

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-FIRST MEETING OF THE  
NATIONAL COUNCIL ON THE HUMANITIES

- - -

Friday, August 8, 1986

8:30 a.m.

- - -

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

EBERLIN REPORTING SERVICE  
12708 Valleywood Drive  
Wheaton, Maryland 20906  
(301) 933-7248/933-4613

C O N T E N T S

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

PAGE

MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING  
Mr. Kingston.....1

REPORTS  
Introductory Remarks, Ms. Cheney.....1  
Introduction of New Staff, Mr. Kingston.....7  
Application Report and Matching Report,  
Mr. Cherrington.....8  
Status of Fiscal Year 1986 Funds, Mr. Cherrington.....9  
Status of Fiscal Year 1986 Appropriation Request,  
Mr. Cherrington.....10  
Representation of NEH by Council Members,  
Mr. Kingston.....11  
Use of Promotional Funds for Grant Activities,  
Mr. Kingston.....13  
National Capital Arts and Cultural Affairs Program Report  
Mr. Agresto.....13

COMMITTEE REPORTS ON POLICY AND GENERAL MATTERS  
Education Program, Mr. Allen.....18  
Fellowship Programs, Ms. Himmelfarb.....21  
Preservation Grants, Fr. Schall.....22  
Research Programs, Mr. Berns.....23  
General Programs, Mr. Ritcheson.....15  
State Programs, Mr. Hart.....24  
Challenge Grants, Mr. Carey.....25

EMERGENCY GRANTS AND ACTIONS DEPARTING FROM  
COUNCIL RECOMMENDATIONS - APPROVALS  
Mr. Kingston.....32

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

C O N T E N T S  
CLOSED SESSION

	<u>Page</u>
EMERGENCY GRANTS AND ACTIONS DEPARTING FROM COUNCIL RECOMMENDATION - DISAPPROVALS Mr. Kingston.....	35
FISCAL YEAR 1988 BUDGET PLANNING Mr. Cherrington.....	38
EDUCATION PROGRAMS, Mr. Allen.....	47
FELLOWSHIP PROGRAMS, Ms. Himmelfarb.....	58
PRESERVATION GRANTS, Fr. Schall.....	62
RESEARCH PROGRAMS, Mr. Berns.....	63
GENERAL PROGRAMS, Ms. Kilpatrick.....	74
STATE PROGRAMS, Mr. Hart.....	84

P R O C E E D I N G S

MR. KINGSTON: The 81st meeting of the National Council on the Humanities will come to order.

Council members received in the mail and also in folders at the committee meetings yesterday, a draft copy of the minutes from the last meeting of the Council. Are there any additions or corrections to those minutes?

(No response.)

MR. KINGSTON: If not, they will stand approved as published.

Introductory Remarks, Lynn Cheney.

INTRODUCTORY REMARKS

MS. CHENEY: I very much enjoyed the chance I had to sit on three of the committee meetings yesterday. I had meant to sit in on all of the committee meetings yesterday, but found myself so interested wherever I went that I couldn't get away. So next time I will be sure to make it to the committee meetings I missed this time.

They were very interesting events for me. I was most impressed with the thoughtfulness of the deliberations. There is so much to do, that I kind of expected it to be more hurried than it was. While they proceed efficiently it is also true that they proceed with great thoughtfulness and that large and important questions are raised as individual applications are

EBERLIN REPORTING SERVICE

1  
2 considered.

3 Without going into too much detail, I will  
4 mention that yesterday in the Fellowships meeting the  
5 very large question, one that I faced time and again of  
6 what are seminal text and, indeed, what are the humanities,  
7 came up. This, of course, is a question that I am asked  
8 almost daily and that I certainly thought about a lot in  
9 the last two months.

10 I find myself returning again and again, when I  
11 think of this question, to Matthew Arnold, with whom I  
12 spent some rather intense years as a graduate student.  
13 Arnold's classic definition of the humanities is the best  
14 that has been thought and known in the world. And this  
15 has always seemed to me to have greater feel to encompass  
16 the case exactly as it should be.

17 Arnold goes on. I spent some time with "Culture  
18 and Anarchy" this last weekend, and Arnold goes on with  
19 what I think is a crucial expansion of this idea. "Those  
20 are the happy moments of humanity", he writes. "Those  
21 are the marking epochs of the peoples life. Those are  
22 the flowering times for literature and art and all the  
23 creative power of genius, when there is a national glow  
24 of life and thought when the whole of society is in the  
25 fullest measure permeated by thought sensible to beauty,  
intelligent and alive. Only it must be real thought and

EBERLIN REPORTING SERVICE

1  
2 real beauty, real sweetness and real light."

3 What he is doing is objecting to the idea that  
4 the general public should be given a different intellectual  
5 diet than the best that has been thought and known in the  
6 world; that the general public should somehow be given  
7 something that is watered down and inferior.

8 "Culture works differently", he says. "It seeks  
9 to make the best that has been thought and known in the  
10 world current everywhere, to make all men," and all women  
11 I would add, "live in a atmosphere of sweetness and light  
12 where they may use ideas as it uses them itself, freely  
13 nourished and not bound by them."

14 Well, it certainly seems to me that that is a  
15 statement that makes a most appropriate goal for this  
16 Endowment, is to make the best that has been thought and  
17 known in the world current everywhere. And it is something  
18 that I plan to keep in the back of my mind over these  
19 next four years to measure ourselves against.

20 It is something that I have had in my mind this  
21 week as I am thinking of the efforts we are about to  
22 undertake that I hope will help us get a little closer to  
23 that goal.

24 One of the things that we are currently doing  
25 is hiring a person who will be called the Access To  
26 Excellence Coordinator. This is a person whose job it will

EBERLIN REPORTING SERVICE

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

be to go to areas of the country, to pockets in the country that are otherwise -- that are now underserved by Endowment programs.

The point is not to bring in applications that aren't as good as the applications that we have now. The point is to make it clearly understood everywhere what kind of applications we are looking for, what our goals are, and to bring in applications from underserved areas that will be excellent in the same sense that we have excellent applications now.

I am also hoping that over the next four years the State Councils can be used in creative ways to bring the message of the Endowment, to bring the goals of the Endowment, into areas of the country where we aren't as well-known as we might be.

We do have something of a problem with regional representation. We do tend to get collected on the coast, specifically on the east coast. The State Councils, I think, could be a powerful vehicle for helping us to get in between California and New York too.

A plan that we are currently working on, that we haven't quite gotten all of the details ironed out yet, but that we are moving forward on, has to do with the Bicentennial of the Constitution.

I have been stunned by the flowering NEH efforts

1  
2 during the past few years, the flowering of scholarship  
3 that is now happening as the result of grants that were  
4 made in our Research Division in particular.

5 The Encyclopedia of the American Constitution  
6 will be out soon, the Founder's Constitution will be out  
7 soon. The four new volumes of Ferrand will be out soon.  
8 These will be absolutely crucial documents over the next  
9 century and perhaps beyond, crucial documents to  
10 constitutional scholarship.

11 It seems to me that they are documents that  
12 should be widely available. And what we would like to do  
13 is to find a way to use the Endowment's resources and the  
14 basic desire, I sense, on the part of the American people  
15 to more about the Constitution, to use those resources  
16 and that desire to somehow come up with a program so that  
17 we can get, what I am calling in my mind, a bicentennial  
18 bookshelf in every library in the country, one that will  
19 be anchored around these fine, fine pieces of scholarship  
20 that are now coming on line. And it will be supplemented  
21 by other very basic texts on the Constitution.

22 There should be an annotated Constitution there,  
23 of course. There should perhaps be -- there should  
24 certainly be papers of the Founders. There should,  
25 perhaps, be biographies on the Founders.

Some of the scholars with whom we consulted have

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

suggested we might want popular histories of the Constitution on this shelf.

This is a plan we are working on and I think it fits perfectly in the paradigm of trying to make the best that has been thought and known available everywhere.

Today we are also announcing an invitation, this is not an initiative it is an invitation, to people involved in a television production to submit to us projects that deal with American lives. It is my observation that the general public now is fascinated by biography. This is a genre that attracts the widest kind of interest. It is our belief that, handled expertly, it is also a genre that can be highly educational and that while biography is fascinating, partly because it does deal in particulars and people love knowing particulars of other people's lives, when handled well quickly moves to universals and tells us not only about one life, but about life in general and certainly about the historical period in which that life occurred.

I am very sanguine about these efforts we are beginning to undertake. As I read and traveled and talked to people over the past two months, I do have the impression that we are sowing in fertile ground. That there is a growing desire on the part of the American people, in general, to know the great text and the important ideas and

PENGAD CO., BAYONNE, N.J. 07002 FORM 740

1  
2 the historical events that have shaped our culture.

3 Certainly that idea was driven home to me when  
4 I was reading through the State Council book and I got to  
5 Vermont. Vermont is doing some wonderful things. Many  
6 of the states are, but I was particularly struck by what  
7 is going on in Vermont.

8 The State Humanities Council in Vermont has 230  
9 people signed up to take Latin. These are ordinary  
10 citizens from every walk of life. But my favorite thing  
11 is in the town of Woodstock, Vermont, where they have  
12 signed up 16 people to take ancient Greek. Partly I am  
13 enchanted because of the name "Woodstock."

14 Now Woodstock, New York, of course, was the  
15 ultimate happening of the 1960s. Hundreds of thousands  
16 of people gathered to listen to rock music and smoke  
17 questionable substances. This is the ultimate event of  
18 the 1960s. What I would like to see is Woodstock, Vermont  
19 where 16 citizens are learning ancient Greek become the  
20 archetypal event of the 1980s. And I look very much  
21 forward to working with all of you seeing if we can't  
22 move as far in that direction as we can. Thank you.

23 (Applause.)

24 MR. KING: I would like to introduce the new  
25 staff who have joined the Endowment since the last meeting  
of the Council. First off is Martha Bohachevsky-Chomiak.

EBERLIN REPORTING SERVICE

1  
2 Martha is a familiar face because she served time here  
3 before as an IPA is has now returned to head the Traveling  
4 Collections Program.

5 Also here is Gary Claywell. These biographies,  
6 by the way, are in your -- there is Gary in the back --  
7 in your folders. Gary is with (inaudible) Systems Office.  
8 Many of you will be talking, over the next several months,  
9 and I hope years, with Barbara Kostok. Barbara is Lynn's  
10 secretary in the Chairman's Office.

11 And Dudley Varnum. Is Dudley here? Dudley  
12 just joined to be Assistant Director in the Division of  
13 General Programs. He heads our Museums Program.

14 Moving on the agenda to Contracts Awarded in  
15 the Previous Quarter, we won't have any discussion because  
16 there were none. However, we will have discussion about  
17 Applications and Matching Funds. Steve Cherrington.

18 APPLICATIONS REPORT AND MATCHING REPORT

19 MR. CHERRINGTON: The application report is Tab  
20 B in the brown folder. The edition you have before you  
21 this time compares the applications at November, February  
22 and May Councils of 1985 and November, February and May  
23 of 1986.

24 The number of applications is up about 400, by  
25 a gross amount of 400 so far this year and this is mainly  
due to a significant rise in applications to the Younger

Scholars Program.

I also would like to point out that applications continue to be down in the Education Division.

If there are no questions I will move on to the Matching Report. It is also in the brown folder. As of this point Matching is down about \$1.6 million in 1986 compared to 1985. I have said many times, though, that Matching in 1985 was markedly strong in the beginning of the year and then tailed off later. So our forecast at this point would be that Matching will be about the same as last year, maybe a little less, but probably about the same.

I continue to be amazed by General Programs. Matching in General Programs was up 300 percent last year and it is up four percent above that in '86.

Preservation is also showing a lot of Matching activity. This is new for them. They succeeded in getting some matching offers out there on the implementation basis of the U.S. Newspapers Project and we will have to see how these work out.

STATUS OF FISCAL YEAR 1986

MR. CHERRINGTON: The next thing up is the Status of Fiscal Year 1986 Funds through the end of July, which is 80 percent of the way through the fiscal year. We spent 70 percent of our money. And this is in accordance

EBERLIN REPORTING SERVICE

1  
2 with our past history. August Council, as you would  
3 certainly all know by now, is a rather busy Council, and  
4 we should have not trouble obligating our entire  
5 appropriation.

6 All year long I have also been mentioning, as I  
7 said a couple of minutes ago, the volume of applications  
8 to the Division of Education Programs has been a problem.  
9 When we began to put together the Council books for August  
10 Council, it became apparent that we would not have enough  
11 high quality applications in Education to spend our full  
12 appropriation there.

13 Also at the same time the number of truly  
14 excellent applications to the Division of General Programs  
15 as exceeded our expectation, especially for some major  
16 television projects and also in public humanities projects  
17 we received a lot of excellent applications in support of  
18 the Bicentennial projects.

19 So we made a reprogramming request to Congress.  
20 We don't have formal word on this yet. OMB did approve  
21 our request, however. Yesterday we did receive a letter  
22 from the House of Representatives approving the request  
23 and the Senate has indicated verbal approval, but we  
24 don't have an official letter from them yet.

25 STATUS OF FISCAL YEAR 1987 APPROPRIATION REQUEST

MR. CHERRINGTON: Next would come the 1987.

EBERLIN REPORTING SERVICE

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

In the brown folder there is a memo and a chart showing the status of the appropriation request for 1987.

In July the House of Representatives passed a bill appropriating \$138,641,000 for the Endowment in 1987. This is the same as our original appropriation for 1986 before Gramm-Rudman kicked in. We have not heard officially from the Senate yet. They were supposed to mark up our bill yesterday. Jason was there until 7:00 o'clock and they still hadn't finished.

Indications are that the bill will be about the same as the House bill, perhaps a little bit less. OMB, however, is threatening to veto the Interior bill if it emerges in the form it is in now. They say it is too expensive and there is also a move in Congress to restrict the President's authority to defer appropriations. And we will have to keep an eye on this.

I think that is it.

MR. KINGSTON: Are there any questions about the reports on the status of funding?

(No response.)

MR. KINGSTON: If not, we will move on to a memo that you have in your folders. It is a brief memo on representation.

REPRESENTATION OF NEH BY COUNCIL MEMBERS

MR. KINGSTON: As you recall at previous Council

1  
2 meetings, Council members had expressed interest in being  
3 representatives of the Endowment at various events and  
4 activities that are tied with the projects that we are  
5 supporting.

6 Susan Metts and I have described the ways in  
7 which we hope to be able to employ Council members at  
8 various events for which we receive invitations.

9 Again, we do not have the administrative funds  
10 to send you to these activities and would ask that you do  
11 so gratis. But if you are interested in representing the  
12 Endowment, by all means please let Susan or me know and  
13 we will see that the invitations are passed on.

14 Are there any questions or comments about that?  
15 Frances?

16 MS. RHOME: I think that some of us have in  
17 mind the fact that within our own states in which travel  
18 costs are not involved, there are many opportunities in  
19 which we do, indeed, speak for NEH. And since we are  
20 familiar with the programs we can do that. But some of  
21 us are hesitant to assume that role unless we know that  
22 you know the program we are doing follows the prescribed  
23 policies that you have here. I think this can be very  
24 helpful. It expands in a very basic way the influence of  
25 NEH itself.

MR. KINGSTON: Other comments or questions?

(No response.)

MR. KINGSTON: Again, I want to make it clear that we realize your time is precious and there are instances in which you must decline. By all means tell us so.

The other memo in the folder was a memo on the use of promotional funds connected with grants.

USES OF PROMOTIONAL FUNDS FOR GRANT ACTIVITIES

MR. KINGSTON: I believe you have discussed this memorandum in committee. It emerged from consequence of discussion at the last Council meeting. Are there any comments or questions that you have about our procedures as are laid out in that memorandum?

(No response.)

MR. KINGSTON: Very good. If not we will move on the agenda to John's report on the National Capital Arts and Cultural Affairs Program.

NATIONAL CAPITAL ARTS AND CULTURAL AFFAIRS PROGRAM

MR. AGRESTO: This is Tab G of your agenda book. I really have very little to add to what is in that memo that was sent to you a few months ago.

The National Capital Arts Program was designed by Congress a few years ago to support those cultural and artistic organization in the District that, in Congresses opinion, do not receive other major financial support,

1  
2 unlike city or state orchestras, city museums or public  
3 museums elsewhere. We are merely the administrative  
4 agent for it.

5 We received 16 applications last year. There  
6 was a panel composed of myself and Frank Hodsell and J.  
7 Carter Brown. We simply took the applications, measured  
8 them against the standards that were given by Congress.  
9 Fifteen out of the 16 met those standards. There was a  
10 funding formula we followed, and we disbursed the money.

11 We did not ask for this program and we are not  
12 asking for it this year, although I think I can assure  
13 you that it will be in the budget again and we will  
14 probably also be the administrative agent.

15 There is something very sweet about being asked  
16 to administer it because Congress recognizes that we can  
17 do it cleanly and efficiently and quickly. In fact, we  
18 did it this year within deadline, in fact before the  
19 deadline.

20 The only thing I want to do is in public right  
21 now thank not Hugh Hewitt and Jason Hall who worked on  
22 it, but Edie Monza from the Challenge Grant Office who,  
23 more than anyone else, made it happen ahead of time. If  
24 there are any questions on that I will be glad to answer  
25 them.

MR. KINGSTON: Questions.

EBERLIN REPORTING SERVICE

(No response.)

MR. KINGSTON: If not we will move on to the reports from the Divisional Committees. Charles has a later appointment this morning so I think we will start with the report, if we may, from the Division of General Programs and then go back into the order as it is published. Charles.

COMMITTEE REPORTS ON POLICY AND GENERAL MATTERS

GENERAL PROGRAMS

MR. RITCHESON: Thank you Tom, and Chairman and colleagues.

During its public session my Committee considered a number of items related to the work of the Division. As a departing member of the Council I took the opportunity to express several thoughts to my colleagues and to the staff. If I may, I would like to summarize briefly what I told the Committee yesterday.

First, I wish to say that it has been an honor to serve this country and the humanities. And I should add a pleasure too. I think the Endowment has made real progress in the past several years and I congratulate my colleagues on the Council for the important contributions they have made.

Before taking leave of you I also want to repeat some of the concerns that I expressed to the Committee

EBERLIN REPORTING SERVICE

1  
2 yesterday.

3           First, I urge the new Chairman to press for  
4 more and better evaluation fo the projects supported  
5 throughout this agency. I note, with some disappointment,  
6 that we have yet to develop a satisfactory way to evaluate  
7 the projects and it seems to me that prudence would  
8 dictate a closer examination of how we spend the public's  
9 money.

10           Secondly, as a historian, I worry about the  
11 tendency to dilute scholarship by confusing history with  
12 journalistic accounts of recent events. Too many projects  
13 seem to assume that it is possible to write instant  
14 history, but there is no such thing as instant history.  
15 Real history demands distance and perspective gained only  
16 by the passage of time. And I hope that my colleagues  
17 will remember this warning.

18           The Committee also heard a report from the  
19 Director, Don Gibson, on the work of the Division and it  
20 acknowledged the presence of new members. The Committee  
21 is especially happy to welcome a new Assistant Director  
22 for the Museums and Historical Organizations Program,  
23 Dudley Varner.

24           In the open session we also discussed the report  
25 prepared by the Assistant Chairman on promotional costs  
for Endowment supported projects. The Committee expressed

EBERLIN REPORTING SERVICE

1  
2 its approval of this report and we concluded that, if  
3 anything, the sums devoted to promotional costs are rather  
4 modest.

5 The Committee was pleased that the Endowment  
6 has established procedures to inform Council members of  
7 receptions and special events.

8 Finally, Mr. Gibson announced that Voices and  
9 Visions, a 13-hour television series on major American  
10 poets, received \$2.1 million from the Annenberg Project.  
11 This gift will insure its airing next fall on PBS.

12 Mr. Gibson noted that the Endowment provided  
13 the initial and sustained support for this project and,  
14 in effect, made it possible.

15 In supporting this series the Endowment fulfilled  
16 several Council goals. We highlighted significant literary  
17 works, underwrote a major series for public broadcasting  
18 and encouraged non-Endowment support.

19 I come now to the Walter Berns part of my  
20 report, Madame Chairman, and take great pleasure in  
21 exhibiting two of the superb products produced in recent  
22 months. I am referring particularly to this really  
23 delightful Persistence of the Spirit, a catalog, which  
24 accompanied a statewide project in Arkansas tracing and  
25 analyzing 300 years of Black history. And, finally, just  
so that you know we had a piece of the action too, the

1  
2 catalog Liberty, a catalog produced to accompany an  
3 exhibition mounted in the New York Public Library in  
4 commemoration of you know what.

5 (Laughter.)

6 MR. RITCHESON: Madame Chairman, that concludes  
7 my report and your instant history.

8 (Laughter.)

9 MR. RITCHESON: And with your permission I will  
10 now leave the Council. Thank you.

11 (Applause.)

12 MR. KINGSTON: Before you go, Charles, let me  
13 ask if there are any questions or comments that Council  
14 members wish to direct to you.

15 (No response.)

16 MR. KINGSTON: Very good. We will move back to  
17 the agenda and to the report from the Division of Education  
18 Programs, Bill Allen.

19 DIVISION OF EDUCATION PROGRAMS

20 MR. ALLEN: After praising Division staff for the  
21 beautifully prepared Committee book for the August Council,  
22 the Committee on Education Programs turned to Director  
23 Pam Menke for a brief report on staff changes in the Division.

24 Ms. Menke noted that Carolyn Murphy has recently  
25 been promoted to Program Assistant in the Elementary and  
Secondary Schools Program. She informed us that Lynn

EBERLIN REPORTING SERVICE

1  
2 Maxwell-White is now in place as Assistant Director for  
3 the Central Disciplines Program. Then she went on to  
4 tell us about two recent departures and one impending  
5 departure from the Division's Exemplary Projects Program.

6 We learned that Christine Kalke is now a Program  
7 Officer in the Division of Fellowships and Seminars. We  
8 learned that Jack Myers is now a Program Officer in the  
9 Division of Research Programs. And we learned that after  
10 serving the Division of Education Programs for five  
11 minutes on an IPA assignment, Paul Peterson will soon be  
12 moving to Ashbrook College in Ohio to become Deputy  
13 Director of the John Ashbrook Center for Public Affairs.

14 The Committee thanked all of these fine staff  
15 members for their many contributions to the work of the  
16 Division and wished them well in their new positions.

17 At this point the Committee turned to a brief  
18 discussion of the Division's current guidelines. Everyone  
19 commended the staff for the clarity and helpfulness of  
20 the Education Programs brochure and members of the  
21 Committee who had been on the Council for several years  
22 observed that the Division's emphasis on rigorous  
23 teaching of the major text and topics of the humanities  
24 had played a significant role in the national movement  
25 back to a sound liberal arts education for all Americans.

In response to a question about whether the current

1  
2 guidelines were encouraging stronger proposals, Caroline  
3 Reed Wallace pointed out that better proposals were, in  
4 fact, being submitted and she said that one reason was  
5 that for many institutions the application process was no  
6 longer something mystical or formidable, but something  
7 with which they felt comfortable.

8 She attributed this not only to the guidelines  
9 but also and properly to the staff's intensive efforts to  
10 interpret them and to work with applicants interested in  
11 developing proposals.

12 Frances Rhome reinforced this point by observing  
13 that Endowment sponsored workshops and grant opportunities  
14 and proposal preparation had stimulated competitive  
15 applications from many institutions that would once have  
16 been intimidated by the idea of applying for an NEH grant.

17 At the same time, however, Ms. Rhome agreed  
18 with another Committee member who said that he would like  
19 to see more evidence of imagination and creativity in the  
20 proposals submitted to the Division of Education Programs.

21 As the discussion drew to an end I suggested  
22 that we all continue to ask ourselves what the Division  
23 is accomplishing that is particular to its own mission  
24 within the Endowment. I commented that from my perspective  
25 the focus of that mission should remain on efforts to  
bring about improvements in the teaching of the humanities.

1  
2 MR. KING: Comments or questions about the  
3 report.

4 (No response.)

5 MR. KING: If none, we will move on to the  
6 report from the Committee for the Office of Preservation,  
7 Jim Schall. I am sorry, let's have the report from the  
8 Division of Fellowship Programs, Bea Himmelfarb.

9 DIVISION OF FELLOWSHIP PROGRAMS

10 MS. HIMMELFARB: The Committee was pleased to  
11 welcome Professor Christian Cupf as an observer to the  
12 meeting. Professor Cupf has been nominated for membership  
13 on the Council but has not yet been confirmed by the  
14 Senate and we do hope --

15 MR. KING: Excuse me, Bea. Can you put the  
16 microphone down?

17 MS. HIMMELFARB: And we look forward to his  
18 confirmation before our next meeting.

19 We also greeted Christine Kalp, the new humanist  
20 administrator in the Summer Seminars for Secondary School  
21 Teachers Program. She comes from the Division of Education  
22 Programs, where she has been working in the Exemplary  
23 Projects.

24 Having completed an extensive review of the  
25 work of the Committee a session or two ago, we found  
ourselves with very few policy or principle matters to

EBERLIN REPORTING SERVICE

1  
2 discuss. The Committee, therefore, reviewed the schedule  
3 of applications to come before it at the November meeting  
4 and we then considered a staff report responding to a  
5 Committee member's suggestion of a possible supplemental  
6 deadline for junior level transfer students in the Younger  
7 Scholars Program.

8 After careful study of the options the staff  
9 had concluded, and the Committee concurred, that such a  
10 deadline would be neither feasible nor equitable. Thank  
11 you.

12 MR. KINGSTON: Any comments or questions about  
13 the report?

14 (No response.)

15 MR. KINGSTON: Now the report from the Office  
16 of Preservation Grants.

17 PRESERVATION GRANTS

18 FR. SCHALL: We had a discussion of Stephen  
19 Anspach's essay on film preservation. The Committee  
20 approves the Offices efforts to focus on this problem and  
21 to support the establishment of preservation techniques  
22 and to assess the extent to which this is a concern  
23 appropriate to the humanities.

24 It was noted that at some time in the future  
25 the Government may wish to require preservation standards  
for movies supported by NEH funds as we require after

EBERLIN REPORTING SERVICE

1  
2 the (inaudible) when we subsidize publication cost books.

3 I might add that Mr. Cannon pointed out that  
4 there is now a book which is devoted to the United States  
5 Newspaper Program Cataloging Aspects, which was an edition  
6 of a journal which I am sure you all read regularly called  
7 "Cataloging and Classification Quarterly".

8 (Laughter.)

9 FR. SCHALL: In this journal Jeff Fields (?)  
10 had an introduction and Harold Cannon had a long essay on  
11 the (inaudible) to the newspaper project that you might  
12 like to see. I will pass it around.

13 MR. KINGSTON: Any comments or questions?

14 (No response.)

15 MR. KINGSTON: We will move to the report from  
16 the Division of Research Programs, Walter Berns.

17 DIVISION OF RESEARCH PROGRAMS

18 MR. BERNIS: As usual there was no member of the  
19 public present in our public session. Rich Ekmen took  
20 the occasion to introduce new staff and to acknowledge  
21 the departure of some members of the staff.

22 In this place it is appropriate for me to say  
23 that one mark of the excellence of the staff I think can  
24 be found in the fact that when they do leave the staff  
25 here they go to very fine positions indeed.

Marcella Grendler is leaving us to become the

EBERLIN REPORTING SERVICE

1  
2 Associate Librarian for Special Collections at the  
3 University of North Carolina. We will miss her. As, I  
4 say, it is an exalted position and she surely deserves it.

5 Beyond that we discussed briefly Tom Kingston's  
6 memorandum on the promotional costs connected with certain  
7 grants. Since very few Research Division projects entail  
8 promotional costs, our discussion of this was not very  
9 long and not very spirited.

10 (Laughter.)

11 MS. HIMMELFARB: It is a non sequiter, may I say.

12 (Laughter.)

13 MR. BERNS: That is all I have to say.

14 (Laughter.)

15 MR. KINGSTON: We move on to the report from  
16 the Division of State Programs, Jeffrey Hart.

17 DIVISION OF STATE PROGRAMS

18 MR. HART: Thank you. The Division of State  
19 Programs was pleased to welcome, as guests, at its open  
20 session Sandra Myers, President of the Federation of  
21 State Humanities Council and Jamil Zenaldin (?), the  
22 Executive Director for the same.

23 The Committee discussed the preliminary report  
24 on the state and regional exemplary awards. This report  
25 is in its preliminary stages and no conclusions are now  
available.

EBERLIN REPORTING SERVICE

1  
2 The completed report by Harach Gregorian on  
3 education programs in the schools by State Humanities  
4 Councils was distributed.

5 Brian Mitchell reported on his visit to the  
6 Chattauqua Project in South Dakota. It was called  
7 "Travelers on the Plains" and presented in dramatic form,  
8 with various historical personalities important in the  
9 local history of that region, along with scholarly  
10 commentary.

11 The program seemed to be very popular as well  
12 as intellectually effective. Published background material  
13 of high quality was made available to Council members.

14 Memoranda from Mr. Kingston were read and  
15 discussed.

16 In the closed session the budget was briefly  
17 discussed. Sorry. I will tell some funny stories then.

18 (Laughter.)

19 MR. KINGSTON: Any comments or questions about  
20 the report?

21 (No response.)

22 MR. KINGSTON: There being none, the report  
23 from the Office of Challenge Grants, George Carey.

24 OFFICE OF CHALLENGE GRANTS

25 MR. CAREY: Thank you. In its open session the  
Committee heard a report on the current challenge grant

EBERLIN REPORTING SERVICE

1  
2 award to the Society for the Preservation of New England  
3 Antiquity, SPNEA as it is called.

4 This particular grant is an example of the  
5 kind of unique overarching support for an institution  
6 that our challenge grants can provide.

7 SPNEA is the largest and second oldest private  
8 preservation society in the United States. Founded in  
9 1910 to preserve buildings, objects and archival material  
10 which reflected New England history, the Society now owns  
11 41 historic houses standing 300 years, 75,000 objects and  
12 an internationally recognized archives which is a primary  
13 source for research in New England studies.

14 However the institution, for 60 years, moved  
15 from crisis to crisis saving houses from bulldozers. It  
16 had no resources for maintenance of these houses, for  
17 educational programs such as exhibitions or catalogs of  
18 collections, or for a Director of Development to find the  
19 long-term financial support for these activities.

20 In 1980, with a new Director and a new staff  
21 with graduate degrees in history and architectural history,  
22 the Society began to position itself to apply for a  
23 challenge grant. Research on the collections was undertaken  
24 by staff and consulting historians. And two major  
25 exhibitions of New England cultural history were mounted  
with NEH support in the Massachusetts museums.

EBERLIN REPORTING SERVICE

1  
2           Eleven houses were designated as period houses  
3 with furnishings intact, often from the same families  
4 over 250 years, which would be used to convey information  
5 about New England cultural history.

6           Nine 17th century study houses, unfurnished and  
7 unrestored, were opened to be used for study of continuing  
8 traditions of medieval construction techniques.

9           In 1983 a \$750,000 challenge grant with a  
10 required match of \$2,250,000 was awarded to SPNEA. Of  
11 the total amount of \$3 million, the Society used \$1.8  
12 million to create an endowment that provided support for  
13 a Department of Education, including new permanent  
14 positions for a Director and Assistant, an ongoing program  
15 of exhibitions, school programs and site interpretation,  
16 and a captial repairs fund for the buildings.

17           The Society has also allocated funds for the  
18 renovations necessary to prepare five historic properties  
19 for educational programs. And it has used some of the  
20 endowment funds to support an Office of Development.

21           Gallery space has been created in one of the  
22 historic houses so that major exhibitions may be mounted  
23 within SPNEA's own property.

24           With the establishment of the Department of  
25 Education, a major newspaper donated endowment funds to  
support a public school project in Boston, which will draw

1  
2 on the Society's outstanding resources to enable students  
3 to examine the historical development of their own  
4 neighborhoods.

5 The challenge grant has, therefore, enabled the  
6 Society to move from a position where the Director was  
7 solely responsible for raising funds from former donors,  
8 to an institution with a sophisticated mechanism for  
9 reaching a broad constituency of donors.

10 Ongoing support will be in place for enhanced  
11 research programs which will provide the foundation for  
12 exhibitions and publications using the rich resources of  
13 SPNEA to explain New England history to the public.

14 This report on SPNEA and discussion of it  
15 constituted the business of our open session. Thank you.

16 MR. KINGSTON: Are there comments or questions?  
17 Rita.

18 MRS. RICARDO-CAMPBELL: Let me preface this  
19 with (inaudible) on the native Bostian and appreciate the  
20 history of New England. I am curious about several  
21 things, not having heard about this until just this  
22 moment; that is one is the breakdown of the administrative  
23 costs of this organization.

24 I picked up in the quick reading such things as  
25 hiring and establishing staff, to keep ongoing support  
was another phrase. I would like to know, on the budget

1  
2 of this organization, what percent of the monies are for  
3 administrative costs, how new staff people will be added?  
4 I guess, basically, not knowing much about challenge  
5 grants, since I am a westerner and we never get to the  
6 meetings because of the extra implied by it, whether for  
7 any other areas of the country such a type of grant has  
8 been give or is this breaking out a whole new area for  
9 challenge grants?

10 MR. BLESSING: No.

11 MRS. RICARDO-CAMPBELL: I just don't know.

12 MR. BLESSING: This is rather typical of a  
13 challenge grant in a lot of ways. The money that is  
14 being used for staff positions for the development of  
15 education programming and, to some extent, for maintenance  
16 of the properties, is coming out of the endowment fund  
17 that was established with the use of the challenge grant.

18 MRS. RICARDO-CAMPBELL: May I interrupt you.  
19 Pardon me, but what other organizations, you say it is  
20 typical, have received this type of grant?

21 MR. BLESSING: Well, we have supported about one-  
22 third of the challenge grants made over the course of the  
23 program -- have gone to museums and historical societies.

24 MRS. RICARDO-CAMPBELL: Such as?

25 MR. KINGSTON: The Chicago Historical Society  
has received a major grant, for example.

1  
2 MRS. RICARDO-CAMPBELL: Are they all in New  
3 England or are they scattered?

4 MR. KINGSTON: The Chicago Historical Society  
5 is an example that I remember.

6 MRS. RICARDO-CAMPBELL: I suspect other west  
7 coast members would like to receive breakouts of where  
8 the challenge grant kind of goes in the past as well as  
9 in the current. And that is a formal request.

10 MR. KINGSTON: I would be happy to send a list  
11 of the institutions that have received challenge grants.  
12 Do you want them from the beginning of the program or for  
13 the last couple of years?

14 MRS. RICARDO-CAMPBELL: It is not that old of a  
15 program, is it?

16 MR. KINGSTON: About 10 years.

17 MRS. RICARDO-CAMPBELL: Since the beginning of  
18 the program, but also a breakout of administrative costs  
19 in addition to operating costs.

20 MR. KINGSTON: In the challenge grants there is  
21 no direct reimbursement for a direct cost, which would be  
22 the administrative cost.

23 MRS. RICARDO-CAMPBELL: As I recall George  
24 Carey's remarks, he said that it would enable them to  
25 hire considerable additional staff. It is very difficult  
for an economist to think about the budget with that type

1  
2 of thing without knowing where the money is going.

3 I mean, you just say you give \$1 million here  
4 and -- in other words, a little detail would be appreciated.

5 MR. KINGSTON: But in the different cases they  
6 were citing it is an endowment for operations. It is an  
7 operations endowment.

8 MRS. RICARDO-CAMPBELL: -- we will be able to  
9 see, maybe, a very nominal, brief, accounting summary of  
10 the monies, how they spend them.

11 MR. AGRESTO: You may be able to see firsthand  
12 how a challenge grant operates. I think the Hoover  
13 Institution received a \$900,000 challenge grant a few  
14 years ago. So that is one you would have some firsthand  
15 knowledge of.

16 MRS. RICARDO-CAMPBELL: But I would like to see  
17 a whole list of them and see what they look like. I  
18 remember for (inaudible) born in Washington.

19 MR. KINGSTON: We will send you a list with  
20 grants and the purposes and if there is something more  
21 that you want come to the Information Office and let me  
22 know and we will get it for you.

23 MRS. RICARDO-CAMPBELL: Thank you very much.

24 MR. KINGSTON: Yes.

25 MS. RHOME: As a member of the Committee, I  
think most of us are very impressed with the thoroughness

1  
2 with which most of these grants have been pursued by NIH,  
3 that is the determination of the use of the monies.

4 The exciting thing about it, to whether you are  
5 an economist or not, is the amount of outside funding  
6 that this generates as a consequence of the program  
7 itself, not only in dollars and cents, but the numbers of  
8 public persons who become involved in the projects and  
9 therefore through their actual voluntary service manage  
10 to garner a bit of humanities along the line.

11 I think it is a tremendous program. I appreciate  
12 your concern about how the funds are going. And I think  
13 that is an important point. But I wanted to add that  
14 there is a spirit here that is exceedingly impressive by  
15 the program.

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

18 (No response.)

19 MR. KINGSTON: If there are none in open session,  
20 we will move to the emergency grant requests that were  
21 approved.

22 EMERGENCY GRANTS AND ACTIONS DEPARTING  
23 FROM COUNCIL RECOMMENDATION - APPROVALS

24 MR. KINGSTON: There were two emergency grants  
25 that were approved in the last quarter. Are there any  
questions about either of those grants? Louise/

1  
2 MS. KERR: The Third World Culture -- I guess  
3 it strikes me as curious. Is there such a thing as third  
4 world culture?

5 MR. KINGSTON: Would you comment?

6 MR. EKMAN: This is a conference that would  
7 bring together people from fields concerned with  
8 interpretation, such as literary interpretation and  
9 creative artists, both visual and literary, from various  
10 parts of the world.

11 One of the questions the Project Director has  
12 in mind is whether, in fact, it is fair to assume that  
13 there is a unified thing called third world culture. And  
14 the problem that that poses as an ideology interfering  
15 with questions of literary and artistic interpretation.

16 The request for the emergency grant here is  
17 confined primarily to the expenses of producing the  
18 results of the conference in a form where other people  
19 can read through the various essays and papers. Duke  
20 University is supporting most of the costs of the conference  
21 itself.

22 MR. KINGSTON: Other questions? There is one  
23 approval of an application from the last Council, which  
24 represents a reversal of the Council recommendation. Are  
25 there any comments or questions about that application?

(No response.)

1  
2 MR. KINGSTON: There being none, there is one  
3 other item of business to announce in open session.

4 In order to allow for people to get to the  
5 meetings of such Committees as Preservation and Challenge  
6 and in order to also exercise more cost-effectiveness in  
7 terms of travel and housing, we are going to schedule the  
8 Challenge Grant meeting in November, which is the big  
9 meeting, that is when the applications are reviewed, for  
10 Thursday afternoon, not Wednesday afternoon. So the  
11 Challenge Committee should anticipate Thursday afternoon,  
12 I forgot the actual date, will be the time for the meeting  
13 to discuss Challenge applications.

14 Are there any other questions, comments or  
15 concerns for the open session of the meeting?

16 MS. CRESIMORE: Would it be possible for us to  
17 have some water for the next portion of the meeting? We  
18 usually have some around. It is not a very serious issue  
19 or anything, but I would like some water.

20 MR. KINGSTON: Sure. Let's take an adjournment  
21 of 10 minutes, and resume at 10:00 o'clock in closed  
22 session.  
23  
24  
25

C L O S E D S E S S I O N  
EMERGENCY GRANTS AND ACTIONS DEPARTING  
COUNCIL RECOMMENDATIONS - DISAPPROVALS

1  
2  
3  
4  
5 MR. KINGSTON: We will begin the meeting again.  
6 We are resuming in closed session. The first item in the  
7 closed session is a review of emergency grants which have  
8 been declined. There was one emergency grant rejected.  
9 Are there any questions about that? It is in Tab H in  
10 your books. I am sorry, three emergency grants that were  
11 rejected. Any questions about those?

12 There was one reversal of Council recommendations  
13 which is a reject from the Council about that application.  
14 Any comment about that application? Louise.

15 MS. KERR: It was accepted? The reverse was  
16 one that was accepted and reversed?

17 MR. KINGSTON: It had been recommended.

18 MS. KERR: What was the rating on that?

19 MR. KINGSTON: Do you remember the original  
20 panel ratings on application?

21 MR. GRIEST: Woman and Welfare. No, but there  
22 should be a program. I can't --

23 MR. KINGSTON: We can --

24 MR. GRIEST: I will get it.

25 MR. KINGSTON: This particular application was  
a split and therefore it had to be --

1  
2 MS. KERR: But I mean on the way up that had  
3 been from the panel.

4 MS. GRIEST: I will get those panel ratings for  
5 you.

6 MR. KINGSTON: Any other questions or comments?  
7 Phil.

8 MR. SCHAEFFER: It was said that one of the  
9 reasons for disapproval was that the endowment learned  
10 some -- there were some statements contrary to fact. Are  
11 you able to elaborate?

12 MR. KINGSTON: Yes, as I remember, the applicant  
13 had proposed a research project based on certain economic  
14 trends and statistics and when we checked over the  
15 application, Ken Kolson is here and he may be able to  
16 comment further, when we checked over the application  
17 those statistics were not in accord with the information  
18 that we had available, other economic figures that we had  
19 received. Ken, do you want to comment further.

20 MR. KOLSON: There were assertions in the  
21 application (inaudible) public policy, the level of public  
22 policy (inaudible) programs and so on, assertions that  
23 were simply not true (inaudible).

24 MR. KINGSTON: But as I recall the principle  
25 reason for rejection was that this was a policy. It was  
a policy -- Any other comments or questions? Fran?

1  
2 MS. RHOME: I am on a different one.

3 MS. KERR: In the letter to the applicant what  
4 was said?

5 MR. KINGSTON: Well, this was a traveling  
6 collections grant so there is not a why not process.  
7 There is a general letter explaining the reasons why most  
8 grants do not --

9 MS. GRIEST: One of those reasons listed is  
10 that it tends more to social sciences (inaudible).

11 MS. KERR: That is what you would say?

12 MS. GRIEST: We give her the list of reasons  
13 and she generally --

14 MR. KINGSTON: Frances, you had a question?

15 MS. RHOME: Yes, I did. I have a question  
16 regarding the emergency grant that was turned for  
17 disapproval for the Theater for New Audience. I have a  
18 vested interest in it because it is Shakespeare and I do  
19 know that it is very difficult to get funds for Shakespearian  
20 events. The public is not waiting to hear about a  
21 Shakespearian play, I am sorry to say.

22 What I am asking is, is this a request, proposal  
23 now, dead in the water or is it one of those things that  
24 can be handled jointly through NEA as well as NEH?

25 MR. KINGSTON: Correct me if I am wrong, but  
the real problem here was that they wanted funds for student

1  
2 performances. That was the general thrust of the  
3 application which, by policy, we do not support. Their  
4 proper avenue of support would be the Arts Endowment.

5 MS. RHOME: Student performances of what age?  
6 We have our graduate students at the universities performing  
7 that are 18 years and older.

8 MR. KINGSTON: Right. What they want to do is  
9 use the funds to support some 3,000 students participation  
10 in snippets and pieces, on stage, of various Shakespeare  
11 plays. That kind of support for performance is something  
12 we simply have not and do not do by policy. That is the  
13 sort of thing that we would turn over to the Arts Endowment.

14 MS. RHOME: It is hard to get children involved  
15 in Shakespeare and I just ask --

16 MR. KINGSTON: We do have a good number of  
17 modules (?) on Shakespeare that are aimed toward that,  
18 particularly by way of teachers, the Shakespearian  
19 Institute this summer and several other activities.

20 Other comments or questions?

21 (No response.)

22 MR. KINGSTON: If not, we will turn to the  
23 Fiscal 1988 Budget Plan, Mr. Cherrington.

24 FISCAL YEAR 1988 BUDGET PLANNING

25 MR. CHERRINGTON: Before I do that I would like  
to give a brief update of the Gramm-Rudman Act. It has been

1  
2 an exciting summer with that.

3 I meant to do this in open session. I just  
4 forgot to get to it. So there is nothing secretive about  
5 this.

6 On July 7th the Supreme Court ruled that the  
7 enforcement provision of Gramm-Rudman was unconstitutional.  
8 This gave an employee of the legislature, the Comptroller  
9 General of GAO, he cannot serve in an executive function.  
10 The way the law was set up he would issue the sequestration  
11 order which would reduce the amount of appropriations.

12 The Gramm-Rudman Act anticipated that the  
13 Supreme Court might have a problem with this, so they had  
14 a fall back revision. And this meant that Congress had  
15 to pass a joint resolution approving the budget cuts for  
16 1986. In late July they did vote to do this and the  
17 President is expected to sign this bill. I haven't heard  
18 that he has done this officially yet.

19 What this means is that the 4.3 percent reduction  
20 for 1986 will stand. The future, no one knows. Gramm-  
21 Rudman and Hollings want to replace the Comptroller  
22 General as the trigger with OMB. The Senate, in fact, in  
23 the debt-ceiling bill of July 31st put such a provision  
24 on the bill.

25 Last week Senator Dole of Kansas said that the  
debt-ceiling bill would have to be stripped of all riders

1  
2 such as the Gramm-Rudman provision so it can get through  
3 before they want to go on recess.

4 The House is concerned that making OMB the  
5 executor of this sequestration would increase the power  
6 of the Executive, so they may not want to do that in the  
7 end anyway.

8 The deficit target for 1987 is \$144 billion.  
9 The Congressional joint budget resolution, passed on June  
10 28th, assumed a deficit of \$142.6 billion, slightly under  
11 the Gramm-Rudman ceiling. But the last few months, as we  
12 all know, the economy has slowed down somewhat and because  
13 of that revenues projected for '87 are lower than expected.

14 Because of this, the deficit in '87 is now  
15 projected to be higher than the \$142 billion figure. In  
16 fact, right now, it appears like it will be \$170 billion  
17 or more.

18 The next step, on August 15th OMB and the  
19 Congressional Budget Office take a snapshot of the state  
20 of the economy. If the deficit is within \$10 billion of  
21 the \$144 billion target, in other words it can be up to  
22 \$154 billion, if it is within \$10 billion of \$144 everything  
23 is fine. But if it is not, and it is not expected to be,  
24 Congress must either cut spending or the President, on  
25 September 1st, will issue another sequestration order.  
And when he does that the budget has to go back to the \$144

1  
2 deficit level. Does everyone have that straight?

3 (Laughter.)

4 MR. CHERRINGTON: Okay. A much easier problem  
5 is the budget for 1988. There is nothing in your folder,  
6 but we did send out the Council budget paper to all of  
7 you last week. Maybe that is why some of you didn't get  
8 it.

9 (Laughter.)

10 MR. CHERRINGTON: I did hear that some of you  
11 didn't get it. We called all of you, vacations being  
12 what they are in the summer, we called all of you to see  
13 which address you wanted it sent. But I do understand  
14 that some people did not get a copy. Is there someone  
15 who would like one? We have some up here. It is  
16 fascinating reading.

17 The main feature of the budget is the amount.  
18 It is \$132,679,000. This is a freeze at the Gramm-Rudman  
19 '86 appropriation level, although we have made some  
20 adjustments in allocations among programs and Divisions.  
21 The main increase, as you can see, is in General Programs.  
22 This is a recognition of the increasing quality of  
23 applications in this Division. And it is also in line  
24 with the reprogramming requests made earlier when we too  
25 '86 funds and directed them in that Division.

As Mrs. Cheney said earlier today, one of the

1  
2 things we are trying to do in General Programs is to  
3 increase -- to emphasize biographies in the Media Program,  
4 the Libraries Program also was increased, the Bicentennial  
5 Bookshelf program that she mentioned earlier as well.

6 Challenge Grants: We increased that amount  
7 because we are trying to fund all excellent proposals in  
8 that Division. That has been a little difficult lately  
9 because the average size of the approvals has gone remarkably.

10 What seems to have happened is that the larger  
11 proposals, the larger budget size proposals, seem to be  
12 the projects that are better. And the average grant size  
13 has gone up quite a bit.

14 State Programs: The funding has increased  
15 there as well. The quality of regrants is much improved.  
16 Also one thing we have done, a long overdue thing, the  
17 administrative costs of the State Councils have been  
18 frozen since 1982. So in 1988 we hope to give each State  
19 Council an additional \$10,000 for administrative purposes.  
20 This should also help the State Councils with their  
21 requirements in the reauthorization legislation.

22 Other Divisions: Education is about the same  
23 as in 1987. As I mentioned a couple of times this morning,  
24 applications have gone down there a little bit and we are  
25 going to be looking at guidelines in that program.

We would also like to do some media projects in

1  
2 Education if possible.

3 Fellowships: The '88 request is about the same  
4 as in 1987. Funding is up slightly in summer stipends.  
5 The actual stipend was increased there a couple of years  
6 ago and we are increasing the absolute budget amount in  
7 that program so that the number of stipends awarded are  
8 not decreased.

9 Summer Seminars: College teachers and secondary  
10 school teachers will both be experimenting with seminars  
11 of shorter lengths.

12 Research: 1988, again, very similar to '86 and  
13 '87. The most Treasury funds in the agency will be  
14 allotted to Research. Research has a very good idea in  
15 the International Program. Some of the planning activities  
16 of the International regrantees will now be considered in  
17 the Conferences Program.

18 Preservation is pretty well-stable funding. It  
19 is a little bit of a decrease. They are going to be  
20 doing some more matching in that program, which we also  
21 look upon quite favorably.

22 Administrative expenses will also go up. The  
23 rent we pay for this building is going to be going up  
24 about \$225,000. Staff costs will also be going up about  
25 \$225,000. As you all probably know the official Government  
per diem rates have gone up and the Federal Retirement System

EBERLIN REPORTING SERVICE

1  
2 is also going to be a little more expensive.

3 Any questions?

4 MR. KINGSTON: Comments or questions? George?

5 MR. KENNEDY: Is this an appropriate point to  
6 raise a question about a specific recommendation in dollar  
7 amounts?

8 MR. KINGSTON: Yes.

9 MR. KENNEDY: I note, with interest, that of  
10 the very few requests, line item requests, which are  
11 lower than the 1987 requests, that for publications in  
12 the Research Program is the most significant decline in  
13 percentage and I have discussed this with Rich briefly  
14 that I am somewhat concerned about that decline, that it  
15 might be perceived as a backing away from the commitment  
16 to assist publication on behalf of the Endowment.

17 Some of you will remember that publications  
18 was, as it were, forced upon the Endowment by the Congress.  
19 It was not initiated within the Agency. That was some  
20 years ago.

21 It does seem to me that the Endowment's assistance  
22 with publication is, indeed, essential for the long term  
23 and we pump millions and millions of dollars into research  
24 and, yet, make only a fairly token contribution to the  
25 actual publication and dissemination of that research in  
permanent form on acid free paper. And I hope that there

1  
2 will be some flexibility within the line items of the  
3 Research Program so that if the request does go forward  
4 in this from that some additional money might be transferred  
5 there, if need, for excellent projects and certainly that  
6 the Endowment will, in the long run, continue to develop  
7 and find other ways of strengthening the publication of  
8 research.

9 MR. CHERRINGTON: A couple of issues here.  
10 Since research is appropriated to us in a lump sum, the  
11 flexibility you asked for does exist.

12 A couple of other things. In the last few  
13 years publications has made more use of matching funds.  
14 They have a special program to help presses improve their  
15 operations. So there will probably be Treasury funds  
16 allocated to publications in addition to the definite  
17 funds you see here.

18 Two other things. I understand that you will  
19 be moving to one deadline next year, one feature. And  
20 also this seems to reflect the excellent applications  
21 that we have been receiving.

22 In the last few years the allocation for  
23 publications has started out higher during the year and  
24 we have lowered it as the applications come in. Perhaps  
25 Rich would like to --

MR. BERNS: I had intended to say something about

1  
2 that during my report. Since it is now brought up it is  
3 appropriate to say something. Rich, I think, will add  
4 some more details.

5 MR. EKMAN: You have covered the main points  
6 Steve. We are confident that the estimated level here  
7 will allow us to support all of the excellent applications.

8 These grants tend to be very small. So if we  
9 find during fiscal '88 that there are a few more very  
10 highly rated ones, we are confident that we can find the  
11 money for those in other categories of the Division.

12 MR. KINGSTON: Other comments or questions?  
13 Ellis.

14 MR. SANDOZ: I simply want to associate myself  
15 with George's comments and, of course, serve on the  
16 Committee, I will have to reiterate this as directly in  
17 the Research Committee.

18 I think to move to 400 to 337 down to 250 in  
19 submission, when these also include purchase of computer  
20 requirement, as I recall, within the same competition,  
21 that is correct isn't it, Rich?

22 MR. EKMAN: Actually the computer purchase  
23 grants tend to be funded entirely out of matching funds.  
24 So they would not be reflected in the figures you see here.

25 MR. SANDOZ: In any case, I do think that these  
little subvention (?) grants for specialized publications

1  
2 publications of the kind and which are essentially scholarly  
3 works which cannot be expected to meet the cost of  
4 production by university presses, I think this is a very  
5 small program but I think it is a very important program  
6 and I second George Kennedy's remarks.

7 MR. KINGSTON: Other comments or questions?

8 (No response.)

9 MR. KINGSTON: All right. If there are none we  
10 will move then to the review of applications by Division.  
11 The report first from the Division of Education Programs.  
12 Bill.

#### 13 DIVISION OF EDUCATION PROGRAMS

14 MR. ALLEN: Thank you. Phil reminds me that  
15 maybe it would work better if I try (inaudible). We will  
16 see.

17 During its closed session the Committee on  
18 Education Programs focused on some 20 applications. In  
19 several instances the Committee members had questions  
20 about budgets or project activities. In each case the  
21 Division staff clarified the points at issue to the full  
22 satisfaction of the Committee.

23 In its discussion of two proposals for National  
24 Institutes for Elementary and Secondary Teachers, ES21411,  
25 Skidmore College, and ES21384, Marymount College of  
26 Virginia, the Committee sought assurance that the sponsoring

EBERLIN REPORTING SERVICE

1  
2 institutions would, in fact, be able to attract teachers  
3 from beyond their own regions.

4 In each case the staff offered evidence that  
5 there was sufficient demand for the institutions to  
6 justify NEH funding.

7 During this discussion of proposal EH20647, the  
8 University of California at Santa Cruz's application for  
9 an Institute on Interpretation in the Sciences and  
10 Humanities, the Committee advised the staff to seek  
11 clarification about exactly what participants would read  
12 and about how much they would engage in dialogue with the  
13 distinguished scholars who would serve as the faculty for  
14 the Institute. In general, maybe felt comfortable with  
the staff recommendation to support the proposal.

15 I might add a note that I was personally  
16 concerned because I knew that one of the principles of  
17 this proposal for an Institute in the summer was also an  
18 applicant in the Fellowship Division for a seminar through  
19 the summer, which seemed to me a parallel period, but I  
20 have noted that the recommendation from the Committee was  
21 not to support that particular seminar. So that possible  
22 conflict doesn't exist in my own mind at this point. We  
will see what happens.

23 The Council Committee, in its deliberations on  
24 Shaw University, ET20035, discussed the particular

1  
2 importance of a potential grant recipient providing  
3 evidence of fiscal responsibility.

4 In the instance with Shaw University the  
5 Committee asked that firm evidence be sought and obtained  
6 from Shaw prior to a grant being awarded to the institution.  
7 The Committee reminded staff of Council's recent approval  
8 of a policy to deny support to individuals in default on  
9 student loans. Institutions, it was thought, could hardly  
10 be exempted from a like standard.

11 With two other proposals the Committee found  
12 itself in at least partial disagreement with the staff  
13 recommendation. In one instance, 20649, the Organization  
14 of American Historians, proposal to develop a series of  
15 teaching packets on woman's history, two of the Committee's  
16 five members voted against the staff's recommendation for  
17 support. Their concern was that the materials to be  
18 developed and disseminated would present only one  
19 perspective on a complex topic and they questioned the  
20 wisdom of seeming to give the Endowment's endorsement to  
21 what might strike some scholars as a form of propaganda.

22 The other three members of the Committee felt  
23 that the materials would be responsibly prepared and  
24 distributed and they thought it important to support the  
25 OAH's effort to integrate women's studies into mainstream  
courses on history and culture.

1  
2 In the second instance, EL20160, Duke University's  
3 proposal to create a joint program in U.S. history at  
4 Duke in Chapel Hill, all five Committee members voted to  
5 overturn the staff's recommendation for support.

6 Everyone felt that what the two universities  
7 wanted to do was well worth doing. Several expressed the  
8 hope that the project would eventually serve as a model  
9 for collaboration in other regions. But, given the size  
10 and distinction of the two History Departments involved  
11 the Committee found it difficult to justify NEH support  
12 because of the cost involved in what appeared to be the  
13 ordinary cost of business. This proposal has therefore  
14 been moved from the recommended to the not recommended  
15 category in the final motion you have before you. I now  
16 move the adoption of that motion.

17 MR. KINGSTON: Any questions or comments?

18 MS. CRESIMORE: I have a comment. I have some  
19 real concerns about application ET20035. I expressed  
20 these concerns to Mr. Allen and to Ms. Menke prior to the  
21 Education Committee meeting yesterday.

22 MR. ALLEN: That is Shaw University.

23 MS. CRESIMORE: Shaw University on page one.  
24 My main concern relates to alleged financial  
25 irregularities on the part of the institution involved  
that may involve other governmental agencies such as the

1  
2 Department of Education and Internal Revenue Service.

3           Such alleged financial irregularities have been  
4 reported extensively in the media over the past few  
5 months. Now I am the last person in the world to feel  
6 that anything in print is correct, but I think there  
7 are some serious allegations here and I would hope that  
8 the staff would pursue this and check with some of these  
9 other governmental agencies to find out what is going on  
10 there.

11           Also, I want a point of clarification on this.  
12 Are you attaching a condition in your statement to the  
13 finding of this particular application that the staff do so?  
14 What did you mean by --

15           MR. ALLEN: The motion includes a request that  
16 they see to proper accounting procedures and eligibility  
17 in terms of fiscal propriety with the institution.

18           MS. CRESIMORE: There is a broader issue involved  
19 here. And I would also like clarification on what the  
20 policy is regarding this particular matter.

21           I understand that the Endowment does have a  
22 policy relating to individuals seeking funds from the  
23 Endowment, they cannot have problems with Federal agencies  
24 over funding in the past. This does not include institutions  
25 at all? How is this matter handled when it does come up?

          MR. KINGSTON: This has been discussed from time

1  
2 to time. There is indeed policy, in fact there is,  
3 correct me if I am wrong, Steve, even regulation about  
4 the existence of Federal liens against any institution.

5 If there are Federal liens, whether from the  
6 IRS or any other grant-making agency, we cannot award  
7 funds until those liens are accounted for in all.

8 What happens is, of course, that we evaluate an  
9 application on its standing merits and then once that  
10 application has been approved by Council we are not ever  
11 obligated to award funds. The award of funds is always  
12 contingent upon the capability of a grant recipient to  
13 account for funds, managements cost (?) and so on.  
14 Because we hear these allegations about Shaw University,  
15 we are already investigating.

16 We could go so far as to conduct a preaudits  
17 award survey if that is necessary. In any event, I want  
18 you to be assured that we will not be awarding funds to  
19 an institution which has outstanding Federal obligations.

20 MS. CRESIMORE: Well, I understand that they  
21 have defaulted on payment of certain Governmental loans.

22 MR. KINGSTON: In that case they will not be  
23 eligible to receive our funds.

24 MS. CRESIMORE: Okay. Then the staff will  
25 pursue this.

Let me ask you this: How do the agencies

1  
2 communicate with one another? Are you sent memos as to  
3 institutions or individuals that have defaulted on  
4 payments? How do the agencies communicate with one  
5 another?

6 MR. KINGSTON: Generally the agencies communicate  
7 through the Auditing Offices. There is a lead agency in  
8 each case, that is the agency that determines the indirect  
9 cost rate and so forth. And that agency will notify  
10 other agencies that have grant awards to or pending, not  
11 necessarily know about pending, but to an applicant of  
12 any financial irregularities, but always about any  
13 financial findings and consequences that arise.

14 These, in fact, come back to our Audit Office.  
15 They are reviewed in our office. The report of our office  
16 is transmitted to both the Divisions and me.

17 MS. CRESIMORE: Have you, to this date, received  
18 any information about Shaw University from another  
19 Governmental agency reporting that they are in fault of  
20 payment?

21 MR. KINGSTON: We have received information of  
22 a non-conclusive nature. That is, we have no written  
23 communications with other agencies, but we have been  
24 communicating particularly with IRS and the Department  
25 of Education.

MS. CRESIMORE: The Department of Education.

1  
2 So, therefore, if you pursue this and you find  
3 that they are in default with payments on Federal loans,  
4 then this money will not be awarded, correct?

5 MR. KINGSTON: That is right. The funds will  
6 not be awarded until they take care of that outstanding  
7 Federal obligation. A lead agency can declare them  
8 ineligible for Federal funds and we would do that in due  
9 course.

10 Louise.

11 MS. KERR: I have two questions. One is a  
12 question of clarification on what you just said. Did I  
13 understand you to say that if anyone defaults on any loan  
14 of any kind to the Federal Government is ineligible?

15 MR. KINGSTON: Again, I need to rely some on my  
16 General Counsel. But if there is a default on a Federal  
17 obligation, generally that institution is ineligible to  
18 receive further Federal funds unless or until there are  
19 conditions that satisfy the obligation. That may include  
20 a repayment schedule or a repayment agreement.

21 MS. KERR: Does that include individuals as  
22 well, individuals or institutions?

23 MR. KINGSTON: There is a difference between  
24 individuals and institutions. It is this agency's policy  
25 not to award funds to an individual who has not met -- is  
in default of a student loan.

1  
2 MS. KERR: Well, I would suggest that the  
3 statement that we have about student loans be revised to  
4 say that anyone in default of any loan, perhaps including  
5 a student loan, would be ineligible.

6 MR. KINGSTON: Well, you run into a problem  
7 when you are dealing with an institution that they would  
8 not, themselves, have a student loan. The procedures are  
9 already in place for institutional obligations to the  
10 Federal Government.

11 MS. KERR: But our policy is what?

12 MR. KINGSTON: Our policy in regard to  
13 institutions?

14 MS. KERR: Individuals.

15 MR. KINGSTON: Individuals. It is not to award  
16 funds to any individual who is default on a student loan.

17 MS. KERR: But I thought you just said on any  
18 obligation.

19 MR. KINGSTON: No. I said on student loan. We  
20 are talking about the individuals now.

21 MS. CRESIMORE: Isn't it a stated policy that  
22 an individual who is in default of payment to the Federal  
23 Government cannot apply for loans from the National  
24 Endowment for the Humanities? Is it stated in the  
25 application?

MS. KERR: It is only student loans. That is the

1  
2 policy we have. That was just a clarification.

3 The application that -- 20649, page 11, the  
4 Organization of American Historians. I have no problems  
5 at all that this would be one-sided and be problematic in  
6 that respect. It is my recollection that while I was on  
7 the Education Committee we funded one very similar to  
8 this at Northwestern. Is that correct?

9 MS. MENKE: We funded a planning grant to the  
10 Organization of American Historians to develop.

11 MS. KERR: I thought it was --

12 MS. MENKE: It may have been.

13 MR. SANDOZ: Tom.

14 MR. KINGSTON: Ellis and then Bill.

15 MR. SANDOZ: Would there be some merit in having  
16 a memorandum on this question that we are talking about,  
17 when funds will be denied to institutions and individuals?

18 MR. KINGSTON: Sure. We would be happy to do  
19 that. We will have for the next Council meeting a  
20 memorandum describing the policies on eligibility. Bill.

21 MR. ALLEN: I just want to clarify for Louise  
22 that the concerns expressed in the Committee about the  
23 one-sided nature of the OAH project did not touch their  
24 particular opinion as the holder's opinion or even as  
25 they might have some impact on their research.

This is a project whose entire meaning and

1  
2 substance is a dissemination effort on a very broad scale,  
3 intending to structure, as far as possible, curricula in  
4 wide ranking institutions.

5 So that what we were looking at was propaganda  
6 of process, not their being one-sided in their view of  
7 it, and whether it was an appropriate task for this  
8 agency to support that kind of outreach with a specific  
9 intention of disseminating to others a particular view.  
10 That was his concern.

11 MS. KERR: Well, I am familiar with the packets  
12 and I guess that is why I am not really troubled with  
13 that. I don't think that that is a problem for me. But  
14 I was concerned about the fact that this was a second  
15 one, but I see that --

16 MR. KINGSTON: Other comments or questions  
17 about the motion from the Education Committee? If not,  
18 all of those in favor of the motion please say aye.

19 (A chorus of Ayes was heard.)

20 MR. KINGSTON: Any opposed?

21 (No response.)

22 MR. KINGSTON: The motion carries.

23 MS. CRESIMORE: I would be in support of  
24 abstaining from voting on ET20035 and I would request  
25 that the Chairman take a close look at that particular  
application and situation please.

MR. KINGSTON: We will show that abstention.

The Report from the Division of Fellowship Programs. Bea.

DIVISION OF FELLOWSHIP PROGRAMS

MS. HIMMELFARB: The Committee had an extensive discussion of some 35 applications which all the Committee members read in full and some of which did raise the issue that the Chairman alluded to, the problem of the definition of seminal texts.

The discussion was impassioned and, needless to say, inconclusive. And it just may be that at some future session we will come before you with some attempt to clarify that concept, but not just yet.

What we have for you today is a motion in three parts on these yellow sheets, first having to do with the Faculty Graduate Study Program, where we recommended the approval of seven applications in this list, and a disapproval of the five remaining applications.

The second, Summer Seminars for Secondary School Teachers. We recommended the approval of 52 applications and the disapproval of the remaining 120 applications. And the third, Summer Seminars for College Teachers, where we recommended the approval of 56 applications and the disapproval of 94 applications.

There is one addendum that I should inform you of.

1  
2 In the College Teachers Seminar motion there are three  
3 recommendations for bicentennial seminars for law professors  
4 and I bring this to your attention only because they do  
5 not fall under the College Teacher Seminar category,  
6 properly speaking.

7 These apply to FS21735, Richard Epstein and  
8 Timothy Fullard, The Genius of the American Constitution  
9 at Colorado College; FS21736, Gordon Wood and William  
10 Nelson, the Origins of Constitutional Supremacy at New  
11 York University, and FS21737, Racovy and Gray, Political  
12 Experience and Thought in the Making of the Constitution  
at Stamford.

13 I move the adoption of this motion.

14 MR. KINGSTON: George.

15 MR. KENNEDY: I would like to say a few words  
16 about the not recommended application that is on page 15  
17 of the Fellowship applications, the last one on page 15,  
FV20676.

18 MS. HIMMELFARB: They were paginated separately.

19 MR. KENNEDY: It is Summar Seminars for Secondary  
20 School --

21 MS. HIMMELFARB: Secondary.

22 MR. KENNEDY: Page 15. A grant to Houston A.  
23 Baker, University of Pennsylvania for a seminar in Black  
24 Women Writers and the Blues. I would like it reported

1  
2 that there was a split vote in the Committee and there  
3 was extensive discussion. I would like it recorded that  
4 I voted in favor of the seminar.

5 It seems to me that we need it or something  
6 like it within the Summer Program. It seemed to me that  
7 the seminar was one of high quality and that perhaps the  
8 rejection was a mistake and I hope that the Chairman will  
9 give it personal attention.

10 MR. KINGSTON: You are asking that the Chairman  
11 do that?

12 MR. KENNEDY: Yes.

13 MS. HIMMELFARB: May I comment on that? This  
14 is one of those applications that did raise the question  
15 of seminal text.

16 It should be understood that the guidelines for  
17 the secondary school summer seminars are very explicit  
18 about this. I don't have them in front of me, but they  
19 do require that these seminars be concerned with the  
20 intensive study of seminal texts.

21 In reading this application it occurred to many  
22 of us that these did not, in fact, qualify as seminal  
23 text in any sense of the word. And it is on those grounds  
24 that we rejected that application.

25 MR. KENNEDY: It would seem to me that they did  
qualify.

(Laughter.)

MS. SILVERS: I found myself during this discussion quoting Hume (?). I don't know if I (inaudible) Aristotle.

The issue of what is a seminal or (inaudible) work is one that is central to the humanities. And I afraid that if you (inaudible) a lot of us will be out of business.

(Laughter.)

MR. KINGSTON: Anything else about the Fellowship motion?

MS. CHENEY: I just have one comment. When there is a split panel and you wish to call it to my attention, it is very useful for me if someone speaks from the other side too; that I have on the record someone speaking from both sides. I will, of course, see the file but I just think it is very useful in the records of this meeting to have someone speaking for both sides. Thank you.

MR. KINGSTON: It may be helpful too, I am not sure that all Council members are aware, that when there is a split in committee that that application simply be routinely asked for and ask the Chairman --

Other questions, comment?

(No response.)

1  
2 MR. KINGSTON: All those in favor of the motion,  
3 aye.

4 (A chorus of ayes was heard.)

5 MR. KINGSTON: Opposed.

6 (No response.)

7 MR. KINGSTON: That motion passes.

8 We move on to the action of the Preservation  
9 Committee.

10 PRESERVATION GRANTS

11 FR. SCHALL: The Preservation Committee  
12 (inaudible) normal consideration (inaudible), Association  
13 for Symposium on (inaudible) Preservation and (inaudible)  
14 State Education Department on (inaudible). Therefore I  
15 move adoption of the motion.

16 MR. KINGSTON: Second?

17 MR. : Second.

18 MR. KINGSTON: We have a second. Any comments  
19 or questions?

20 (No response.)

21 MR. KINGSTON: All those in favor please signify  
22 by saying aye.

23 (A chorus of ayes was heard.)

24 MR. KINGSTON: Opposed.

25 (No response.)

MR. KINGSTON: That motion carries.

Report from the Committee for Research Programs.

Walter.

RESEARCH PROGRAMS

MR. BERNS: The motion is on the gold-colored paper.

We had a total of 115 applications. We are asking your vote in support of our recommendations that 52 percent of these, some 60, be supported, 52 rejected and three deferred.

We call your attention to those particular proposals where we were divided. First to those proposals where we reversed staff recommendations. On page 21, R021347, the panel was divided on this one. Staff agreed with those who were positively inclined. Our Committee was also divided; two against funding and one in favor of funding. That is a reversal of the staff recommendation.

Another one in this category, on page 25, RX20822. The Committee voted to support this particular proposal. It was flagged for our attention. The staff had recommended against the proposal based on the panel's ranking of it and the staff's recognition of budgetary limits of the Division. So, in a sense, what we are doing here in reversing the staff's recommendation is making a judgement on this particular proposal and judging it superior to others.

EBERLIN REPORTING SERVICE

1  
2 We thought that the conference was important,  
3 that the institution has had an exemplary record of  
4 important work. This would be an important conference.

5 I should also point out there is a somewhat  
6 lower budget than requested.

7 Another one that we reversed, one that had been  
8 flagged for our attention. On page 7, RP20894. The  
9 Committee disagreed with the staff here believing that  
10 the positive comments on this particular proposal that had to  
11 do with the poet John Skelton outweighed the negative  
12 comments. So we reversed staff's recommendation.

13 The Committee was divided on two others that I  
14 will call to your attention. On page 21, R021351, Al  
15 Blaustein's proposal to publish a book of essays having  
16 to do with the effect of the American Constitution  
17 overseas. I emphasize that we did not reverse staff's  
18 recommendation here, but we, ourselves, were divided on  
19 this one and we had a very spirited conversation on this  
20 one and perhaps Mr. Sandoz would like to say something  
21 about that. He and I were the discontents on this one.

22 MR. SANDOZ: Now?

23 (Laughter.)

24 MR. SANDOZ: We just had quite a divergent  
25 assessment of the value of this proposal. And my hunch  
was that the cosmetics of the proposal had camouflaged the

1  
2 real imaginativeness and value of what Blaustein was  
3 about.

4 Since it is difficult to really mediate a  
5 discussion of that kind without taking taking the document  
6 out and going over it page-by-page which, as you know,  
7 Committee meetings are not really designed for us to do  
8 when we have 115 proposals before us, we ended by agreeing  
9 to disagree.

10 I do say that this is a unique proposal in my  
11 experience on the Council in four years. It is an attempt  
12 to gather from 60 international scholars the impact of  
13 the United States Constitution among governments throughout  
14 the world. And the ratings are quite high from very  
15 competent people. And I remain convinced that it is a  
16 good deal better proposal than we finally thought it was.

17 MR. BERNS: Thank you. I apologize for asking  
18 you to do that because there is nothing really gained by  
19 that discussion at this point. Although on othe other  
20 one something might be gained because of some general  
21 questions.

22 MS. SILVERS: I did want to raise a question  
23 about the reasons for R021347, the MacIntyre proposal,  
24 which is a proposal from a philosopher. And you know that  
25 I have a constant concern that philosophy proposals have  
very tough sleighing in the Research Division, for the

1  
2 purposes of this discussion.

3 I understand that there may be some difficulty  
4 in reviewing when persons outside of philosophy review  
5 philosophers peculiar ways of dealing, for instance, with  
6 historical material. But I am wondering what the grounds  
7 were for overturning the recommendation?

8 I have read the proposal. I am certainly  
9 familiar with the project, as is our whole profession.

10 MS. KERR: I think this would be one that the  
11 Chairman would want to take a particular interest in,  
12 partly because of the rating included by the panelists,  
13 2Es, 2Rs, and 2SMs. So this is what you might call divided.

14 (Laughter.)

15 MS. KERR: The Committee itself was divided as  
16 well and by timing I was the last one to decide, so I was  
17 the one who decided in the negative.

18 It seems to me that the Chairman would want to  
19 particularly look at the arguments which I agree, that  
20 Anita refers to, on the one hand from the philosophers  
21 who have asserted, and rightly so, that the man has an  
22 outstanding reputation and the work he has done thus far  
23 is a great contribution and therefore have voted in the  
24 positive, but from the historians, who are quite skeptical,  
25 first about his grasp of the historical periods and it  
says he (inaudible) make comparisons of. And, secondly, they

1  
2 feel that he has not justified those particular (inaudible)  
3 in time. I think it is a judgement call and the vote is  
4 not going to change on the Committee.

5 MS. SILVER: Philosophers had abuse and --

6 MR. BERNS: There is one other item that I call  
7 your attention to. This has to do with the papers of  
8 George Catlett Marshall, RE20607 on page 2. We were  
9 divided but our division did not result in a reversal of  
10 staff's recommendation.

11 This proposal does raise some interesting  
12 question. And here it is appropriate for me to call on  
13 Ellis Sandoz to say something because it has to do with  
14 the extent to which we, as a Federal agency, attempt to  
15 influence the kind of work that is done in this particular  
16 case by scholars (inaudible) very important person.

17 Ellis Sandoz makes a point, and he is surely  
18 justified in making it, that the Endowment ought to be  
19 proud of the association with this project. I think we  
20 are proud of it, but we did have some misgivings about  
21 the pace with which the work is being done.

22 We sent a distinguished historian on a site  
23 visit and he reported. I myself have to confess that I  
24 was swayed in my vote by the report of that site visitor.  
25 I understand perfectly well what Ellis is saying about  
the impropriety and inappropriateness of our intervening in

1  
2 work of these people. But, of course, there is something  
3 to be said on the other side.

4 We do have a right to be concerned with how  
5 Federal money is being spent, how our taxes are being  
6 spent, our taxes at work. Ellis, what else?

7 MR. SANDOZ: Well, you covered it pretty well,  
8 I think, Walter. That is a fair summation.

9 When you have an excellent product that is  
10 appearing and with which we can all take a certain amount  
11 of pride, and the question essentially is the methodology  
12 of the project, whether the pace is sufficient to suit  
13 us, and we arrive at a negative decision after a  
14 preliminary affirmative decision to support on the basis  
15 of the stoginess or the resistance of the Project Director  
16 to accept our suggestions and to speed things up or to  
17 use certain techniques that he is not using, even though  
18 end product is an excellent product, it seems to me that  
19 we have quite preaching and gone to meddling as it is  
20 sometimes expressed.

21 I find that stretching the bounds a bit of our  
22 responsibility, which is indeed to assure excellence in  
23 this kind of product, and there is no question about the  
24 excellence of it, only that it is not being done fast  
25 enough. And I wondered whether Boyd (?) papers edition  
of Lincoln -- if we were in a comparable position on that

EBERLIN REPORTING SERVICE

1  
2 on, which I recall started about 1950 and is in volume 21  
3 now -- so that was the substance of well do we insist, as  
4 the price of accepting support, that our suggestions be  
5 accepted and if not then it becomes a kind of ultimatum  
6 situation which I found distasteful and I think may be a  
7 bit excessive.

8 MR. BERNES: Let me add something else.

9 MS. HIMMELFARB: Are these technical suggestions  
10 or substantive ones? I mean, does it have to do with  
11 word processing or something?

12 MR. SANDOZ: Techniques, syntax.

13 MR. BERNES: The question, I suppose, ought to  
14 be close to me, whether our votes would have been changed  
15 by (inaudible) situation unseen.

16 The fact of the matter is that we knew very  
17 well that the project would go forward whether our money  
18 was given to them or not. The bulk of the money for  
19 support of the papers come from another source. Had we  
20 known that our vote would have put an end to the publication  
21 of the papers of George Catlett Marshall, who knows what  
22 we would have decided.

23 On the other hand, were it true that the bulk  
24 of the money for the project came from us, the Project  
25 Director would not have been so doggoned arrogant in his  
response to the site visit.

EBERLIN REPORTING SERVICE

1  
2 MR. SANDOZ: Yes, he would have knuckled under  
3 for sure.

4 (Laughter.)

5 MR. SANDOZ: That is my whole point.

6 MS. CHENEY: The question that nobody has  
7 pointed out is that I am interested in from the discussion,  
8 was it a matter of productivity. And it is not a matter  
9 of using the computer so much. It is a matter of how  
10 long it is taking.

11 MR. EKMAN: This is a general question that  
12 faces many projects in the Research Division that are  
13 long-term projects where the same grantee comes back  
14 every few years for what he hopes will be the next  
15 installment of his funding.

16 Inevitably, reviewers and panelists and  
17 increasingly the staff of the Endowment ask questions  
18 about cost effectiveness. And often the review process  
19 accumulates a number of suggestions that could be passed  
20 along to the Project Director, how he could go about his  
21 business better.

22 Often these are friendly suggestions that are  
23 accepted by the Project Director willingly; sometimes  
24 they are not. That then raises the question that we face  
25 with the Marshall proposal which is to what extent it is  
appropriate for us in the bureacracy to make judgements about

1  
2 the shape and progress of these projects on the basis of  
3 the comments accumulated through the review process, or  
4 to what extent we ought to look only at the quality of  
5 the product, irrespective of cost effectiveness and the  
6 means of getting it.

7 MR. SANDOZ: I will say just one other thing,  
8 since I believe you understand my view of this.

9 It strikes me that one volume in four years,  
10 with a second in press, ain't too bad in terms of  
11 productivity given the massive problem of organizing  
12 such a project. And I do find that we tend to be -- we  
13 are tending to become a bit meddlesome in excellent  
14 projects of which this is one.

15 Now you may agree with that. You may not agree  
16 with it, but that is the impression that I have.

17 MR. BERNIS: In principle, I guess, everybody  
18 agrees with you on that point, on the meddlesomeness and  
19 inappropriateness of it. Certainly our recommendation to  
20 the Chairman would be to see to it that we don't get  
21 involved in that sort of thing.

22 Two more items, one of which I will report and  
23 the other one Rich will have to report. We were divided  
24 also on RX20806, which is on page 27. It is a proposal  
25 from Carnegie-Mellon University. We were divided largely  
because some people thought that it was not really in the

1  
2 humanities.

3 The other item that --

4 MS. KERR: Just very briefly, I would also  
5 appreciate it if you would take a close look at this one  
6 because I was one of those people who thought (inaudible).  
7 This is a proposal which received all Es from the panel  
8 and it was brought to our attention. The essence, I  
9 think, of the discussion is whether or not this is a  
10 project on child development which we would put in social  
11 sciences, or the history of childhood and childhood  
12 development, which would put it in the humanities.

13 MR. BERNES: One other item that was flagged for  
14 our attention has to do with a request from the American  
15 Enterprise Institute and therefore I dissociated myself  
16 and left the room while it was being discussed and Rich  
17 will talk about it here.

18 MR. EKMAN: On page 22 of the motion you will  
19 see proposal RO2021367, a proposal from Mike Malbin from  
20 the American Enterprise Institute.

21 It is listed in the not recommended section,  
22 but that is not really true. The Committee recommendation  
23 is a tie, a tie between the two members present, Sandoz  
24 and Kerr.

25 The background is this: That the specialist  
reviewers were mainly in favor of the proposal. The panel

1  
2 was mainly against the proposal. Walter Berns absented  
3 himself and the Committee discussion resulted in a  
4 tie, reflecting to some degree the same difference of  
5 perspective between historian and political scientist  
6 that showed up in the opinions of the specialist reviewers  
7 and the panels.

8 As a compromise in the course of the discussion,  
9 the staff suggested that a grant of a smaller size,  
10 equivalent to one year's salary, be given to Mr. Malbin,  
11 but on that suggestion, too, there was a tie vote, one to  
12 one. So, in a sense, there is no recommendation on this  
13 one yet, although the conventions of the way we do business  
14 calls for putting the proposal on the not recommended  
15 section of the motion. Page 22.

16 MR. BERNES: That is the end of what I have to  
17 say about this particular motion. I move the adoption of  
18 it.

19 MR. KINGSTON: Are there questions of comments  
20 about the motion?

21 (No response.)

22 MR. KINGSTON: All those in favor.

23 (A chorus of ayes was heard.)

24 MR. KINGSTON: Opposed.

25 (No response.)

MR. KINGSTON: The motion is approved.

1  
2 Report of the Division of General Programs.  
3 Kathleen sitting in for the Chairman Charles Ritcheson.  
4 Right?

5 MS. KILPATRICK: Yes.

6 GENERAL PROGRAMS

7 MS. KILPATRICK: During the closed session we  
8 reviewed the fiscal year 1988 budget plan and expressed  
9 our satisfaction with the proposed increases for these  
10 programs.

11 Turning to the other pages, we first considered  
12 177 media applications of which 31 were recommended by  
13 staff for funding. The Committee concurred with the  
14 staff's recommendations in all but four cases. The first  
15 of these is GN22942, The Philippines and the United  
16 States, a History. That is page 27 of the motion.

17 You may recall that a similar application was  
18 deferred in February and rejected in May. The proposal  
19 received a strong endorsement from the panel for production.  
20 The staff concluded that a grant to script the first two  
21 programs, covering a period from the Spanish American War  
22 until Philippine independence was more appropriate.

23 The Committee, however, was not convinced that  
24 the approach would be solidly grounded in historical  
25 methodology. We concluded it was primarily a journalistic  
treatment of the subject.

EBERLIN REPORTING SERVICE

1  
2 The Committee was also non-supportive of the  
3 production request for GN22775, One Hand Don't Clap, the  
4 story of calypso music, page 8 of the motion.

5 We were not convinced that the film would lead  
6 to the understanding of Caribbean culture that the  
7 applicant claims. By a vote of three to zero with one  
8 abstention the Committee overturned the staff recommendation  
9 to fund the project.

10 The Committee also disagreed with the staff  
11 recommendation for a planning grant for GN22894, Song and  
12 Social Change: We Shall Overcome. That is page 22 of  
13 the motion.

14 The applicant proposes to examine the history  
15 of the song "We Shall Overcome" and its use in the civil  
16 rights movement. The Committee concluded that the program  
17 would not be sufficiently scholarly, but rather a salutary  
18 piece.

19 We also discussed three other proposals  
20 recommended by the staff and in each case sustained the  
21 staff judgement.

22 In the case of GN22868, Stalin, page 3, we  
23 agreed that the concerns raised by an outside evaluator  
24 could be overcome during the research and scripting stage.

25 The application GN22787, Great Expectations:  
Life and Death in the World of High Tech Medicine, page 1,

1  
2 requests fund to plan two programs that will examine high  
3 tech medicine and its impact on the medical profession's  
4 relationship with patients.

5 The Committee did not object to the project,  
6 per se, but we believe that it would be enhanced by the  
7 addition of an economist knowledgeable about the high cost  
8 of medical technology and its impact on the physician/patient  
9 relationship.

10 Although the Committee sustained the staff  
11 recommendation to support GN2902, Lowell Fever, the Lowell  
12 Mills, 1839 to 1846, page 5, we recommended a slightly  
13 reduced budget.

14 The Committee paid special attention to five  
15 applicants not recommended for funding by the staff. In  
16 four cases the Committee concurred with the staff's  
17 recommendation. They were GN22832, Labor and the Bill of  
18 Rights, page 15; GN22878, The Great American Experiment,  
19 page 20; GN22884, Mercy Otis Warren Radio Drama, page 21;  
20 and GN22927, The Living Constitution, page 25.

21 With regard to The Living Constitution, a  
22 portion of the pilot show was viewed by the Committee.  
23 The Committee agreed with the panel and staff criticism  
24 of the film and concluded that support for additional  
25 programs is not justified.

GN22906, Visions of Social Order, page 6, requests

1  
2 funds for two one hour discussion shows, one on John  
3 Locke and the other on Karl Marx.

4 The Committee noted that the content was well-  
5 conceived but that the proposal was criticized for failing  
6 to provide an interesting and engaging treatment for film.

7 Since the Locke program in particular was found  
8 to be especially thoughtful, the Committee concluded that  
9 this show should be produced before support for the other  
10 programs in this series could be considered. A recommendation  
11 for funding, however, is on the condition that a revised  
12 script on Locke be reviewed by the Endowment before funds  
13 for the production are released.

14 I call your attention to two other projects  
15 recommended for funding which we believe have great  
16 potential, GN22769, The Civil War, page one of the motion,  
17 which is a major five-hour, five-part series produced by  
18 Ken Burns who, you may recall, did Huey Long and the  
19 Brooklyn Bridge.

20 Finally, we support -- we offer support for a  
21 major eight-part series on archeology, GN22833, New  
22 Directions in Archeology. We look forward to an interesting  
23 and high quality series of educational programs.

24 In libraries the Committee received 46  
25 applications, 12 of which were recommended for funding by  
the staff. The Committee gave special attention to a

1  
2 proposal from the Peninsula Library System in California,  
3 GL 20733, page 31 of the motion, to support planning for  
4 a reading and discussion series on the Vietnam War.

5 The Committee approved of the way in which the  
6 war, in general, would be comparative of the veteran  
7 experience reading and discussing selected works of  
8 literature. They therefore concurred with the recommendation  
9 of the staff to fund.

10 The Committee next turned its attention to 38  
11 applications in Public Humanities Projects, of which six  
12 were recommended by the staff.

13 Special attention was given to the application  
14 from the Chautauqua Society, GP21320, page 40, which the  
15 staff recommended against. After a discussion the Committee  
16 sustained the staff recommendation.

17 This meeting of the National Council marks the  
18 last cycle of the Youth Projects Program. We considered  
19 35 applications of which staff recommended six. The  
20 Committee, again, sustained all of the staff recommendations  
21 but there was extended discussion on one application from  
22 the State University of New York at Plattsburg, GZ2296,  
23 page 46.

24 The applicant proposes to conduct a summer  
25 project on the subject of family history. The members of  
the Committee questioned whether this approach would give

1  
2 participants an adequate introduction into historical  
3 methodology.

4 The Committee split with two members in favor  
5 of the recommendation to fund this project and two opposed.  
6 In accordance with agency policy a tie vote sustains the  
7 staff recommendation.

8 Finally, the Committee considered 18 projects  
9 presented by the Office of the Bicentennial, of which six  
10 were recommended by staff. Although the Committee accepted  
11 the staff's recommendations, the question was raised  
12 about the propriety of Endowment support for an application  
13 for a public research syndicate, GV20109, page one.

14 The applicant seeks renewed funding from the  
15 Endowment for syndication services which brief articles  
16 on the Constitution are distributed to newspapers around  
17 the country. Members of the Committee questioned whether  
18 this might be an essentially journalistic service involving  
19 the agency too closely in contemporary political debate.

20 After seeing a list of the scholars and public  
21 figures who have contributed to this series the Committee,  
22 again, sustained the staff recommendation. That concludes  
23 my report.

24 MR. KINGSTON: Other comments, or are there  
25 comments or questions? Rita.

MS. RICARDO-CAMPBELL: I would like to be recorded

1  
2 as abstaining on page 27, GN22942, the Philippine project,  
3 because I know Claude Buss of Stanford University and I  
4 felt I should.

5 The other one is a general comment and it is  
6 not specific to the application which concerned the  
7 Pacific rim and basin. It was not, I don't think, well  
8 thought out, I concur, by the panel and so forth. I do  
9 think since I have been here on this Council nothing on  
10 Hawaii and the Pacific rim has been really discussed. I  
11 may be wrong, but the general feeling in my mind is we  
12 should at least look to the fact that the United States  
13 has got the West Coast, that the growing international  
14 trade problems, which are very extensive, are concerned  
15 with the Pacific rim and that basically we might put the  
16 word out that we are interested in research projects of  
17 that nature.

18 The project of Hawaii public television, Ring  
19 of Fire, the Pacific Rim, it didn't appear to be a well  
20 thought out project. But, just the same, I think it  
21 raised in my mind why aren't we ever seeing things along  
22 that line and this is just a general statement.

23 MR. KINGSTON: Other comments or questions?  
24  
25 Walter.

MR. BERNIS: Let me say a few more words about  
that John Locke thought (?) because I cannot imagine anyone

1  
2 whose life lends itself less to its film. And I say that  
3 as an admirer of John Locke.

4 MS. RICARDO-CAMPBELL: I agree.

5 MR. BERNS: I mean his colleagues over in  
6 Amsterdam and so forth are plotting to overthrow thrones  
7 and in the process lose their heads. Locke stays away  
8 from that sort of stuff altogether. He writes a letter  
9 on toleration. He founds the Bank of England.

10 (Laughter.)

11 MR. BERNS: He is concerned with money. And of  
12 all of the political philosophers that I have ever read  
13 he is the least erotic.

14 (Laughter.)

15 MR. KINGSTON: Kathleen.

16 MS. KILPATRICK: It was an interesting situation.  
17 Actually the scholars on the panel all rated that script  
18 excellent.

19 The media people, though, were very disappointing.

20 (Laughter.)

21 MS. KILPATRICK: What we are recommending is  
22 that they go ahead but that the script be retreated, be  
23 reworked, to make for a more interesting presentation on  
24 television. It is very informative. You know, the  
25 scholarly level is wonderful and we think that they could  
do it with a retreatment. I am sorry.

1  
2 MR. BERNS: Louise said get Robert Redford to  
3 play Locke.

4 (Laughter.)

5 MR. KINGSTON: Ellis.

6 MR. SANDOZ: I would suggest you get Maurice  
7 Cranston as an advisor on this because he knows all the  
8 dirt on John Locke.

9 (Laughter.)

10 MR. SANDOZ: And can liven this up in a fashion  
11 that might even interest Walter Berns. Locke, pretended  
12 to be a sort of quiet fellow but actually he was writing  
13 in code and using invisible ink. And he thought that his  
14 fate might be the same as old Phil Sidney's (?) had been.  
15 And he, instead of pulling together the glorious revolution  
16 actually formated (?) a revolution. So there really is a  
17 little drama there and Cranston knows all of this.

18 MS. KILPATRICK: Cranston is involved in the  
19 project.

20 MR. SANDOZ: Good.

21 MR. KINGSTON: Other comments or questions. Bill.

22 MR. ALLEN: I can't resist making a comment  
23 that I made occasionally when I served on the General  
24 Committee, that it strikes me our media program makes a  
25 mistake if we go too far in the direction of assuming  
that the films are supposed to be rivals to Hollywood.

1  
2 I think there is such a thing as effective  
3 media, which conveys the things we are concerned with and  
4 will be appreciated by the public without Louise signing  
5 up Robert Redford.

6 And while I tend to think about Locke in a way  
7 that Walter does, I am mindful of the highly successful  
8 film on Adam Smith, whom I regard as only slightly more  
9 erotic.

10 (Laughter.)

11 MR. KINGSTON: Other comments.

12 MS. RHOME: Well, we have to keep this in  
13 perspective because --

14 (Laughter.)

15 MS. RHOME: -- Walter described what he said was  
16 a very unspirited meeting in which he then told us about  
17 discussions in which people argued hither and con, back  
18 and forth, he even had to leave the room and as a  
19 consequence his non-spirited committee meeting made ours  
20 sound like dullsville.

21 (Laughter.)

22 MR. KINGSTON: All those in favor of the motion.

23 (A chorus of ayes was heard.)

24 MR. KINGSTON: Opposed.

25 (No response.)

MR. KINGSTON: The motion passes.

Report from the State Committees. Jeff Hart.

STATE PROGRAMS

MR. HART: Thank you. We apologize for not having anything as lurid as John Locke to bring before you.

(Laughter.)

MR. HART: Most of our closed session was taken up with a state-by-state discussion of the biennial proposals from the State Councils Program Offices offering comments and interpretations.

Merit awards of \$50,000 were approved for eight states, eight State Councils; Alabama, California, Louisiana, Maryland, Montana, Texas, Utah and Vermont.

An increase of \$15,000 is proposed for the Puerto Rican Humanities Council. This is to pay for the translation of selected and very high quality visual material now available only in spanish.

The interim state progress reports were considered and approved. The motion for action is before you.

MR. KINGSTON: Comments or questions? Louise.

MS. KERR: This means that you are now on a cycle where all states are --

MR. HART: No. About half the states were up this time and the others submitted progress reports.

MR. KINGSTON: Other comments or questions

EBERLIN REPORTING SERVICE

1  
2 about the State Report?

3 (No response.)

4 MR. KINGSTON: All those in favor of the motion.

5 (A chorus of ayes was heard.)

6 MR. KINGSTON: Opposed.

7 (No response.)

8 MR. KINGSTON: That motion passes.

9 Is there any other business to bring forward in  
10 the closed session of the Council? Phil.

11 MR. SCHAEFFER: I just wanted to say that since  
12 this may be my last meeting, I just want to make a comment.

13 I want to first congratulate the new Chairman  
14 and wish her a prosperous tenure. And also say to my  
15 friend Mr. Agresto that I will be lobbying the Democrats  
16 on your behalf for your hearing next week, any of the  
17 Democrats I know.

18 Commenting on your report, Madame Chairman, I  
19 just want to say that I like the idea of an access person.  
20 But the access person should not, I suggest, just go into  
21 areas where there has been little access to the humanities,  
22 but should go into areas where there has been great access  
23 to the humanities and where grants are almost taken  
24 for granted.

25 In the last meeting we discovered that the  
University of California, under the overall tutelage of

EBERLIN REPORTING SERVICE

1  
2 Bill Hoenig, who has brought innovation to California,  
3 had two proposals rejected because they were not prepared  
4 in the appropriate manner. So I think that the outreach  
5 should be general.

6 And, again, I just want to extend my best wishes  
7 to you and already I have seen the effects of your good  
8 work, bringing water to a dry meeting.

9 (Laughter.)

10 MR. SCHAEFFER: I hope that the rest of your  
11 initiatives will be met with enormous success and that  
12 your tenure and service as Chairman of the National  
13 Endowment for the Humanities will be met with a major and  
14 positive chain reaction.

15 (Applause.)

16 MS. CHENEY: Thank you.

17 MR. KINGSTON: Louise.

18 MS. KERR: This is the fourth last meeting that  
19 I have attended.

20 (Laughter.)

21 MS. KERR: And it will be the very last. And I  
22 would like to join in wishing farewell. I am very sure I  
23 will retract the next time I am back. A farewell to all  
24 here, particularly the staff. I have been on virtually  
25 every committee and have been in contact with most of the  
staff members and I think that that is one of the sources

1  
2 that you should be very pleased to call upon. I too have  
3 been very happy with some of the changes that I can  
4 already see. I personally want to congratulate you.

5 I would also like to make a particular comment  
6 on access and it is related to some of the information  
7 that we have received for this meeting about the numbers  
8 of applications in particular Divisions.

9 It seems to me that you might very well want to  
10 consider asking that officer, whoever it might be, not  
11 only to describe the programs and make available information  
12 about how to apply, but find ways of reaching down further  
13 into that trough.

14 It seems to me, for example, that there may be  
15 a limit to the number of high school teachers at this  
16 point who will be applying to Summer Seminars if the  
17 experience in my town is an example. We have an excellent  
18 high school, we have excellent teachers, but there is a  
19 limit below which teachers will apply without some further  
20 mechanism for getting them to us.

21 So you churn that later, three or four times,  
22 the numbers are going to diminish. I suspect that may be  
23 true in this kind of program development that we have  
24 been engaged in for the last four years.

25 There is a certain clientele that is readily  
available and below that level of clientele there is going

EBERLIN REPORTING SERVICE

1  
2 to have to be a great deal of cultivation.

3 This officer might find ways in all Divisions  
4 and through the Divisions to find out whether or not that  
5 is a fact and how to break that barrier. With that I  
6 would like to say thank you and congratulations and thanks  
7 to everybody.

8 (Applause.)

9 MR. KINGSTON: There being no other comments I  
10 will entertain a motion to adjourn.

11 MR. : So moved.

12 MR. KINGSTON: All in favor.

13 (A chorus of ayes was heard.)

14 (Whereupon, at 11:20 a.m. the meeting was  
15 adjourned.)  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25