

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

EIGHTY-THIRD MEETING OF THE
NATIONAL COUNCIL ON THE HUMANITIES

- - - -

February 13, 1987

- - - -

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

- - - -

Eberlin Reporting Service
12708 Valleywood Road
Wheaton, Maryland 20906
(301) 933-7248

C O N T E N T S

	<u>Page</u>
II. Minutes of Previous Meeting - Mr. Kingston	3
III. Reports	
A. Introductory Remarks - Mrs. Cheney	3
B. Introduction of New Staff - Mr. Kingston	9
D. Conflicts of Interest - Mr. Kingston	11
E. Application Report and Matching Report - Mr. Cherrington	13
F. Status of Fiscal Year 1987 Report - Mr. Cherrington	14
G. Status of Fiscal Year 1988 Congressional Budget Request - Mr. Cherrington	14
H. Committee Reports on Policy and General Matters	
1. Education Programs - Mr. Allen	18
2. Fellowship Programs - Ms. Himmelfarb	21
3. Preservation Grants - Mr. Schall	22
5. General Programs - Mr. Ritcheson	23
7. State Programs - Mr. Ms. Cresimore	25
8. Jefferson Lecture - Mr. Chickering	28
I. Emergency Grants and Actions Departing from Council Recommendations - Approvals - Mr. Kingston	35
J. Emergency Grants and Actions Departing from Council Recommendations - Disapprovals - Mr. Kingston	35
IV. Education Programs - Mr. Allen	38
V. Fellowship Programs - Ms. Himmelfarb	45
VI. Preservation Grants - Mr. Schall	46

C O N T E N T S
(continued)

Page

VII. Research Programs - Mr. Berns

47

VIII. General Programs - Mr. Ritcheson

53

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

P R O C E E D I N G S

MR. KINGSTON: I would like to call to order the 83rd meeting of the National Council on the Humanities. You received in the mail, and have also in your folders, a copy of the minutes from the last meeting. Are there any additions or corrections that you wish to make at this time? If there are none, the minutes will stand approved as published. Introductory Remarks, Mrs. Cheney.

INTRODUCTORY REMARKS

MS. CHENEY: I thanked the Council yesterday morning for having been so prompt and so supportive on the Bicentennial Bookshelf grant. I thought this morning I would read you sections from two very nice letters, two of many nice letters, that we received about this program. For those of you in our public audience, this is a plan whereby the Endowment matches \$500 in order to provide a sum total of \$1,000 to purchase books on the Constitution, and we provide the libraries with a recommended list.

This list has been circulated to a number of scholars. I say that because it happens that on the list are some very fine products that have come out of our Research Division, for example, the Encyclopedia of the American Constitution and the Founders' Constitution.

But, in any case, this has been a very successful program, and I get some measure of that success from letters

1 like these. This particular one is from Berkeley Springs,
2 West Virginia, from a Jean Moser. She writes, in part:
3 "Berkeley Springs is a small rural place. Most people here
4 have never seen an original source. They will never get to
5 the Library of Congress to do historical research. The
6 bookshelf project allows our local library to own valuable
7 original source books. The truth will be there as clear as
8 possible for whomever may be moved to seek it."

9 From the Carlsbad Public Library, from George
10 Webster, the librarian, I received the following letter:
11 "These books will be a tremendous asset to us in Carlsbad,"
12 he writes. "We are relatively isolated here in the desert
13 and are the only source of such research materials for miles
14 around. Community support has been overwhelming and touching.
15 A small group, consisting mainly of retirees, has already
16 pledged the matching \$500 in donation. They collected the
17 money within 24 hours of hearing about the grant. It has
18 sparked interest in both the community library and in our
19 upcoming U.S. Constitution Bicentennial."

20 The books are important in and of themselves. It
21 is important to have them available to as many people as
22 possible. But it also seems to me very important to have ways
23 to draw people into the library, to make sure that they
24 actually come in contact with the books, to make sure the
25 books are opened and used.

1 For that reason, I awarded a Chairman's grant to
2 the Federation of State Humanities Councils, and with that
3 grant, they have put together a guidebook to public pro-
4 gramming, particularly oriented to the books on the Bicenten-
5 nial Bookshelf. This guide will be important, not only in
6 the summer ahead as we lead up to September 17, 1987, the
7 bicentennial of the signing of the Constitution, I am con-
8 vinced it will be important in the years ahead.

9 Even though it is, as I say, focused in on using
10 the books on the Bicentennial Bookshelf and on Constitutional
11 programming, what it does is bring together the wisdom of
12 people who have become very expert at public programming,
13 brought that wisdom together in one place, so that we will
14 be able to disseminate it to other people who haven't thought
15 quite so long and quite so hard about how one undertakes
16 programs of this kind.

17 The other topic I wanted to address this morning
18 has to do with the Elementary and Secondary Education Study
19 that the Endowment is undertaking. This Elementary and
20 Secondary Education Study, and it focuses, of course, on
21 humanities in the elementary and secondary schools, was
22 mandated by the Congress. It is, however, I think, a great
23 opportunity for the Endowment to be able to address a subject
24 that I think is too often neglected.

25 When I read editorials, for example, about how to

1 make our schools more competitive -- this has become the
2 latest buzzword -- the editorials, the articles, the thinking,
3 almost inevitably concentrates on basic skills, math, science,
4 laudable ideas all, but equally important, I think, if this
5 nation is to retain its place in the world, is humanities
6 education.

7 And, so, in the months ahead, we will meet with
8 an advisory group that consists of both scholars in humanities
9 and teachers to seek their advice, to seek their guidance,
10 on the subjects we ought to be addressing in this study that
11 we are doing for the Congress. It doesn't seem a stunning
12 thing to bring scholars together with teachers who have
13 actually been in a classroom, but this is a very unusual
14 approach to looking at education in America.

15 The thing that usually happens is that there is
16 a division of some kind. Either you bring together scholars
17 or you bring together teachers. This seems to me to neglect
18 a problem that has existed in American education for decades,
19 which has been that the elementary and secondary schools
20 operate in a totally separate world from the colleges and
21 universities. There are many historical reasons why this
22 has happened, but as I travel around the country, as I talk
23 to people who have worried about this subject for far longer
24 than I, it seems to me that one of the major recommendations
25 we must make, and one of the examples we must set, is to show,

1 to say and to show, that all of education is an undertaking
2 in which each of us is involved no matter which particular
3 level we happen to spend most of our hours in.

4 There are examples at the Endowment, of course,
5 where I think we have shown the way in emphasizing the
6 importance of this. Our Summer Seminars for Secondary School
7 Teachers are a prime example, wherein we bring together fine
8 scholars with high school teachers from around the nation.
9 In the Education Division, we do a similar kind of thing
10 in our institutes. So, this notion that all of education is
11 of apiece and that all of us need to be concerned about all
12 parts of it is a statement that we want to make very clearly
13 as we proceed through our efforts and put this report together.

14 I am not sure how many of you have met Celeste
15 Colgan. Celeste. Celeste is here working as my special
16 assistant and is coordinating with Jeff Thomas to put together
17 the logistical arrangement the bibliographical arrangements.
18 It is a very complicated undertaking to begin a subject as
19 vast as elementary and secondary education in the humanities
20 in the United States.

21 I always hesitate when I make one of these opening
22 statements, hestiate to mention specifics, since I am sure
23 to leave out one division or another. But as I was looking
24 over the subjects I wanted to talk about this morning. it
25 did occur to me that I had been eclectic, ecumenical perhaps,

1 in focusing on these two topics since we do have these fine
2 programs in both Fellowships and Education that focus on all
3 of education as a unity and since the Bicentennial Bookshelf
4 Program provides fine products from our Research Division
5 together with an effort from our General Programs Division
6 to get this program going together with the involvement of
7 the State Councils in making sure that people actually come
8 into the library and read these books.

9 I will point out to you what has already become
10 clear to a number of you, and this gives me an excuse for men-
11 tioning our two Offices too, that we have had some personnel
12 changes. George Farr is now heading up the Office of Pre-
13 servation, and Harold Cannon has taken over the Office of
14 Challenge Grants. I am sure that all of you too are aware
15 that we have a new Division Director of Education, Jerry
16 Martin.

17 Well, I won't take more of your time. We have
18 important grants to look at and I look forward to hearing
19 your deliberations.

20 MR. KINGSTON: Mr. Agresto?

21 MR. AGRESTO: Just very briefly, let me say a few
22 words about something that we have entitled the Foundations
23 of American Society Program at the agency. I think we all
24 sense what a success the Bicentennial has been not only from
25 the start with seminars and fellowships but through the books

1 supported through the Research Division down to the Bicen-
2 tennial Bookshelf.

3 But the Bicentennial itself technically is over
4 soon. Yet we wanted to continue the kind of fervor and ideas
5 that began there and so we initiated an emphasis that we are
6 calling Foundations of American Society Program. It will be
7 housed in the Fellowship Division, but as with the Bicen-
8 nial Program itself, all divisions will be shareholders in
9 it.

10 Through the program what we want to do is again
11 follow up some of the themes that we had in the Bicentennial
12 Program, talk about the foundations of American institutions,
13 talk about the ratification of the Bill of Rights, talk about
14 the ratification of the -- and so on. But even more than
15 that building upon the more political and philosophical
16 backgrounds and bases of the Bicentennial initiative about
17 the consequences of that founding for all of American arts
18 and letters and American science.

19 So, it is a slightly more broad based program but
20 one that I think we trust will be just as successful as the
21 Bicentennial Program that is just finishing. Thank you.

22 MR. KINGSTON: Are there any questions or comments
23 that Council members wish to ---

24 INTRODUCTION OF NEW STAFF

25 MR. KINGSTON: If not, you have in your folders a

1 listing of short biographies for new members of the staff;
2 Celeste's biography, Jerry's biography is on that list. I
3 would like to introduce as well other program staff and
4 administrative staff that have joined the agency in the last
5 quarter.

6 Rick Emmerson -- Rick, would you stand -- is Deputy
7 to the Director in the Division of Fellowships and Seminars.
8 He may look vaguely familiar because he did serve a stint
9 here as an IPA, what, two years go? Frank Frankfort has
10 just joined the Education Division as a humanist administra-
11 tor.

12 John McGrath -- is John -- way in the back -- has
13 just joined our Office of Publications and Public Affairs.
14 Thank you, Jack. We have changed the name of the old Office
15 of Public Affairs and have made it the Office of Publications
16 and Public Affairs, because so often we are questioned in
17 our budget hearings about what this office does and do we
18 really need a staff of 12, or whatever the number is, just
19 to conduct public affairs. The majority of the work that
20 indeed the office does has to do with guidelines, the publi-
21 cations we put forth, and so on.

22 John Meredith has just joined our Division of State
23 Programs as a humanist administrator. Susan Sienkiewich --
24 way in the back -- Susan heads the Operations Branch of our
25 Personnel Office. Elizabeth Welles? Elizabeth is over here

1 and has also joined the Division of Education Programs as a
2 humanist administrator. Bob Winans? Bob is over here. He
3 is the new Assistant Director in charge of the Reference
4 Materials Program in the Division of Research Programs.

5 We will skip over the next agenda item because no
6 contracts were awarded in the last quarter and we will
7 proceed to the Application Report. Mr. Cherrington? Oh, I
8 am sorry. Yes, I did skip -- I didn't mean to skip Item D.

9 CONFLICTS OF INTEREST

10 MR. KINGSTON: Item D, Conflicts of Interest. In
11 your folder, in the agenda folder, we always publish the
12 Council's policy, adopted policy, on conflicts of interest.
13 Every two years or so, it is time to review that policy and
14 the statement to amend it as necessary. We will do that at
15 the May meeting. We will communicate with you between now
16 and May, but if you do have suggestions or amendments that
17 you would wish to make between now and May, certainly you
18 can communicate those to me or direct it to our General
19 Counsel, Brent Hatch.

20 From time to time, as new Council members join the
21 Endowment, we do have to apprise the Council of certain
22 rulings. This is fairly conventional. There is considerable
23 precedent. If Bob Hollander were here, I would ask him to
24 leave at this point, but since he is not here, I won't ask
25 him to leave. Instead, I will say that he is a member of the

1 National Council, but he is also the co-director for a
2 current NEH grant, RT2064986, the Dartmouth Dante project.
3 This grant ends August 31, 1988, and is the second award to
4 the project. Under the grant, Professor Hollander does
5 receive some remuneration. He has explained his participa-
6 tion fully in a confidential statement of employment and
7 financial interest that he filed at the time of his appoint-
8 ment to the Council.

9 We bring this matter to the attention of the
10 National Council to inform Council members both of the facts
11 and of the opinion of our General Counsel that because
12 Professor Hollander was not a member of the Council at the
13 time that the award was made it is proper for him to receive
14 compensation as co-director and to carry on such negotiations
15 concerning the grant as might be necessary.

16 Of course, Professor Hollander is not able to be
17 remunerated for any future grants or any supplements to this
18 grant during his tenure on the Council. This is sort of a
19 standard comment that we make in instances of this sort,
20 but we do make this statement publicly so that Council mem-
21 bers, if you have concerns or comments or objections to the
22 opinion of the General Counsel, can be invited to send your
23 comments or concerns in writing directly to Brent Hatch.

24 All right. We will move to the Application and
25 Matching Report.

APPLICATION REPORT

MR. CHERRINGTON: The Application Report is Tab B and this edition is already in your agenda book. This version compares what you did at last November Council with what you did in November of 1985. As I say in the memo, about 640 fewer applications were received this past November than in previous years. There have been a lot of deadline changes recently that probably had a lot to do with this.

By the way, it is the February and May Councils that are very busy in Research rather than February and August as I have indicated in the memo. So, everybody on the Research Committee won't have a breather in May like you may have thought.

The Application Report in May will be much different because the 848 applications for the Bicentennial Bookshelf will be included in that one.

MR. KINGSTON: Any questions about the Application Report? The status of matching funds?

MATCHING REPORT

MR. CHERRINGTON: The Matching Report is in the brown folder and it is labeled Tab B. As I say in that report, matching in all areas of the Endowment is the same or even higher than last year with the exception of General Programs. We think this is because in 1987 General Programs didn't begin the year with a large backlog of gift

1 certifications to be processed. But we expect General to
2 pick up very quickly. Right, Don?

3 MR. GIBSON: Certainly.

4 MR. CHERRINGTON: All right. Again, the Bicen-
5 tennial Bookshelf is part of General Programs and it is a
6 matching program so that will have a big effect on the report
7 I give you in May.

8 Other areas are very strong, however. Matching in
9 Education is running about double last year and the Preserva-
10 tion Program is doing quite well with matching. We had
11 wondered whether the preservation world would make use of
12 matching, but they seem to be doing quite well with it.

13 MR. KINGSTON: Any questions about matching funds?
14 Status of Fiscal Year 1987 Funds.

15 STATUS OF FISCAL YEAR 1987 FUNDS

16 MR. CHERRINGTON: Also in the brown folder is a
17 combined memo talking about 1988 and 1987. I will actually
18 deal with 1988 first.

19 The budget for 1988 has gone up to Congress and
20 everyone should have received a copy. If you haven't let
21 me know and I will get one to you. The total request for the
22 agency for 1988 will be \$126,890,000. I mention in the memo
23 that the federal retirement system, new federal retirement
24 system, is more expensive. I might explain how that works.

25 In the past, the agency was only responsible for

25 per cent of the actual costs of federal retirement. With the new system, we have to pay it all. In one way, this makes 13-year veterans like me more valuable to the agency, because if we stick under the old retirement system, we are actually cheaper to the agency. So, we are encouraging all long-time employees to stick around for a while.

1987 funds are being obligated according to schedule; 31 per cent of the fiscal happens to be over and we have spent about 33 per cent of our funds. So, everything seems to be proceeding fine there. In 1987, Congress appropriated \$4 million for the National Capital Arts and Cultural Affairs Program. You may remember this is a past-through grant program for cultural organizations located in the District. The Administration has recommended that this appropriation be withdrawn. Congress has 45 legislative days, which began on January 5, to consider this action. If they do nothing, or if they disagree with the Administration's request, this appropriation goes forward and that is probably what will happen. That is what happened last year.

Gramm-Rudman is still with us. The President's total request for 1988 meets Gramm-Rudman targets right now. The target for 1988 was \$108 billion, the deficit target. This, however, assumes that this whole budget will be accepted and also assumes that certain economic conditions will prove true. The last few years neither of these things has

1 happened. In fact, in 1986, the Gramm-Rudman target, deficit
2 target, was \$172 billion and it turned out to be \$221 billion.
3 That is a \$49 billion difference. In 1987, the Gramm-Rudman
4 target was \$144 billion and already it looks like it will
5 be at least \$173 billion. So, that is about \$29 billion
6 difference. So, things could get worse in this area.

7 Also, Senators Gramm and Rudman -- I am not sure
8 where Hollings stands on this one -- but they are trying to
9 attach a provision to the debt ceiling that will require
10 sequestration again. You may remember that our budget last
11 year was reduced by an automatic percentage, and they are
12 considering attaching this to the next debt ceiling bill,
13 and we will have to keep an eye on that as well.

14 MR. KINGSTON: Any comments of questions? Louise.

15 MS. KERR: I have been trying to figure out this
16 Application Report, and I just want to make sure I under-
17 stand. We have a decline of 600 applications for the period
18 but has there been a proportionate -- well, we have not
19 diminished the amount of money we give out.

20 MR. CHERRINGTON: No.

21 MS. KERR: Is there any -- I mean. it seems to me
22 now, since I am in my eighth year of my six-year term, that
23 over the last several years there has been a consistent
24 decline in the number of applications. Is that correct?

25 MR. CHERRINGTON: Not really. Last year, we had

1 about 8,000 applications. The year before that, 1985, we
2 had about 7,000. Maybe it is the points that I talk about
3 that you might be seizing on. Again, as the whole year plays
4 out, because of Bicentennial Bookshelf and other initiatives,
5 I think we will be equal to last year or higher. As I men-
6 tion in the memo, we have seen a decline in fellowships, for
7 instance.

8 MS. KERR: But an increase in college teachers.

9 MR. CHERRINGTON: Yes, that is right, independent
10 scholars reflect -- the other. Also, as I mentioned in the
11 memo, Research has changed some deadlines around and we
12 think the applications for Research will pick up later in
13 the year as these deadlines become more established.

14 MS. KERR: Yes, but Bicentennial Bookshelf is not
15 the equivalent of a fellowship.

16 MR. CHERRINGTON: It is not.

17 MS. KERR: Okay.

18 MR. CHERRINGTON: Again, we are trying to stimulate
19 applications in that area. For instance, in Travel to
20 Collections last year, we increased the stipend and we also
21 increased -- you can now travel anywhere in the world rather
22 than just in North America. We are doing things in the
23 Fellowships Program to try to boost applications there.

24 Also, Carl Dolan is going everywhere. We expect
25 his actions to bear fruit.

1 MS. CHENEY: But the point of Carl going everywhere
2 is to bring people into the Endowment who may not be as
3 familiar with grant making procedures as others. It is not
4 simply a numbers game here. It is an access game that we
5 are ---

6 MS. KERR: Well, I remember last year -- I think
7 it was sometime last year that we talked about a decline
8 in the senior fellows -- I think that there were a variety
9 of reasons which were not all negative. I think maybe
10 shifting applications around was another.

11 MR. KINGSTON: Other comments or questions about
12 the financial reports? If there are none, we will proceed to
13 the reports from the various Council committees. First on
14 the agenda is Division of Education programs. Mr. Allen.

15 EDUCATION PROGRAMS

16 MR. ALLEN: Thank you. The Committee of Education
17 assembled yesterday morning at 9:30, and we welcomed Robert
18 Stevens, who joined us in his first committee meeting,
19 though he was with the Council last November. We are happy
20 to have him. We are now only one appointment to come of
21 being full strength. We also were happy to welcome Jerry
22 Martin, our new Division Chairman, and three new staff mem-
23 bers in the division: two program officers, Frank Frankfort
24 and Elizabeth Welles; a secretary, Tanya Brooks. The
25 committee also noted the departure of Pamela Menke to become

1 provost of Lesley College in Massachusetts and wish her well.
2 We expressed our gratitude to John Andrews for acting very
3 well and without prompting.

4 The committee then listened to Carl Dolan's report
5 on the Endowment's Access to Excellence Program, and Mr.
6 Dolan said that his primary objective is to reach those
7 schools and organizations that represent underserved popula-
8 tions. He distributed to us the summary of the efforts he
9 has made so far. He gave us copies of the Access Program's
10 recently printed brochure.

11 We then in our discussion to the new guidelines,
12 which you have heard us refer to before and which are yet
13 being developed within the division. Mr. Martin explained
14 that where the division has been operating for the last
15 several years under a three-part structure, it shall now
16 operate under a two-part structure, namely, that of elemen-
17 tary and secondary education on the one hand and higher
18 education in the humanities on the other. He observed that
19 the principal reason for the change was to make it easily
20 for potential applicants to discern where they might focus
21 their attention.

22 Since the committee hadn't had time to give the
23 latest draft of the guidelines adequate review, we limited
24 ourselves to general observations, among them, on balance,
25 the new text seemed to preserve the most important features

1 of the version we had praised in our November meeting. We
2 did suggest changes in wording in several passages.

3 On the whole, however, we found the new approach to
4 be an improvement over the guidelines now being used by the
5 division and also agreed that we would submit, by writing
6 or telephone, comments within the next week because we are
7 anticipating these guidelines will be promulgated by the
8 end of the month.

9 The one policy matter that emerged in the committee's
10 public session, and which we want to bring to the attention
11 of the full Council, had to do with the division's practice
12 of sometimes asking applicants to study additional information
13 on proposals before them in response to questions addressed
14 during the review process.

15 Although we were happy to agree that there were
16 often good reasons for obtaining further information about
17 a project before awarding funds to support it, I said that
18 I was strongly opposed to providing supplemental information
19 prior to a final decision on the proposal, above all, sub-
20 stantive information, and reflected that it might be more
21 equitable for the division either to recommend against funding
22 or to recommend funding with conditions when dealing with
23 applications that pose such special problems. The other
24 members of the committee concurred, and the division staff said
25 that in future they would avoid this kind of intervention in

1 the review process. Thank you.

2 MR. KINGSTON: Any comments or questions about the
3 report from Education Programs? A report then from the
4 Committee on Fellowships and Seminars.

5 FELLOWSHIP PROGRAMS

6 MS. HIMMELFARB: The committee opened its session
7 by welcoming a new staff member, Richard Emmerson. Long-
8 timers on the committee, such as myself, were particularly
9 pleased with this appointment because we had the pleasure
10 of working with Mr. Emmerson in the past when he was first
11 with the Fellowships Program as an IPA member and then with
12 the Summer Seminars Programs, I believe.

13 We were also pleased to learn, as Mr. Agresto has
14 just told us, that the Foundations of American Society
15 Program will be housed in the division.

16 We considered the 1988 budget request. The funds
17 of \$7,567,000 will support the Fellowship Summer Stipend,
18 Travel to Collections, and Younger Scholar awards, and
19 \$6,984,000 will support the two Summer Seminar Programs for
20 college teachers and for secondary school teachers.

21 The committee reviewed the agendas for its meetings
22 for the year and the final item of business during the open
23 session was the review and approval of new guidelines for
24 the Travel to Collections Program. The guidelines were revised
25 in very minor ways.

1 MR. KINGSTON: Any comments or questions about
2 the report on Fellowships and Seminars? The report from the
3 Preservation Committee. Bob Schall.

4 PRESERVATION GRANTS

5 MR. SCHALL: The Preservation Committee also wel-
6 comed Mr. Stevens as part of our committee. We also were
7 grateful to notice the appointment of George Farr as the
8 Director of the staff and we wish to comment and commend
9 Joe Cannon for his yeoman's service in establishing that
10 particular division and, I might say, his eloquent inspira-
11 tion and carrying through.

12 The general discussion had to do with generally
13 the needs of administrators in preservation programs in
14 various libraries. This had to do with mainly the number of
15 centers by which they program can proceed and the need to
16 promote and encourage this particular operation.

17 The only other thing I would call to your attention
18 is in your brown folder there is a news release concerning
19 the humanities support of the United States Newspaper Project.
20 This is a rather widely read report which appeared in the
21 press throughout the country, and I think it explains in
22 itself a good deal about the importance and the value of
23 the program.

24 MR. KINGSTON: Thank you. I think we may want to
25 add that because of our lead in preservation the Chairman has

1 been asked to testify before the House in some hearings that
2 are, on a broad scale, addressing the whole issue of preser-
3 vation. Report from the Committee on Research Programs?

4 MR. BERNES: No public, no business.

5 (Laughter.)

6 MR. KINGSTON: Any questions about the report?
7 Report from the Division of General Programs. Mr. Ritcheson.

8 GENERAL PROGRAMS

9 MR. RITCHESON: I thought I had taken leave of you
10 colleagues. I will not now take leave of you again since
11 the future still is not quite clear. I am more and more
12 sympathetic with Lotte Lehmann and hence will not make a
13 farewell appearance on this occasion. I am relieved to see
14 you still here, however.

15 Now, there were no issues of general policy on
16 the agenda for yesterday's meeting. But the committee was
17 pleased to hear a report from the Director of the division
18 on the staff's activities in evaluating Endowment projects.
19 We were also heartened to learn that an Endowment-supported
20 six-minute documentary film, "Isaac in American," was nomi-
21 nated this week for an Academy Award. This film, which
22 deals with the work of Isaac Bashevis Singer, will be broad-
23 cast as part of a PBS American Masters Series.

24 Mr. Gibson also brought to our attention another
25 film supported by Media Programs, "Seize the Day." This

1 adaptation of a Saul Bellow novel stars Robin Williams and
2 will be broadcast on PBS in early May.

3 We also learned that another project, an exhibition
4 of photographs and documents entitled, "Persistence of the
5 Spirit," served as a centerpiece of the Endowment's celebra-
6 tion of Black History Month. This project examines 300
7 years of black history in Arkansas, and it is with the
8 greatest reluctance I do not exhibit the handsome catalogue
9 out of deference to my friend, Walter Berns.

10 We were delighted to receive copies of the booklet
11 from a Libraries project on H. G. Wells, sponsored by the
12 Champaign Public Library in Illinois. Mr. Gibson also
13 called our attention to the favorable review of the exhibit,
14 "The Machine Age, which recently closed at the Brooklyn
15 Museum. Many of you may have read the Wall Street Journal
16 review. If you have not done so, I am going to read to you
17 a small excerpt from it, which I hope you will be as
18 delighted as I was.

19 If I may quote from it directly: "It is quite an
20 odd experience to walk through a museum show and repeatedly
21 hear yourself and others exclaiming, 'We used to have one
22 of those in our house.' Finding out that some of those old
23 radios, toasters, and victrolas have been raised to the
24 status of artefacts makes you feel a bit like Moliere's
25 Monsieur Jourden when he learned that he had unwittingly

1 been talking prose all his life." That concludes my report,
2 Madam Chairman.

3 MR. KINGSTON: Questions? The report from the
4 Division of State Programs, Mrs. Cresimore.

5 STATE PROGRAMS

6 MS. CRESIMORE: The State Programs Committee met
7 as scheduled on Thursday, February 12. The committee wel-
8 comed new staff member John Meredith, Program Officer for
9 the Western Region, and members of the public, Sandra Myers,
10 President of the State Humanities Councils, and Robert
11 VAughn, Executive Director of the Virginia Foundation for
12 the Humanities in Public Policy.

13 The session of the meeting open to the public
14 focused on three topics: the Bicentennial Bookshelf, with
15 emphasis on the Chairman's grant to the Federation of State
16 Humanities Councils; the upcoming competition for state and
17 regional exemplary awards; and institutional development
18 among state councils.

19 Marjorie Berlincourt began the discussion by
20 reporting that 848 libraries have received matching grants
21 for the establishment of a Bicentennial Bookshelf. There
22 were applications from all 50 states as well as from Puerto
23 Rico, the District of Columbia, and the United States Virgin
24 Islands. The State Humanities Councils were very active in
25 contacting libraries and encouraging them to apply. Sandra

1 Myers, the President of the Federation of State Humanities
2 Councils, then described a proposal developed by the
3 Federation under a Chairman's grant to produce materials to
4 accompany the Bicentennial Bookshelf.

5 Entitled "Celebrate the Constitution--a Guide to
6 Bicentennial Programs," the guide offers model programs for
7 reading and discussion series, conference, and summer seminars.
8 It will soon be published and distributed to libraries, state
9 councils, and Bicentennial Commissions.

10 Nancy Rogers then outlined the upcoming state and
11 regional exemplary awards competition. The division is
12 expecting between 20 and 25 proposals to be reviewed by a
13 panel on March 16 and presented at the May Council meeting.

14 The discussion of institutional development among
15 state humanities councils was began by Robert Vaughn, the
16 Executive Director of the Virginia Foundation for the
17 Humanities and Public Policy. He described the evolution of
18 this council since its establishment in 1974. In outlining
19 the history of the foundation, Mr. Vaughn concentrated on
20 two major themes: first, programmatic development leading
21 to the founding of the Virginia Center for the Humanities in
22 1986, and secondly, the obtaining of state funding and
23 support. Key steps in these developments were the outlining
24 of a five-year plan by the council in 1982 which entailed
25 the establishment of major topics for programming through

1 1987 and the careful planning which resulted in state appro-
2 priation beginning in 1980.

3 Mr. Vaughn stressed the need for active involvement
4 by the members of the council in all aspects of the council's
5 work as well as the amount of time and patience involved in
6 establishing a structure as complex as the Virginia Center
7 for the Humanities, which is now sponsoring residential
8 fellows as well as colloquia and seminars.

9 Members of the staff of the Division of State Pro
10 grams then described institutuional development in seven
11 other states, including the purchase of a house in Indiana,
12 rent-free office space in Kentucky and New Hampshire, and
13 the gift of a house in Iowa.

14 MR. KINGSTON: Any comments or questions? Fran,
15 please.

16 MS. RHOME: Will Celebrate the Constitution that
17 you referred to will be available either free of charge or
18 for purchase, and if so, where would we go to get it?

19 MS. BERLINCOURT: Through the Federation.

20 MS. RHOME: Through the Federation?

21 MS. BERLINCOURT: Yes.

22 MS. RHOME: Thank you.

23 MR. KINGSTON: Report from the Jefferson Lecture
24 Committee.
25

JEFFERSON LECTURE

MR. CHICKERING: The Jefferson Lecture Committee met Thursday afternoon to review plans for the 1987 Jefferson Lecture, to re-examine the procedures and criteria for selection of the 1987 Jefferson lecturer, and to review nominations for the 1988 lecturer.

The 1987 Jefferson lecturer, Forrest McDonald, will present his address Wednesday evening, May 6, at the National Building Museum, the Pension Building, here in Washington. A second lecture, hosted by the -- Center for the Humanities at the University of Kansas at Lawrence, Kansas, is scheduled for Wednesday evening, May 13. Council members wishing to submit the names and addresses of individuals to be invited to either lecture should send the names and addresses to Susan Metts here at the Endowment before March 2. Both lectures will be followed by a reception.

The committee discussed other activities surrounding the lecture and concurred with the proposal to discontinue the public symposium following the Washington address. Instead the committee has asked staff to explore possibilities for a social event, perhaps a sherry reception or dinner, involving the lecturer, Council members, and a few invited guests. This then would take place after the Thursday meeting of the Council.

Members then reviewed principles for selecting the

1 Jefferson lecturer and reaffirmed the following criteria for
2 emphasis in choosing lecturers: (1) the individual should
3 demonstrate exemplary scholarship in one of the disciplines
4 of the humanities; (2) the individual is able to give an
5 original and substantive address relating to broad public
6 issues with a central perspective of the humanities disci-
7 plines; and (3) the individual is able to speak from an
8 experience wide ranging enough to reach a variety of persons
9 drawn from different backgrounds and disciplines.

10 Finally, the committee spent the rest of its
11 meeting on reviewing over 100 nominations submitted this
12 winter by Council members, former Council members, past
13 lecturers, and others. The committee narrowed the list to
14 17 individuals for whom staff will prepare extended bio-
15 graphies prior to the May meeting. The list and biographies
16 will be sent to all Council members in late April.

17 In May, the committee will again meet to form
18 recommendations to present at the plenary meeting of the
19 Council. Of course, Council members will have an opportunity
20 to nominate individuals not on the slate and the Council
21 will select the 1988 lecturer at that meeting.

22 MR. KINGSTON: Any questions or comments?

23 MR. SCHALL: Would you give some discussion about
24 the proposal about a discussion conference with a lecturer --
25 afterwards, I mean, the reasons for that?

1 MR. CHICKERING: Yes. The concern was expressed,
2 I think, in the Chairman's Office initially, and by a number
3 of the members of the committee that the discussion, symposium,
4 the following night last year drew a very substantially lower
5 attendance than the lecture itself, limited mainly to staff
6 and Council members. In the light of -- some people also
7 emphasized that it seemed inconsistent with the celebratory
8 nature of the occasion, in effect, to give a variety of
9 people equal standing -- to stand, in a sense, in a theatri-
10 cal position to judge the lecturer much as the major network
11 news shows judge the State of the Union message.

12 The thought was perhaps we might try and have a
13 much less formal occasion for more informal discussion which
14 might encourage a deeper exploration of issues and a more ---

15 MS. KERR: Could you say that last sentence again?

16 MR. CHICKERING: Well, the idea -- there was a
17 feeling last year, to put it bluntly, that when each of the
18 discussants at the symposium the night following the Jefferson
19 Lecture could stand at the lectern and speak to an audience
20 that it tended to discourage a real joining of issues in a
21 non-adversarial way. There was a kind of a posturing. That
22 was one word used by some one or two of the committee mem-
23 bers.

24 There was a feeling that in a more informal setting,
25 such as a sherry reception, or an informal dinner, in which

1 people could sit around a table and discuss issues that
2 there would be more opportunity for a non-adversarial
3 exploration of issues without the theatrical impediments
4 that some people felt were present last year.

5 MR. KINGSTON: Mr. Sandoz?

6 MR. SANDOZ: If you will permit me to just add one
7 word. We thought it would be especially fitting and satis-
8 fying perhaps to the Council since the selection of the
9 Jefferson Lecturer is the one and only thing that we actually
10 do, everything else being a recommendation, to have some-
11 thing like a -- not simply a social occasion -- where we
12 could chat informally with, in this case, Professor McDonald,
13 but actually sit around a table, if that were possible, and
14 get his thinking and talk to him in a way that would be
15 something on the order of a kind of seminar setting, quasi-
16 seminar setting. That would be an intellectual event and
17 not merely a social event.

18 Some of us, perhaps privately more than in that
19 meeting, had hoped that since this is the observation of the
20 200th anniversary of the framing of the Constitution that
21 this might also be a suitable time for the breakthrough
22 when the President would be interested in honoring the
23 humanities' best person who is speaking about the Constitu-
24 tion and might perhaps include the Council.

25 MR. KINGSTON: Other comments or questions? Charles?

1 MR. RITCHESON: The West Coast members would be
2 particularly interested to know what time was evening on
3 May the 6th.

4 MR. KINGSTON: It is set for 8:00 Wednesday
5 evening, but you will here on everything because the Jefferson
6 Lecture Committee is meeting Wednesday afternoon anyhow.

7 MR. RITCHESON: Oh, yes. Thank you.

8 MR. KINGSTON: Other comments or questions? Walter?

9 MR. BERNS: Very briefly, and this is all news to
10 me, and since I was a participant in last year's subsequent
11 forum, I would merely say that any idea that this Council
12 has that we will have an intellectual discussion of merit
13 around a sherry table and a dinner is mistaken.

14 MR. SCHALL: Can I make one other ---

15 MR. KINGSTON: Yes. Bob Schall.

16 MR. SCHALL: Has it been the tradition of the
17 Council for a long time to have this? Was that itself an
18 innovation -- the year before and the year before that?

19 MR. KINGSTON: A symposium of some sort has been
20 in existence for, I think, four years, Susan. I am going
21 back to Peliken.

22 MS. METTS: (Inaudible.)

23 MR. KINGSTON: The Library of Congress sponsored
24 an independent symposium group for Peliken. There was not
25 one for Sidney Hook. But over the last two years, there

1 have been seminars.

2 MR. SCHALL: Had the same kind of judgment -- I
3 mean, was this a one-shot judgment or was it the same feeling
4 about it earlier? What kind of publicity or what kind of
5 coverage was that given?

6 MR. KINGSTON: Susan, do you want to comment? Come
7 to the microphone. Susan Metts has done the event for the
8 last several years.

9 MS. METTS: We did it based on the event over the
10 past two years. It has been done obviously in coordination
11 with the Jefferson Lecturer and the express wishes of the
12 Jefferson Lecturer whether or not we did one. Mr. Hook did
13 not want to -- feel up to doing one. We did one with Cleanth
14 Brooks and then last year with Kowakowski. So, it has been
15 over the period of the last two years basically that it
16 all came up for discussion.

17 MS. KERR: Historically, there has been some
18 intellectual exchange on and about the message of the
19 lecturer sponsored by someone, and I have never heard this
20 complaint before.

21 MR. AGRESTO: I have gone to two of them. I thought
22 the one with Cleanth Brooks was a shame and a disaster.
23 People got up -- no one expects people to get up simply to
24 praise the lecturer or to review his life or to save what
25 a fine lecture it was. But it did seem to me to be taking

1 the occasion to take ugly and nasty potshots and a forum
2 to do it in. I thought last year's was, in some ways,
3 slightly better, but still the comments after both symposiums
4 are we putting the lecturer through this and why are we
5 paying for it?

6 MR. KINGSTON: Fran.

7 MS. RHOME: We had one about six years ago and
8 held it in the Washington Hotel banquet room -- basement I
9 called it. On that occasion, we quite a large group that
10 did attend. We had outside people who came in to comment
11 on the state of -- it seems like it was on education at the
12 time -- that were there. That was a very successful one
13 because there was a good interchange with the group that
14 attended. We had that the next morning. It was a morning
15 kind of symposium that drew a different kind of a crowd than
16 an evening crowd with sherry and festivities. I think that
17 does make a difference on where it is located and the time
18 of day.

19 MR. KINGSTON: Yes. For example, last year's
20 symposium, the choice, in concert with the Council, was to
21 keep the audience small, hoping to encourage dialogue. Other
22 comments or questions about the report from the Jefferson
23 Lecture Committee? There being none, I will refer you to
24 Tab E ---

25 MS. CHENEY: Tom, I would just like to say we will

1 certainly take all of these comments under advisement and
2 try to put together an event that will provide open and fr-e
3 intellectual exchange and hopefully maintain the celebratory
4 nature of the Jefferson Lecture.

5 MR. KINGSTON: Next on the agenda is a discussion
6 of Approved Emergency Grants and Approved Actions Departing
7 from Council Recommendation.

8 EMERGENCY GRANTS AND ACTIONS DEPARTING FROM

9 COUNCIL RECOMMENDATION - APPROVALS

10 MR. KINGSTON: These are the awards that were made
11 only. You have under Tab E two emergency grants that were
12 approved, one of which, by the way, is the Federation grant
13 for the guidelines for the Bicentennial Bookshelf. Are there
14 questions about either of the two emergency grants made in
15 the last quarter?

16 EMERGENCY GRANTS AND ACTIONS DEPARTING FROM

17 COUNCIL RECOMMENDATION - DISAPPROVALS

18 MR. KINGSTON: If you flip over, there are five
19 awards that were made that represent reversals of the
20 Council recommendation. Are there any questions about any
21 of those five? All right. Is there any other business,
22 therefore -- I am sorry. Leon, did you have a question?
23 Is there any other business before the open session of the
24 Council?

25 There being none, we will adjourn for 12 minutes

1 and resume in closed session.

2 (Whereupon, at 9:57 a.m., a brief recess was taken.)

3 MR. KINGSTON: We are resuming the meeting of the
4 83rd Council in closed session. Still in Tab E of the
5 agenda book. Are there any questions about the four emer-
6 gency grants that were rejected? If not, are there any
7 questions about the four disapproved grants which represent
8 reversals of the Council recommendation?

9 MS. CHENEY: Before we move to various divisions,
10 I just want to say a word -- we have one new Council member
11 and I will direct my comments to you, but it is really a
12 commentary intended for the Council as a whole and for
13 staff members present.

14 I think sometimes the procedures that we go through
15 before you get your Council books aren't entirely clear.
16 You do see from your Council books, and I must -- this parti-
17 cular session -- particularly commend the Council book in
18 General Programs. It was done -- I finally got your atten-
19 tion -- it was very thoughtfully and thoroughly and frankly
20 put together, which is exactly the kind of detail that I
21 find useful and I know the Council members do too.

22 In any case, the work that the staff at the Endow-
23 ment, which is very professional, very bright and competent,
24 the work that the staff puts into reviewing proposals as a
25 result of panels and the reviewers' opinions which are sought

1 is evident to you when you get your Council books. There is
2 another step in this process, though, that I think is less
3 evident to you and that I just wanted to comment on briefly.

4 And that is what happens when a proposal is flagged
5 for your attention. This is not done lightly. The 5th floor
6 doesn't take the binders out and throw these into the air
7 and select three or four at random just to make sure that
8 everyone at the Endowment is on his or her toes. If a
9 proposal has been flagged for your attention, it usually
10 means that at least four people on the 5th floor have read
11 the file from cover to cover. We are very familiar with it
12 before we trouble you and ask you to look at it.

13 When you receive a covering memo on any specific
14 proposal, though it may come from one specific person on the
15 5th floor -- it may come from Tom, it may come from John --
16 you should be aware that it is not a memo that represents
17 simply one opinion. It is a memo that represents consensus.
18 It is a memo that particularly represents my point of view.

19 I think there was a little confusion yesterday
20 in Education about exactly what the process was on the 5th
21 floor that went into drawing Council members' attention to
22 a specific proposal. So, I just wanted you to know that
23 though the senior staff may present you with less paper
24 you also receive our very considered judgment when we do ask
25 you to look at specific applications.

1 MR. KINGSTON: We will move on to the closed
2 session reports of the respective committees beginning with
3 Bill Allen and the Division of Education Programs. Bill?

4 EDUCATION PROGRAMS

5 MR. ALLEN: Thank you. I should say, in light
6 of the comments you made, Lynne, that we did, of course,
7 spend some time in our meeting yesterday talking about a
8 series of five proposals. We encountered some difficulties
9 but rather more difficulties of form than substance; namely,
10 the procedure of flagging proposals was one we are, with
11 the exception of Bob Stevens, who was newly introduced to
12 it, quite familiar with and perfectly happy to work with.
13 We did have some problems in simply getting memos and getting
14 proposals on this particular cycle which, therefore, made
15 the entire process somewhat more debilitary.

16 MS. CHENEY: (Inaudible.)

17 MR. ALLEN: Than it might otherwise have been.
18 But, nevertheless, because we take this matter very seri-
19 ously, we accommodated ourselves once fully informed what
20 the circumstances were and put in that labor which is a neces-
21 sary prelude to judgment through the last evening and this
22 morning, and we do have a report for you.

23 During its closed session, the committee focused
24 on some 20 proposals, including several of those that had
25 been singled out for special attention in the memorandum from

1 John Agresto. In all but two of the instances discussed
2 during the committee meeting, the committee concurred with
3 the staff recommendations.

4 In the first of those instances, which is Applica-
5 tion EK20202, Assumption College's proposal to develop new
6 core courses, one in history and one in literature, the
7 committee concluded that only the history portion of the
8 project should be funded. Everyone who had reviewed the
9 proposal agreed that this part of the application was
10 exemplary, but there was almost equal unanimity among the
11 reviewers that the literature portion of the application
12 needed considerably more development. The final motion
13 reflects an appropriate reduction in the budget for this
14 application.

15 In the second instance in which the committee's
16 judgment departed from that of the staff, EK20212, Portland
17 State University's proposal to revise and expand its inte-
18 grated studies program, the committee concluded that there
19 were so many unanswered questions about the application that
20 it would not be wise to fund it as submitted. The committee,
21 therefore, moved this proposal from the recommended to the
22 not recommended category.

23 In the third instance in which the committee as
24 a whole concurred with the staff recommendation, EG20069,
25 Rollins College, the proposal to establish a Master of

1 Liberal Studies Program in its School of Continuing Education,
2 the vote was split. I dissented from the panel recommenda-
3 tion on the basis of my objection to the staff's role in
4 soliciting additional information from the applicant.

5 One of the applications that elicited extensive
6 discussion was EG20067, University of Pennsylvania's proposal
7 to develop six humanities seminars to be offered in its
8 Master of Arts Program in Social Gerontology. Robert Stevens
9 felt that in this instance a wealthy institution was perhaps
10 requesting a considerable amount of money to support a
11 project that would feature little more than a token appearance
12 of the humanities. Alternatively, Peter Stanlis argued that
13 social gerontology was itself a field of the humanities,
14 and Frances Rhome said that this appeared to be a superb
15 program that would serve as a model for other institutions.

16 At the end of our meeting, we decided to read the
17 entire dossier for this proposal and vote on it this morning.
18 As a result of that tally, the committee moved this proposal
19 from the recommended to the not recommended category. It
20 appears in your listing in the recommended category. It
21 should be moved to the not recommended category.

22 In the discussion of EK20201, University of Arkansas,
23 Little Rock, a proposal to promote the use of original texts
24 in all of its introductory courses, the committee applauded
25 the goals of the project but concurred with the panelists

1 and staff in their view that the plan to achieve these goals
2 was weakened by a number of flaws in its implementation
3 strategy. The committee, therefore, left the proposal in
4 the not recommended category.

5 As the meeting ended, the committee decided to
6 read, in addition to the proposal from the University of
7 Pennsylvania, the full dossiers of a total of nine proposals
8 that -- of those that had been singled out. The proposals
9 in question were: EG20058, the University of Delaware;
10 EG20059, Frostburg State College in Maryland; EG20064, the
11 University of Nevada at Las Vegas; EG20066, North Texas
12 State University; EK20201, University of Arkansas at Little
13 Rock; EM20169, Eureka State College, or Eureka College,
14 pardon me; EM20172, Morris Hill College in North Carolina;
15 and EM20175, the University of New Hampshire.

16 In three instances, namely, North Texas State,
17 EG20066; Morris Hill, EM20172; and Eureka College, EM2017 --
18 pardon me, North Texas State is EM20172 and I have the same
19 number here for Morris Hill, but that would not be correct.
20 North Texas State should be EG20066; I beg your pardon.
21 Morris Hill, EM20172, and Eureka College, EM20169.

22 The committee was split in these cases by votes
23 of two to two. These proposals, therefore, remain as
24 recommended by the staff but without committee recommendation.
25 The committee is divided.

1 In the remaining five instances, the committee
2 sustained the original five staff recommendations, namely,
3 EG20058, University of Delaware; EG20059, Frostburg State;
4 and EG20064, Nevada-Las Vegas; EK20201, Arkansas; EM20175,
5 New Hampshire. I might point out that, though most of these
6 votes are divided both in one form or the other, it is not
7 that the committee has been unusually truculent. It is
8 rather that in reading the proposals overnight and taking
9 a tally on them in the morning we did not have occasion for
10 that ventilating discussion which would have ordinarily
11 produced movement in the committee.

12 The motion, therefore, is in the form before you,
13 and I move its adoption.

14 MS. CHENEY: Thank you and I appreciate your
15 willingness to work so hard at the last minute. As I say,
16 Jerry has been on board -- what, a month now?

17 MR. MARTIN: Three weeks.

18 MS. CHENEY: The next Council meeting, I am sure,
19 will go more smoothly.

20 MR. KINGSTON: There is a motion before you, as
21 amended, and the amendment is the University of Pennsylvania,
22 EG20067, is moved from the recommended to the non-recommended
23 category. Is there any discussion of the motion? George?

24 MR. CAREY: Yes. Just a point of information. I
25 noticed that some institutions have been granted more than

1 they requested, and I wondered why.

2 MR. KINGSTON: The simple answer to that in most
3 cases is that the applicant did not figure in the cost of
4 bringing the project director to the Directors' Workshop
5 that we sponsor here at the Endowment, and they have added
6 in that cost. It is usually a matter of \$500, I think. Jim?

7 MR. SCHALL: I noticed that in a number of these
8 programs, the term "non-traditional" is used. I am thinking
9 of the University of San Francisco. How does that translate
10 into English if I might refer to ---

11 (Laughter.)

12 MR. ALLEN: If you want it in English, I will
13 answer rather by calling on staff. The program for non-
14 traditional learners essentially focused on those over 25
15 years of age, out of school for at least 5 years, or some-
16 thing of that order.

17 MR. SCHALL: Yes. We are all non-traditional
18 learners.

19 MR. ALLEN: People in the professionals, people
20 who study for continuing education programs. That is what
21 is normally meant by non-traditional learners. Sometimes
22 categories of populations, whether calculated in terms of
23 relative material status or race or ethnicity or other
24 concerns will also enter in.

25 MR. KINGSTON: Yes, Anita.

1 MS. SILVERS: I am glad actually that you moved the
2 Penn State program to the non-recommended. There is another
3 problem that is -- in that committee's past. Sometime back
4 we talked about the issue of funding projects that were
5 designed for the -- to produce master's degrees in con-
6 tinuing education, and we produced some policy or other
7 about it. I can't remember what that was.

8 MR. ALLEN: I am innocent of that, Anita. I have
9 only been around ---

10 MS. SILVERS: That is very possible. This is so
11 long ago, Bill, that there is nobody -- but I seem to recall
12 that there was a very long discussion indicating that this
13 kind of proposal has been controversial in the past. If
14 somebody can remember back to what it was we decided about
15 proposals for master's degrees in continuing education -- I
16 have a funny feeling we decided that they should not be
17 supported.

18 MR. ALLEN: I would hate to infringe on other
19 people's territory, but I wondered whether Rich Eckman might
20 have any memory of that.

21 MR. ECKMAN: Anita, your recollection is sub-
22 stantially correct.

23 MS. CHENEY: Which leaves us where?

24 MS. SILVERS: It is fine right now, because it
25 has been moved to a ---

1 MR. ALLEN: Yes. But it must be pointed out that
2 there are some programs this year that also have this degree
3 relationship to them that are being funded. We did not
4 discuss this, whether it is a problem of institutional
5 memory or not, but I should not that, for some of us at
6 least, it was a matter of reflection whether these degree
7 programs as such were an appropriate use of the funds.

8 MR. KINGSTON: Other comments or questions about
9 the motion? Those in favor, signify by saying "aye."

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

11 MR. KINGSTON: Opposed?

12 (No response.)

13 MR. KINGSTON: And the motion carries. The report
14 from the Division of Fellowships and Seminars. This is the
15 yellow motion. Bea?

16 FELLOWSHIP PROGRAMS

17 MS. HIMMELFARB: The committee received 2,087
18 applications -- as well as Scholarships for College Teachers
19 and Independent Scholars and those applications which had
20 been deferred from the last Council meeting. The meeting
21 reviewed 37 applications in detail and is recommending a
22 total of 433 awards.

23 Under the Summer Stipends Program, there were 1,421
24 applications. The committee considered 16 of these in detail
25 and is recommending 215 awards.

1 The Young Scholars Program, there were 650 applica-
2 tions. We reviewed 16 of these and we are recommending 224
3 for awards. Of those Fellowships for College Teachers and
4 Independent Scholars, 16 applications having been deferred
5 from the last meeting, we reviewed 5 of these in detail and
6 we are recommending 4 awards.

7 We are moving the adoption of the motion contained
8 in the yellow packet. I should add one detail here. Under
9 the Summer Stipends Program, under disapproval, I think -- it
10 has been pointed out to me that I should have specified that
11 we are disapproving 1,206 applications. I move for the
12 adoption of this motion.

13 MR. KINGSTON: The motion is on the table. Any
14 discussion or comments? Those in favor of the motion?

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

16 MR. KINGSTON: Opposed?

17 (No response.)

18 MR. KINGTON: The motion carries. The report
19 from the Committee on Preservation, Jim Schall.

20 PRESERVATION GRANTS

21 MR. SCHALL: The Preservation Committee -- is on
22 the orange paper. The only comment I would like to make is
23 that the second item there, the Illinois Historic Preserva-
24 tion Agency proposal, is the 25th state to be organized in
25 this program. I won't calculate how many is left to go yet.

1 I will leave it up to you.

2 In addition, I point out the next one on Columbia
3 University and that this remains to be the only program
4 which has a formal conservation program as part of their
5 Library Science Department and also which trains people to
6 administer it. So, it gets a fair amount of granting from
7 this organization because of that. Columbia -- has agreed
8 to try -- enough to replace the Endowment's contribution
9 with their own funds. We seem to be satisfied with -- in
10 any case, I propose the acceptance of this motion.

11 MR. KINGSTON: This is the -- I don't know what
12 color this is. This color.

13 MS. CHENEY: Salmon.

14 MR. KINGSTON: Salmon. Those in favor of the
15 motion?

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

17 MR. KINGSTON: Opposed?

18 (No response.)

19 MR. KINGSTON: It carries. The report from the
20 Division of Research Programs. It is the yellow motion.
21 Walter?

22 RESEARCH PROGRAMS

23 MR. BERNES: It is old gold, isn't it? I begin with
24 a statement that will have to be amended in due course. In
25 our report, we are following the advice exactly of the

1 committee -- of the staff. As I say, that will have to be
2 amended. This does not indicate in any way that the members
3 of the Council committee do not scrupulously review these
4 various proposals. I think it is instead an indication of
5 the quality of the work done by the staff.

6 We were at full strength in the committee yesterday
7 unlike other Council committees. It was quite clear from our
8 discussion that everybody present in the Council had read
9 these things with great care. Lots of questions were raised.
10 No question for which the staff did not have an answer
11 indicating that the staff had considered all these things,
12 and staff certainly should be commended for that fact.

13 In our motion, pages 1 to 13, having to do with
14 additions, 35 were recommended for approval, 35 for dis-
15 approval. The translations, pages 14 to 31, 30 recommended
16 for approval, 85 for disapproval. Publication -- 49 applica-
17 tions. How many did we -- all 49? Half of that. That is
18 right, 50 -- under Tools, two supplements of existing events
19 and then Interpretative Research having to do with archaeology,
20 17 recommended for support, 47 for disapproval.

21 Now, the amendment that I have to make. We found
22 ourselves in Translations with insufficient funds to cover
23 the projects, the grants, recommended. We knew this in
24 advance and therefore had to find the money someplace, and
25 we had a spirited discussion. We had flagged certain

1 proposals that might possibly be candidates for rejection,
2 and we finally settled on one, a proposal on page 21 on the
3 Court -- having to do with the Court Diaries of Ethiopia in
4 the Years 1919-1935. The amount of that particular grant
5 was \$48,000 and that brought us more or less within budget.

6 We had a discussion in the afternoon yesterday of
7 two things that might very well have been discussed during
8 our public session. It had to do with translations and
9 the centrality of certain proposals. We had a discussion as
10 to what a central translation project was and we agreed, I
11 think, that each of us on the committee could more or less
12 agree as to what was central with respect to western civili-
13 zation. We run into difficulties in understanding what is
14 central with respect to more exotic regions of the world.

15 Since I have been on the Research Committee, I have
16 to confess that I have encountered languages I have never
17 heard of before spoken by peoples I didn't know existed.
18 To understand what would be central in such a tradition, I
19 have to confess I don't know. I do think we all agreed that
20 there is a problem here. I think we all profited from the
21 discussion. I hope the Chairman, who was present during
22 this time, profited from the discussion.

23 There was some agreement that the next time our
24 programs -- what are they called -- next time the guidelines
25 are revised, we will adopt some language to emphasize the

1 importance of central rather than peripheral projects, and
2 we hope that that will suffice.

3 We also had a discussion of another subject that
4 could very well have been discussed during the public part
5 of our meeting yesterday. That had to do with subventions
6 that we make to university presses. During the course of
7 this, I made a confession that I am more inclined to set
8 aside reservations when I look at the amount of money involved
9 and find that there is only, say, \$5,000 and I am willing
10 to say, well, it is only \$5,000 so what is the use of arguing
11 about it.

12 Ellis Sandoz is not here now. I drew that kind
13 of confession out of him too. Louise, I think you took the
14 Fifth Amendment on this one, didn't you?

15 MS. KERR: No, I said, when it is important, I
16 consider it.

17 MR. BERNES: At any rate, we all raised a lot of
18 questions about the subventions program, and we were satis-
19 fied in every case by members of the staff that they had
20 thought of all these things too. I move the adoption of the
21 motion.

22 MS. CHENEY: Walter, I just want to say that I
23 always profit from discussions in which you are involved
24 even though I do not always agree with the conclusion.

25 MR. KINGSTON: Jim?

1 MR. SCHALL: Could I have a point of information?
2 I notice that there are three grants, and there may be more
3 than that, that are given to non-American citizens, two
4 English and one Canadian. What is the point of that? Is
5 there a formula for a number that you can grant or is it just
6 the evidence of the -- or what?

7 Well, I noticed the one on Canada is on page 18.
8 There is a lady from Canada. On page 19, there is a man from
9 England, and on page, there is somebody from England also,
10 on the -- of all things.

11 MR. EKMAN: The general policy, of course, is to
12 give the funds to Americans and American institutions, and
13 I believe in these cases the individuals are fully eligible.
14 That has been checked out.

15 MR. SCHALL: They are eligible. All I am asking is
16 are they eligible because they are in an American institution
17 or ---

18 MR. EKMAN: Both ways. Either if they are applying
19 through an American institution, they are eligible, or if
20 they are Americans who are at the moment not living in the
21 United States, they are also eligible.

22 MR. SCHALL: These could be Americans living in
23 England?

24 MR. BERNS: I think I am right in saying that,
25 in the case of subventions, for example, the Univerity of

1 Toronto Press, for example, received a couple of grants from
2 us. Those are for books published by or written by Americans,
3 published by the University of Toronto Press but written by
4 Americans.

5 MR. KINGSTON: Louise?

6 MS. KERR: I just wanted to add that in the dis-
7 cussion on centrality that we, I think, did conclude that
8 we were interested in significance. That the word we were
9 using was "central" but what we were looking at was, as this
10 Council has in the past, looking for the works of highest
11 significance.

12 MR. KINGSTON: Other comments or questions? On
13 the motion before you, those in favor?

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

15 MR. KINGSTON: Opposed?

16 (No response.)

17 MR. KINGSTON: The motion passes. Before we look
18 at the General Programs motion in detail, I do want to report
19 for the record some declared abstentions from discussion and
20 voting. Mrs. Cresimore should be recorded as abstaining
21 on GN23024. Mr. Hollander is shown as abstaining from dis-
22 cussion and voting on GN23021, GN23023, GN23025, GN23026,
23 GN23127, GN23128. That takes care of the record. Now, the
24 report from General Programs, please.
25

GENERAL PROGRAMS

MR. RITCHESON: The committee reviewed a total of 261 applications and approved 69 at a cost of \$6,750,000 in outright funds and \$2 million in matching. We gave particular attention to eight applications and sustained the staff recommendations with one exception.

In the Media Program, the committee discussed several applications at length. I call your attention to GN22977, Rites of Passage, page 3 of the motion. This is a series of adaptations and short stories for adolescent audiences to be produced by Robert Geller, who gave us the American short story series.

The committee notes that the proposal received a rare rating of eight E's. The issue discussed was the matter of language and taste in one of the stories, Harold Brodsky's "First Love and Other Sorrows." We explored the sensitive matter of censorship, and the committee concluded that the language is faithful to the literary work and important to the integrity of the script. Thus, we voted to recommend the proposal.

With respect to GN22985, Presidents in Crisis, page 3, which proposes to produce a film on Lincoln's decision to supply Fort Sumter and to script a program on Harry Truman's decision to drop the atomic bomb, the staff recommended support only for the production of the Lincoln

1 program. We note that it is a two-hour drama and therefore
2 an expensive production. We also discussed the panel vote
3 of two E, four BG, and two G and concluded that although the
4 vote is one of the highest it was examined by a panel that
5 was particularly rigorous. We agreed that the program has
6 many strengths, including a first-rate group of scholars and
7 and an experienced producer. We were satisfied that the
8 amount offered is fair, but since a director has not yet
9 been chosen, the Endowment will not release the funds until
10 the staff approves a director.

11 I refer now to Two Appalachian Folktales, that is,
12 GN23014, on page 4. The proposal requests support for the
13 adaptation for a children's audience of an Appalachian
14 folktale, which is a variation on the Cinderella theme.
15 Again, the issue discussed was language and taste, in particu-
16 lar, the use of a racial epitaph, and in general, of the
17 Appalachian dialect and expression. We concluded that we
18 should not presume to alter the historical text and in so
19 doing perhaps destroy the authenticity and cultural integrity
20 of the piece.

21 GN23051, Beckett Directs Beckett, page 5, requests
22 support to produce three of Beckett's plays with a discussion
23 by scholars and literary critics following. We agree with
24 the staff that this offers an excellent opportunity to have
25 on film a play directed by such a distinguished author. We

1 also believe it prudent to offer support for only one play
2 and to do so on a matching basis.

3 Finally, I call your attention to GN23001, the
4 Diego Rivera film project, on page 15. The staff recommended
5 full support to script for the 60-minute documentary examin-
6 ing the life and works of the artist. In this case, the
7 committee asked to see the proposal file, and after examining
8 it, we were troubled by comments by panelists that there
9 was insufficient attention given the artist's Mexican and
10 Latin American dimension and insufficient exploitation too
11 of other archival and film materials on the subject. After
12 further consideration, we concluded too that in one hour's
13 time the proposers could not possibly do what they said they
14 would do. Rivera's life and work raise important questions
15 about the relationship between art and society, the place of
16 the artist in society, the relationship between culture and
17 technology, between the artist and the public, and between
18 the patron and the artist. All these were things which were
19 proposed to be explored and presented through the film to a
20 wide adult audience.

21 Further, Diego Rivera was extremely controversial.
22 We would need some assurance that the complexities of the
23 controversy and the merits of the arguments on both sides
24 would be explored, not just touched on or mentioned. We
25 would need, for example, some assurance that the controversy

1 should not be boiled down to one of artistic freedom on one
2 side and anti-intellectualism or social control on the other.
3 Finally, along these lines, critical distance on the part
4 of the film makers and scholarly consultants is crucial. Yet
5 it seemed to the committee that there was a present danger
6 that the proposal be a celebratory treatment of Rivera, the
7 man, described as a larger than life figure and as a master
8 who helped open the way to artistic freedom, and so on. For
9 these reasons, the committee is recommending that the project
10 be rejected.

11 The committee then turned its attention to Humanities
12 Projects in Libraries and the application particularly,
13 GL20751, page 31, from the District of Columbia Public
14 Library. The committee was troubled by the title of the
15 project, "Don't Read These Books--an Exploration of Issues
16 in Intellectual Freedom" as not being truly reflective of
17 the intent of the project.

18 The staff assured us that the books chosen for
19 reading and discussion had been banned at some point in
20 history, but that fact was merely an inducement to get the
21 books read, studied, and discussed. The books themselves
22 certainly merit discussion. Among them are Huckleberry Finn,
23 The Grapes of Wrath, and The Awakening. The committee there-
24 fore asked the staff to discuss a change in title with the
25 District of Columbia Public Library, and assuming that this

1 would done to the staff's satisfaction, the committee agreed
2 to recommend the proposal for funding.

3 In Public Humanities projects, the committee gave
4 extended consideration to two applications. In the case of
5 GP21369, an application from the University of Toledo, page
6 39, we discussed an issue raised by the panel concerning
7 the wide disparity in fees paid to project consultants.
8 Although we too are troubled by the apparent inequities, we
9 concluded that the Endowment should not attempt to set fees
10 or salaries for project staff and consultants. We agree that
11 the staff strategy of offering some support in the form of
12 matching funds would probably lead the applicant to rethink
13 some of its budget categories. We, thus, upheld the staff
14 recommendation to fund this proposal at a reduced amount
15 but to leave the allocation of funds up to the applicant.

16 Finally, the committee took up the application
17 from the Friends of Independence National Park, GB20127,
18 page 46, and gave it a thorough examination. While this
19 project to distribute poster exhibits on the framing of the
20 Constitution has considerable appeal during the Bicentennial
21 Year, the committee concluded that the lack of coherence
22 and failure to connect these exhibits to a convincing inter-
23 pretative framework would result in a weak contribution.
24 After considering this matter at length, the committee voted
25 to sustain the staff's recommendation against the application.

1 Madame Chairman, this concludes my report.

2 MR. KINGSTON: Are there any questions about the
3 report from General Programs. Jim?

4 MR. SCHALL: Could I go back to the first thing
5 that was mentioned about the Presidents in Crisis on page 3,
6 about the Harry Truman -- was that just merely a question of
7 money and the program or was it a question of ---

8 MR. RITCHESON: I think it fair to say it was a
9 matter of quality, Jim.

10 MR. KINGSTON: Louise?

11 MS. KERR: On the Diego Rivera film project, could
12 you give me a little bit more information about the panel
13 ratings?

14 MR. KINGSTON: It is 3 E, 3 BG, and 1 G.

15 MS. KERR: Could the Chairman take a look at that
16 one?

17 MS. CHENEY: I would be glad to.

18 MR. KINGSTON: Walter?

19 MR. BERNS: I know that you have all discussed this
20 and it has been taken into account, but I think it is worth-
21 while at least announcing it here for the whole Council. On
22 page 33 of this motion, GL20770, you are recommending a grant
23 of \$74,320 to the State Historical Society of Wisconsin,
24 John Kaminski's project. We yesterday in our motion, and
25 Council has now approved that motion, on page 2 of our motion,

1 are recommending a grant of \$170,000 to the University of
2 Wisconsin, John Kaminski project, same project, different
3 program.

4 In our Council committee meeting yesterday, I made
5 the remark that in this particular case, this documentary
6 history of the ratification of the Constitution and Bill of
7 Rights, that used to be housed in the Archives in Washington.
8 In 1968, I used those materials. I made that remark to
9 indicate the length of time this project has been going for-
10 ward and the lack of progress in it for very good reasons
11 and so forth and so on. We were all assured that the program
12 is efficient and things will go forward.

13 I think it is important, however, for Council to
14 note that we are making two grants, approving two grants,
15 to this one institution and we have to be assured that this
16 Kaminski program is capable of taking these two sums of
17 money and going forward with two programs.

18 MR. KINGSTON: Don?

19 MR. GIBSON: If I could respond. We are aware of
20 that situation, and we have already had conversations with
21 Rich's division as well as the Chairman's Office. We will
22 meet shortly after the Council meeting, after the Council
23 decides on this, to determine how we will proceed.

24 MR. KINGSTON: Bill?

25 MR. ALLEN: Yes, Charles, on page 31, District of

1 Columbia proposal, I wasn't entirely clear what the objection
2 was to the title of this, the retitling episode. Where did
3 the objection to the title originate?

4 MR. RITCHESON: We thought that the concept of
5 intellectual freedom was much too broad for this particular
6 project. I might say that the objection, or the question I
7 should say, to this project centers solely on the title. We
8 were perfectly agreeable -- agreed to the fact that these
9 books were important, should be read. They shared the common
10 fate of having been banned at some particular moment in our
11 history, but this, in itself, conceivably be an item under
12 the general rubric of intellectual freedom but the term
13 "intellectual freedom" was too broad, we thought, for this
14 particular exercise, and therefore, we wanted a tightening
15 of the language in the title.

16 MR. ALLEN: So, it is not the first part of the
17 title, "Don't Read These Books..." that you were objecting to.

18 MR. RITCHESON: Oh, we think that is nice. I mean,
19 that is all right. It is the hook that we sort of objected
20 to, the intellectual freedom hook.

21 MR. ALLEN: It reads "...An Exploration of Issues
22 in Intellectual Freedom," which I read as rather narrow.
23 You don't see it that way?

24 MR. GIBSON: Basically, the introductory lecture,
25 which will be presented at the beginning of this project, it

1 will not focus on the question of intellectual freedom but
2 rather on the literary merit of the individual works which
3 the participants will be reading. There will be a lecture at
4 the beginning in which a scholar will trace the question of
5 intellectual freedom historically and relate it somewhat
6 to these specific books. Beyond that, they really are not
7 going to be discussing intellectual freedom.

8 MR. ALLEN: -- expressing a concern which seems to
9 me rather highly proscriptive and perhaps inappropriate.

10 MR. GIBSON: Well, the committee is not conditioning.
11 It is merely asked the staff to talk with to determine if
12 they can come up with a ---

13 MR. ALLEN: I appreciate that, but that is the
14 context in which I make my remark.

15 MS. KERR: It seems to me that one of the reasons
16 that is implicit in that, in reading those books, is why
17 would these have been questioned, why would these have been
18 proscribed, or taken off the list, or whatever. So, it
19 should be a running theme.

20 MR. RITCHESON: I certainly hope that will be done.
21 If it were a running theme, it would be a different matter,
22 but as Don has suggested, has stated, these theme is confined
23 to the initial lecture.

24 MS. KERR: But wouldn't it be more appropriate if
25 you are going to have conversations to ask them to have it

1 be a running theme rather than to ---

2 MR. RITCHESON: That would be proscriptive. That
3 surely would be proscriptive, Madame Chairman.

4 MR. KINGSTON: Fran?

5 MR. RHOME: Did the committee make a suggestion as
6 to the title that you preferred?

7 MR. RITCHESON: No.

8 MR. KINGSTON: Jim? Other comments or questions?
9 The motion before is moved, General Programs. All in favor?

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

11 MR. KINGSTON: Opposed?

12 (No response.)

13 MR. KINGSTON: That concludes the agenda. Are
14 there any other items that Council wishes to raise? I
15 will entertain a motion for adjournment. Those in favor?
16 The meeting is adjourned.

17 (Whereupon, at 10:57 a.m., the meeting was
18 adjourned.)

19

20

21

22

23

24

25