to be accomplished, how these ideas, which are wonderful ideas, how we are going to fulfill the mandate that was given to us by Congress and in our legislation, and how we are practically accomplish it. Even if we had no objection whatsoever, I think that below the surface or maybe even doing it explicitly in some cases, there are real questions about the implementation, the administrative structure.

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

I would like very much to be convinced that we do not ---- as I see it, but I see actually what ends up being 15 programs as opposed to three. I see the possibility that within each of these categories we have five different media and rather than having special -- I don't know how it would be arranged. If we're going to still have one media staff that's going to go through all the divisions which, without saying so, takes us back to where we were and it gets us to the point that I think Mary Beth was trying to make, and that is, are we going to have five different media staffs.

I just don't know how it's going to work out administratively in order for the best results to occur.

MR. : I think I can at least respond to that point.

Within the document that the plan describes is that we have people who specialize in media projects in each of the areas and we may well supplement that with an individual who has a specialty in media.

Incidentally, if I could just say one thing. It's not any part of our intention that this structure should in any way inhibit anyone from applying to the Endowment. There is nothing in this structure that says that the or-

ganizations that apply can only be additional organizations or long standing organizations or anything of that type. We have expectations of all of the same kind of initiative that has gone on in the past going on within this new structure. It's only that when those initiatives are formed that we will ask which of these aims the initiative is intending to achieve and judging it in those terms.

But there is no suggestion here that projects will now come from universities but not from television stations. We know very well that they're going to come from television stations. When we talked to folks from PBS they don't have any thought that they're not going to be making submissions to the National Endowment for the Humanities. They know very well that they're going to be doing it and those same television stations that have submitted fine proposals to us in the past will continue to do so.

MS. : Well, let me follow up on a question that I think that Francis was suggesting.

In our -- when we finally get to the budget part, which is, as they say, the bottom line, how are we going to adjust for the extensive media across these divisions? How is this going to be translated in budgetary terms?

MR. : Each of the units will have built into it financial support for media projects. Right now, of course, we have a large media category and then we have some smaller categories. This new arrangement, the categories will all be of significant size because they will all contain --

MS. : Let me ask a question in a slightly different way. We have three categories in which -- in all of which media proposals can be made. Are those then -- how are those going to be judged one against the other as the best way to spend that enormous amount of money?

MR. : They will be the intellectual content of those --

MS. : But if each of those panels then rates one or the more -- highest -- or say five, and you only have so much in each category. Let's say you have two of them left over in one category and you don't have any in the other. How do --

MR. : If you could, just to clarify the same problem right now.

If the media program were to propose as it stands, the media program ---- would recommend more obligations

than funding and we have funds in the media program we are in exactly the same circumstances. The question is then we do rank some media project higher than a museum project which ----.

MS. : But just let's say that the very top one within a given category, a given program, that they all get highest ranks in that category but they don't necessarily get highest ranks -- they get highest ranks in the media program for that particular category, but they're not the same as the one that was really outstanding or one that's lesser in another category gets funded. That's what I'm trying to say.

MR. : I think what I'm trying to say, by way of response, is we have the same circumstance now. I think that in --

MS. : But if you use the analogy of fellowships, you get all of the top fellowships are funded.

MR. : Yes. I think that it's likely that the same thing would happen here. We have not, I think, --

We have not yet begun to talk about what dollars we're giving. Since we can't predict in advance, starting with a new format, let me make a suggestion just for

purpose of our concern.

Suppose we divide it among the three and simply gave a third to each of these categories. Then I think that what we would do is as the year progressed we would begin to find that one of them is more highly subscribed than another. Our current structure in the relationship among those programs is part historical, and we have no way when we began to know where the burden of applications would come or the volume or its ----. It's a degree of trial and error.

This is not a defense or an answer to your question. Our difficulties are concurrent across categories, but fundamentally, we have the same problem, whether we're talking within division or, in fact, across division.

MS. : Well, except that now we have limits on how much we can spend on media.

MR. : Well, yes, but --

MS. : Are we going to have limits within each of these categories for media?

MR. : No, not necessarily. I think that we have --

MS. : So, then in any one of these categories the whole budget could be eaten up by media?

MR. : Yes, or by museums, if they present, I think, the most telling applications ---- historical ideas. The best applications in that category, if they happen to be museums, then it's conceivable by this structure the money would go to museum applications.

You have to go on the basis of what reasons ----, but you're right. That is a possibility.

MS. : Could I comment on the reason why I said that this is an administrative problem that faces us in budgeting.

What brought it up was the assessment that came from you, as a matter of fact, that you had to give in the hearing ground, and there were two things in that amendment two that was in the --

One was the question that during the past six months several divisions have been reorganized and program consolidation reformulated. What are the purposes or organizing principles for these actions? I saw that that applied to what we were doing, but the second thing came under 37 -- item 37 in general programming.

Your submission states that present agency program objectives do not warrant carrying humanities in libraries and program development as separate line items. So as I

was thinking of the budget, I was thinking of separate line items.

I saw this as an administrative function for the administrative staff to determine how the budget will be lined up line items, and that is where I am. What are the specific agency program objectives with which these programs are inconsistent, why not eliminate these activities, which went on to other questions, but the line item.

So, the question that I had was that with budgeting it may eliminate some of the separate line items that presently exist and Louise is enlarging upon that, saying how are we going to control it if it's not in a separate line item. That I see as the responsibility of the budgeting to make such a kind of a proposal and then to bring it back to us for us to review, just to see whether that does or does not occur.

MR. : I want to see if I can summarize where we now stand. We're no longer hearing that General Programs is the catch-all for everything that doesn't fit everywhere else.

We now are offered a quite clear, and I think an exciting, way of doing the part of our work having to do

with the general public.

I don't think that the counsel, committee or those of us assembled, have the capacity to advise the staff on how we would develop concrete means of translating goals into procedures and so on. We just can't advise you. The Committee probably could, but the others of us could not.

The real thing that we can help on remains focusing on the main point, which is a shift from the means of delivery to the goals.

If I can respond then, Harriet, to your correct concern which we all share for Congressional policy, I would like to make two points.

First of all, the people I chatted with told me that they had very open minds and they'd be happy to listen so I was a little less intimidated. As Joseph Duffey used to say, we're not an entitlement program, and the Congress has defined us as not an entitlement program by establishing for those constituencies also the institute of museum services and the corporation of public broadcasting, which are focused on the support of the institutions as such.

We have a different type of job which the Congress so far has given us and the premise of our work is different

from IMS or CPB. So I think that the notion of our offending pressure groups that would then complain to Congress, may be set aside. I may have misinterpreted what you were saying, but clarify it because I don't mean to misinterpret it. I'm only responding to what I got.

MS. ZIMMERMAN : I don't think I ever said anything about pressure groups. I don't remember ever using the word and I certainly wasn't thinking about it. I was just making comments in the way that, in the best of my knowledge, that the Congress tends to ----.

I really hadn't thought at all about them responding to pressure groups. The thought never even occurred to me. I will say that it is my opinion that we have been enormously fortunate and I would like to go on the record about that.

In the Congress there are men and women who have taken a particular interest in our program on both sides of the aisle. We are extremely fortunate to have people of such high quality that have concerned themselves with the arts and humanities. I don't mean to -- I think they are absolutely marvelous, and their understanding us, support for and concern about the work that we do is truly outstanding.

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

But what I was reflecting is that ---- people that are at times very piercing and difficult in questions that they ask they ----, and we are very fortunate, and I have never thought of any of them ----. That would be to demean them beyond my wildest dreams.

Please let me make myself thoroughly clear on that and I also would not attribute to them any cynical motive, but rather I would call it a great love for us and a great love for our concern.

MR. : Great.

Can I move on to the other point? Again, as I said the main point as I see it, it's still shifting on mode of organizing from the media, of delivery to the substance of what is delivered.

You referred to other divisions and my mind went down that. I think that we're doing both. When we look at research, we are dividing the program by the function. We move from preservation of materials to organization of materials to use of materials, and this without regard to the recipient organization.

I agree with you that in fellowships we seem to be focusing on the kind of institution, college, university and research center as we go from one category of fellow-

ship to the next.

To some degree, this emerges from the type of person whom we want to work with, who will be more likely for one sort of program in a college and for another sort of program in a research center.

So it fits the function of the division. But I think your point is well said, that we are really operating with mixes, some divisions one way, some divisions another, and some divisions with a mix of both principles. If we could express our doubts, I think the consensus that we're all expressing is that we wish General Programs could work in such a mix of the two principles, that we gain the intellectual clarity of the report as it stands and we retain the cooperation, the capacity to work with the existing institutions who carry out the purposes of the General Program.

That would be an ideal way of doing it. I don't know if it can be done.

MS. : If I may just for a moment. I think that that is what concerned me about what ---- said. When he ---- and I think he's very possibly right, that media would find itself less able to compete because media programs tend less to have what he calls, you know,

---- of humanities. I think that's fairly accurate and a fairly accurate statement from my knowledge of those kinds of activities. He's probably right, and the point is, is that what we want. Do we want a situation, for example, where media because of that is disadvantaged in competition here, and I think, it is my understanding, at least from what I hear from the people around here, that no, that isn't what we're after.

So, that's one of those cases where I think we have to think about a mix. We have to figure out a way where we would be encouraging -- where we would be working out a way to compensate for what he may be absolutely right about, the fact that they tend to have fewer academicians on their staff than museums do. We simply have to deal with it. That's a fact and what we're looking for is a mix.

MR. : Yeah. Then I'd like to associate myself with your remarks. We don't want to weaken what we've got. We want to strengthen what we've got. We've got problems in achieving goals but there are only those people essentially who can reach those goals. I mean, without TV we might as well close, and so on down the line.

So, there should be no suggestion that in the reform and the reorganization of the program we are trying to create more opportunities for, let us say, academic humanists, and fewer opportunities for TV humanists. That is the contrary and I think if we can in the next stages of discussion and planning achieve that, we've really progressed.

MS. : It would be wonderful if we could come up with a ----.

(Speakers comments are inaudible.)

MR. : Lorry's point, I thought, as I gathered listening to him earlier, was that at the present time a TV proposal comes from TV people, who then co-opt an expert. And what we're saying is that we'd like programs using TV to come from academic people who would co-opt TV people. If that were the position that was being proposed, I would conclude, as I suspect you do, that it is impractical and probably not even desirable. So that has to be clarified and it's got to be provided for. I don't think our limited group knows quite how, but I think we can say we do not want to say you can do a better job because you have a Ph.D., and then the other one who has the imagination to use TV. We think both are needed and

we're trying to improve the quality of the work.

MR. : Because of the size of the audience we have lunch for the counsel upstairs. I'd like to suggest ----.

I gather from the conversation that we are not likely to have an extensive session after lunch, but we do have a number of things to talk about. Therefore, I was thinking there is no reason to postpone lunch.

MS. : Wait a minute. Let me just ask is that agreeable to everyone that we break at quarter past twelve and ----.

I'd be happy to stop it at any point that you want to stop it. I'm just asking is it agreeable that we break at quarter past twelve and reconvene. We'll reconvene at 1:00.

MS. : I just want to comment on this point, that this problem is one that we focus on every single time we meet, and we say, how can we involve consultants more integrally into the project. And the reason we have this problem is because the TV proposals so often ---- the continuing contribution of the consultants. They device formulas of how he's going to get them submitted to the projects and so on. But it reflects this

basic problem.

MS. : I just wanted to say one thing about if we're going to look to other divisions for advice, which I think we might very well do. It seems to be possible to think of research and fellowships as both intended to fulfill the mandate. Fellowships, in my view, happen to be a format, and therefore, then it breaks down to constituency.

I don't know how that helps but it seems to me that it's something that we might think about. The objective is clear in both of those and they do go by format because of practical terms.

MS. : Yes. I just have a comment. I am not usually one who believes in received wisdom and I don't think that's the way I'm thinking about this structure, because I agree that the current structure has no rhyme or reason to it. I entirely agree with what Steve said in the beginning.

I just want to reiterate what I said, that it seems to me that what we ought to be looking for is a way to accomplish our goals with a minimal disruption of things that people have been accustomed to, and that doesn't mean that we don't change it. I think we should change

it. It's just that I'm not sure that we need this drastic a change to accomplish what we want to accomplish. I think we're all agreed on what we want to accomplish and it's more a tactical point than anything else.

And the kind of breakdown that I suggested there very briefly when I was talking before, is not by any means the same as what the current one is, and yet, it is less different from the current one and the one that's being proposed, and it strikes me that it is one that might be more comfortable for people to deal with, simply because I think we're going to set a lot of people at sea with these new -- with these particular divisional categories which are philosophical, as has been pointed out. And people might have a great deal of difficulty with coping with those.

As I said, I don't think we ought to cause more difficulty for our applicants than they already have.

MS. : I think we ought to break for lunch. We will reconvene at 1:00.

(Whereupon, the meeting broke for lunch.)

A F T E R N O O N S E S S I O N

MS. : -- a discussion that all of us barely remember, although I have the advantage of reconstructing it because nobody remembers what we actually said. Maybe I can produce a mythology.

Harriet talked about the fundamental thrust of this division being to provide humanities for the general public, and it seems to me that we do that in two different ways.

First of all, through institutions that have experience in providing lots of things for the general public and those are the museums, the libraries, the media, et cetera, and then directly to members of the general public. We haven't really done very much of that except perhaps the youth grant program. It is very very hard to do. I would urge that we do continue to have some ways of doing that because we -- if there's any place that we have fallen behind the National Science Foundation and the NEA, it is precisely because we do not have that community out there of persons who are not professionals or somehow related to an institution.

But it also seems to me that the issue of whether more academic institutions now will be funded, or whether

we will continue to fund primarily the institutions like libraries, museums and the media, ought to be dealt with within the evaluative criteria that will have to be appended to these categories. And it seems to me that we can do that in the following way.

We are going to have to ask of every applicant how likely it is that that applicant is going to reach the general public. Now, among the things that I presume we'll be asking and I presume that applicants will have to tell us, is first of all, what's their track record.

Academic institutions are not typically going to have a track record in reaching the general public. Second, we are going to have to ask applicants how do they intend in this project to reach the general public, and of course, to some extent that involves their track record.

But once again, I do not believe that academic institutions are going to have -- are going to be particularly expert in convincing us that they can reach the general public. So, I suspect that when we lay out the evaluative criteria, at least some of the concerns about shifts in funding from those institutions that typically now serve the general public to those that do not, will be taken care of. At least, I would urge that this sort of

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

evaluative criteria be included.

Secondly, I really do urge that we find some way of funding for very small amounts of money, individuals who are not professionals or the humanities who are not associated with any institution, simply because these will be exemplary instances of how non-professionals without institutional contacts can actually use and benefit from the humanities. And I think that we do -- have funded in the past some exemplary and extremely cost effective projects, and I'd like to continue doing that.

Can I just run through all these? Okay.

Now, Steve has pointed out to me all the objections about, administrative objections about how to do that, and I recognize every single one of them. But I think this is a good problem for us to try to solve, how we could actually try to fund individuals.

I do note, by the way, that although we have representatives of the constituencies here, one constituency that apparently is not represented is youth, although I'm not everybody has been a youth at some point.

Well, let's say that many of us would be willing to make that claim. And I think that there is something to be said for leaving some room for the unorganized public

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

as well as the organized public.

On the point of commensurability, I guess I really don't have very much problem about comparing a media project to a library project to a museum project. I think this is a -- If it turns out that there are changes in the amount of funding going to these various kinds of institutions, then I guess we will have to face the following question.

Maybe some of these institutions are better at doing humanities projects than others. If that is the case, then I think we have to take steps to improve those which do not, such as specifically getting them or helping them to involve humanities experts on their staff.

Now, finally, I do want to make a point about significance. The first thing I thought when you raised that question, Harriet, is maybe it would get John ---- to write a position paper on significance. But after I thought that John really has enough work to do.

It occurs to me that this is really the burden on the applicant, that what we need to tell applicants, and this occurs across the entire Endowment, is that they must convince the panels and the reviewers that what they are doing is significant, to our criteria that their projects

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

must be significant in the humanities. We we ought not to try to have a definition of what counts as significant because it is in the construal of your project as significant that you really convince the people who are reading it, that this is worthwhile being funded. And I note that we have the same problem across all the divisions.

May people who do not get senior fellowships, for instance, complain about not getting them, and very often it's because they have not provided a convincing story or account in their proposal about why what they want to do is significant. Then what they say is, "but everybody should be familiar with my work anyway. So why should I bothered in the application to say that this is significant."

Well, if you can't write in your application why this is significant, then it's very likely you're not going to be able to convince anybody in the finished work that it is significant. So, I think that we don't have much of a problem about defining significant and this is something that is part of the applicant's job to do, to show us that this is significant.

I would want to avoid our defining it because we might cut off an awful lot of good ideas.

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

MS. : Would you object if I --

MS. : No, please. Go ahead.

MS. : I would just like to ask you whether or not you would consider adding to your definition of reach, reach and involve.

I tell you why I say it. I think I alluded to it before. I have this concern that we not ever become a program which lectures back without involvement. I think, to put it in a university context, I think that everyone of you who teaches in a university has had the experience, unfortunately, at one time or another, of lecturing at people that you were not at all sure were learning anything or participating.

To me that does not exemplify the educational process as I understand it, and it also raises the very practical problem that unless we get what we are sure that what the applicant tells us not only how he is going to reach the general public, but how they will involve them. The reason I would like to underline it is because it brings us to something else that we haven't talked about at all today.

If we talk about it often enough, maybe it is something we should be considering as part of our guidelines,

and that is evaluation.

You see, there has to be some way of -- I have never been satisfied that we had a way, an adequate way of evaluating whether or not we were in fact reaching and educating the public, the general public, in either humanities in general or its specific discipline.

Certainly by only requiring that the applicants show us how he's going to reach them, we don't deal with that at all. We deal with it a little bit better when he has to tell us at least how he is going to involve them because then we might be able to perceive some change, desired change, from our perspective in the person who has been involved in this exercise in humanities.

But I think we ought to give some consideration, perhaps to some -- and I don't know how to do it. I'm trying to be general. We should try to build in some sort of evaluative process that ensures to us that something in fact is happening as a result of what we're doing. Otherwise we ----.

MS. : I think that, Harriet, I am very supportive of that but I also think that if we're going to require that our applicants involve and then evaluate involvement of the general public, we ought to try to do

a little of that ourselves, because I don't believe that we ought to be judging people unless we try to do it ourselves and found out how easy or hard it is to do. That's why I would like to see us try to do some direct involvement.

Most of our applicants are institutions just as we are and if we can't do something as an institution it's really unfair to ask all those other institutions to do it.

MS. : (Portions of speakers comments are inaudible.)

---- I don't think we've ever found one that ----.
-- but it was something like that, that when the various departments or program officer who in fact had worked with the program from its inception was then the person to whom the evaluation was entrusted. There might be something wanting in that system, which is not to imply that it has in fact turned out that way, but that perhaps we could find a better way of ensuring for ourselves in every division of the Endowment, and certainly in this division, that something in fact is happening in ----.

MS. : One thing I would caution, having been involved in many more projects than I ever want to

think about, is that we really then need to look at the budget implications. It is really unfair to say to an applicant, here is the amount of money you have but you must build in what is going to end up being an independent and, therefore, expensive evaluation model.

So, I think that we need to look at various approaches to evaluation and decide how much of our budget we think it is worthwhile and productive to put into evaluation, rather than ordering applicants to skim it from somewhere. It's a terrible thing when applicants discover that they can't be as productive as they want to because they've got to expand the funds on doing something that in the end may be non-productive and that's proving to somebody else how productive they were.

MS. : I want to thank the chair for being so careful so see that we all get to make our little point.

We do have our vested interest but most of us are really trying to include them all so that we are bipartisans.

I brought up this morning, and made a snide remark, about age and inclusion or all groups, but really I have a very important objection to this statement on page three, and the reason that I am objecting to it is not

because of the groups that are included, but because it is an emphasis on two subjects and we have always been all inclusive.

That is the statement in the center paragraph, the last sentence that says, "Applications for children and family activities will be strongly encouraged within all three basic categories. Such grants would not be awarded to individuals but rather to institutions sponsoring projects intended for groups of young people."

The reason I object to it, and I am an educator who deals with young people all of the time and I understand it, and I think that this may be a statement to be certain that we do not the youth projects that have been involved.

But nevertheless, I think that it goes -- we have not voted on such a policy and we have always attempted to include all groups. So, I think that this emphasis must either be voted upon as an adoption of policy or it could be worded in a different way, possibly, to assure that all groups may be included in some of the special projects. And if it is directed toward the youth projects, specifically, say so, bluntly, that we do not mean to lose those particular projects but they are to be included.

As this reads, it does say that in all three cate-

gories that the recruitment, the strong encouragement and the product as adapted for youth groups is going to be the major emphasis. So we need an explanation or I would like to see it cut out.

MR. : I see you ---- the wording, I believe, is something that makes sense to us, which is a fact that we know now has to be changed. You put your finger on it.

The reason that wording is there is that traditionally since the public programs began, they were defined for the adult out of school public. Therefore, this definition is in there in order to clarify for people familiar with us the fact that the adult classification is not longer a requirement.

What you pointed out is that unless you begin knowing the old system then, this isn't a corrective. It appears to be a move in another direction. So we'll find a way to word that in such a way that people will know that.

MS. : All right. That's good. Thank you for that.

MS. : If it's agreeable to all of you now, I would like to suggest that anyone now who has anything that they would like to say in conclusion, say

it or bring it up. Anyone who has anything to bring up or would like to say now, then ----.

MS. : I would like to ask what the next process is. We have thrown out all kinds of things. Is it going to be rewritten?

MS. : (Inaudible)

MS. : All right.

MS. : (Portions of this speaker's comments are inaudible.)

I think I have said what I want to say, and that is how that involvement should be ----.

MS. : Well, first, just with regard to the last point, I think that one of our major general public programs is at stake, and one of the ways they go about doing that is to involve whatever the intended public, representatives of the intended public, would be ----, at least for the dissemination of the material, to find out if, in fact, that is something that that public is interested in. And that's a minimal example of the ways you could go about any project.

But I had a couple of other things that I wanted to see. First, I wanted to go back and mention something that we had talked about this morning, and that is

consultation, and I would like to emphasize that my impression is that if whatever program we've adopt is to be acceptable, I would like to see that consultation take place prior to adoption of guidelines, not just at the end of the process, to sell it to them.

So, I would like to make that clear and have that begin as soon as possible.

Then, as regards -- a question for consideration of those who will be making the next -- going the next step, it was raised in part by what Anita was saying. It seems to me that in the past one of the problems that we might be trying to redress or address is the quality of the programs proposed by certain kinds of groups.

That is not to say that the ideas are not good enough or even that the people are not good enough and so on. I would like to see some room made in whatever form the guidelines eventually end up for consultation grants, for planning grants. That is to say, to identify the kinds of people who may not be good grant writers.

What I partly heard Anita say is that they're going to be people who, if in the end we have groups, constituent groups or kinds of proposals that are consistently funded, oftentimes they look good paper but they're not

quite so good in practice. And we know in all divisions that the possibility is that they are good grant writers.

And, so one of the things we need to ensure is that the people out there who have good ideas but simply are -- they're in rural areas or whatever, they simply don't know how to go about doing a good humanities project. It seems to be incumbent upon us to find ways to serve them well, but necessarily in giving a big grant. There are some of those people who never get a grant under current circumstances.

That seems -- that was one of the kinds of objections I originally had, not objections, but questions that I had when the education guidelines were being reviewed, and I thought that those were dealt with fairly well.

Again, partly because they are not necessarily format, but they are categorically a different way. They're not philosophically driven, as you put it. The consultation grants and pilot grants, those kinds of things that we would want, that are not necessarily inherently just substantively based, but in fact, they are mechanisms which are based on sound humanities which could be adopted, model grants, or whatever, within these categories.

Now, how are we going to do that, using this means

as opposed to some of the means we use in other divisions. Are we going to have sub-categories or programs or line items?

Those are practical questions. It seems to me that we -- I anticipate that we will have to face. Are we going to have a model grants program in this --or could we? How would we go about using this format?

And I think it would be worthwhile considering how that would -- how we could do it, given the premises of this outline you've given.

I have still another question, which may be inappropriate at this time, but since you have almost asked for concluding remarks, it has to do -- In some respects it is totally irrelevant, but it has to do with the '83 as opposed to the '84 budget.

Is it inappropriate to raise that kind of question?

Again, I may be totally inaccurate about this or my impressions may be wrong because my information comes from, primarily, organs that are not NEH organs.

I have read in the Federation newsletters and in the National Alliance for Humanities newsletter that there are differences in the budgets as passed by the House and the Senate. I have no idea what in the end will happen or

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

what stipulations we will be under, but I would like to put on the record my request to the staff or whoever, to the committee, or whoever is responsible, to have some sort of discussion, some sort of proposals for expending the money, if in fact, or alternatives, if in fact it goes the divisional way that the Senate has proposed, as opposed to the programatic way or the line item way that the House has passed.

I would like to be able to have the Counsel, the Committee and the Counsel, make recommendations in February in time for us not to get caught in the crunch we did last time, because my own personal impression is that that's not going to fly. If it goes more in the direction of the programatic line, it's not going to fly and I would like us, again, with the --

Well, it's because we won't have another opportunity or -- I won't have another opportunity to request this formally and on the public record, that's all. I would like to be able to have some opportunity to see that in February so that the guidelines can be ready in time for whoever is going to apply, or for us to have some plan.

It seems to me that whatever happens, one of the problems that we may be dealing with is the appearance as

well as the reality of our commitment to General Programs in specific items within the budget.

MR. : (Comments are inaudible.)

MS. : No, no. I'm not talking about '84. I'm talking about '83.

MR. : I understand. I just wanted to say when you brought the two points together by saying that --

MS. : No, that's why I said it's extraneous to this discussion.

MR. : All right.

MS. : It is extraneous to this discussion except for the fact that --

MR. : I didn't understand ----.

MS. : No, no, no. It's totally extraneous to this point, but I would like -- but I know that we're going to -- we may have money left over or not allocated in the way we thought it was going to be allocated in the summer time.

MR. : (Portions of this speakers comments are inaudible.) -- Senate and House differences and they are paying much attention to the expenditures of '83. We do not want to happen in '83 what happened in '82.

Steve, George and I meet daily on that. More important, is that we have a lot of conversations and perhaps most important ----.

MS. : Yeah, I understand that. But the point I am making is that I would like to be able to have some recommendations, alternative recommendations, to the Counsel that whatever your thoughts are, that the Counsel, I presume, is going to -- last year they approved it but they didn't approve it until May, I think. And I would like to be able to have some of those recommendations on the table in February.

MR. : Okay. We're not anticipating the question of approval by Counsel for the program ----.

MS. : Okay, then correct me if I'm wrong. My understanding is that we have -- that the 1983 budget that we have adopted is one which is different from the programatic lines that are being recommended by the House, and therefore, we have not done planning.

My second understanding is that in other divisions we have A and B categories. That's easily taken care of. In this division we don't have A and B categories and we may have to have new initiative. If we are to have new initiative, it would seem to me worthwhile for every-

body that we have those on the table by February so that everybody will know what they are.

MR. : We have taken steps to cover ourselves. Within the media program there is a special deadline in March for children's media and for applications from those who have previously had planning on ---- grants, move on to what would be the introduction of their proposal.

We also have very large cycles presently in media and museums. With the help of those people in the field we have increased dramatically the number of applications and I anticipate that we will have the fine projects and support that will enable us to use the money wisely that we might get.

MS. : I have no doubt that any money we spent will not be spent wisely. My -- The thing that I am trying to avoid, however, for example, is my understanding that there are monies for libraries which may be problematically spent.

MR. : Libraries are a part of the program development activities and those library proposals will be coming in at the March deadline.

MS. : So we would have no trouble -- we

would not have any extra money to spend even under the programatic ----?

MR. : The new structure can accommodate the elements of both points. I understand ----.

MS. : I think we ought to --

MS. : Then, in any case, for purposes of letting everybody know that we are addressing the issue, then we ought to do it in February.

MS. : ---- it's worth making and we don't want to be caught in the situation where we remake deadlines and we want to send clear messages out. And I understand what you are saying. And I know that both Steve and George are taking it very seriously and will see to it that that is done.

MS. : Anyone else?

Well, if -- In that case I think I will do a sort of a summing up, as best I can.

What I think is the concensus, as I understand it, and anyone is free to disagree with me, and then sort of lay out what I would hope would be an agreeable future.

I think that it seems that everyone is in agreement that the goals are exemplary, that the program should have very clear substantive goals that everyone can understand,

and that that should be -- and that humanities grant -- no grant should be given in this program which does not clearly has as its motivating force, shall we say, things that are implicit in those goals that we should, in that sense, be substantively driven.

I think that it is also the consensus that there are -- we can see some problems which we have occasionally described as administrative, technical, sometimes in a more substantive sense, although not substantive to the humanities. We see that there are some problems in the administration, in the categories, and in the ways that should be done.

I think we see, further, some problems in interpretation of what it is that we decide to do to the people out there who will care a great deal about doing it with us and that it is our strong desire to do it in such a way that they will clearly understand what is our purpose. And further that we will do it in such a way as to elicit from them the kinds of proposals that we wish, and to that extent we need to be sure in advance that what we are proposing is not totally out of "sync", if you will excuse me for using that expression, with what it is that they, in fact, feel and what they are capable of doing. We need

to take that into consideration. It will not do us any good to put out categories that no one will send back proposals that are of the quality that we wish.

I think that sort of -- And that we should involve the public. I think we agreed on that.

I hope, I will throw in that thing that I said in the end, that we will discuss the question of evaluation. That does disturb me and I'm going to say it again.

MS. : First, I would like to thank all of your. I think it has been an absolutely outstanding discussion and I personally have enjoyed it thoroughly and I felt that, as some of us has said that it's a shame, that we just can't have more meetings like this, where small groups of the Counsel get together to discuss an issue without a terrible time constraint.

Now, I would like to propose procedurally that Steve and George, or whoever or however, should write up what they understand to be the sense of what we did here today and what was said and that that be circulated through the -- to the remaining members of the Counsel who were not able to attend this meeting. I feel that they should have a full reporting of what we've done, and also, an opportunity which was denied them because they couldn't

be present here, to comment. So I would like that that be circulated to them, and that they be asked and that their comments be solicited, and at the same time, if any of you have any further comments you would like to make upon reflection of reading what we've said, you should send them back or call or whatever, to Steve and George and submit them to them.

Then at that point or concurrently or during some period of time, that they should continue the exemplary process they have begun of consultation with our constituents.

I think it's ---- with whom you should speak and who you haven't spoken with and perhaps you can carry out Jeff's idea of circularizing at some point. Maybe it's too soon now, but ---- those people, and ask them what their reaction is, whatever is necessary to do, so that we have fully consulted ahead of time and hopefully have looked at all our ----.

At that point I would hope that you would then be able to write a second diagram that would be circulated to the committee and to the Counsel and give us sufficient time to look at it, with specific recommendations of where we are, that would serve as the subject for our discussion

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

at the February ----. -- for us at the committee level at the February counsel and then we could go on from there, at which point we can see where we are, how much we have, in fact, been able to accomplish. We may decide at that point that we are ready to bring it to the full counsel and you all are welcome to sit in on any such discussion that we have and we may be ready to bring it to you in February or whenever it is or however the mechanism goes on from there.

That would be my suggestion for procedure. If anyone has anything now that they would like to add, please do so.

MS. SILVERS : (Portions of the speaker's comments are inaudible.)

Anybody who would like to provide ----.

MS. ZIMMERMAN : Anita, I must answer you. I have brought that up because I had thought originally that we couldn't do that. I was told that that is not the custom, our custom. I want you to know that it did receive consideration and now it may receive further consideration, but it has not been the custom of the Counsel to ---- in this way to solicit comments from the public ----.

MS. SILVERS: Harriet, I understand that it is not

our custom but it ought to be. ---- knowledge of what everybody thinks and the way we find out now is by telephone calls and things that come in the mail and those of us on the West Coast are three hours behind. We find out things three days behind.

It seems to me that the ---- but I'm familiar with the public ----. It's usually thoughtful, informative and ----. If this hasn't been the custom ---- why it hasn't been.

MS. ZIMMERMAN: As I said, my first thought was to agree with you completely and I had thought originally that we would elicit that kind of comment.

I do want to thank all of you from the public who have taken the time and trouble to come. We all appreciate it enormously.

But, as I say, I was dissuaded and that is something which we can consider and we will take it up again.

MR. : I think you have summarized where we now stand very well. I have one thing to add, which I think most people will concur with.

It sounds to me as if we're aiming at a shift for fiscal -- for '85. I mean to say, that our goal would be that the proposal reach the stage of implementation so

that in FY '85 budget planning we have these new categories in place and articulated and announced and so forth.

Does that sound correct?

(Comments and responses inaudible.)

MR. : My concern was that it not be '86.

MR. : No.

MS. : In '85, I think the only reservation that I would have about '84 is that I have a very strong sense that this has been an extremely valuable meeting, and therefore, how much more valuable it would have been if all the members of the Counsel could have participated. I think that what has been proposed is a very radical change -- quite a radical change, and I think that before we undertake such a thing we ought to take all the time necessary to ensure that what we come with will be as, what I said in the beginning, something that everyone can enthusiastically applaud and something that will work.

MS. ZIMMERMAN: Is there anything that anyone else would like to say?

MR. : First of all, members of the Counsel are here as representatives of the public. If there are views from the public which have not been heard, let's

hear them. I have a sense that those views have been heard. I don't want us to go away thinking that some counsel members considered something without hearing from the people.

It seems to me that the voice of many people ---- in this meeting. I can say that is my sense of it, but if there are strong views from the public about what is going on, could we take ten minutes?

MS. : Is there anyone out there representing the public that would care to say anything?

Why don't you identify yourself?

MR. REAGER: I'm Larry Reager and I'm the director of the American Association of Museums and ----.

There have been comments which really summarize the letters that people sent to ---- the chairman, Harriet.

(Portions of this speaker's comments are inaudible.)

First of all, I think it's important to say that the process that Steve and George have involved our organization and others is to be commended, and in my twelve years in ----. It's without parallel and it's to be commended.

I think that I would be not doing service to the museums if I did not say that when we first heard about this and people in the field first heard about it, that

there was and still is a tremendous amount of skepticism, simply because late this summer ---- Congress asked for the program two and a half million dollars -- fiscal '82 fund out of the museum.

We have done everything in our power in working with the chairman, Steve and George to try to assure the field that commitments of the Humanities Endowment has not been lessened in supporting projects in the humanities. But we have not been successful to date.

Anyone who sits in this room and thinks that there is not skepticism and concern out in the field in major museums and small museums ----. Therefore, it's going to be difficult for us -- it will make it more difficult for us to succeed in convincing them that what the Counsel and the chairman finally adopt is really in the best interest of helping museums.

I think that there is tremendous concern ----. We have three categories and we have ---- in each category, and even with the administrative budget that you have requested for '84, not taking into account the possible reduction recommended by the Senate of \$500,000, how can we have somebody that represents the interests of museums ----.

She has done a wonderful job and we are all grateful

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

to her. But again, we are very concerned about it. We need strong leadership to ensure ----. To some extent I believe that agencies have a responsibility to encourage applications, and this is all kinds of applications, museums, media organizations, universities.

---- and I think that Bill pointed out earlier that for your December 13th deadline we hope that you are going to see a flood of really good applications. If not, then by God, the next time we're going to work even harder to get that number up and the quality up.

I think it's important that this not be ----. I think that is going to ----.

I think Steve state, much more eloquently than I, how important those goals that Steve and George have identified for us, how important those are going to be. Not only to making your program better, but frankly, to help make museums better, because it will provide leadership at the national level. So museums will start thinking about this ---- and it's going to affect everything ---- through humanities.

And one last thing. There is a significant number of museums whose only purpose is to promote and advance the humanities. There are museums who do a little bit of

everything. ---- and there are four museums that are just as essential to advancing ---- as major universities. I think that is a situation that has to be addressed outside of the General Program.

Again, I thank you for giving me this opportunity and I tell you that the Endowment is making steps that I think will really strengthen how museums help ----.

MS. ZIMMERMAN: Thank you very much. That was very thoughtful.

You had given me copies and I hadn't distributed them because I had no impression about how one dealt with correspondence from outside, but on the other hand, I will take it upon the chair to say that I also felt uncomfortable or feel uncomfortable, that I should have information that my fellow counsel members don't, so if there's anybody that would like copies of that letter you're more than welcome to come and get it.

I'd like to thank Larry for that, and also that he has exalted our leadership and staff.

MR. : He's not exactly your average man in the street, very Joe Public but I'm very glad to hear from him.

MS. ZIMMERMAN: Those are some comments that we have

hoped that we had thought about, and I'm very grateful to you.

Is there anyone else who would like to say anything?

In that case, I thank you all very much.

MR. : And thanks to the chair for the best meeting we've attended.

MS. ZIMMERMAN: Thank you very much. I appreciate that comment.

The meeting is adjourned.