

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

SEVENTY-EIGHTH MEETING OF THE
NATIONAL COUNCIL ON THE HUMANITIES

November 8, 1985, 9:00 a.m.

Old Post Office
1100 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C.

EBERLIN REPORTING SERVICE
12708 Valleywood Drive
Wheaton, Maryland 20906

TABLE OF CONTENTS

<u>AGENDA ITEM</u>	<u>PAGE NO.</u>
Minutes of Previous Meeting -- Mr. Kingston. . . .	3
Introductory Remarks -- Mr. Agresto.	4
Introduction of New Staff -- Mr. Kingston.	8
Final Fiscal Year Reports: Applications, Gifts and Matching, and Obligations -- Mr. Cherrington.10
Fiscal Year 1986 Appropriations and Reauthorization -- Mr. Cherrington.15
Election of Vice Chairman -- Mr. Agresto and Mr. Kingston.26
Jefferson Lecture -- Mr. Kingston.28
<u>Committee Reports on Policy and General Matters</u>	
Education Programs -- Mr. Dille.29
Fellowship Programs -- Ms. Himmelfarb.31
General Programs -- Mr. Ritcheson.38
Research Programs -- Mr. Berns40
Preservation Grants -- Mr. Berns42
State Programs -- Mr. Hart43
Challenge Grants -- Mr. Cohn44
Emergency Grants and Actions Departing from Council Recommendation/Approvals.57

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

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CLOSED SESSION

<u>AGENDA ITEM</u>	<u>PAGE NO.</u>
Remarks by Mr. Agresto58
OMB Hearing on Fiscal Year 1987 Budget -- Mr. Cherrington84
Funding Commitments Report -- Mr. Cherrington.85
Education Programs -- Mr. Dille.88
Fellowship Programs -- Ms. Himmelfarb.89
General Programs -- Mr. Ritcheson.97
Research Programs -- Mr. Berns	110
Preservation Grants -- Mr. Berns	115
Challenge Grants -- Mr. Cohn	116

P R O C E E D I N G S

MR. KINGSTON: Our microphones will be on in a moment. I will call the meeting to order.

This is the 78th Meeting of the National Council on the Humanities. I will call your attention to the fact that there are two microphones in front of you. The big microphone is the one we would ask you to speak into as soon as they are on. They will amplify our voices. The little microphones-- please do not move-- they are the reporting microphones that we use to form a transcript.

MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING

The first item of business is the minutes of the previous meeting. Council members have received in their folder a copy of a letter from Rita Ricardo-Campbell with requested insertions into the minutes. If there are no objections, we will append that letter in whole to the prior minutes.

(No response.)

MR. KINGSTON: Hearing no objections.

MR. : Move to approve.

MR. KINGSTON: We will so do. Are there other corrections or modifications to the minutes? Ellis, please.

MR. SANDOZ: I don't have a copy of the minutes with me, but as I recollect on page nine of the minutes, there is a reference to a Literary Conference in New Orleans which was

1 in fact at Louisiana State University in Baton Rouge.

2 It was close, I mean it was 80 miles, you know.

3 MR. AGRESTO: Yes, it is on page nine, a state
4 program. A Conference on Southern Literature which is to be
5 held in Baton Rouge. It says the Walden series (?).

6 MR. KINGSTON: All right, on page nine of the
7 minutes, we will correct that to read the Conference to be
8 held in Baton Rouge. Oh, is that where that is?

9 (Laughter.)

10 MR. KINGSTON: Are there other additions or cor-
11 rections to the minutes?

12 (No response.)

13 MR. KINGSTON: Very good. We will move on to
14 Mr. Agresto's introductory remarks, and the microphones are
15 now on.

16 INTRODUCTORY REMARKS

17 MR. AGRESTO: Let me be brief and just bring the Council
18 members and the staff members and the guests up-to-date on
19 a few important events.

20 The Senate hearings were held over this past month,
21 a tentative vote on this nomination is scheduled for
22 November 19. Again, this is a tentative vote, but we are --
23 that is at least a target date that we have been given from
24 the Senate for a vote on his nomination.

25 The second point I want to make is one thing that we

1 we have done as an Agency since February, since the hearings,
2 were a number of issues beginning with the announcement of the
3 preservation issue in February moving to a very small new
4 program that was started for Law School Seminars for law
5 professors in American History to a more major program, the
6 Young Scholars Bicentennial Program which I announced at the
7 Hearing put on-- conducted by the Bicentennial Commission of
8 the United States that you have just shared.

9 I never expected-- or we never expected when we
10 announced this that it would take on as well as it did. We
11 have, so far, and the announcements have been in newspapers,
12 it went over the press, it went over the wires, the AAP put
13 it on the back pages of newspapers. (tape interruption)
14 -- 1500 requests for applications.

15 We already have over 300 applications in place and
16 that is five weeks before the deadline, so I think we struck
17 a nerve. After that, we announced two other initiatives, one
18 on the State of America and the other on the (tape interruption)
19 I thought these were necessary and appropriate for us to focus
20 on and to highlight.

21 And response there has also been very heartening and
22 Jeff Thomas from the Office of the Planning and Budget is
23 coordinating all that and tells me that we are-- not according
24 to any notices, we have the--

25 Other points: we expect to be reauthorized within
a few weeks. We will get the details on this

1 later. There was something in-- the Council members were
2 reading yesterday in their brown folders-- and Steve
3 Cherrington will speak about the details for your organiza-
4 tion later on, but he is going to do it when he is scheduled
5 for 9:40 o'clock.

6 As for Appropriation, both the House and Senate
7 seem intent on upwards around a figure of \$139 million and
8 change. The details, however, of the breakdown of that
9 allocation again is yet to be decided upon.

10 We expect that conference some time-- we are on
11 a continuing resolution. We will continue on the continuing
12 resolution otherwise.

13 But I do expect that that will get voted on
14 before the Congress recesses at the end of the year.

15 Just one last point. Tomorrow morning, starting
16 at 9:00 o'clock in my office and at 9:30 o'clock we will meet
17 in Room 506, those Council members and staff members and others
18 who are involved in the Humanities Science and Technology
19 meeting that we are having. We will have coffee in my office
20 and at 9:30 o'clock the meeting begins.

21 That is all I have to say. Thank you.

22 MR. KINGSTON: Louise.

23 MS. KERR: Could you-- could you give us some idea
24 about what the budgetary provisions for the-- are going to be?
25 How-- do you have a target amount of money or a proportion of

1 budget and how is it going to be administered?

2 For example, out of the Education fund, do you have
3 some sense of how much money is going to come out of the
4 Education budget and--

5 MR. AGRESTO: No, in fact we purposely left that
6 vague and unstated.

7 Whenever I have some issues and certainly when I
8 have two initiatives on the standing-- of the Senate, I would
9 not-- the first question always asked is how much is this
10 going to be to us. That seems to be an attractive, attractive
11 focus to put a number on.

12 I have resisted giving any figure on these. We will
13 as we do in all things, fund all proposals that demand-- that
14 are excellent and some that are very good and not others.

15 The last thing I think we need to do is establish
16 a certain pot of money and then find out that it is either
17 too much or too little.

18 The proposals as they come in will come under guide-
19 lines and procedures of the--these institutions and would
20 be judged by the staff of the Division and the Council Committees
21 and the Council.

22 These aren't the only ways of highlighting and
23 directing and hopefully cultivating projects in these areas, but
24 I didn't think it appropriate to say we will spend "X"
25 amount of dollars on this. I didn't give a gross Agency figure

1 on that I could make so that I could it divisional figures.

2 MS. KERR: I am just curious because especially
3 if it-- it is a terrific idea, as a U.S. historian, I am
4 particularly happy about that. However, I don't know how
5 U.S. historians there are and it would seem to me we would
6 want to look at this program very carefully because it could
7 end up-- especially if this is as popular as you say that it
8 is.

9 MR. KINGSTON: Any other comments or questions?

10 (No response.)

11 MR. KINGSTON: We will move on to the introduction
12 of new staff members. We have several new staff members
13 because we began in this last quarter a new academic year.

14 First of all, I would like to introduce Martha
15 Crunkleton. Martha, would you stand up?

16 Martha is-- has been at the Endowment before but has jus
17 taken on new duties as the Acting Assistant Director in the
18 Education Division.

19 Robert Bledsoe, way in the back, has joined as an
20 IPA in the Research Division.

21 Sara Chapman-- Sara is over here-- is Acting
22 Assistant-- or is the Assistant Director in the Education
23 Division under an IPA contract. The full biographies, by
24 the way, you will find in your folder. You may have looked
25 at those last night.

1 Hrach Gregorian is way in the back and is working
2 in the State Programs Division.

3 Michael Hall--

4 MS. : He has gone to a professional--

5 MR. KINGSTON: -- is out working, but he is working
6 for Fellowships. Okay.

7 William Maher is over here in the Research Division.

8 Kathleen Mitchell, Kathleen is over here, has
9 joined the staff with the Fellowships Division.

10 And David Nichols, Dave is over here and is working
11 also in the Research Division.

12 Paul Peterson, back there in the middle, is working
13 out of the Office of Planning and Budget.

14 Peter Schultz, sitting next to Paul, is also working
15 out of the Office of Planning and Budget.

16 Steve Tigner-- is Steve here, Guin? Steve has
17 joined us to direct our Summer Seminars.

18 MS. GRIEST: Steve Tigner has--

19 MR. KINGSTON: Is also working for the Division.

20 MS. GRIEST: Our former Chairman has filched him
21 away for today.

22 MR. KINGSTON: But he is not supposed to do that.

23 MS. GRIEST: I know that.

24 (Laughter.)

25 MS. GRIEST: He was grabbed and left us.

1 MR. KINGSTON: You do not have-- you will have in
2 time a complete biography for Pamela Menke, but I would like
3 to introduce her at this time. Pam is back here.

4 Pam will be joining us in January as our new
5 Director of the Division of Education Programs and I want to
6 take this opportunity as well to extend profuse to John
7 Andrews. He has done an excellent job as the Acting Director
8 during our period of research. Thank you, John, very much.

9 In your Council book under Tab "A", you will find
10 a sole contract that has been left since last quarter. This
11 is the contract of the National Federation of State Humanities
12 Councils.

13 Are there any questions or comments about the
14 contract?

15 (No response.)

16 MR. KINGSTON: There being none, we will move on to
17 the "Final Fiscal Year Reports. Applications, Gifts, and
18 Matching; and Obligations". Mr. Cherrington.

19 FINAL FISCAL YEAR REPORTS:

20 APPLICATIONS: GIFTS AND MATCHING: AND OBLIGATIONS

21 MR. CHERRINGTON: Okay, in the brown folder yester-
22 day, the three reports I am going to discuss at this time
23 were passed out.

24 The first one I will talk about is the Application
25 Report. This report compares the applications considered

1 and recommended by the Council in 1984 and 1985.

2 As I say in the report, applications are down around
3 10 percent. There are some minor adjustments in museums. In
4 1984, there were three deadlines. In 1985 there were two.

5 But the main area of decline is in Fellowships. I
6 think I have said this before-- this seems to be part of a
7 national trend.

8 OPB is going to be doing a study of summer seminars
9 for college teachers. This may reveal what is going on here.
10 We hope to have this report to you at the February Council.

11 As the Fellowships Committee discussed yesterday,
12 we are doing other things to try to increase applications.
13 The Traveling Collections Program, for instance-- as the
14 Committee discussed yesterday, the eligibility in this program
15 may be opened up for grants all over the world rather than
16 just North America and western Europe.

17 And also, in 1987 we hope to increase the stipend in
18 that program as well.

19 Younger Scholars: the applications were way down
20 in '85. As I explained before, we believe this is because
21 the deadline for applications in this program was set too
22 close to the beginning of the academic year. This didn't give
23 people enough time to submit their applications.

24 So, in 1986, we have changed this deadline and we
25 have also had a lot more publicity on this program and as a

1 result, applications in-- into the Younger Scholars, excuse
2 me, are up to 715 this year and last year we only got 170.
3 This is quite a remarkable achievement.

4 As John said, the Younger Scholars-- Bicentennial
5 Younger Scholars Grant also may bring in another 500 applica-
6 tions.

7 Not all programs were down in '85. The Project
8 Research went up because they had a special deadline in
9 archeology. Humanity, Science, and Technology also went
10 up-- this is-- we now run our own competition in this program
11 and it is gaining some momentum.

12 The funding ratio, the success ratio of applications
13 remains about one in four.

14 All right, then I will move right into the next one.
15 This is the G and M report, also in your brown folder.

16 As I mentioned, there might be a few minor adjust-
17 ments in this report because putting the books together at the
18 end of the year is not an exact science, but the adjustments
19 will be minor, and the basic trends you see in this report
20 will continue. Basic trends you see in this report will

21 There are two tables in this report. The first is
22 the regular chart that I give you every Council. The second
23 is a special chart on the Offers that are closed during the
24 year.

25 As we had been forecasting, '85 is a record year

1 for Matching. It exceeded all our expectations. \$17.6 million
2 in Matching in 1985, and that excludes the Challenge Grant
3 Program.

4 Education matching was up 100 percent. General
5 Programs up a remarkable 300 percent. The only indicator
6 of G and M activity that is down slightly is the amount of
7 total open offers. That might be an indicator of how much
8 matching will be done next year.

9 As I explained in the memo, this is actually a
10 technical adjustment, part of which is the fact that State
11 Programs is closing out all of its offers at the end of the
12 fiscal year.

13 This is a good move. I think it will help the
14 States and the State Councils put their books in order because
15 beginning with the new year they will have a new grant and
16 a new G and M offer to work on.

17 The percentage of offers that were fully reached
18 is also a record. The only thing I am worried about a little
19 bit is continuing this momentum in '86.

20 In \$140 million budget, we want \$14 million in
21 Treasury funds; unfortunately the House Appropriations
22 Bill we have right now only has \$9.3 million in the Treasury
23 funds. So, we are hoping something can be done.

24 MR. : The Senate will-- the Senate Bill
25 has a higher figure.

1 MR. CHERRINGTON: Yes, the Senate Bill does have a
2 higher figure.

3 Let's move on then. The last one is the report on
4 1985 obligations. This shows how the money was spent in 1985.
5 No real comments here.

6 The way it is organized, each project that will
7 receive any money in 1985 is shown there. This could be a
8 project that was awarded in a previous year that received a
9 supplement or amendment in 1985.

10 We were able to obligate everything by the end of
11 the year that we had including some Treasury funds that were
12 deobligated from 1984.

13 And that is it.

14 MR. KINGSTON: Are there any questions about fiscal
15 year 1985 and this report?

16 MR. ALLEN: I have one question.

17 MR. KINGSTON: Bill.

18 MR. ALLEN: Steve, could you explain to me what our
19 situation is relative to the year-to-year congressional
20 authorizations in light of prospective commitments of ours?

21 MR. : We can't hear you down here.

22 MS. : We can't hear you.

23 MR. ALLEN: You can't hear me? I am sorry. I asked
24 Steve to explain to me what our situation is relative to the
25 year-to-year congressional authorization and appropriations

1 in light of our prospective commitments.

2 MR. CHERRINGTON: Okay. Later in the agenda, I will
3 be talking about funding commitments. This would be under
4 Tab H. That might be a better time to do it.

5 MR. ALLEN: Will that touch the Matching Grants?

6 MR. CHERRINGTON: Yes, yes it will.

7 MR. ALLEN: Okay.

8 MR. KINGSTON: Other questions about fiscal year
9 1985?

10 (No response.)

11 MR. KINGSTON: All right. I will turn to Steve to
12 talk about "Appropriations in Fiscal '86 and the Reauthorization
13 Process".

14 FISCAL YEAR 1986 APPROPRIATIONS AND REAUTHORIZATION

15 MR. CHERRINGTON: Okay. Also in your folder there is
16 a memo on '86 appropriations.

17 As John as been saying, the basic situation right
18 now is we don't have a Bill. We have a House-- full House---

19 MR. KINGSTON: Tab C.

20 MR. CHERRINGTON: I am sorry?

21 MR. KINGSTON: Tab C.

22 MR. CHERRINGTON: Thank you. We have a full House
23 Bill and a Senate Committee Bill. They are both around the
24 same amount, but as you can see there are some differences
25 in the accounts within them.

1 In fact, you might look at the last two columns in
2 my chart. You will see that we are somewhat-- we are
3 concerned about the allocations and fellowships, humanities
4 programs for adults, preservation, Treasury and Administrative

5 As I just said in my Matching report, we are
6 worried that the House matching figure might slow our
7 momentum in matching there and also the figure for preserva-
8 tion could be a problem because we are trying to get the
9 initiative underway.

10 The figure for Administrative could also be a
11 problem. We might not be holding any more Council meetings,
12 for instance, because that is quite a low figure.

13 MR. : This is all under the House Bill.

14 MR. CHERRINGTON: Yes, these are all under the
15 House Bill.

16 The Senate Committee report would be acceptable to
17 us.

18 As has been mentioned, for our continuing resolution
19 through November 14, the first thing that has to happen the
20 Senate must act, the full Senate must act on a Bill and right
21 now we are fourth in line behind the Farm Bill, the Debt
22 Bill, and the Reconciliation Bill, and--

23 (Laughter.)

24 MR. CHERRINGTON: --I have asked what is being
25 reconciled here and no one seems to know, but, anyway.

1 Following this, there will have to be a Conference
2 Committee, so I think it is safe to assume that we will be on
3 another Continuing Resolution.

4 This has happened a lot. We had one, two, three
5 CR's before. In fact, in 1984, I think we were on a Continuing
6 Resolution for the whole year. This is not really Government's
7 finest hour.

8 Again, back to my chart. The column we would really
9 prefer, at the \$140 million level is the Senate Capability
10 Level.

11 We prepared this in response to a request from
12 Senator McClure who heads our Appropriations Committee in the
13 Senate.

14 One more problem with the CR-- it is sometimes
15 difficult to pass this time of year because this is when they
16 become somewhat like Christmas trees and this is when the
17 pork barrel and riders get attached so we are a little worried
18 about the passage of the Bill.

19 MR. KINGSTON: Let me ask if there are any questions
20 about the status of Appropriations?

21 (No response)

22 MR. KINGSTON: There being none, do you want to speak
23 to Reauthorization?

24 MR. CHERRINGTON: Let's see. Also, in Tab C in your
25 folder, we have a point by point discussion of the Senate and

1 House Reauthorization Bills.

2 Normally, there would be a Conference to resolve
3 the differences between the two Bills, but this year it
4 appears as if there will not be, and the two Bills will just
5 be merged together and then they will be sent to each House
6 for approval.

7 MS. KERR: I have a question.

8 MR. KINGSTON: Louise.

9 MS. KERR: Yes. Given that the reauthorization
10 process is a relatively infrequent process having taken place
11 at this point only four times, I would request that this very
12 clear and cogent thoughtful and thorough listing of the items
13 of the Bill which we have some interest in be appended to the
14 minutes and that furthermore I would like to have those
15 sections which refer specifically to the differences in EEOC
16 provisions to be noted or at least to be-- to have some
17 attention drawn to them in the body of the minutes. Not
18 necessarily by quoting or including them, but simply by way
19 of saying that one might want to look at the appended list
20 with particular notation of--

21 I think that that would be very helpful for the
22 historical record for-- to have this body make note of the--
23 those things which it has taken interest in in the reauthoriza-
24 tion process.

25 MR. KINGSTON: Okay. John?

1 MR. AGRESTO: The language on EEOC as you have it
2 here is the language of the House Bill as it stands at
3 present.

4 There almost surely will be some modification of
5 that. The modification will be as follows as I am told,
6 although I don't know-- I say this as I am told. That this
7 Agency will be instructed in the House Bill and we anticipate
8 the Senate will not object, to file by the beginning of-- by
9 the end of January, the beginning of February next year, goals
10 and timetables with the EEOC.

11 That is slightly different from what happens here
12 and surely radically different from Council policy and my
13 in the past.

14 MS. KERR: Well, I was really-- what I really was
15 interested in noting that in this list of the differences
16 that we would have there are several.

17 I mean, there are a whole series of provisions
18 which refer to what we might broadly construe as EEOC kinds
19 of provisions, and I simply wanted as a principal to have--
20 I would like to have them noted.

21 I was not really speaking specifically to--

22 MR. AGRESTO: The EEOC.

23 MS. KERR: I was not speaking specifically to what
24 you have noted, but to broadly construe the notion of EEOC.
25 EEO-- equal opportunity.

1 Would you like me to talk to Shirley about those
2 provisions that I would like noted?

3 MR. AGRESTO: What notes?

4 MS. KERR: Oh, okay. Well I just-- okay, we can
5 go through and I would like, for example, to have in addition
6 to the appendix of this-- the list, page-- on page four,
7 item 10 for example, as well as 11, as well as 12. And I
8 think that that would be all, but I would have to read it more
9 carefully to be sure and I could let you know.

10 MR. KINGSTON: Let me get this clear, Louise.
11 You would like to have these incorporated into the body of
12 the minutes? They are--

13 MS. KERR: No, I would like this to be appended
14 but I would like the minutes to make particular notation of
15 those items in the body of the minutes.

16 MR. KINGSTON: Okay. The document is already part
17 of the official record. The minutes or the transcript of the
18 meeting, and--

19 MS. KERR: I would like them appended to the
20 minutes.

21 MR. KINGSTON: --the agenda will be-- an appendix.

22 MS. KERR: I would like them appended to the next
23 issue of our minutes.

24 MR. KINGSTON: All right. But, you can do this
25 as a formal motion then.

1 MS. KERR: If you feel it has to have a formal
2 motion and it can be voted up or down, that is fine. I would
3 like to recommend that that be the case.

4 MR. KINGSTON: Okay. So, we have a motion then to
5 append--

6 MR. RITCHESON: I want to make a recommendation,
7 Mr. Chairman, of how constitutionally where we stand. Is it
8 a motion? I didn't hear a motion.

9 MR. KINGSTON: I think we can only-- this is
10 eccentric in terms of the way that we would report the minutes
11 but we would have to enter it in, I think, as a motion-- a
12 motion to append it to the minutes, this specific document.
13 This is not a correction or addition to the minutes in terms
14 of the review of the minutes. It is a request to put a
15 specific document into the minutes in a form that we do not
16 normally use.

17 MR. RITCHESON: Does this have any indication about
18 policy or any kind of shift or change?

19 MS. KERR: I see it as only, from my point of view,
20 an historical record of this meeting as we talked about it at
21 this meeting today.

22 MR. AGRESTO: Made as a motion, it would open up the
23 floor for discussion.

24 (Simultaneous discussion.)

25 MS. KERR: I agree with that, all that I have said.

1 MR. KINGSTON: Yes, we understand it is a motion
2 and we can open up the issue for discussion.

3 So, there is a motion before the floor to append
4 the full document on Reauthorization to the minutes. Is there
5 a second?

6 MR. : I second the motion.

7 MR. KINGSTON: The motion has been seconded. Is
8 there any discussion about it?

9 MS. HIMMELFARB: I don't see the appropriateness
10 of this at all. This is--

11 MR. KINGSTON: Please use your microphone.

12 MS. HIMMELFARB: I don't see the appropriateness of
13 this in the minutes at all. The minutes reflect what we have
14 done in this body. We have not done any of these things--

15 These may be a matter of record and therefore they
16 should appear as part of the record of this Council, but they
17 cannot appropriately be regarded as anything we have done.

18 Indeed, the Senate and the House have yet not
19 themselves acted upon these provisions. So, how do they appear
20 in the minutes? I don't understand that.

21 MS. KERR: We have-- it is my understanding that we
22 have acted upon them in the sense that we have, at least through
23 the staff, taken some sort of positions on these.

24 I mean, we have attitudes toward these.

25 MS. HIMMELFARB: Attitudes don't really get reflected

1 in the minutes. The minutes are the record of policy, as I
2 understand it, taken by this group.

3 MR. AGRESTO: Louise, if you would like a discussion
4 of the policy matter, why don't we just ask for a discussion of
5 the policy matter?

6 MS. KERR: Well it is, I didn't see-- I see this as
7 simply a record of our monitoring of the reauthorization
8 process. That I don't think is necessarily policy, but it is
9 simply part of the record.

10 MR. AGRESTO: Anita.

11 MS. SILVERS: This is a parliamentary inquiry. If
12 we are having a discussion of whether these documents should
13 go in the minutes, I have a funny feeling that the documents
14 will have to go into the minutes as part of the record of the
15 discussion.

16 (Laughter.)

17 MS. SILVERS: Which would mean that we wouldn't--
18 I mean it is rather odd to move to put something or other into
19 the minutes, but the minutes do have to reflect whatever it is
20 we are discussing. So it would have to be--

21 MR. KINGSTON: Let me-- let me try to be clear.
22 What happens is--

23 MS. HIMMELFARB: No. Not necessarily. If we decide
24 not to put them in the minutes, then they don't get put in the
25 minutes.

1 MS. SILVERS: That is true. That is the truth.
2 Then we take a motion to direct the-- whoever is taking the
3 minutes to exclude this.

4 What I am trying to suggest is that maybe this is
5 getting itself done in the process of our discussing it.

6 MR. KINGSTON: Let me just explain technically what
7 happens. The minutes are built out of the transcript of the
8 discussion of this meeting.

9 What also constitutes the formal minutes of the
10 meeting is a copy of the Agenda book and all the documents
11 that appear in it.

12 So, this particular document that we are talking
13 about does appear as an appendage to the minutes already,
14 but I think what Louise is asking is that this be made --
15 an additional document appended to the formal transcript of
16 the-- and highlighting it.

17 Yes, please.

18 MR. ALLEN: I would like to amplify what I think
19 Anita was saying moments ago.

20 We have pending a motion having cited certain
21 specific provisions to be highlighted in the appendix to the
22 record, to the minutes, then presumably the motion would have
23 to be written in the minutes of this meeting with reference
24 to those specific provisions.

25 At this point, they are already included in the

1 minutes unless we take a specific action to exclude them.
2 Now if the motion fails to carry, they still remain in the
3 minutes with all comments having been made on them.

4 MS. SILVERS: That is what I think is the case.

5 MR. KINGSTON: Are there other comments? Questions?

6 (No response.)

7 MR. KINGSTON: Well the motion before the floor
8 right now is to append it to the minutes, a copy of the
9 Reauthorization document which was in Tab C of the Agenda
10 book.

11 All those in favor of that motion, please signify
12 by saying "aye".

13 (A chorus of ayes was heard.)

14 MR. KINGSTON: Opposed?

15 (A chorus of nos was heard.)

16 MR. KINGSTON: I will ask for a show of hands,
17 please. Those in favor of the motion.

18 (A show of hands was seen.)

19 MR. KINGSTON: Those opposed?

20 (A show of hands was seen.)

21 MR. KINGSTON: The motion is defeated.

22 MS. SILVERS: I want to be recorded as abstaining.

23 MR. KINGSTON: All right. Are there any other
24 comments?

25 MS. : Conflict of interest.

1 MR. KINGSTON: All right.

2 MR. : May I ask what the vote was?

3 MR. KINGSTON: The vote as I counted it was five
4 for the motion, 12 against the motion, and two abstentions.
5 I can recount them if there are any questions.

6 All right. That being done, the next item on the
7 agenda--

8 MR. AGRESTO: That will be the end of our discussion
9 on reauthorization unless further comments.

10 MR. KINGSTON: The next item on the agenda is the
11 "Election of a Vice Chairman of the Council" for a term of
12 two years.

13 ELECTION OF VICE CHAIRMAN

14 MR. AGRESTO: Today is a day of comings and goings
15 and the first person-- since we are going to be now electing
16 a new Vice Chairman, I think it only appropriate for me and
17 for all of us to thank George Kennedy who has been a support
18 and a help to not only me and Tom, but to all of us here.
19 And I wouldn't want the new election to take place until after
20 we had all thanked him for what he has done. Thank you.

21 (Applause.)

22 MR. KINGSTON: Council members have in their
23 folders a copy of a ballot for Vice Chairman. There were two
24 duly-- there were two duly recorded nominations to Vice
25 Chairman of the Council, A. Lawrence Chickering and Jeffrey

1 Hart.

2 It is appropriate for Council members to speak on
3 behalf of either nominee before we ask for a formal tally.

4 (No response.)

5 MR. KINGSTON: There being no comment, we will ask
6 you if you would please, to mark the ballot that is in your
7 folder and fold it once. I will ask our General Council and
8 his staff to pick up the copies, your ballot copy and to
9 compile the tally.

10 MR. KINGSTON: I don't (inaudible)

11 MS. : It is on "D".

12 MR. KINGSTON: If you have mislaid the ballot, we
13 do have additional copies, Shirley, and can give you one. But
14 please only mark one ballot.

15 (Members marking ballots)

16 MR. KINGSTON: Yes, Charles.

17 MR. RITCHESON: I have been disenfranchised.

18 (Simultaneous discussion.)

19 MR. RITCHESON: No ballot.

20 MR. KINGSTON: Everyone has received a ballot-- all
21 the Council members?

22 Charles hasn't received a ballot yet either, Shirley.
23 Roland needs one.

24 MS. SILVERS: The notion of giving academics a
25 ballot a day before and expecting them to be able to find it

1 is-- the secretary would ball you out if you lost it.

2 MR. KINGSTON: Is there anyone else who is missing
3 a ballot?

4 All right, so mark those slips, elect them.

5 While the tally is going on-- Mary, Charles over here didn't
6 get one.

7 While they are collecting the ballots and the tally
8 is going on, let me explain the agenda for Jefferson Lecture
9 which is described in a memorandum under Tab "E" of the Council
10 Agenda book.

11 You will note that we have set back by three months
12 the time table for the selection of the Jefferson Lecture.

13 The reasons are indicated in the memo.

14 We will be asking the members of the Committee to
15 meet the day prior to the February meeting of Council, a
16 presumption that even though we have a class of Council members
17 whose terms normally would end before the next Council member
18 meeting, that that class would be sitting for the next meeting
19 but that class would be sitting for the next meeting and
20 members of the class who are sitting on the Jefferson Lecture
21 Committee are invited to attend the meeting in February.

22 That meeting will be open to a complete and
23 thorough review of the procedures and a consequence of that
24 meeting will be-- be reporting back to the February meeting of
25 the Plenary Council about the procedures for the 1987

1 Jefferson Lecture.

2 Are there any questions or comments about the
3 process?

4 (No response.)

5 MR. KINGSTON: There being none, let's move on to
6 the next item on the agenda while we eagerly anticipate the
7 results of the election.

8 We will open with the "Committee Reports on Policy
9 and General Matters" starting first with the Education
10 Division, Mr. Dille reporting.

11 COMMITTEE REPORTS ON POLICY AND GENERAL MATTERS

12 EDUCATION PROGRAMS

13 MR. DILLE: John Andrews opened the public session
14 report on the recent staff changes. John Walker has become
15 a Special Assistant to the Education Secretary Bennett.

16 Judith Ginsberg will soon become Director of Research
17 and lecture in Spanish at Fordham University.

18 We welcome two newcomers to the Division. You have
19 met IPA Assistant Director Sara Chapman.

20 The newly reported Director of the Division of
21 Education Programs, Pamela Menke, will be coming to the
22 Endowment in January from Colby Sawyer College in New
23 Hampshire where she now serves as Provost to Dean of the
24 Faculty.

25 She spoke for a few minutes indicating that she is

1 solidly behind the curricular recommendations and to reclaim
2 a legacy and indicated her firm commitment to the Division's
3 emphasis with a wise and eloquent speech and the Committee
4 then pointed out the areas of disagreement with her, as is our
5 want. That took some time.

6 Director Apparent Menke seemed undismayed to
7 discover that we would soon all be gone.

8 (Laughter.)

9 MR. DILLE: The reports of the Committee's efforts
10 to respond to concerns that we raised in the August meeting are
11 as follows: Martha Crunkleton shared a set of statistics
12 about the relative success rates of various types of institu-
13 tions applying for Central Disciplines Grants where the data
14 indicating the number of applicants from state colleges and
15 universities is roughly proportional to the number of such
16 institutions around the country. The success rate of such
17 institutions is roughly equal to that of other types of
18 institutions.

19 Carolyn Reed-Wallace and Jamie Sepelow (?) told the
20 Committee about two upcoming workshops for historically Black
21 Colleges and Universities including one to be hosted by Sam
22 Cooke at the University of New Orleans.

23 And we heard the report on the many ways in which
24 the members of the Division are disseminating information at
25 professional meetings and at educational institutions.

1 There was one matter which caused us some concern.
2 It was a report that responsibility for review and administra-
3 tion of Education Programs' Bicentennial projects was being
4 shifted from the Bicentennial Office.

5 And John responded to several questions about the
6 rationale for the new procedure, but at least two members of
7 the Committee asked to be put on the record as finding it
8 difficult to understand or justify.

9 It is a Committee, incidentally, where two members
10 is sort of like a majority.

11 Then he skipped to the closed meeting because this
12 would be probably improper to report when I report in the
13 closed session, I end the whole thing with roses, champagne
14 and maudlin speeches of farewell.

15 (Laughter.)

16 MR. KINGSTON: Any comments or questions about the
17 report from Education?

18 (No response.)

19 MR. KINGSTON: There being none, we will move on to the
20 "Report on Policy and General Matters from the Division of
21 Fellowships", Bea Himmelfarb.

22 MS. HIMMELFARB: The Fellowship Committee welcomed
23 the new staff members. Stephen Tigner of the Program Office
24 of the Summer Seminars for Secondary School Teachers, formerly
25 of the University of Toledo.

1 And two new IPA appointments, Michael Hall from
2 Centennary College of Louisiana and Kathleen Mitchell from
3 Perdue.

4 We reviewed the schedule of meetings-- of programs
5 for the next several meetings and we then discussed one policy
6 issue.

7 And that concerned the question of what we call
8 the unaffiliated scholar; that is, the scholar who is not
9 affiliated with any academic institution.

10 At the moment, a fellowship application from an
11 unaffiliated scholars can go to either the Independent Study
12 and Research Program or to the College Teacher Fellowship
13 Program.

14 Now the Independent Study and Research Program is
15 primarily intended for those in universities; that is,
16 universities with doctoral programs.

17 The College Teacher Fellowship Program has been
18 primarily intended for four year colleges.

19 This seems to do a disservice in most cases to the
20 unaffiliated scholar who chooses to apply to the Independent
21 Study and Research Program for several reasons. That scholar
22 is less likely, for example, to have access to a major
23 university library. He is much more likely to be working the
24 long hours and so on which makes the situation more comparable
25 to the college teacher rather than the university professor.

1 We decided, therefore, to recommend the following:
2 that university-- that the unaffiliated scholar apply to the
3 program that is currently designated the College Teachers
4 Program rather than Independent Fellowship Program.

5 That the Independent Fellowship Program be reserved
6 for those from universities, and that the current College
7 Teacher Program be expanded to include not only those from
8 four year colleges, two year colleges, but primary or secondary
9 schools and also the unaffiliated scholar.

10 The names of the programs would then have to be
11 changed. The entire Fellowship Program would continue to go
12 under the rubric of NEH Fellowships, and the two separate
13 categories under that rubric would be, "Fellowships for
14 University Teachers", and "Fellowships for College Teachers
15 and Independent Scholars".

16 Within the University Teacher Program, we would
17 continue to distinguish between junior scholars and senior
18 scholars.

19 MR. KINGSTON: Any comments or questions?

20 MS. RHOME: I have a number of inquiries in our
21 Bloomington community of Indiana University from persons who
22 are retired. They are no longer affiliated and yet they are
23 of a professorial rank who now have time to finish that book
24 that they have been working on.

25 Where would they fall, then? Would they fall with

1 this-- with the regular--

2 MS. HIMMELFARB: In the College Teachers Program.

3 MS. RHOME: In the College Teachers Program.

4 MS. HIMMELFARB: College Teachers and Independent
5 Scholars.

6 MS. RHOME: So I can-- thank you.

7 MS. HIMMELFARB: It removed the ambiguity and
8 uncertainty that we had previously.

9 MS. RHOME: Sure.

10 MR. KINGSTON: Anita.

11 MS. SILVERS: I guess I have a couple of questions
12 about this change. The first is that I would take it the
13 funding for the two programs would be adjusted to reflect the
14 larger number of applications in College Teachers.

15 The second thing I guess I am not understanding too
16 well is that the-- when I used to serve many years ago on the
17 panels for the College Teachers competition, the-- one of the
18 important considerations was the relation between the appli-
19 cants project and that person's teacher responsibilities.

20 In addition, the former publication record of
21 applicants was assessed in respect to weight of teaching load,
22 other opportunities, that sort of thing.

23 Now those criteria, of course, would not apply to
24 independent scholars, and so essentially you are going to
25 income answerables competing against each other using two

1 different sets of criteria within the same competition. I am
2 not sure how that is supposed to go.

3 Is it the case that an independent scholar with a
4 spotty prior publication record would be in a less advantageous
5 position than a college teacher with identical publication
6 record, but with the explanation of a heavy teaching load or
7 would that not come into--

8 MS. HIMMELFARB: The independent scholar has other
9 responsibilities presumably, like making a living, you know, work
10 working 40 hours a week or whatever so that the disparity
11 actually is less gross in including the independent scholar in
12 a College Teacher Program than it currently is in the
13 Independent Study and Research Program.

14 But-- Guin, do you want to add--

15 MS. GRIEST: I might just add, Anita, that you
16 served on panels in the very early years of the Program, and
17 it has evolved because we found that most college teachers
18 are indeed of exactly the same breed as university teachers
19 and what they wanted to do is research.

20 And that research might not be related to their
21 teaching in that-- let's say a specialty in Victorian litera-
22 ture and the person is teaching three sections of rhetoric
23 and one other genre course, you know.

24 So that--- and they were struggling to make the
25 connection and it couldn't be done. So that we found what has

1 happened is, what they want is research time, time for study
2 and research and we have accordingly adjusted our guidelines
3 to suit that.

4 MR. KINGSTON: Other comments or questions?

5 MS. KERR: I have a question.

6 MR. KINGSTON: Yes, Louise.

7 MS. KERR: It is very difficult to hear down here
8 just because it is so fuzzy.

9 Did I hear you say that you would also have a
10 program for elementary and secondary teachers? Or did--

11 MS. HIMMELFARB: No, applicants from elementary
12 or secondary schools could apply to the College Teacher Program
13 and Independent Scholar Program.

14 MS. KERR: This would be teachers-- who would that
15 be except for teachers?

16 MS. HIMMELFARB: I am sorry?

17 MS. KERR: If it were not teachers, who would it be?

18 MS. HIMMELFARB: Well, I say, they would be
19 teachers.

20 MS. KERR: Oh.

21 MS. HIMMELFARB: Yes. They would be teachers.

22 MS. KERR: And they--

23 MS. HIMMELFARB: They would have the same status as
24 independent scholars that have been obviously neither affiliated
25 to a major university nor to a college.

1 MS. KERR: And they would also be fitting in under
2 the same guideline that you have just described?

3 MS. HIMMELFARB: Yes, as an independent scholar.

4 MR. KINGSTON: We do concede that but--

5 MS. HIMMELFARB: I mean if an independent scholar
6 happens to be a high school teacher, you know, as far as I am
7 concerned that doesn't disqualify him as a scholar.

8 MS. KERR: Oh, I didn't want to say he should be
9 disqualified. I am just trying to clarify it.

10 MS. HIMMELFARB: You know, we are just opening it
11 up, spelled out really, a provision that is implicit in the
12 current practice.

13 MR. KINGSTON: Peter.

14 MR. STANLIS: Concerning the whole matter of
15 independent scholars, I would like to raise a question on one
16 of the decisions made by the--

17 MR. KINGSTON: You will have to wait until Closed
18 Session.

19 MR. STANLIS: Oh, I see. All right. An appropriate
20 time.

21 MR. KINGSTON: Okay.

22 MR. STANLIS: But this policy does not exclude
23 independent scholars from what you are saying?

24 MS. HIMMELFARB: Oh, not at all. It is very
25 hospitable to them.

1 MR. STANLIS: Okay.

2 MS. HIMMELFARB: And this is intended to be more
3 hospitable to them, to give them a better break than they have
4 had when they have been competing with university professors.
5 That is really what is intended.

6 MR. KINGSTON: Other comments or questions?

7 (No response.)

8 MR. KINGSTON: Well, before we proceed in the
9 reports, let me announce the results of your election.

10 The new Vice Chairman of the Council who will
11 assume his duties immediately following this meeting is
12 A. Lawrence Chickering.

13 MS. : What does the "A" stand for?

14 MR. KINGSTON: You will have to ask as the first
15 order of business.

16 All right, may we proceed to a "Report from the
17 General Programs Division", Mr. Ritcheson reporting.

18 GENERAL PROGRAMS

19 MR. RITCHESON: Mr. Chairman, during the Open Session
20 of the meeting, the Division reported on the plans concerning
21 special initiatives, Understanding America and Understanding
22 Other Nations.

23 The Division will encourage applications relating to
24 these emphases in all its programs. The staff sees this as
25 an opportunity for exploring broad themes in American history

1 through film, reading and discussion groups, as well as special
2 exhibitions.

3 We next discussed ongoing evaluation projects,
4 especially the examination of the Interpretive Skills Workshops
5 funded in the Museums and Historical Organizations Programs.

6 We were pleased to hear that this evaluation is
7 almost completed and that the report will be presented at the
8 February Council meeting.

9 Two productions supported by the Media Program,
10 Booker and Out of Time, recently received Alpha Awards at the
11 American Children's Television Festival.

12 We were particularly gratified to hear of this
13 recognition for programs resulting from the Children's Media
14 Initiative. We look forward to hearing of similar successes
15 in the future.

16 Finally--and this I come to the Walter Berns part of
17 my report-- the staff made a presentation of materials developed
18 by projects supported in both the Media and the Museums and
19 Historical Organization Programs. I want particularly Walter
20 to see this absolutely magnificent catalogue, India, developed
21 in connection with the exhibition currently on view at the
22 Metropolitan Museum of Art in New York.

23 We also received a copy of "The Web", a brochure
24 describing 23 works of classic American literature and 14
25 Greek myths which have been transformed into 70 half hours

1 of radio drama.

2 That concludes my report, Mr. Chairman.

3 MR. KINGSTON: Any comments or questions about the
4 report from the Division of General Programs?

5 Frances.

6 MS. RHOME: Where can we order copies of the
7 "The Web" and of "India"?

8 MR. RITCHESON: Copies of the India --

9 MS. RHOME: "The Web".

10 MR. GIBSON: Excuse me, of which?

11 MS. RHOME: "The Web".

12 MR. GIBSON: I can provide information for you after
13 the meeting. I don't have it right here.

14 MS. RHOME: Thank you, Don.

15 MR. KINGSTON: Stay in touch with Mr. Gibson.

16 MS. RHOME: I will do that.

17 MR. KINGSTON: Our "Report from the Division of
18 Research Programs", Mr. Berns reporting.

19 RESEARCH PROGRAMS

20 MR. BERNs: --but as usual--

21 MR. KINGSTON: Just a second, Walter, grab a
22 microphone.

23 MR. BERNs: As I say, we had a public session
24 yesterday, but as usual we had no members of the public
25 present.

1 We discussed, briefly, the new guidelines.

2 (Laughter.)

3 MR. BERNES: And I have just been informed by
4 Mr. Kkman that this year we have contributed 22.5 feet of
5 shelf space filled by books published with the support of
6 grants from this Division.

7 MS. HIMMELFARB: How much do they weigh?

8 (Laughter.)

9 MR. BERNES: We will have that figure next year.

10 (Laughter.)

11 MR. BERNES: Dan Jones made some announcements with
12 respect to developments concerning the so-called EVST Program
13 the acronym, Ethics and Values in Science and Technology,
14 events taking place at the National Science Foundation.

15 Since then, Kass is going to-- well the point about
16 Dan Jones' report was that this program, this EVST Program
17 over there no longer has Program status.

18 Now, Leon, you are going to meet with some people
19 tomorrow, is that right?

20 MR. KASS: --Walter, we are going to have-- I think
21 this is the meeting that the Chairman has already referred to,
22 that there is a panel tomorrow on relations between Science,
23 Technology, and Humanities, an Advisory Panel that will begin
24 tomorrow.

25 MR. BERNES: That concludes my report from the

1 Research Division. May I report also on the public session
2 of the preservation?

3 MR. KINGSTON: Please.

4 PRESERVATION GRANTS

5 MR. BERNS: Our entire meeting yesterday with-- on
6 preservation matters I said took between 10 and 15 minutes.
7 I was corrected last night-- someone had a stopwatch apparently--
8 and was told it took nine minutes.

9 In our Public Session on Preservation, and I would
10 point this out especially for Chairman Ritcheson, that we
11 actually accomplished and we have something to report this year
12 and that has to do with a major publication that members of the
13 Division of Preservation can take real pride in and justifiably
14 so.

15 There are eight volumes out in the anteroom here
16 for your perusal and what they amount to are the publication
17 of the "United States Newspaper Program National Union List",
18 a tremendous research resource identifying the newspapers
19 published in the United States and the close territories of
20 the United States identifying the repositories in which these
21 newspapers are to be found and listing the issues of the
22 newspapers to be found in each of the repositories.

23 As I say, a major research assistance program and
24 Harold Cannon and his colleagues certainly are justified in
25 taking great pride in having had something to do with the

1 successful publication.

2 This is available in the eight volumes out there
3 and also in microfiche addition.

4 And that concludes my two reports.

5 MR. KINGSTON: Any questions about the report both
6 on the activities of the Research Division or the Office
7 of Preservation?

8 (No response.)

9 MR. KINGSTON: There being none, we will move on
10 to the "Report on Policy and General Matters from the Division
11 of State Programs", Mr. Hart reporting.

12 STATE PROGRAMS

13 MR. HART: Mr. Chairman, the State Program
14 Division had no grants to consider this time; therefore, we
15 were able to have a more reflective discussion of developments
16 and tendencies in the area of the Division's responsibilities.

17 I think the chief, or principal value of the
18 discussion was that the Council members got a more detailed
19 and concrete sense of what actually happened in the field and
20 in relations between the Program Officer and the State Councils.

21 There was discussion in changes of the Program
22 Officer assignment, discussion of problems in two states and
23 how these are being resolved. The chief point there, I think,
24 was the slowness with which these reforms or solutions move
25 forward because of the NEH structure of relations between the

1 Division and the State Council.

2 There was a preliminary report on State education--
3 programs run by the State Councils in education, programs that
4 work through the schools.

5 The conclusion there, tentative, was that there are--
6 these programs are sharply up in number.

7 There was discussion of the current and forthcoming
8 Humanities articles in Magazine Prospectives, an organ of the
9 American Historical Association; a discussion of the Federation
10 and its role; and the upcoming meeting in Kansas City.

11 The whole discussion yesterday I think was very
12 useful and reflective which made me at least wish that we could
13 have more of these overviews.

14 Thank you.

15 MR. KINGSTON: Thank you. Are there any comments
16 or questions about State Programs?

17 (No response.)

18 MR. KINGSTON: There being none, we will have the
19 "Report from the Committee for Challenge Grants," Mr. Cohn.

20 CHALLENGE GRANTS

21 MR. COHN: Mr. Chairman, at its August 1985 meeting,
22 the National Council of the Arts, during a discussion of its
23 Challenge Grant guidelines proposed that institutions be
24 forbidden to apply simultaneously to the NEA and the NEH for
25 a Challenge Grant.

1 Since it was recognized that this suggestion would
2 have ramifications for the operation of the NEH Challenge
3 Grants Program, the NEA did not implement this recommendation,
4 this guideline for fiscal year 1986 in order that we might have
5 an opportunity to consider fully the implications of such a
6 change in existing policy.

7 The Challenge Grants Committee was then asked by the
8 staff to make this issue the focus of its open session the day
9 before yesterday.

10 Until 1983, the question of concurrent applications
11 was moot, since it was then possible for institutions to
12 hold concurrent Challenge Grants from both the NEH and the NEA.

13 Since then, however, the two Endowments have agreed
14 that institutions whose work makes them eligible to apply to
15 both agencies would be barred from accepting concurrent
16 Challenge Grants.

17 No attempt was made at that time, however, to
18 prohibit institutions from applying concurrently to the NEA
19 for the support of its activities in the arts, and to the
20 NEH for activities appropriate to its mandate.

21 And the policy pertaining to eligibility of previous
22 recipients of a Challenge Grant from either agency remained in
23 force, namely, such an institution may apply to one Endowment
24 at any time after it has submitted an acceptable final narrative
25 report to the other.

1 At the meeting of the Arts Council, it raised-- it
2 considered and raised several reasons for altering the present
3 policy of allowing concurrent applications to the NEA and the
4 NEH.

5 Our Committee informed by our staff that it does
6 not perceive the present practice of permitting concurrent
7 applications to be a pressing problem in part because of
8 positioning of the program's calendar in relation to NEA, but
9 more because the number of concurrent proposals compromises
10 such a small proportion of its cycle: only four percent this
11 year; six percent in 1984.

12 The number of concurrent recommendations is even
13 smaller. In two of the past three years, there have been no
14 instances where institutions had the good fortune of choosing
15 between the NEA and the NEH Challenge Grant.

16 Over this entire period, only four institutions have
17 been so affected.

18 Given this situation, the Committee agreed that the
19 potential saving of staff time resulting from a prohibition
20 a concurrent proposals would be minimal and probably more than
21 offset by the time that the staff anticipates it would be
22 necessary to explain to prospective applicants the rationale
23 for this new exclusionary ruling and to monitor its compliance.

24 Moreover, the current procedures that had been
25 evolved by both the NEH and the NEA for coordinating information

1 on concurrent applications and recommendations have been working
2 smoothly for both programs.

3 Now the Committee recognizes that the potential delay
4 in accepting an NEA Challenge offer while concurrent applicants
5 await a decision from the NEH does pose an inconvenience for
6 the Arts Endowment.

7 It is our understanding, however, that the NEA has
8 the funding flexibility to make additional awards if it so
9 chooses, so that money need not be-- so to speak-- lost to the
10 institutions in a cycle where joint offers from the NEA and the
11 NEH are a factor.

12 Moreover, the Arts Endowment has recently embarked
13 on an evaluation of the future direction of its Challenge
14 Grant Program, and there is every indication that its character
15 may change dramatically after the fiscal year 1987--- 1987
16 cycle.

17 The Committee thus questioned whether this is the
18 most appropriate time to alter the eligibility criteria for
19 applicants when the problem that such a change is designed to
20 to solve may not be an issue at all in the newly structured
21 program.

22 The Committee was also disturbed that the institu-
23 tions affected by the prohibition of concurrent applications
24 would be forced to wait over two years to see if they will
25 receive an award from NEA or NEH if a proposal is made first

1 to the NEA and then rejected and-- I might add parenthetically--
2 and almost two-and-a-half years if a proposal is submitted first
3 to the NEH.

4 We believe that such a delay might affect the
5 viability of these institutions special fund raising campaigns
6 in which either the NEA or the NEH Challenge Grant can often
7 be, as you well know, a crucial component.

8 Moving the two programs in simultaneous cycles
9 would diminish this delay, but is not seen really to solve the
10 basic problem since both agencies would still be in the posi-
11 tion of not knowing what choice concurrent applicants would
12 make at the time final recommendations must be made.

13 * [This change in policy might also force institutions
14 to make a second difficult choice, a very difficult choice,
15 between resubmitting an improved proposal to one agency, or
16 submitting a new application to the other and therefore place
17 these institutions at a disadvantage to other institutions
18 not affected by this interdiction.

19 In regard to the concern that the policy of allowing
20 concurrent applications may suggest an uncertainty about
21 eligibility criteria and create a problem which is really
22 a public relations problem, the Committee agreed that con-
23 current proposals from an institution should not be construed
24 to imply a request for the support of the same or even similar
25 activities.

1 Moreover, prohibiting concurrent applications
2 might create its own more serious public relations problem
3 by appearing to invalidate a position consistently maintained
4 by the two agencies in the past that each have a distinctive
5 and separate contribution to make to the nature of those
6 cultural institutions who have responsibilities for both
7 the Arts and the Humanities.

8 They concurred with concern which was voiced by
9 members of the Arts Council, that the proposed new policy
10 might establish a damaging inconsistency between Challenge
11 Grants and other programs of the two agencies which now
12 also accept applications for the same institution for different
13 projects.

14 ~~NA~~ [Finally, the effect of denying eligible institutions
15 the right to submit concurrent applications seems much more
16 sweeping in its impact than prohibiting the award of dual
17 Challenge Grants since the former policy limits the potential
18 opportunity for a large number of institutions to receive
19 support for the arts or humanities activities while the latter
20 policy, of course, given the history of the joint funding
21 recommendations by the NEA and the NEH affects only a handful
22 of institutions who are, in any case, by the time the prohibi-
23 tion is enforced assured of support for either their work in
24 the arts or their work in the Humanities.

25 Mr. Chairman, in view of these considerations,

1 the Committee unanimously recommended that no change whatsoever
2 be made in the existing policy regarding concurrent applica-
3 tions to the NEA and the NEH for Challenge Grants and that this
4 finding also, of course, be conveyed to the Arts Endowment.

5 MR. KINGSTON: Thank you, Marcus. Are there any
6 comments? Anita.

7 MS. SILVERS: I want to express my admiration at
8 the sensible and cogently argued position of the Challenge
9 Program Committee.

10 I wonder, though, given the fact that the Committee
11 was responding to what seems to be a position of the entire
12 Arts Council-- I said what appears to be a position of the
13 entire Arts Council whether it might not be appropriate for
14 this Council to take a Council position because we are
15 responding to their Council position.

16 And I would be delighted to move the adoption if that
17 is appropriate, of the position that was expressed by the
18 Challenge Grants Committee.

19 MR. KINGSTON: All right, there is a motion then
20 for this Council to accept the recommendation of the Challenge
21 Grants Committee about overlapping NEA/NEH applications.

22 Is there a second to that motion?

23 MR. : Seconded.

24 MR. KINGSTON: There is a second to that motion.

25 This motion, if approved, would be transmitted in full to the

1 National Endowment for the Arts with a record of the vote of
2 the Council.

3 Are there other comments, now, on the motion?
4 Bill.

5 MR. ALLEN: I wanted to express my appreciation too,
6 Anita, and to do that more fully, I wanted to ask whether I
7 might have those very substantive comments made available to
8 be prior to the next minutes so that I could look at them?

9 In that light, I am put to some difficulty by your
10 motion because I am certainly sympathetic to what you intend,
11 but I cannot say that I have reflected on this as fully as I
12 might otherwise have preferred to do.

13 MR. KINGSTON: Anita.

14 MS. SILVERS: My motion is simply to move the final
15 position, that is the conclusion of the Challenge Grants
16 Committee.

17 I took the rest of the report to be argument for
18 that conclusion. It was a full argument. I would hope that
19 whenever anybody on this Council gives a full complicated
20 subtle argument in favor of a position would not have to delay
21 voting on the position until everybody could read the entire
22 argument. That would seem to be a-- to be motivation to give
23 brief and bad arguments rather than full and good arguments.

24 That wasn't a great argument on my part, but--

25 (Laughter.)

1 MR. KINGSTON: Are there any great arguments?

2 (No response.)

3 MR. KINGSTON: Other comments about the motion
4 before the Council?

5 MS. KERR: I just want to-- may I just clarify
6 Mr. Allen. Is it that you want to know for-- could you
7 clarify a little what it is because I would be willing to
8 delay or to wait until next time if--

9 MR. ALLEN: Well I suppose someone should-- if you
10 could say something more Marcus about what the time require-
11 ments are in this regard.

12 Is it-- would it be inappropriate for us to take
13 this vote in February, for example, or is the conversation of
14 such a nature that we really ought to respond now?

15 MR. COHN: Why postpone until February?

16 MR. KINGSTON: John.

17 MR. AGRESTO: Let me see if I can answer that. We
18 are not picking a fight with our sister agency, the fight
19 was before.

20 When the Challenge Grant staff gave the Council
21 their arguments on the matter, I had those transmitted to the
22 Arts Endowment. I also called up the member of the Arts
23 Endowment Council who had proposed the motion who would have--
24 Jack(?) on this Council, and asked him if he would --
25 if he had any problems with our requesting that they not

1 bind us in their legislation so quickly and he said he had
2 no problems on that score.

3 So we have had, in fact, in two phases. We can
4 in fact vote today on our sentiments and our judgment--
5 and we can at the next formalize that by shipping them the
6 full report.

7 But we are not-- they know what our position is
8 and they agree.

9 MR. KINGSTON: Frances.

10 MS. RHOME: May I-- being a member of that Committee,
11 we did indeed discuss it at great length and very seriously,
12 and I believe that our Chair has put our expressions in a most
13 articulate statement. I appreciate that.

14 But you understand that our recommendation is for
15 no action, and therefore, it does not involve anyone in doing
16 anything except saying that we don't care to--

17 MR. AGRESTO: --not to take action at all.

18 MR. KINGSTON: The consequence if this motion is
19 approved is simply to transmit to the Arts Council the vote
20 of the Plenary Council in accepting the report of the Challenge
21 Committee and its recommendation.

22 MS. RHOME: May I add that we felt it would be
23 impertinent for us as a Committee to make such a statement of
24 policy unless it was brought to this General Council for
25 everyone's consideration.

1 MS. KERR: Is it not then the case that at this
2 point officially we do not have a position. The Committee
3 has recommended a position which, as Professor Allen suggests,
4 we would be confirming or not, and-- so you have conveyed the
5 sentiment of the Committee which will likely be confirmed and
6 I understand that you would like to delay confirmation of
7 that 'till February.

8 That wouldn't hurt anything because everybody
9 knows what we think we are going to do. Right?

10 MR. KINGSTON: Right.

11 MS. KERR: I would suggest, if it is not unfriendly,
12 that we wait until February to do the confirmation.

13 MS. SILVERS: Can I hear some positive argument
14 for waiting until February?

15 MR. ALLEN: I think the point of waiting until
16 February-- well, there isn't a positive argument in the sense
17 that I didn't want to address the substance of the Committee
18 recommendation because I do not assess myself in a state to
19 address the substance of it.

20 I have the impression that this is a policy consider-
21 ation of some significance and I was only craving indulgence
22 that I be allowed to reflect on the policy consideration which
23 I have not done.

24 MS. RHOME: May I respond?

25 MR. KINGSTON: Yes, Frances.

1 MS. RHOME: This is a matter of profound substance
2 change. It is a simple suggestion that has come down in an
3 informal kind of a way that we are responding to and we are
4 saying "no we don't".

5 In many respects, may I say, that to delay this
6 kind of action particularly since we have had back hall
7 conversations regarding it, that we are allowing the matter
8 to possibly fester into something that might become more
9 profound, so therefore our action today to say we don't care
10 to change, it is really not that-- it would not make that much
11 difference.

12 MR. ALLEN: Allow me to propose-- I didn't want to
13 make this more weighty than it seems to be becoming. I don't
14 want a chance to reflect on it.

15 Let us proceed with the action. I proceed on the
16 assumption that we are not for it, particularly given the
17 description that we have had, of returning to it again even
18 in February if we choose.

19 MR. KINGSTON: Yes, Bill.

20 MR. AGRETO: And I did have to act in lieu of this
21 discussion since the Arts Council met the week before this
22 Council and I did not want them to firm up their side of it with-
23 out your counsel to me.

24 MS. RHOME: Right.

25 MR. COHN: --expressing the Committee's thanks to

1 the staff for this excellent work that it did in helping us
2 through this maze of material, particularly the historical
3 background that a great number of us did not either understand
4 or appreciate or have knowledge of. We thank the staff.

5 MR. KINGSTON: There is a motion before the Council
6 to accept in full the recommendation of the Challenge Committee.

7 Would all those in favor of the motion signify by
8 saying "aye"?

9 (A chorus of ayes was heard.)

10 MR. KINGSTON: Opposed?

11 (No response.)

12 MR. KINGSTON: Hearing no objection, that motion
13 passes unanimously.

14 Thank you, Marcus.

15 The next item on the agenda for Open Session has
16 to do with emergency grants that have been approved for
17 funding. I please call your attention to the fact that we
18 can discuss only those applications that have been approved
19 for funding.

20 You will find them in Tab "F" of the agenda book.
21 There are four such Emergency Grants listed and we will
22 entertain questions about any of the four.

23 (No response.)

24 MR. KINGSTON: If there are none, then you should
25 be-- you should take a look at the reversals of Council

1 recommendations that had been approved for funding. They are
2 in the back of Tab "F".

3 Again, there are four such grants made-- there are
4 four grants that were funded despite the Council's recom-
5 mendation not to fund them.

6 Any questions about any of those four?

7 (No response.)

8 MR. KINGSTON: There being none, before we close
9 the session and go into the next items on our agenda, John
10 wants to take over the podium for a moment to make a few
11 remarks.

12 MR. AGRESTO: I said before that this was a day of
13 comings and goings. I would like to-- I didn't announce it
14 at the beginning, but let me announce it now.

15 The interim Council members, those Council members
16 who were here on appointment by the President have almost all
17 of them been confirmed now by the Senate.

18 Yesterday I swore them in a ceremony up in my office.
19 Today I have the distinct pleasure of giving them their
20 certificates, signed by the President and on-- as they say--
21 museum quality paper suitable for framing. Now we should give
22 it to them-- if you would come up.

23 (Passing out documents.)

24 MR. AGRESTO: I am going to open yours up and show
25 them what it looks like.

1 The seal of the United States and the President's
2 signature-- Jill Cresimore, Leon Kass, Bill Allen, Kathleen
3 Kilpatrick, and George Hart who is not an appointment, who
4 made it on his own right.

5 (Laughter.)

6 MR. BERNES: Mr. Chairman.

7 MR. AGRESTO: Yes.

8 MR. BERNES: I think you should note that unlike
9 William (?), these people got their commissions actually
10 delivered to them.

11 (Laughter.)

12 MR. AGRESTO: They have been actually delivered by
13 the person who is supposed to deliver them and nothing can take
14 it away for six years.

15 As to the guildings, as is customary and is our
16 delight to do, we would like to give a small present to those
17 who are officially at this meeting to whom this will be their
18 last-- for whom this will be their last Council meeting.

19 I say officially-- and that is probably even the
20 wrong word-- because we do not have nominees to take your
21 place, so please your calendars clear for February. This may
22 not be your last Council meeting, but just in case it is, we
23 want to give you a token of our esteem at the present.

24 What we have, needless to say, are books, a copy
25 of the Jefferson volume for all outgoing Council members with

1 an inscription with their name, an inscription from us on the
2 inside.

3 Marcus Cohn, Charles Ritcheson--

4 (Applause.)

5 MR. AGRESTO: -- who as you know is completing with
6 this the expiring term of Art G (?). For this--

7 (Applause.)

8 MR. AGRESTO: Sam Cook.

9 (Applause.)

10 MR. AGRESTO: Frances Rhome.

11 (Applause.)

12 MR. AGRESTO: Roland Dille.

13 (Applause.)

14 MR. AGRESTO: Louise Kerr.

15 (Applause.)

16 MR. AGRESTO: Anita Silvers.

17 (Applause.)

18 MR. AGRESTO: George Kennedy.

19 (Applause.)

20 MR. KINGSTON: At this time, we will close the meeting
21 to the public. I am sorry, Charles, please.

22 MR. RITCHESON: May I raise a point which I think
23 needs some consideration. In view of the discussions which
24 have recently taken place, I think it would be wise for the
25 Council to reaffirm its resolution of February 17, 1984,

1 Mr. Neusner's resolution offered and passed by the Council
2 which states that "the National Endowment for the Humanities
3 should neither favor nor slight anyone because of race, color,
4 national origin, religion or gender." Further, I would add to
5 that that the Council takes this opportunity to commend the
6 previous Chairman and the present Acting Chairman of the
7 Endowment for their exemplary devotion to the principal of
8 equal opportunity in administration at the NEH.

9 That is my motion, Mr. Chairman.

10 MR. : Second.

11 MR. KINGSTON: A motion has been made and seconded
12 to reaffirm the resolution of February 1984. Is there
13 a discussion of that motion?

14 MR. COOK: Does that mean opposition to basic
15 affirmative action program, go the time taken?

16 MR. RITCHESON: Does that--

17 MR. COOK: Does that mean opposition to vigorous
18 affirmative action to correct injustices of the past? Does
19 it mean opposition to time taken for those?

20 MR. RITCHESON: Mr. Chairman, *responded that* it does not mean such
21 a thing. It means support for equal opportunity.

22 MR. COOK: But does it mean opposition to vigorous
23 affirmative acts in the Program to correct injustices of the
24 past and does it mean opposition to those time takers?

25 MR. AGRESTO: Would I be right in saying that this

1 would be a resolution that would support the actions taken by
2 the Administration both my own and Bill Bennett's regarding
3 these?

4 MR. RITCHESON: That is true.

5 MR. AGRESTO: Thank you.

6 MR. COOK: But what about--

7 MR. AGRESTO: Myself and Bill Bennett in the
8 name of the Councils are the issues of-- primarily are the
9 issues of goals, timetables, and equal opportunity. Yes?

10 I think it is directed specifically in that--

11 MR. COOK: Is it not submitting certain data to
12 the Equal Opportunity Commission?

13 MR. AGRESTO: I gather that is the intention.

14 MR. COOK: It means all that?

15 MR. AGRESTO: I think---

16 (Simultaneous discussion.)

17 MR. : What is the point? I don't under-
18 stand it.

19 MS. SILVERS: I would like to make-- this may be a
20 parliamentary request or maybe personal privilege, but I
21 listened to a discussion yesterday regarding an interpretation
22 of the Council position where the Council had, in my view,
23 adopted a set of words which are-- if you will pardon the
24 expression-- Government.

25 And then I heard different people with different

1 interpretations of what that meant. I would like to have a
2 motion on the floor which is not ambiguous. I think that is
3 what Mr. Cook is asking for, a motion that is not ambiguous.

4 I think that Mr. Agresto has given an interpretation
5 of the motion and I would feel very comfortable if the motion
6 said precisely what Mr. Agresto had done interpreting the
7 motion so that we are very clear about what we are voting on.

8 MR. RITCHESON: I think I ought to say that in my
9 opinion that I think the motion is far from ambiguous. It is
10 a reaffirmation of action taken earlier by the Council. That
11 action itself is surely not ambiguous.

12 I then-- then I went forward to add a commendation of
13 the past Chairman and of the present Acting Chairman for their
14 scrupulous regard for equal opportunity in the NEH administra-
15 tion.

16 MR. AGRESTO: If I could give a little history on
17 this,--

18 MR. RITCHESON: What can be ambiguous about that,
19 Anita?

20 MS. SILVERS: Well, the second part is not ambiguous.

21 MR. COOK : I think it is ambiguous. --and have
22 some doubt about what it includes, in the interest of which,
23 I see no reason resurrect that. It just creates a greater
24 ill will and hard feelings, misunderstandings and so forth.

25 And I think we ought to be concerned with healing

1 wounds rather than creating new ones. When I heard Mr. Agresto
2 speak yesterday in Executive Session, I was impressed.

3 Some of us felt that we should make the motion a
4 very opposite motion. I am not going to make it because I
5 think it would add to the feeling of brokenness in this
6 Council, a feeling of misunderstanding and a feeling of ill
7 will, so I am not going to offer that.

8 And I think this would simply exacerbate deep
9 wounds and I see it serving no constructive purpose whatso-
10 ever.

11 MR. KINGSTON: Mr. Kennedy.

12 MR. KENNEDY: I voted for the motion last time
13 because I thought to vote against it was a vote for prejudice.
14 But I feel the motion was a trap and I have regretted my
15 vote ever since as I have watched the way the Council has
16 interpreted that resolution and I agree with much of what
17 Mr. Cook has said, and it seems to me that-- and Mrs. Silvers--
18 that the motion doesn't really address the issue, it glosses
19 it over in terms that make it very difficult to vote against
20 it but we know that voting against it is probably the right
21 thing to do.

22 MR. KINGSTON: Mr. Hart.

23 MR. HART: I plan to vote for this motion because
24 it seems to me that the language of goals and timetables
25 inevitably is translated into preferential treatment, and

1 therefore, is in violation of the Civil Rights Act of 1964.

2 And in voting for it, I think that I am voting
3 indeed for equal opportunity and not for special privilege.

4 MR. KINGSTON: Mrs. Rhome.

5 MRS. RHOME: I agree with George in that there has
6 been some difficulty in when we consider this particular
7 resolution.

8 It came out of the discussion that erupted due to
9 our past Chairman's action on the Hill regarding the response
10 to the Department's requesting affirmation action information.

11 And at the time, I gave a discussion of the regula-
12 tions in which I indicated that quotas and goals were ---
13 quotas had been disapproved by -- an order by President
14 Nixon's and was not included in affirmative action and that
15 goals were merely guidelines in which a person showed a good
16 faith effort to openly advertise and to openly-- open the list
17 for promotions for persons.

18 And in that discussion, which in a way was rather
19 heated because we were concerned about this action, the-- this
20 particular resolution was offered as a compromise wording
21 that we were working on.

22 And I accepted it and said that I approved and that
23 I was pleased that a colleague would bring forth such a
24 resolution.

25 Therefore, I have to tell you that it was with great

1 Chairman of the Endowment to refuse an order from the Equal--
2 the EOC and in a sense what Council was doing at that time was
3 voting its confidence in the Chairman.

4 It, therefore, I think makes some sense for this
5 Council to express its view on this matter one way or the
6 other.

7 I am not so sure that is true at all right now.
8 What would be the effect of this motion if it were adopted
9 or if it were defeated?

10 I am persuaded by Sam Cook that-- of the inappro-
11 priateness in a sense for us to discuss it here now. Surely
12 we cannot debate it and persuade one side or the other and I
13 am not going to be persuaded by Sam and he is not going to
14 be persuaded by me.

15 This is a subject that has been discussed all over
16 this City all the time. I took part in a press conference the
17 other day in which people postured and I postured along with
18 everybody else-- made a statement and was duly recorded and
19 the press duly ignored it all.

20 We have all said what we have to say on this. The
21 Congress is going to act. I just wonder whether Charles would
22 be willing to withdraw the motion or whether the person who
23 seconded it would be willing to support the withdrawal and let
24 us get on with the private business of this private session.

25 MR. KINGSTON: John.

1 shock that I heard yesterday that that was not the understanding
2 of everyone else within the Council, that it was not a re-
3 affirmation of the practices of affirmative action which are
4 the legal law of the land, but that were denial of them, and
5 I have not accepted that inference.

6 And I recall at the time that we had some difficulty
7 with the minutes and I was so concerned that when our minutes
8 came and they were not complete transcription of the discussions
9 that occurred here, and we had to come back and request that
10 a full transcription come to us, that I wondered at the time
11 why in the world we didn't get a complete transcription on the
12 first occasion because that hasn't been the action in the six
13 years that I have been here on our Council.

14 We have been free to discuss and openly talk about
15 policies and share our views and we are a heterogeneous
16 group for that very reason.

17 And so I was disturbed, and then I realized yesterday
18 that perhaps there was a reason for it, that there was a
19 different interpretation. And I must confess that I was
20 deeply grieved and I have to, for that reason, vote against
21 this motion.

22 MR. KINGSTON: Mr. Berns.

23 MR. BERNs: When this motion was adopted, I think it
24 made some sense for this Council to act one way or the other
25 as it did. The context was a decision on the part of the then

1 MR. AGRESTO: I will back up and give you some
2 history on this as I remember it.

3 When in February of that year, Bill Bennett did not
4 submit goals and timetables, he submitted a letter to the EEOC
5 explaining the reasons why he would not submit goals and
6 timetables.

7 There was some discussion, considerable discussion
8 at this Council as to the appropriateness of that action, and
9 as to the grounds of that action.

10 It was the sentiment of the Council that the action
11 was correct and supportable and the Council wanted to go on
12 record as supporting it.

13 Jack Neusner, a member of the Council, composed the
14 motion that we are discussing now, again, and took that
15 motion out of the letter that Bill Bennett himself wrote to
16 Clarence Thomas of the EEOC.

17 It was the-- by the-- a general understanding
18 the core basis upon which Bill Bennett's action rested. It
19 was the core sentiment and statement of his stand.

20 That was so understood, I think, and I don't mean
21 to contradict you, Frances-- that was so understood by many--
22 For example, I remember Louis Hector (?) saying he had to vote
23 against the motion as did others-- had to vote against the
24 motion because he disagreed with Bill Bennett on this position
25 for affirmative action.

1 There were others who abstained, but there were
2 many-- there were some who voted no, and I think it was clear
3 that they knew what the-- that the motion-- what the origins
4 of the motion were and what the impact and importance was.

5 Walter is also absolutely correct. Nothing will
6 come of this for in fact Congress will in its wisdom bind us
7 to supply goals and timetables. I am almost as certain of
8 that of as I am certain of anything.

9 The only effect of the this would be symbolic in
10 a sense, to say to Congress we may-- perhaps we must do it,
11 but we have not been moved from our position or our arguments.

12 MR. KINGSTON: Louise then Bea(?)-- I am sorry,
13 Anita then -- yes, go ahead.

14 MS. KERR: I am sorry. I would-- I would support
15 Walter in his plea that this be withdrawn. However--

16 MR. KINGSTON: Could you speak up a little, please?

17 MS. KERR: I would support Walter in his plea that
18 this be withdrawn.

19 However, I would suggest that the results-- the
20 result of that action was in fact the legislation to which
21 we are now responding.

22 MR. KINGSTON: Bea, did you want--

23 MS. HIMMELFARB: My remarks are entirely anticipated
24 by Walter. I, too, want to endorse Walter's remarks and
25 to strongly urge that the motion be withdrawn that it does--

1 that I think Mr. Cook put the matter very well.

2 At this point, that I think to raise again that
3 issue is devisive. The issue has been settled. Congress
4 may do what it likes. That is not within our perview at this
5 point and I don't think that anything constructive is gained
6 by rediscussing that issue in those terms now.

7 MS. SILVERS: To my knowledge, regardless of what
8 one's interpretation of the Council's previously adopted
9 position is, there has-- there was not a situation in which
10 the Chairman of the Endowment and the Council were taking
11 different positions.

12 And, what I have some concern about and I will join
13 with the others in urging that this action not be taken at this
14 time, is a situation in which a Chairman may make a decision
15 and the Council will have already locked itself into a position
16 prior to that Chairman's facing whatever needs to be faced.

17 I would hope that the Council would be in a position
18 to discuss that with the Chairman at the appropriate time.

19 MR. KENNEDY: I would like to move to table the
20 motion.

21 MR. KINGSTON: There is a motion-- there is a motion
22 to table the motion. Do you have an addendum?

23 MR. KENNEDY: Indefinitely.

24 MR. KINGSTON: Indefinitely.

25 MR. : Second.

1 MR. KINGSTON: And it has been seconded. A motion
2 to table does take precedence. Are there-- is there any other
3 discussion?

4 (No response.)

5 MR. KINGSTON: All those in favor of the motion--

6 MR. RITCHESON: Mr. Chairman.

7 MR. KINGSTON: Yes?

8 MR. RITCHESON: I have heard from the distinguished
9 members of this Council arguments--

10 MR. KINGSTON: Speak up, Charles, please.

11 MR. RITCHESON:--Arguments why this motion which I
12 moved should be withdrawn. I am not disposed to do that.

13 I believe that there is a matter of conscience
14 involved on this side as well. And I would like to see this
15 matter resolved at this time.

16 Now, in a parliamentary sense, of course, this
17 motion to table takes precedence over the existing motion
18 and I have to ask, therefore, if it is in fact tabled, is this
19 a way of getting rid of it altogether or will it be brought
20 forward at a later date?

21 MR. KINGSTON: In terms of procedure, of course, you
22 can move to reconsider the motion at any time.

23 Ellis.

24 MR. SANDOZ: I want to associate myself with opposi-
25 tion to tabling. I see no justification in this-- in the sort

1 of apprehensiveness which has been expressed on this occasion.

2 We are reaffirming here a perfectly straight forward
3 pair of statements, one of which is already on the record as
4 being that of the Council; the other which is to say that we
5 do commend the previous Chairman and the present Acting
6 Chairman for their devotion to the principle of equal opportu-
7 nity of the administration of this Agency.

8 Those are absolutely blameless statements to make.
9 I think that they do not conflict with anybody's fundamental
10 principles. The fact that we do not go into further detail, is
11 a matter beside the point.

12 We are devoted, indeed, to equal opportunity and we
13 do believe that equal opportunity is a matter of conscience,
14 has been manifested and displayed both verbally and in act
15 by Mr. Bennett and by Mr. Agresto and I think that it is
16 perfectly proper and indeed perhaps more than proper that we
17 affirm that at this particular juncture and not table.

18 MS. RHOME: Point of parliamentary procedure.

19 MR. KINGSTON: Yes.

20 MS. RHOME: I believe that the motion to table does
21 not require any discussion and must be met immediately.

22 MR. KINGSTON: All those in favor of the motion to
23 table, please raise a hand.

24 (A show of hands was seen.)

25 MR. KINGSTON: Those opposed to the motion to table--

1 (A show of hands was seen.)

2 MR. KINGSTON: The motion is defeated. We are back
3 to consideration of the primary motion.

4 MR. ALLEN: I have a question.

5 MR. KINGSTON: Bill.

6 MR. ALLEN: I voted against tabling the motion not
7 because I am not persuaded that perhaps it couldn't be with-
8 drawn, but because it seems to me an inappropriate way to
9 resolve the question.

10 I stopped at the Monmouth (?) College to give a
11 lecture on the way over here under the title "America's
12 Raw Nerve".

13 The subject of that lecture was this discussion in
14 substance. I quite agree it is a sensitive matter. I quite
15 agree it produces conflicts which seem nearly irresolvable.

16 I also have the opinion that we must regard our
17 responsibilities as reaching beyond the immediate question of
18 our personal sensibilities because it really is the fate of
19 more than this Council and our friendships that is at stake.

20 I am reminded further that I wasn't, of course,
21 present when the resolution was adopted. I did not participate
22 in that and that reminds me of the cliché, of course, you can't
23 drip in the same river twice.

24 And I would admonish the Council not to try bathing
25 in the same river twice on this day. I would suggest that the

1 motion be separated and that the reaffirmation of the new
2 resolution be withdrawn, but the commendation which would be
3 fitting presuming that this may be the last opportunity we
4 have to do that, of our Acting Chairman to be acted upon.

5 MR. RITCHESON: If that were in the amendment, then
6 I as mover of the motion will accept it.

7 MR. KINGSTON: You are accepting a division of the
8 motion?

9 MR. RITCHESON: Yes.

10 MR. KINGSTON: All right. So the motion now stands
11 in two parts, the prior part of the motion would be a
12 reaffirmation of the February 1980--

13 MR. ALLEN: He was withdrawing that and amending
14 it.

15 MR. KINGSTON: What is that?

16 MR. ALLEN: It was a withdrawal of the first part,
17 amending the motion would to be commendation of our Acting
18 Chairman.

19 MR. RITCHESON: That was my intention. It was to
20 withdraw the first part, reaffirming something which does not
21 need reaffirmation apparently since it is in our minutes,
22 though I think in a parliamentary fashion you will have to
23 have the permission of the second of the motion.

24 MR. KINGSTON: So the motion now stands as only the
25 second part.

1 MR. RITCHESON: Commendation of the former Chairman
2 and of the present Acting Chairman.

3 MS. : Can I ask for clarification of that
4 motion?

5 MR. KINGSTON: Let me make sure that the seconder
6 is accepting that modification of the motion. Allen.

7 MR. HART : The seconder does not accept, so the
8 motion stands as it was originally worded.

9 MS. KERR: Would you-- could you read the second
10 half of that motion, the exact wording?

11 MR. KINGSTON: The motion stands--

12 MR. RITCHESON: The Council takes this opportunity
13 to commend the previous Chairman and the present Acting
14 Chairman of the Endowment for their exemplary devotion to the
15 principle of equal opportunity in administration of NEH.

16 MR. KINGSTON: Sam.

17 MR. COOK: Yes, I agree with Walter Berns. We have
18 persuasive arguments, but I do want to comment on what Jeffrey
19 Hart and what Ellis Sandoz said about race preference and
20 treatment.

21 Now I know the courts have said that it is legitimate
22 to use race as a conscious factor in the rectification of
23 injustices in the past.

24 Blacks were excluded, deliberately. They were
25 cursed deliberately. They were denied equal opportunity,

1 deliberately, on conscious grounds.

2 So, in terms of the justice and the social order,
3 in terms of any other kind of justice, it is perfectly
4 legititmate to use race as a conscious factor to rectify
5 injustices and wrongs and tragedies of the past and to
6 deny this is to deny equal opportunity.

7 So it seems to me that the Affirmative Action
8 Program timetables and goals are indispensable to a guaranteeing
9 of equality and opportunity.

10 You know, it is one thing to speak of formal equality.
11 It is quite another to speak of material equality, but the
12 conditions are-- because of the whole burden the issue, it
13 seems to me unfair to argue abstractly that Blacks have
14 equality of opportunity and to talk about preferential
15 treatment for Blacks now is simply nonsense. It is an
16 absurdity, it seems to me.

17 So, if you excluded us on grounds of race, I say
18 include us on grounds of race and these have the same logical
19 statement and the same moral statement.

20 MR. KINGSTON: Jeff.

21 MR. HART: Well, of course, I have heard exactly
22 that argument on countless occasions. The fact that the
23 courts have said that race can be taken into account is simply
24 one aspect of the situation.

25 Courts have changed their mind in the past and the

1 question then becomes is this good public policy. I think
2 that for public policy to be based upon racial considerations
3 is a radical departure from what I would consider to be good
4 American public policy.

5 And a person born in 1950 and 25 years old today,
6 entering the labor market, did not own slaves, did not benefit
7 from discrimination in some such way, to invoke the past in
8 those terms, in terms of hiring, firing and promoting, seems
9 to me to be not legitimate.

10 And that is why I think that this Council in its
11 role of articulating what the policy of the Endowment should
12 be has a moral responsibility to reaffirm its resolution in
13 the past and to commend the executives in the Endowment
14 who have been faithful to that policy.

15 MR. KINGSTON: Bea, please.

16 MS. HIMMELFARB: In view of the fact that I endorsed
17 Mr. Cook's previous recommendation to withdraw the motion,
18 I find myself in the paradoxical position now, while disagreeing
19 with the substantive position on this matter-- I find myself
20 in the odd position now of once again agreeing with part of
21 Mr. Cook's statement.

22 Yes, indeed, I think this is the heart of the matter,
23 the exclusion of the category of race and the inclusion of the
24 category of race have as you say precisely the same logical
25 status and moral status. They are both illogical and they are

1 both immoral and it is precisely because I feel very strongly
2 that they are profoundly immoral, that to include now the
3 category of race, to make this a criteria of social policy,
4 is precisely as immoral as it was to exclude it previously.

5 MR. COOK: Unless the condition-- the material is
6 the same, in concrete empirical terms, when Blacks have equal
7 status with Whites.

8 When to have equality of opportunity, the same
9 chances, then you eliminate race as a category factor. But
10 until that-- we arrive at that point, based upon the tyranny
11 of racism in the past on which Blacks did--- it seems to me
12 that you are really sanctifying and moralizing injustice and
13 freezing it into the social order and political system.

14 And this, to me, is immoral. Utterly immoral.

15 MS. HIMMELFARB: Material conditions are never the
16 same for all people in all societies at any time whatsoever.

17 MR. COOK: Well that is the--

18 MS. HIMMELFARB: And now to make-- to make that the
19 grounds for a difference of status is even more profoundly
20 disquieting, it seems to me, than your previous statement.

21 That would mean that anyone who is poorer than any-
22 one else, had somehow an inferior moral status than someone
23 who is richer, anyone who is less bequeathed or bestowed with
24 the natural gifts were somehow less moral than I--

25 MR. COOK: We are not speaking of individual cases.

1 We are speaking here in terms of broad social categories of
2 racism.

3 MS. HIMMELFARB: Well even ---

4 MR. COOK: I would agree with you philosophically
5 in terms of individual cases. You are right.

6 But here we are speaking of Whites and Blacks in
7 terms of that this should be for power and opportunities within
8 American history, the American social order.

9 John Dewey said that freedom means power. That is
10 what--it means effective participation, the power to do and
11 not to do.

12 And this is what Blacks have been denied equal
13 opportunity of.

14 MR. KINGSTON: I had a call for the question.

15 MR. RITCHESON: Mr. Chairman. I want, as the mover
16 of this motion, to make one final statement for my part.

17 I realize how very deeply the currents run. I
18 realize how--

19 MR. KINGSTON: Could you move towards the microphone?

20 MR. RITCHESON: I realize how very emotional and
21 how many important considerations are involved here.

22 It is for this very reason that I have made my
23 motion this morning. This matter is important and cannot
24 be simply ignored and hence, I thought, in my judgment it was
25 right to bring it back to the Council again. It will come

1 back, no doubt, many times in the future.

2 But it was, in my judgment, right and proper that this
3 highly emotional important issue be presented once more.

4 MR. SANDOZ: Since I have been mentioned in the
5 discussion, let me say that almost the last thing in the world
6 I would like to do is to get into a debate with President
7 Cook since I am overmatched and know it before I start.

8 But, I-- the spirit in which I think the-- this
9 resolution should be perceived, and I hope accepted by the
10 Council, is to reaffirm the principle of equal opportunity
11 without going into details and specifics and mechanisms as
12 to how equal opportunity may or may not properly or politically
13 be best achieved and to commend the administration of this
14 Agency whose record is exemplary in precisely the categories
15 that I think are most concerned-- to those who have voiced
16 opposition to the resolution.

17 The record of this administration and this Agency
18 stands at the very top of the entire Federal bureaucracy in
19 its exemplary adherence to the substance of equal opportunity
20 and I believe that is constant with the convictions of every
21 single member of this Council, and we are debating the
22 question of mechanisms.

23 I would hope, therefore, in terms of the principle
24 we can stand together and I would even hope that we could do
25 it in a unanimous vote.

1 MR. KINGSTON: Frances.

2 MS. RHOME: I think this entire conversation is
3 very wrenching, and it is particularly wrenching to me because
4 the second part of this motion which asks us to endorse the
5 actions of Bill Bennett and of John Agresto, two men in whom
6 I am very fond, and although we disagreed on some principles
7 that doesn't mean that we have a right to either condemn or
8 condone one's thoughtful judgments that have brought them to
9 certain considerations.

10 And I don't want to have to vote against this
11 motion. I don't want to have to publicly say that I disapprove
12 and that is what I am being forced to do because in this
13 one action I cannot approve a public action, and this is not
14 a straight forward comment as it has been described.

15 What this is saying is that this body approves
16 the Director and the Acting Director's public defiance of a
17 Federal regulation. And I am sorry, John, this is awkward.
18 I dislike it intensely.

19 And I particularly dislike the fact that it -- this
20 has been brought to the floor as a straight forward action
21 when it is not. It is a devious action in order to bring
22 this entire group to making the same public statement.

23 These things are hard for me to say.

24 MR. RITCHESON: May I call for a question, please,
25 Mr. Chairman.

1 MR. KINGSTON: I still have one more comment because
2 I recognized Anita, yes.

3 MS. SILVERS: This is really just a comment that I
4 feel I am forced to make about the dimension of taste.

5 I think that one can admire moral actions regardless
6 of whether one happens to agree with the consequences of those
7 actions or not.

8 However, I think that actions move from being
9 moral actions operating in the moral domain to becoming
10 political actions when they require votes of confidence rather
11 than the initiative of the moral agent.

12 I keep thinking about whether one would admire
13 Socrates more if his friends and colleagues had voted in favor
14 of his courageous action.

15 I don't think that that would have had anything--
16 add anything to his courage and I would just like to note that
17 in this entire debate, I fear that what we are doing is moving
18 the entire matter from the plane of individual moral action
19 where we can respect each other's differences into a political
20 action and it does disturb me a bit.

21 MR. KINGSTON: There is a motion on the floor. I
22 believe everybody understands the motion and I will call for
23 the vote. I would like a show of hands please.

24 Those in support of the motion as stated, please
25 raise a hand.

1 (A show of hands was seen.)

2 MR. KINGSTON: Those opposed to the motion as
3 stated.

4 (A show of hands was seen.)

5 MR. KINGSTON: Any abstentions?

6 (Mr. ^{George} Jeffrey Hart and Mr. John Agresto abstained.)

7 MR. KINGSTON: All right. The motion passes.

8 Is there any other business before the Open Session
9 recesses?

10 MS. SILVERS: Could you report the vote please?

11 MR. KINGSTON: The vote was 13 for, 7 against, and
12 one abstention--

13 MS. : Two abstentions.

14 MR. KINGSTON: Two. I am sorry. Two abstentions.

15 Any other business before the Open Meeting of the
16 Council?

17 (No response.)

18 MR. KINGSTON: We will take a 10 minute adjournment
19 for coffee before we enter the Closed Session.

20 (Whereupon a brief recess was held.)
21
22
23
24
25

C L O S E D S E S S I O N

MR. KINGSTON: If we are all assembled, I would like to begin in Closed Session.

We will continue the discussion of Emergency Grant Requests. We have one application that was rejected. Is there any question-- are there any questions about that one application? We are still in Tab "F" of the agenda book.

(No response.)

MR. KINGSTON: There being no questions, we do have one reversal of Council recommendation, reversal not to fund.

Any questions about that reversal?

(No response.)

MR. KINGSTON: There being none, we will move to the next item on the agenda for the Closed Session, and this is the "Report on the Hearing for Fiscal 1987", the budget request. Mr. Cherrington.

OMB HEARING ON FISCAL YEAR 1987 BUDGET

MR. CHERRINGTON: There is nothing in your folder about this because there will not be a hearing.

I suggested to OMB that the Agency didn't need a hearing this year, and they agreed. I think this is a compliment to the Agency. They not only look at our budget, they look at the way we are organized, the way we fulfill the purposes of the Agency, things like that.

And the fact that they do not want a hearing, I

1 think is a compliment to everyone in this room.

2 MR. KINGSTON: Any comments or questions?

3 MR. AGRESTO: Can I just underscore that? That is
4 an unprecedented act as far as I know on the part of OMB to
5 simply tell an agency we have confidence in what you have done
6 and what your Council has done and no we just simply do not
7 have to look at the books. And it goes to Steve as well as
8 others here.

9 MR. KINGSTON: The next item on the agenda is the
10 "Report of Commitments". This is the item that was alluded
11 to in the Open Session. Mr. Cherrington.

12 FUNDING COMMITMENTS REPORT

13 MR. CHERRINGTON: All right. There is something
14 in your folder. It is Tab "H", Funding Commitments.

15 Mrs. Ricardo-Campbell was concerned at August
16 Council about the degree to which this Agency had committed
17 its funds in the future.

18 I have put together a chart and a memo here
19 describing the Agency's official commitments. I would like
20 to stress that the only official commitments the Agency has
21 are the actions approved by Council and the Chairman that
22 have not yet been obligated.

23 This is the situation that is constantly in a state
24 of flux. The official commitments of the Agency would be
25 different at each point in time since we are near the end of

1 fiscal year 1985 I selected the beginning of 1986 to be the
2 point that we would actually look at these commitments.

3 You will see that the majority of the dollar amount
4 for these commitments are actually the product of funding
5 patterns.

6 State programs and Summer Seminars for College
7 Teachers, for instance, usually go to August Council and
8 then are actually obligated the following year. That is why
9 the figures in State and Summer Seminars show this Fellowships
10 on our report are so high.

11 Mr. Allen's comment earlier about how these funding
12 commitments would affect-- would be related to future appro-
13 priations for the Agency-- as I point out on the memo, these
14 commitments are so small that they could be incorporated no
15 matter what our budget is, if it is any of the ones I dis-
16 cussed earlier.

17 In fact, all of the Agency's official commitments
18 at this point total \$67.3 million and if we projected in the
19 reverse, this would only be 18 percent of the program funds
20 that we have obligated during the last three years.

21 The commitments on this chart, I do want to emphasize,
22 are all the commitments that we have and they extend over a
23 three year period.

24 I had a conversation one time with Bruce Carnes,
25 my predecessor in this job, and he is now with the Department

1 of Education and they have an \$18 million -- \$18 billion
2 budget.

3 I said, in a sense, that NEH has more discretion in
4 its awards than he does, and he agreed. NEH does not have the
5 entitlement programs, the set asides, things like that that
6 tie up our money.

7 And also, we are 20 years old now and the fact that
8 we don't have a lot of these entitlements really does give
9 us a lot of discretion.

10 I think part of the concern last Council might be
11 related to a misunderstanding of how we obligate money here.
12 If a project is approved for three years of outright funding,
13 all three years of that funding is approved during that fiscal
14 year.

15 A project is not brought up each succeeding year
16 for funding, so in a sense you are not tying up money in future
17 years by approving something for a three year period.

18 We believe this system works well. It gives
19 continuity to our grantees. It means that grantees that do
20 have multiyear funding aren't dependent upon our appropriation
21 every year.

22 The United States Treasury is not a part of this
23 process either because these funds are not-- they stay in the
24 Treasury. They are not out to the grantee until they are sent
25 out in the form of payments. There is no problem with interest

1 on this either.

2 MR. KINGSTON: Any comments or questions about the
3 "Commitments Report"? Louise.

4 MS. KERR: I just have one quick comment.

5 MR. KINGSTON: Use the microphone, Louise.

6 MS. KERR: I am sorry. This is a recurrent question
7 and I am sure that, especially as new Council members come
8 on board you will receive the same question again.

9 I think it would be very helpful to them, to the
10 Council in general, if you would write that-- a brief state-
11 ment with some emphasis as you have just given, to the
12 positive benefits of having three year commitments.

13 I think that too often we tend to concentrate only
14 on the problems that we have and I think that was very
15 helpful.

16 MR. KINGSTON: Other comments or questions about the
17 report?

18 (No response.)

19 MR. KINGSTON: If not, we will move into the
20 consideration of applications.

21 ACTION ON APPLICATIONS

22 MR. KINGSTON: The first Division to report will be
23 the Division of Education Programs. The applications are
24 represented on the meeting. Mr. Dille.

25 MR. DILLE: Because we had no recommendations

1 that could go to the staff and no questions were raised that
2 were not easily dealt with, I would like to move both of these
3 at the same time, vote at the same time.

4 MR. KINGSTON: All right. These are the applications
5 for Humanities Instruction in Elementary and Secondary
6 Education and Applications for Exemplary Projects in Under-
7 graduate Education. There being a motion, are there any
8 questions about these applications?

9 MR. ALLEN: I would just like to make a note that
10 I won't be voting on application numbered ES-21247.

11 MR. KINGSTON: Mr. Allen is not voting on ES-21---

12 MR. ALLEN: Two, four, seven.

13 MR. KINGSTON: Two, four, seven.

14 All those in favor of the motion signify by saying
15 aye.

16 (A chorus of ayes was heard.)

17 MR. KINGSTON: Opposed?

18 (No response.)

19 MR. KINGSTON: The motion is carried.

20 The next report will be from the Division of
21 Fellowships. The motion is represented by the light yellow
22 copy.

23 FELLOWSHIP PROGRAMS

24 MS. HIMMELFARB: The Committee reviewed the
25 recommended applications, the three programs---

1 MR. KINGSTON: Excuse me, could you pull the mike
2 closer.

3 MS. HIMMELFARB: The Committee reviewed and recom-
4 mended applications in the three programs. We had received
5 970 applications for the Fellowships for Independent Study and
6 Research including 85 in the Special Initiative for the
7 Bicentennial Constitution and we are recommending of those
8 149.

9 Of the 690 applications we received in Fellowships
10 for College Teachers, of which 34 were in the special competi-
11 tion for the Constitutional Fellowships, we are recommending
12 110.

13 Of the 286 applications in the Travel to Collections
14 Program, we are recommending 168 awards. In short, we
15 reviewed a total of 1,946 applications and we are recommending
16 a total of 427 awards.

17 MR. KINGSTON: Are there any comments or questions
18 about the applications for the Fellowships Division?

19 Mr. Stanlis.

20 MR. STANLIS: I think I might ask a question.

21 MR. KINGSTON: Yes, go ahead.

22 MR. STANLIS: Concerning on page 160, Log FA-26332.

23 MR. : Louder.

24 MR. STANLIS: Page 160, Log FA-26332.

25 MR. : Could you repeat the number, please?

1 MR. STANLIS: Pardon?

2 MR. : The number, please.

3 MR. KINGSTON: We are talking about the-- in the
4 agenda book, I believe. That would be tab "K".

5 MR. STANLIS: I want to raise a question about the
6 final decision of the matter.

7 MS. : We didn't get the number.

8 MR. STANLIS: Pardon?

9 MR. : What is the number?

10 MR. : Once again, the number.

11 MR. KINGSTON: Page 160. I don't have a page number
12 in my-- give us the grant number where we will be able to find
13 it.

14 MR. STANLIS: Log number FA-26332.

15 MR. : FA-26332.

16 MR. STANLIS: Yes. It is page 160.

17 (Simultaneous discussion.)

18 MS. : Francis.

19 MS. GRIEST: The name of the applicant is Francis,
20 Leslie Francis, F-r-a-n-c-i-s, and it is at--

21 MR. KINGSTON: Oh, it is the bottom of page 80.
22 It is Leslie Francis who is unaffiliated, Arlington, Virginia
23 American literature, the Frost family in England 1912 to 1915.

24 And your question here--

25 MR. STANLIS: Yes, I want to raise a question about

1 the-- make the decision to contract.

2 MS. GRIEST: It is tab "K".

3 MR. KINGSTON: It is tab "K". The applicants are
4 filed alphabetically so if you look under the "F's"--

5 MS. : What page is it in the motion?

6 MR. KINGSTON: It is not in the motion because those--

7 MS. : Oh, okay.

8 MR. KINGSTON: Those, in fellowships we don't put
9 the nonrecommended-- in the motion. We refer to the agenda
10 book.

11 MR. RITCHESON: I think we ought to have a motion
12 concerning the sound service today.

13 (Laughter.)

14 MR. RITCHESON: It is terrible. No one can hear
15 anything. What are we talking about?

16 MR. KINGSTON: All right. We are talking about an
17 application to the Fellowships for Independent Study and
18 Research submitted by Leslie L. Francis, a project to discuss
19 the Frost family's stay in England, 1912 to 1915.

20 This is an application not recommended for funding.
21 The question is, why was it not recommended for funding?

22 MS. HIMMELFARB: Let me repeat the title of the
23 application. "The Frost Family's stay in England, 1912 to
24 1915."

25 This went through two panels. This is one of those

1 unaffiliated scholars we talked about earlier. And it first
2 went to the Independent Study and Research Panel on the
3 request of the applicant where it received very, very low
4 ratings.

5 Because of this problem of the sense of being mis-
6 judged, perhaps unfairly, in the competition with those who
7 might be better qualified and so on, it was then sent to the
8 College Teacher Panel, and it there received rather better
9 ratings, but still not of a level which wouldn't have-- which
10 would have earned it funding.

11 Now. It was the-- the Committee reviewed this
12 application very carefully and we discovered that in the
13 context of the larger competition, that is compared with all
14 the other applications, the subject was relatively narrow in
15 scope and of limited significance.

16 It was going to-- the applicant proposed to deal
17 with essentially the personal life of Frost-- essentially the
18 personal life of Frost, particularly his family relations
19 during this visit to England, a period of three years.

20 And, there was no very clear intimation that this
21 would be very significant in the understanding of his
22 poetry and whatever.

23 And in view of that and in view of, you know, the
24 fact that it received very low ratings from the Panel and that
25 other applications were clearly far superior and far more

1 significant, we recommended not funding this application.

2 MR. KINGSTON: I understand, now, that this is an
3 application which the Committee actually read.

4 MS. HIMMELFARB: Yes, that is right. It was flagged
5 for the Committee and it was read by all the members of the
6 Committee.

7 MR. STANLIS: Well, I would like to comment on the
8 decision nevertheless.

9 The criticism that the proposal is too narrow, I
10 think it is not a very intelligent criticism. I think the
11 more one knows Frost and his career, the more one sees that
12 that is irrelevant. It is like accusing (inaudible) of
13 being too narrow.

14 I think that those were the crucial years in Frost's
15 life and he left America totally unknown. When he came back
16 at the end of those three years, he was very well known.

17 Those years were the deciding factor. There have
18 been several biographers who have written on this, Thompson
19 and others, but they have all presented it in a very perfunctory
20 way from knowledge from the outside in, you might say.

21 Here is the first instance we have in the biography
22 of Frost in the career of Frost, of someone who is in the
23 position to present the same story from the inside out.

24 It is not a question of narrow or broad. It is a
25 question of accuracy and thoroughness in the historical record.

1 I think that Dr. Francis is uniquely situated to
2 do that. Being the granddaughter of Frost, she has all the
3 family archives. She has about a bushel of material that
4 nobody else has available to make use of and she has the
5 whole oral tradition of the Frost family.

6 And it would seem to me that from the-- from the
7 articles that she has already published indicate considerable
8 ability in handling materials of this sort, an excellent
9 article on Frost at Harvard, and also on Frost archeology.

10 The attempt to contribute enormous new insights in
11 original material-- this study would do the same thing and for
12 that reason I would like to see this particular proposal
13 reversed if possible, at least reconsidered by the Acting
14 Chairman.

15 The-- I think this is rather a unique case-- it
16 applies to Frost, to secure once and for all some original
17 records on a very crucial point and important in his life.

18 MR. KINGSTON: We will certainly see to it that
19 the Acting Chairman has an opportunity to read this applica-
20 tion.

21 Mr. Hart.

22 MR. HART: I am glad that that is possible. I haven't
23 read the application, so for all I know it is not an impressive
24 application. But, I can speak very briefly only to the
25 significance of this period in Frost's life.

1 He sold the farm in New Hampshire and moved to
2 Beaconsfield. He had published in obscure places a great
3 deal of verse.

4 At the house in Beaconsfield, he spread out the
5 poetry all over the floor and found in it a pattern which
6 became the structure of his first volume, "Boy's Will",
7 published in London and reviewed by Ezra Pound and became
8 very well known. Yeats, and you know, the whole Rhymer's
9 Club circle.

10 Then he put together his next volume, it came out
11 the next year, "North of Boston" which made his world reputa-
12 tion, you know, a best seller of all things.

13 So, you know, it is only three years but it would be
14 worthwhile writing about Eliot in 1921-22. You know, he is
15 writing the "Wasteland".

16 So, I mean, in its importance, I am impressed by
17 it, but as I say I haven't read the application.

18 MR. KINGSTON: Bea, please.

19 MS. HIMMELFARB: Very briefly. It isn't the three
20 years that are troubling. It is what the applicant proposed
21 to do with those three years and what the applicant proposed
22 to focus on and I am now reading from the brief statement of
23 her own description of the project-- is to focus on the
24 familial dimension of the poet's search for recognition.

25 Now, in that-- when we read the application we did

1 not have a sense that she was going to explore in any depth
2 or with any subtlety the actual effect of those years, the
3 importance of those years in the poet's life of poetry.

4 That was our concern.

5 MR. KINGSTON: You will have-- we will have that
6 application read by the Acting Chairman.

7 Other questions or concerns on the Fellowships
8 motion?

9 MR. STANLIS: Does that require a motion?

10 MR. KINGSTON: No.

11 If not, all those in favor of the motion as it
12 stands, please signify by saying aye.

13 (A chorus of ayes was heard.)

14 MR. KINGSTON: Any objections?

15 (No response.)

16 MR. KINGSTON: The motion carries.

17 We will move on to the report from the Division of
18 General Programs. Mr. Ritcheson.

19 GENERAL PROGRAMS

20 MR. RITCHESON: Mr. Chairman, am I coming through?

21 (Laughter.)

22 MR. RITCHESON: Can you hear me?

23 MS. : Loud and clear.

24 MR. RITCHESON: Very good.

25 MR. : Only when you are being wonderful

1 do you come through.

2 MR. RITCHESON: No champagne here today.

3 Mr. Chairman, the motion for General Programs
4 begins with applications submitted to the Division's Humanities
5 Projects and Museums and Historical Organizations Program.

6 The Committee reviewed 245 applications requesting
7 approximately \$19 million during this first cycle of fiscal
8 year 1986.

9 We are recommending support for 49 applications,
10 20 percent of those submitted at approximately \$4.5 million.

11 The Committee sought clarification on a number of
12 applications, discussed certain policy issues suggested by
13 grants, and raised additional questions about funding action
14 on three proposals.

15 We sustained the recommendations of staff with three
16 exceptions. On the proposal from Frederick S. Wright Art
17 Gallery, University of California, Los Angeles, on page 24,
18 GM-22911, the majority of the Committee was concerned about
19 the theoretical approach of the project and further that the
20 format of the project will not lead to a viable working script
21 that integrates themes and art into a cohesive plan for an
22 exhibition.

23 By a vote of three to two, the Committee recommends
24 rejection.

25 On the University of Utah application, GM-22854,

1 page three, we believe that the conservation request is sound,
2 and by a vote of three to two recommend support for the project
3 at a level of funding that the staff will determine.

4 The Committee concurred with the staff that a
5 separate proposal to mount a traveling exhibition of the
6 prints did not merit support.

7 The Los Angeles County Museum of Art on page five,
8 GM-22921, sought implementation funds for a major exhibition
9 on the relationship of abstract art to certain philosophical
10 and religious movements.

11 We discussed the controversies associated with the
12 request raised by the review panel and additional reviewers.

13 By a majority of four to one, the Committee elected
14 to recommend support for the project at the level of
15 \$100,000 in Matching Funds.

16 That is to say, our grant is to be \$100,000 and is
17 contingent upon their raising an additional \$100,000.

18 Kathleen Kilpatrick wishes to be recorded as the
19 opponent of the decision.

20 The Committee also discussed several other applica-
21 tions and sustained the staff recommendation. Among these
22 were the proposals from the Founder's Society, the Detroit
23 Institute of Arts, page two, GM-22833, Sesshu to Sesson,
24 eight paintings of the Muromachi (?) period, 1336 to 1573.

25 We sought particularly clarification about the exact

1 role that the Japanese government will play in the organization
2 and financing of the exhibition.

3 The staff confirmed that endowment funds will be
4 used to support educational activities and programs at the
5 Art Institute in Detroit and the Committee, by a vote of four
6 to one elected to sustain the staff's recommendation.

7 In addition, we discussed applications from the
8 Elmhurst Historical Museum, page four, GM-22893; the University
9 of California at Los Angeles, page six, GM-22949; the North
10 Carolina Museum of Art, page 23, GM-22902, and voted to
11 sustain the staff's recommendations on each.

12 We found particularly commendable a proposal from
13 the Museum of Fine Arts, Boston, page 10, GM-23028, Goya and
14 the Enlightenment, as an exemplary project and urged that the
15 exhibition's organizers consider expanding the travel schedule
16 for this exhibition.

17 In their discussion of several other proposals, the
18 Committee members reaffirmed their belief that wherever possible
19 museums should encourage exhibitions to travel to as many
20 sites around the country as feasible, thus increasing the
21 national audience for NEH funded projects.

22 We were also concerned about multiple applications
23 from one institution. The Director of the Division pointed
24 out that each application is considered on its own merits and
25 that there is currently no policy in place concerning multiple

1 applications.

2 The Committee requested that the staff prepare a
3 report on this issue to be presented at the February Council
4 meeting.

5 Another issue raised by the Committee concerned the
6 role of the Museum Program in supporting museum publications.
7 What or how much should the Program's role be? Where should
8 the distinction be drawn between publications that appear to
9 serve as scholarly rather than a general audience?

10 The staff will address this issue in detail and
11 report to the Committee in the future.

12 I turn now to the Humanities Projects for Youth.
13 The Committee reviewed 65 applications to Humanities Projects
14 for Youth beginning on page 41 of the motion. With two
15 exceptions, we approved the recommendations of the staff.

16 In the case of a planning application from the
17 State Library of Iowa, GZ-22235, on page 41 of the motion,
18 the Committee believed that the problems that had been
19 identified could be remedied by the applicant.

20 We, therefore, recommend that this project on Issues
21 of Religious Freedom Guaranteed by the First Amendment, be
22 funded.

23 In the second case, the Committee agreed that an
24 application from the Latin American Youth Center, GZ-22221,
25 on page 46 of the motion, be rejected.

1 The applicant proposed to document and analyze
2 language and oral tradition in the Latin-- in the Latino
3 community in Washington, D.C. focusing on a form of slang
4 known as Caliche.

5 The Committee was not convinced that this project
6 would be sufficiently based in the humanities or that it would
7 produce work of adequate quality to warrant funding.

8 We also discussed an application from the Museums
9 at Stoneybrook, GZ-22255, on page 43 of the motion. Although
10 the Committee voted to sustain the recommendation of the staff
11 that the project be funded, one member of the Committee, Ellis
12 Sandoz, voted against support for the project and wished to
13 be recorded as voting against the project.

14 One application was singled out by the Committee as
15 being of particular quality and promise. On page 42 of the
16 motion, GZ-22248, a project from Boston University called the
17 Huntington Theater Criticism Program for High School Students.

18 The project will introduce young people to theater
19 criticism through a study of dramatic texts and the transla-
20 tion of the texts into dramatic performance.

21 If this program is successful, it could well serve
22 as a model for replication in other parts of the country.

23 The Committee also discussed the policies of the
24 Endowment and the Division of General Programs on the prohi-
25 bition of academic credit for project activities supported by

1 grants.

2 We have requested-- once again, I might say-- that
3 clarification on these policies be provided at a future meeting.

4 I turn now to Humanities Projects in Media. In
5 Media we recommend two projects. One, GN-22369, page 52,
6 the Prince. It is very hard not to say "principe", is one
7 film in the series of the Renaissance. This is a deferral
8 from the February Council meeting.

9 The purpose of this 13 part series is to introduce
10 audiences to the historical changes in Western civilization
11 during that period loosely labeled the Renaissance by
12 examining the roles of certain social and professional types.

13 The Endowment supported the pilot film, "The
14 Warrior" which is completed, and argues well for the continua-
15 tion of the series.

16 In addition, the series would also serve as a tele-
17 course, and the Annenberg Foundation has offered funding of
18 \$2 million with certain contingencies, chiefly that funding
19 be completed by other means.

20 While we think that the "Prince" would be a superb
21 program, we believe that its true value, as is incidentally
22 the "Warrior's" would be realized as a part of the complete
23 series, thus the award would be conditional on the applicant
24 raising the remaining funds needed to complete the series.

25 We also recommend GN-22758, page 53, which provides

1 supplementary funds for the "Adventures of Huckleberry Finn",
2 a four hour dramatization based on Mark Twain's novel.

3 This will bring to completion the Twain series. The
4 other programs are "Life on the Mississippi", the "Private
5 History of a Campaign That Failed", and the "Mysterious
6 Stranger", "Innocence Abroad", and the "Tragedy of Puddinhead
7 Wilson".

8 "Huckleberry Finn" will air nationally over four
9 consecutive weeks beginning February 10, 1986 on American
10 Playhouse. We believe that this is a fitting conclusion to
11 an outstanding series.

12 We recommend one application for rejection, GN-22757,
13 on page 53 of the motion. Mr. President-- Mr. Chairman, before
14 I complete my report, I want just to say a personal word about
15 the several votes in which customary unanimity disappeared.

16 I want to assure the Council that this-- these votes
17 were the result of one of the most reflective, one of the most--
18 if I may say so-- intellectually stimulating meetings of the
19 Committee I have ever chaired.

20 The votes represented nowise bad temper or -- they
21 vote-- the most do, however, indicate a depth of intellectual
22 concern and consideration which I find all together commendatory.

23 That concludes my report, Mr. Chairman.

24 MR. KINGSTON: Are there any comments or questions
25 about the applications before you? Frances.

1 MS. RHOME: Yes, I would like to question about
2 GN-22369 that you just described of the "Prince" of which the
3 "Warrior" is a part.

4 You indicate in the Mark Twain series that they are
5 going to be on public television, but I don't think I caught
6 where that 13 part series of the "Prince" will be shown or
7 whether or not that will be available to institutions in some
8 way.

9 MR. GIBSON: It will be aired on-- it will be
10 offered to be aired on the Public Broadcasting System. We
11 assume it will be accepted when the series is complete-- for
12 national airing on PBS and local PBS stations.

13 Following that, or in some cases before that, the
14 film-- as are all our films-- will be made available for
15 purchase and distribution. Otherwise, the schools could
16 purchase it.

17 But it will be a few years before the series is
18 complete, alas.

19 MS. RHOME: I intend to live to be 100.

20 (Laughter.)

21 MR. COHN: Mr. Chairman, can I have a word?

22 MR. KINGSTON: Yes, indeed.

23 MR. COHN: On page 42, there is a grant made to the
24 Huntington Theater-- to Boston University for the Huntington
25 Theater Criticism Program for High School Students. If it were

1 in my power, I not only voted for this with a great deal of
2 enthusiasm, I would have increased the amount of money.

3 I made the suggestion at the meeting that this is one
4 of the most innovative, creative things I have ever experienced
5 in terms of getting children involved in theater.

6 In terms of the play itself, the writing of the
7 play, the understanding of the play, the discussion of the
8 play-- and if we are going to have children and the teacher who
9 are really devoted to the theater, this is one of the techniques.

10 I suggested that we do whatever we can to encourage
11 other universities to have comparable programs. We in the
12 theater are dependent upon a-- the youth who later will take
13 over all of our responsibilities in terms of the theater.

14 This is one of the creative things that I have seen
15 in my six years now on the Council that if I had the power I
16 would have increased the amount of money that they have
17 requested or arbitrarily given money to other kinds of
18 institutions to do the same thing.

19 I urge the Council, Mr. Chairman, in the future
20 to do whatever it can that is possible in terms of getting
21 other kinds of institutions to encourage this kind of partici-
22 pation among young people in the theater.

23 MR. KINGSTON: Thank you. Are there other comments
24 or questions about the motion on General Programs?

25 MS. CRESIMORE: I have a question.

1 MR. KINGSTON: Yes, please.

2 MS. CRESIMORE: I note in the recommended awards
3 here that you have, for example, suggested that we award money
4 to one institution-- three programs at one institution. Is
5 there policy about that? Can an institution request money
6 for several different programs and receive money if the
7 proposals are of such quality for all three, four or however
8 many programs that they submit?

9 MR. RITCHESON: May I answer that?

10 MR. KINGSTON: Yes, please do.

11 MR. RITCHESON: We discussed, this, Jo, at some
12 considerable length in the Committee. We were quite frankly--
13 quite frankly worried about this issue.

14 MS. CRESIMORE: I am very concerned.

15 MR. RITCHESON: What?

16 MS. CRESIMORE: I am personally concerned about
17 that.

18 MR. RITCHESON: Well, we were-- as I reconstruct
19 the discussions, we decided that there was now no policy in
20 place forbidding multiple applications, that our existing
21 policy is to encourage proposals of excellence, and thus
22 if a single institution originates several excellent proposals,
23 they have to be judged on their merits.

24 And if they merit funding, then assuming our
25 capability of doing so, under existing policy we must fund

1 we must fund them.

2 In this particular matter which concerns, I believe
3 the Walters Museum of Baltimore, we have three proposals in
4 widely separate disparate fields, not impinging on each other
5 in the slightest, and they were all splendidly put together,
6 and seemed to address themselves to important matters in which
7 the Endowment has a direct interest.

8 And thus, we could not without being unfair under
9 existing policy, without being unfair to the applicant avoid
10 funding all three.

11 Now the ~~the~~ Council and the Chairman and the staff
12 may wish to consider this matter and change policy, but under
13 existing policy, there was really no alteranative.

14 MR. KINGSTON: As I understand it, the Division is
15 reporting back to the Committee in February on this issue?

16 MR. : Yes.

17 MR. KINGSTON: Other comments or questions about the
18 applications for General Programs.

19 (No response.)

20 MR. KINGSTON: There being none, I will call for the
21 vote. All those in favor of the motion?

22 (A chorus of ayes was heard.)

23 MR. KINGSTON: Opposed?

24 (No response.)

25 MR. KINGSTON: The motion carries.

1 The next report is from the Division of Research
2 Programs, Mr. Berns reporting.

3 RESEARCH PROGRAMS

4 MR. BERNs: Our motion is to fund-- let me say a
5 few words about the Closed Session yesterday.

6 We had a detailed report on what might be called
7 but apparently mistakenly sound of the New York Public
8 Library. This has to do with the discussions going on between
9 the members of the Endowment and the American Council of
10 Learning Societies.

11 The ACLS is making a major effort to increase its
12 endowment. This would involve a request for a Challenge Grant
13 of \$1 million and the question really has to do with-- well,
14 at least, while this request for an endowment is going on
15 they will come forward with their usual requests from us to
16 support various aspects of their program. We discussed that
17 at some length yesterday.

18 We also had a report from Blanche (?) on fiscal
19 year '85 funds, budgeting and I am happy to report that there
20 were no scandals that she could point to.

21 Now, with respect to our applications, we are
22 recommending 47 in various categories, 218 not recommended,
23 and nine deferred.

24 I would like to call your attention to a total of
25 six, as I recall, which we discussed and in some cases we

1 departed from the recommendation of the staff.

2 For example, on page seven, the number is RO-21231.
3 The original staff recommendation of it was to defer.

4 Subsequently we had-- the staff received review of the reports
5 that justified approval and we are now moving that.

6 On page 10, RO-21310, the University of Pennsylvania,
7 Senator Barnes. The staff work on this application is now
8 completed and it can be recommended for approval.

9 On page 27, RO-21238, a proposal to study South
10 Boston High School, a proposal submitted by Michael Tierney.
11 We discussed this at some length. The staff had recommended
12 funding and our recommendation that, on the basis of what
13 turned out to be mixed reviews, we-- the Committee felt
14 that there were deficiencies in the proposal and they were
15 sufficiently serious to cause us to recommend disapproval of
16 that.

17 On page 34, RO-21296, we had a lovely time discussing
18 this one. The request from the American Jewish Historical
19 Society, the principal investigator being Henry Feingold-- this
20 is page 34. The-- we did, indeed, have an extended discussion
21 of this.

22 We are recommending in this particular case, a
23 revised and a resubmitted proposal, and we indicated that
24 we are prepared to consider this at any time, but we are
25 moving to reject this. In this particular case, we did not

1 disagree with staff, as I recall. Is that right? But, we
2 are emphasizing that we would like this proposal to come
3 forward again and indicated our desire to see them to act
4 quickly at any time on it.

5 Principally, in this particular case, there have been--
6 the principal investigator indicated that he had not yet
7 decided as to whom would write the particular volume in a multi-
8 volume history. It was his intention to conduct some sort of
9 a competition before the authors of these volumes were to be
10 selected. We would like to know, in fact, who will eventually
11 win this competition and be selected to write the volumes.

12 On page 40, oh yes, I am sorry-- page 39. RO-21205,
13 a proposal from two distinguished historians, Stanley Elkins
14 Smith and Erick McKittrick of-- what is he from? At any rate,
15 well known American historians-- yes, Columbia.

16 Staff and panel had recommended rejection of this
17 proposal. This is a somewhat delicate situation we are caught
18 in.

19 It had been suggested that neither Mr. Elkins nor
20 Mr. McKittrick had done any work in a period of years and there
21 was some question as to whether they would in fact complete
22 this project. There was no disagreement with respect to the
23 worth of the project.

24 What we are doing here is moving this from reject to
25 defer and asking Mr. Elkins and Mr. McKittrick to respond to

1 our concerns.

2 Then on page 40, RO-21247, a request from Elizabeth
3 Fox-Genovase. This had been recommended for rejection largely
4 because, or at least in part because, there was some concern
5 that the work to be done here was going to be done by graduate
6 students and there was some question as to the degree of super-
7 vision that Professor Fox-Genovase would be able to commit to
8 this project.

9 There was also some question as to the role of
10 Professor Genovase, Gene Genovase, Elizabeth Fox-Genovase's
11 husband and a distinguished American historian. He seemed to
12 be involved unofficially in the project and there was some
13 question as to the role he was going to play.

14 Well, at any rate we now move to defer this and to--
15 with a view to eliciting answers to certain questions.

16 That is the extent of my report. I move the adoption
17 of it.

18 MR. KINGSTON: Are there any questions or comments
19 about this report?

20 MS. SILVERS: I just believe we need to see on
21 this generalizing-- is it the case, as it seems to me, that
22 the vast majority of the HST approvals are historical and that
23 in fact-- I think they are, but I am just guessing from the
24 titles.

25 MR. BERNS: Let me say, Anita, I think it was

1 everyone's opinion-- everyone's considered judgment that this
2 round of HST can be said to be distinguished. Now whether
3 they are historical or not, I--

4 MS. SILVERS: That is the approvals.

5 MR. BERNES: Yes, the approvals.

6 MS. SILVERS: The projects-- I am just a little bit
7 curious because I am always trying to see trendwise.

8 MR. BERNES: Well, it is interesting. We used to
9 have discussions about this and sharp positions and comments.
10 None of that this time.

11 There was general agreement that these were dis-
12 tinguished projects and we could take some pride in them.

13 MR. KINGSTON: Other comments or questions about
14 these applications?

15 (No response.)

16 MR. KINGSTON: All those in favor of the motion,
17 signify by saying aye.

18 (A chorus of ayes was heard.)

19 MR. KINGSTON: Opposed?

20 (No response.)

21 MR. KINGSTON: The motion carries.

22 Walter, you have the report of the Preservation
23 Grants.

24 PRESERVATION GRANTS

25 MR. BERNES: Yes.

1 MR. KINGSTON: That is the white paper.

2 MR. BERNS: This is white paper, very short. We
3 are recommending \$1,352,043, two thirds of which is outright,
4 one third, approximately, matching.

5 They are divided into two parts really. Nine of
6 them--

7 MS. : We can't hear you, Walter.

8 MR. BERNS: Nine of them-- a total of 13 recommended
9 for approval, nine of them are newspaper projects and four
10 of them what might be called the rest.

11 The only comment I would make is that with this
12 round of approvals, these awards will bring to a total of 25
13 the number of states and territories now involved in this
14 National Newspapers Program.

15 I move the adoption of the motion.

16 MR. KINGSTON: Any comments or questions about
17 these applications?

18 (No response.)

19 MR. KINGSTON: There being none, all those in favor
20 of the motion signify by saying aye.

21 (A chorus of ayes was heard.)

22 MR. KINGSTON: Opposed?

23 (No response.)

24 MR. KINGSTON: It carries.

25 We will have the report on the applications before

1 the Challenge Grants Committee, Mr. Cohn.

2 CHALLENGE GRANTS

3 MR. COHN: Mr. Chairman, the number of Challenge
4 Grant applications has increased again this year to 149. The
5 average amount requested and the average amount recommended
6 have also continued to increase.

7 This year, the average amount recommended is
8 \$396,000 with the result that the number of awards has gone
9 down from 46 last year which was 21 percent of the applica-
10 tions to 42 which is 17 percent recommended this year.

11 Although the standards of selection have been very
12 high, the list of awards recommended is still diverse. Let
13 me give you a sampling of the diversity of the ones that
14 were recommended.

15 One, on page one of the report that you have in
16 front of you, the Homer Society of National History in Alaska,
17 CA-2112, is a small museum of primarily Eskimo, Athebaskan,
18 and Aleut's collection, but also a number of artifacts from
19 the homestead, mining and rushing eras.

20 The focus of its exhibition is "Influence of
21 Land and Sea" on these cultures. The Challenge Grant of
22 \$200,000 will help them raise a total of \$800,000 to expand
23 their exhibition and storage space and provide a multipurpose
24 room for the educational programs.

25 Secondly, Concordia College which is on page four,

1 the application is CC-20258, is a private undergraduate college
2 of 2,500 students. With the help of a foundation grant, it
3 has recently instituted a course-- a humanities course
4 required of all freshmen and a writing across curriculum
5 programs, and it requested a Challenge Grant of \$250,000
6 to help establish a \$1 million endowment fund to provide
7 continuing support for these two newly adopted curriculum
8 components and for related faculty development activity and
9 also library acquisitions.

10 The third application I want to call your attention
11 to is the University of Arkansas on page eight. The number
12 is CU-20159. It is requesting a Challenge Grant of \$900,000
13 toward a total grant of \$3,600,000.

14 \$1 million will be used to provide an endowment
15 to support the Center of Arkansas and Regional Studies in
16 an interdisciplinarian humanities program to be offered by the
17 College of Arts and Sciences.

18 Two thirds of the total amount, namely \$2,485,000
19 will contribute a planned \$10 million renovation of the
20 University historic central building to house humanities
21 departments and faculty as well as the Center for Arkansas
22 and regional studies and humanities programs.

23 A small portion of the total grant, \$115,000, will
24 be used for fund raising purposes and will help the University
25 build its own fund raising capabilities.

1 The fourth item I want to call your attention to
2 is on page four also. It is the-- I am sorry, it is not also
3 because I was over on page eight. This is on page four.

4 The St. Lawrence County Historical Association in
5 Canton, New York which is located in an 1833 Greek Revival
6 House maintained as a museum of five period rooms interpreting
7 middle class life of the mid-nineteenth century.

8 It has an extensive collection of local history
9 archives and mounts gallery exhibitions devoted to county
10 history. And it publishes a quarterly journal of historical
11 essays for its 1200 members.

12 It has an active school program and has just tested
13 a private issue of a newspaper for school children containing
14 local history articles.

15 It is requesting a Challenge of \$100,000. The
16 bulk of the resulting total grant of \$400,000 will be used
17 to create an endowment for two purposes: one, to publish the
18 newspaper for school children, and to help create positions
19 for an educational specialist; and secondly, to provide for
20 a program coordinator. The remaining \$50,000 would be used
21 to restore an 1840's kitchen and complete the climate control
22 system which it has.

23 Item number five is the WGDH Foundation in Boston.
24 It is on page one. The number is CB-22033. It is requesting
25 an award of \$750,000 to establish a \$3 million programing fund

1 which will provide venture capital for the research, piloting
2 and completion and also the acquisition of productions in
3 the humanities.

4 WGDH plans to replete the fund a ten year period
5 at the end of which time it will have expended \$4,200,000
6 in principal and interest on the humanities program.

7 This proposal addresses what a-- what many panelists
8 considered the most important problem in public television
9 today, the need for a source of assured funding to support
10 the development of new programs specifically focused on the
11 humanities.

12 The Committee recommends approval of 42 applications
13 listed on pages one through eight in the white paper that you
14 have in front of you.

15 Given the present uncertainty about this year's
16 Challenge Grants appropriation which can only be predicated--
17 only be predicted to fall somewhere between the House figure
18 of \$18,643,000 and the Senate figure of \$16,500,000 we are
19 setting our recommendations at the maximum level with the
20 understanding that the appropriation may not finally provide
21 sufficient funds to support them all.

22 And we are identifying four specific applications
23 for which our recommendations are contingent upon the availa-
24 bility of sufficient funds.

25 These four applications are indicated by an

1 asterisk in the motion: the Central (?) College on page two,
2 the Guilford College which is also on page two, Beloit (?)
3 College on page three, and the East Hampton Historical
4 Society on page four.

5 I need to call your attention to four specific
6 applications which we are proposing-- where they are proposing
7 to use more than \$250,000 of Federal funds for renovation
8 of facilities. By law, such requests must be approved by
9 a two thirds majority of the Council because it is over
10 \$250,000.

11 The Committee recommends that the requests be
12 approved. The four applications are: one, the Guilford
13 College on page two, CC-20222 which proposes to renovate
14 and add a wing to the library.

15 Secondly, the Chicago Historical Society on page
16 four, CH-20092 which proposes to add to its present building
17 and complete the renovation of existing facilities.

18 The third application is the John Carter Brown
19 Library on page four, 20009, which proposes to complete an
20 annex to its present building and renovate sections of its
21 current library.

22 The fourth item is the Graduate Theological Union
23 on page seven, CU-20138, which plans to complete the second
24 and third floors of its library.

25 The remaining applications listed on pages nine

1 through 37 are not recommended for award.

2 Mr. Chairman, I move the adoption of the report.

3 MR. KINGSTON: Thank you. Are there comments and
4 questions?

5 Mr. Kennedy.

6 MR. KENNEDY: I note among the not recommended
7 applications a number of distinguished humanities institu-
8 tions. I have no doubt that these have been carefully
9 investigated, but I would like to draw the Council's
10 attention to that fact. Not only are we turning down
11 Challenge Grants to a number of good small liberal arts
12 colleges that require a lot in the humanities but places
13 like Bryn Mawr, Dartmouth and on page 29 I see that it holds
14 some of the most distinguished research libraries in the
15 country, all in a list, are being turned down despite our
16 great support for the New York Public Library which I approve
17 of, but here we are rejecting the Newbury, the Huntington, and
18 the Folger all on one page.

19 (Laughter.)

20 MR. KENNEDY: That is--

21 MR. COHN: Including the Shakespeare Library in which
22 I have been involved for a number of years.

23 MR. KENNEDY: And which gave us a project, yes.

24 (Laughter.)

25 MR. KENNEDY: I would like some-- I would like some

1 comment on this at least. Is there any pattern in all of
2 this?

3 MR. KINGSTON: I think you may want to comment on
4 the fact that virtually all of these, I believe, are separate
5 time applications and whether there is additional criteria
6 to that.

7 Marcus, do you want to speak to that?

8 MR. COHN: I honestly have no disagreement with
9 George on the stature, the prestige, the great universities
10 on page 29. Frankly, I don't recall any specific instance
11 whey they are being not recommended. Jim, can you help me?

12 MR. BLESSING: The specific instances--

13 MR. KINGSTON: You will have to use the microphone.

14 MR. BLESSING: Oh, I am sorry. The specific instances
15 are different and the-- I would have to go into them one by
16 one.

17 The general answer is that the applications ---
18 that the applications themselves were not, we felt, not
19 a strong a case as could have been and should have been made,
20 particularly for institutions that were applying for a second
21 Challenge Grant.

22 MR. KINGSTON: Is it true, the fact that the ones
23 that George had cited were all second time applicants?
24 Anita, please.

25 MS. SILVERS: This is my parting shot. I would like

1 to make the plea that all of the capital outlay Challenge
2 Grants have attached to them a requirement that the
3 renovated buildings be accessible to the handicapped.

4 I was quite disturbed to go to the Folger, to be
5 told by someone at the Folger on Wednesday evening that
6 although accessibility is being considered when the Folger
7 had a Challenge Grant from us, the architect had said it
8 would be destructive of the unity of the front of the building
9 to put in any kind of accessibility and to he showed an
10 entrance at the back which was to be operated by a bell at the
11 level of 10 feet behind the fence.

12 And I think that the -- that we could not even
13 provide for a bell that somebody sitting down could reach
14 is something that I thought was really ridiculous and I would
15 hope that, unfortunately, one would hope that people would
16 think of these things for themselves. I don't like to use
17 this kind of stick, but there are times when it is very
18 frustrating and you look for any stick you can use.

19 MR. KINGSTON: In fact, when there is any case of
20 barrier-- renovation construction in a Challenge Grant, they
21 must conform with access requirements.

22 The question of the Folger-- the Folger is, the only
23 section that entailed renovation was the back section on that.

24 MS. SILVERS: I understand that, but in fact it is
25 the back section that has the bell that is 10 feet high behind

1 a fence.

2 MR. COHN: But Anita, there were balloons within a--

3 MS. SILVERS: It is true, and I couldn't reach those
4 either, Marcus.

5 (Laughter.)

6 MR. KINGSTON: Louise.

7 MS. KERR: I have got two questions, Marcus. The
8 first has to do with reduction in the number of awards which
9 apparently coincides with the increase in size of the requests
10 as you stated. Am I correct?

11 MR. COHN: I am sorry, I didn't follow you.

12 MS. KERR: Did I understand correctly when you said
13 that the average size of the request has increased and at
14 least-- I don't know that it is a direct result, but what has
15 happened is that there-- that the Committee recommends four
16 fewer awards this year than last.

17 MR. COHN: That is correct.

18 MS. KERR: I don't know if you discussed this and
19 I certainly don't want to go into it today, but I wonder if
20 we could have some discussion or you could prepare some
21 position paper on the relative merits of decreasing the size
22 of the award as opposed to decreases in the number of awards
23 for the future.

24 MR. KINGSTON: As a matter of fact, that issue was
25 brought up as I recall in the budget hearings when we discussed

1 the allocation for Challenge specifically in light of the
2 size-- what we anticipated to be the size of the awards and
3 the number of awards, but we can certainly take that issue
4 up again as we go into programs.

5 MS. KERR: Okay.

6 MR. COHN: Also, as I pointed out, there are four
7 applications that are dependent upon our funding. We are all
8 in favor of those four applications, Guilford, Beloit (?),
9 East Hampton Historical Society, and Center College.

10 We put them on hold, in effect--

11 MS. KERR: The contingent being that there might
12 even be four fewer possibilities. Well, this is for discussion.

13 I am really not raising that for-- I mean this is for the
14 future and not for today.

15 I also wanted to know, it is a question raised
16 specifically by the grantee or the endowment representing
17 the grant award to the Chicago Historical Society which I
18 note received-- I wonder if there were any-- is that not the
19 case? Is it we the people or something like that?

20 MR. : It is a museum. That is not the
21 historical society.

22 MR. COHN: What is the question, Louise?

23 MS. KERR: Did-- am I incorrect in-- did I misread your
24 grant list saying that the Chicago Historical Society received
25 a grant-- fairly large, \$230 or something like that?

1 MR. COHN: Yes, that is correct.

2 MS. KERR: Are there any other-- two questions.
3 Are there any others on this list which have received large
4 grants from other divisions or any grant from other divisions,
5 number one; and are they related in any way?

6 I am particularly interested in if there is to be
7 matching money in one grant, is there affect by having a
8 Challenge that we need to be aware of?

9 MR. KINGSTON: I can give you a generic answer
10 and perhaps the Division may want to speak more specifically.
11 Yes. The short answer is yes.

12 There would be major project applications that have
13 been approved for many of the applicants also in the Challenge
14 Program.

15 The Division is aware of the overlap together and
16 reported all these before the Council of any overlap applica-
17 tions. So that their recommendations are predicated upon the
18 fact that there is no direct connection between the project
19 and Challenge Grant.

20 Secondly, the evaluation of the Challenge application
21 presumes that the project funding-- the project funding can be
22 conducted in conjunction or separate from the Challenge Grant.

23 MS. KERR: We had no such grants apparently this time
24 so we received no note of it. It would be helpful, I think,
25 if we were simply apprised. I don't think that I would object

1 in any way, I would just like to be aware of the overlaps
2 because sometimes I find I would have to look very carefully
3 to be able to make the matches in the Division.

4 MR. KINGSTON: Yes, sometimes there is a technical
5 problem only because you may have a research fellowship
6 application from a faculty member at "X" college which is
7 also in for a Challenge Grant. That is reported.

8 MS. KERR: Well, that doesn't go to an institution.

9 MR. KINGSTON: No, but the institution is cross-
10 referenced so we do have an overlap. I think the Division
11 could indicate when any overlap occurs.

12 MR. COHN: I recall a little incident where it was
13 pointed out to us that the applicant was also applying to
14 another Division. Does that answer your question?

15 MS. KERR: Except that we know that the Chicago
16 Historical Society in apparently unrelated grants is being
17 awarded two grants.

18 MR. COHN: I understand-- it was not pointed out to
19 us and we didn't take it into consideration because we didn't
20 know if there were applications for two grants.

21 MR. KINGSTON: All I am saying is that the Divisional
22 staff did know it, that there were other applications.

23 MR. COHN: Oh.

24 MS. KERR: Well, maybe the Challenge Committee should
25 also be--

1 MR. KINGSTON: If that is what the Committee wishes,
2 certainly we can provide that information.

3 MR. COHN: Well in the future, I think it would be
4 helpful to us if it were provided.

5 MR. KINGSTON: Other comments, questions about the
6 Challenge motion?

7 (No response.)

8 MR. KINGSTON: There is an eccentricity here. We
9 have four applications which must be approved by a two thirds
10 majority vote of Council.

11 What I will do is take the vote on the entire
12 motion. If it passes by a two thirds majority, we will not
13 separate those grants. Do you understand? Okay, fine.

14 All those in favor of the motion as is presented,
15 signify by saying aye.

16 7 (A chorus of ayes was heard.)

17 MR. KINGSTON: All those objecting?

18 (No response.)

19 MR. KINGSTON: The motion passes unanimously.

20 MR. COHN: That is more than two thirds.

21 MR. KINGSTON: That is more than two thirds.

22 MS. KERR: But only barely.

23 MR. KINGSTON: Are there any other comments or
24 questions before the Council?

25 (No response.)

1 MR. KINGSTON: If not, I will declare that at
2 2:00 o'clock in the afternoon, the Council meeting is closed.

3 (Whereupon the meeting was adjourned at 12:18 p.m.)
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25