

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

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

considered.

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

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

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

EBERLIN REPORTING SERVICE

real beauty, real sweetness and real light."

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

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

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

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

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

EBERLIN REPORTING SERVICE

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

EBERLIN REPORTING SERVICE

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

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

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

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

Some of the scholars with whom we consulted have

EBERLIN REPORTING SERVICE

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

EBERLIN REPORTING SERVICE

the historical events that have shaped our culture.

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

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

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

(Applause.)

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

EBERLIN REPORTING SERVICE

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

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

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

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

APPLICATIONS REPORT AND MATCHING REPORT

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

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

EBERLIN REPORTING SERVICE

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

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

EBERLIN REPORTING SERVICE

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

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

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

Are there any questions or comments about that? Frances?

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

MR. KINGSTON: Other comments or questions?

EBERLIN REPORTING SERVICE

(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,

EBERLIN REPORTING SERVICE

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

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

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

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

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

yesterday.

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

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

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

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

EBERLIN REPORTING SERVICE

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

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

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

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

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

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

EBERLIN REPORTING SERVICE

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

(Laughter.)

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

(Laughter.)

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

(Applause.)

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

(No response.)

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

DIVISION OF EDUCATION PROGRAMS

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

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

EBERLIN REPORTING SERVICE

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

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

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

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

In response to a question about whether the current

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

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

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

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

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

MR. KING: Comments or questions about the report.

(No response.)

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

DIVISION OF FELLOWSHIP PROGRAMS

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

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

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

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

Having completed an extensive review of the 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

the (inaudible) when we subsidize publication cost books.

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

(Laughter.)

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

MR. KINGSTON: Any comments or questions?

(No response.)

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

DIVISION OF RESEARCH PROGRAMS

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

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

Marcella Grendler is leaving us to become the

EBERLIN REPORTING SERVICE

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

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

(Laughter.)

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

(Laughter.)

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

(Laughter.)

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

DIVISION OF STATE PROGRAMS

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

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

EBERLIN REPORTING SERVICE

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

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

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

Memoranda from Mr. Kingston were read and discussed.

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

(Laughter.)

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

(No response.)

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

OFFICE OF CHALLENGE GRANTS

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

EBERLIN REPORTING SERVICE

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

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

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

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

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

EBERLIN REPORTING SERVICE

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

EBERLIN REPORTING SERVICE

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.

EBERLIN REPORTING SERVICE

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

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

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

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

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

MR. KINGSTON: About 10 years.

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

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

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

of thing without knowing where the money is going.

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

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

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

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

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

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

MRS. RICARDO-CAMPBELL: Thank you very much.

MR. KINGSTON: Yes.

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

EBERLIN REPORTING SERVICE

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

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

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

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

(No response.)

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

EMERGENCY GRANTS AND ACTIONS DEPARTING
FROM COUNCIL RECOMMENDATION - APPROVALS

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

EBERLIN REPORTING SERVICE

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

MR. KINGSTON: Would you comment?

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

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

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

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

(No response.)

EBERLIN REPORTING SERVICE

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

MR. KINGSTON: It had been recommended.

MS. KERR: What was the rating on that?

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

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

MR. KINGSTON: We can --

MR. GRIEST: I will get it.

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

EBERLIN REPORTING SERVICE

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

EBERLIN REPORTING SERVICE

MS. RHOME: I am on a different one.

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

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

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

MS. KERR: That is what you would say?

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

MR. KINGSTON: Frances, you had a question?

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Other comments or questions?

(No response.)

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

FISCAL YEAR 1988 BUDGET PLANNING

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

EBERLIN REPORTING SERVICE

an exciting summer with that.

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

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

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

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

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

EBERLIN REPORTING SERVICE

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

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

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

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

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

EBERLIN REPORTING SERVICE

deficit level. Does everyone have that straight?

(Laughter.)

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

(Laughter.)

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

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

As Mrs. Cheney said earlier today, one of the

EBERLIN REPORTING SERVICE

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

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

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

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

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

We would also like to do some media projects in

Education if possible.

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

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

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

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

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

EBERLIN REPORTING SERVICE

is also going to be a little more expensive.

Any questions?

MR. KINGSTON: Comments or questions? George?

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

MR. KINGSTON: Yes.

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

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

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

EBERLIN REPORTING SERVICE

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

EBERLIN REPORTING SERVICE

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

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

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

MR. KINGSTON: Other comments or questions? Ellis.

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

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

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

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

EBERLIN REPORTING SERVICE

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

MR. KINGSTON: Other comments or questions?

(No response.)

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

DIVISION OF EDUCATION PROGRAMS

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

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

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

EBERLIN REPORTING SERVICE

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

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

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

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

The Council Committee, in its deliberations on 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.

EBERLIN REPORTING SERVICE

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

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

MR. KINGSTON: Any questions or comments?

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

MR. ALLEN: That is Shaw University.

MS. CRESIMORE: Shaw University on page one.

My main concern relates to alleged financial irregularities on the part of the institution involved that may involve other governmental agencies such as the

EBERLIN REPORTING SERVICE

Department of Education and Internal Revenue Service.

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

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

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

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

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

MR. KINGSTON: This has been discussed from time

EBERLIN REPORTING SERVICE

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.

EBERLIN REPORTING SERVICE

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

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

Louise.

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

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

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

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

EBERLIN REPORTING SERVICE

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

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

MS. KERR: But our policy is what?

MR. KINGSTON: Our policy in regard to institutions?

MS. KERR: Individuals.

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

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

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

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

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

EBERLIN REPORTING SERVICE

policy we have. That was just a clarification.

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

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

MS. KERR: I thought it was --

MS. MENKE: It may have been.

MR. SANDOZ: Tom.

MR. KINGSTON: Ellis and then Bill.

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

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

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

This is a project whose entire meaning and

EBERLIN REPORTING SERVICE

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

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

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

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

(A chorus of Ayes was heard.)

MR. KINGSTON: Any opposed?

(No response.)

MR. KINGSTON: The motion carries.

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

EBERLIN REPORTING SERVICE

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.

EBERLIN REPORTING SERVICE

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

25 EBERLIN REPORTING SERVICE

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.)

EBERLIN REPORTING SERVICE

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

(A chorus of ayes was heard.)

MR. KINGSTON: Opposed.

(No response.)

MR. KINGSTON: That motion passes.

We move on to the action of the Preservation
Committee.

PRESERVATION GRANTS

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

MR. KINGSTON: Second?

MR. : Second.

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

(No response.)

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

(A chorus of ayes was heard.)

MR. KINGSTON: Opposed.

(No response.)

MR. KINGSTON: That motion carries.

EBERLIN REPORTING SERVICE

Report from the Committee for Research Programs.
Walter.

RESEARCH PROGRAMS

MR. BERNES: 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

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

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

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

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

MR. SANDOZ: Now?

(Laughter.)

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

EBERLIN REPORTING SERVICE

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

EBERLIN REPORTING SERVICE

purposes of this discussion.

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

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

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

(Laughter.)

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

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

EBERLIN REPORTING SERVICE

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

EBERLIN REPORTING SERVICE

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

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

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

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

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

EBERLIN REPORTING SERVICE

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

MR. BERNES: Let me add something else.

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

MR. SANDOZ: Techniques, syntax.

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

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

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

EBERLIN REPORTING SERVICE

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

(Laughter.)

MR. SANDOZ: That is my whole point.

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

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

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

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

EBERLIN REPORTING SERVICE

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

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

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

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

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

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

humanities.

The other item that --

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

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

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

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

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

EBERLIN REPORTING SERVICE

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.

EBERLIN REPORTING SERVICE

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

MS. KILPATRICK: Yes.

GENERAL PROGRAMS

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

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

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

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

EBERLIN REPORTING SERVICE

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

GN22906, Visions of Social Order, page 6, requests

EBERLIN REPORTING SERVICE

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

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

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

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

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

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

EBERLIN REPORTING SERVICE

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

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

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

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

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

The applicant proposes to conduct a summer 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

EBERLIN REPORTING SERVICE

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

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

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

MR. KINGSTON: Other comments or questions?
Walter.

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

EBERLIN REPORTING SERVICE

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

MS. RICARDO-CAMPBELL: I agree.

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

(Laughter.)

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

(Laughter.)

MR. KINGSTON: Kathleen.

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

The media people, though, were very disappointing.

(Laughter.)

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

EBERLIN REPORTING SERVICE

MR. BERNES: Louise said get Robert Redford to play Locke.

(Laughter.)

MR. KINGSTON: Ellis.

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

(Laughter.)

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

MS. KILPATRICK: Cranston is involved in the project.

MR. SANDOZ: Good.

MR. KINGSTON: Other comments or questions. Bill.

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

EBERLIN REPORTING SERVICE

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

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

(Laughter.)

MR. KINGSTON: Other comments.

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

(Laughter.)

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

(Laughter.)

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

(A chorus of ayes was heard.)

MR. KINGSTON: Opposed.

(No response.)

MR. KINGSTON: The motion passes.

EBERLIN REPORTING SERVICE

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

about the State Report?

(No response.)

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

(A chorus of ayes was heard.)

MR. KINGSTON: Opposed.

(No response.)

MR. KINGSTON: That motion passes.

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

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

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

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

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

EBERLIN REPORTING SERVICE

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

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

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

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

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

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

EBERLIN REPORTING SERVICE

to have to be a great deal of cultivation.

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

(Applause.)

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

MR. : So moved.

MR. KINGSTON: All in favor.

(A chorus of ayes was heard.)

(Whereupon, at 11:20 a.m. the meeting was adjourned.)