

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

NATIONAL ENDOWMENT FOR THE HUMANITIES

- - - -

76TH SESSION

- - - -

COUNCIL ROOM M-09
1ST FLOOR

- - - -

Friday, May 10, 1985

Old Post Office Building
Washington, D.C. 20506

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

C O N T E N T S

	<u>Page</u>
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	
Introductory Remarks - Mr. Agresto	3
Introduction of New Staff - Mr. Kingston	6
Contracts Awarded in the Previous Quarter - Mr. Kingston	7
Dates of Future Council Meetings - Mr. Kingston	7
Application Report and Gifts and Matching Report - Mr. Cherrington	10
Status of Fiscal Year 1985 Program Funds - Mr. Cherrington	12
FY 1986 Appropriation Request and Reauthoriza- tion - Mr. Cherrington	13
Research Programs/Preservation Program - Mr. Berns	18
Education Programs - Mr. Dille	30
State Programs - Ms. Rhome	31
General Programs - Mr. Ritcheson	31
Fellowship Programs - Ms. Himmelfarb	34
Challenge Grants - Mr. Cohn	35
Emergency Grants and Actions Departing from Council Recommendation - Mr. Kingston	37
Research Programs - Mr. Berns	45
Education Programs - Mr. Dille	56
State Programs - Ms. Rhome	68
General Programs - Mr. Ritcheson	74
Fellowship Programs - Ms. Himmelfarb	80
Challenge Grants - Mr. Cohn	81

P R O C E E D I N G S

1
2 MR. KINGSTON: I would like to begin. I would
3 like to welcome you to the 76th session of the National
4 Council, the meeting of the National Council. We will open
5 with a discussion of the minutes. You have received a draft
6 copy. I would like to note one correction now and will
7 entertain any others that you have spotted. The Vice-
8 Chairman of the Council, George Kennedy, announced the results,
9 in closed session, of the Jefferson Lecture election for
10 1986. The minutes have it listed that I announced and that
11 is not so. Are there other corrections to note in the
12 minutes? If not, may I have a motion for their approval?

13 MR. : So moved.

14 MR. KINGSTON: The minutes are passed. I will
15 turn the microphone over to Mr. Agresto. Before I do that,
16 would all of you be very careful not to move the small micro-
17 phones. They are connected with the stenographic equipment
18 and the recorder. But, of course, if you will address your-
19 selves to the large microphones, those are the ones that
20 are amplified.

INTRODUCTORY REMARKS

21
22 MR. AGRESTO: I have no long speeches for this
23 morning, just a few details, but all of them important.
24 First, I would like to introduce to members of the staff --
25 I introduced yesterday to members of Council -- Mr. George

1 Hart. Could you stand, George? George has been nominated
2 by the President to take Jack Neusner's place on our Council.
3 He is yet to be confirmed by the Senate, but I have invited
4 him to come to this meeting today to attend and to stay for
5 the whole day.

6 Mr. Hart is a trustee of Boston University. He is
7 a trustee of the San Francisco Fine Arts Museum Foundation.
8 He is on the Board of Overseers of the Museum of Fine Arts
9 in Boston. I think he has been on that for about 35 years.
10 He was on the Board of Trustees of the California State
11 University System from 1962 to 1974. He has a degree from
12 Stanford and a law degree from the University of San Fran-
13 cisco. Thank you, George.

14 Also, for Council members, I would like Shirley
15 Blaney to stand. Shirley Blaney is sitting where Serissa
16 used to sit and doing what Serissa would do for us. She
17 works in the general counsel's office. She is the person
18 who will solve all your problems all the time.

19 I have to announce with sadness that Bruce Carnes
20 has been taken from us and has gone to browner pastures in
21 the Department of Education. We are conducting -- we will
22 soon be conducting a search to find a replacement for Bruce.
23 That is a difficult job, to replace Bruce. In the meanwhile,
24 Steve Cherrington is our acting Bruce Carnes. This is
25 Steve on my left here.

1 I will say a few words about the progress of the
2 nomination of Ed Curran. Ed Curran, as you know, was
3 nominated by the President to be Chairman of the Council,
4 Chairman of the Endowment. We are all acting up here, as
5 you know. We expect that his nomination will go before the
6 Senate within a month or thereabouts; therefore, I fully
7 expect that this will be the last Council meeting that I
8 will be chairing. I expect to see Mr. Curran here by the
9 next Council meeting for sure.

10 We had some discussion last time about the preserva-
11 tion initiative that has gotten off to a spectacular start,
12 not only in the work it does, but in the public's eye and
13 in the public press. The initiative was highlighted in U.S.
14 News and World Report. Harold Cannon had a six-minute slot
15 in the first third of National Public Radio's "All Things
16 Considered". We were on the AP wire. We made The New York
17 Times. We did fine.

18 MR. RITCHESON: (Inaudible.)

19 MR. AGRESTO: You don't know how many nasty letters
20 I got because of that, Charles. I really got some very
21 viscious letters. Speaking of saving books and saving other
22 things, the Research Division has a display in the back.
23 Some of you may have seen it at coffee break. Those who
24 haven't seen it really should. Walter Berns asked the Research
25 Division is they could put together a little exhibition of

1 the kinds of work they have funded in that program and they
2 did. They put together a nice exhibition describing the
3 work of the division. It is a cross-section of research
4 grants on one theme. The title of it is "A Nascent Nation".
5 I said it right with all those s's, "A Nascent Nation".
6 It is on early America. Gene Sterud (?) coordinated the
7 contributions to the exhibit, and I think everyone really
8 should take a look at it if you haven't seen it already.

9 I also expect -- I am ending right now -- I also
10 expect this to be a very short meeting. If you will look
11 at your agenda, it says we will end at 12:41. That is the
12 kind of exactitude I like, or even like to be -- let's strive.

13 INTRODUCTION OF NEW STAFF

14 MR. KINGSTON: Thank you, John. There are other
15 staff members who are new to the Endowment, or returning
16 to the Endowment. Three of them are listed in your folder.
17 I would like to have them stand and at least have you
18 recognize them.

19 Noel Milan has joined the Endowment. There is
20 Noel back there. Noel will be working with our Public
21 Affairs Office as a media relations officer. Bill Poole
22 has just come to the Endowment. Bill is back here. He will
23 be working with the Deputy Chairman's Office, more specifically,
24 with John, as a special assistant and researcher. Ken
25 Wood is not here this morning. Ken has returned to the

1 Endowment. As all good auditors, Ken has found something
2 major to sink his teeth into, I understand, this morning.

3 CONTRACTS AWARDED IN THE PREVIOUS QUARTER

4 MR. KINGSTON: I am allowed one minute to talk
5 about contracts awarded in the last quarter. I have been
6 known to go on much longer about nothing, but there are no
7 contracts for the last quarter. This is simply to acknow-
8 ledge the fact.

9 DATES OF FUTURE COUNCIL MEETINGS

10 MR. KINGSTON: You have in the Council agenda book
11 in Tab D a calendar. If you will open to that, we have pro-
12 posed a set of dates for future meetings of the Council. I
13 am sorry. It is Tab B, Tab B, not Tab D. This is the
14 meeting at which we set the 1986 schedule for Council meetings.
15 The one thing to note is that the May meeting would be May 8
16 and 9. That is a Thursday and a Friday. At this point, we
17 are planning to schedule the Jefferson Lecture for the
18 Thursday evening, May 8, available on space that we are
19 presently negotiating for.

20 Is there any discussion of these dates, any problem
21 with them, or comment about them?

22 MR. SANDOZ: Tom, I would be greatly inconvenienced
23 if we could move the November meeting one week.

24 MR. KINGSTON: One week ahead or back?

25 MR. SANDOZ: Forward, preferably.

1 MR. KINGSTON: I think one week forward runs into
2 the Arts Endowment.

3 MR. SANDOZ: Or back.

4 MR. AGRESTO: Back puts it in October and that
5 really is awful early.

6 MR. KINGSTON: Steve, do you know when the NEA
7 Council is? We couldn't move it ---

8 MR. AGRESTO: We could do November 13 and 14.

9 MR. SANDOZ: 13, 14 is what I was thinking about.

10 MR. KINGSTON: November 13 and 14 is proposed as
11 an amendment to the schedule. Is that a problem for any one?
12 That is the week before Thanksgiving. Oh, you are right.
13 I am sorry. Frances, please.

14 MS. RHOME: Does the November 6 and 7 conflict
15 with some other event?

16 MR. SANDOZ: It conflicts with an association that
17 I am an officer of -- meeting. I would have to miss one
18 of my two meetings. I would prefer not to miss either if
19 it is not a matter of difficult to other members of Council,
20 of course.

21 MS. KERR: This may be somewhat facetious, but --
22 because most of these days I would hope and expect not to
23 have any problems. But might I remind those who would have
24 anything to say about that the terms of some of us end in
25 January, but as I understand the legislation, we may be

1 expected to go on. So, you might want to -- candidates now
2 so that the -- don't have any obligation to us -- in other
3 words ---

4 MR. KINGSTON: If there are no objections to the
5 change in that November date for 1986, we would move the
6 meeting dates from the 6th and 7th of November to the 13th
7 of 14th. Are there any objections?

8 MS. HIMMELFARB: Well, we don't know. Some of us
9 haven't looked at these dates -- haven't looked at others.
10 I don't know. Couldn't we do this by mail?

11 MR. KINGSTON: Yes. All right. Let's complete
12 the tally by mail. This is not the forum for the problem.
13 What we will do is propose the dates with the exception of
14 November going to the 13th and 14th. If that poses a
15 problem for any Council members, you will let us know by
16 mail. We will follow that through with a request.

17 MR. KENNEDY: Do you know off the top of your head
18 the August and November dates of this year?

19 MR. KINGSTON: Yes. Steve, August and November of
20 this year? The dates of the August Council this year are
21 what? August 8 and 9 this year. November 7 and 8 for this
22 year.

23 MR. : Do you want to mention the budget
24 meeting at this time?

25 MR. KINGSTON: Yes. That actually does come up

1 later, but I can certainly announce the date right now. We
2 will begin the budget review process and the Budget Committee
3 of the Council is scheduled to meet Friday, July 26, here
4 in Washington. On the Budget Committee is the Vice-Chairman
5 of the Council and chairs of respective divisional committees,
6 but, of course, any Council member is welcome to attend that
7 oversight review meeting. Steve will have more to say about
8 that when we get to that point in the agenda.

9 All right. We will simply mail out a questionnaire
10 about the dates and then confirm in terms of the results
11 that you send back to us.

12 Next item is the Application Report and Gifts and
13 Matching Report. Mr. Cherrington.

14 APPLICATION REPORT AND GIFTS AND MATCHING REPORT

15 MR. CHERRINGTON: Okay. Thank you. The Applica-
16 tion Report was sent to you earlier. It is in Tab C of your
17 agenda book. As I said at that time -- as Bruce said at that
18 time -- there are no real surprises in this report. In fact,
19 the application totals for the last two Councils in '84 --
20 the first two Councils in '84 and the first two in fiscal
21 '85 -- the application totals are practically identical.

22 A few programs are showing decreases in applica-
23 tions. Summer stipends is one. We have been noticing a
24 slight decrease in fellowship applications nationwide. In
25 other national programs, this is also occurring.

1 We have also noticed a slight decrease in the
2 participant applications in our summer seminars. We don't
3 really have an explanation for this, but it does seem to be
4 a national trend. There is also a slight decrease in appli-
5 cations to the Younger Scholars Program. We think this may
6 relate to a change in deadline. The applicants may not been
7 given enough time to prepare their applications before the
8 beginning of school. This application deadline will be
9 changed next year and this shouldn't be a problem.

10 There are, of course, other programs who are show-
11 ing increases. Museums is up slightly at this time. By
12 the end of the year, though, this should actually even out
13 because there were three deadlines in Museums last year and
14 this year we only plan to have two. Project Research has
15 also shown a slight increase. They are going to a one-year
16 deadline in the archaeology area, and they had a special
17 October deadline for renewals.

18 Men in Science and Technology also is showing a
19 slight increase. We now run our own program in this. We
20 used to only have a program with the National Science Founda-
21 tion. Now, we also have our own program there too. That is
22 up slightly as well. Are there any questions?

23 MR. KINGSTON: The next item, I think you will find
24 the material in your folder. It is the Status of Fiscal
25 Year 1985 Program Funds.

1 MR. CHERRINGTON: Can I finish the GM Report?

2 MR. KINGSTON: I am sorry.

3 MR. CHERRINGTON: The next item is the GM Report.

4 Matching is way up. It is almost rather remarkable. As
5 you can see from this memo I wrote, the number of gifts
6 received, actually the amount of gifts received, is up 74
7 per cent this year. Matching funds released are up 63 per
8 cent and offers still open are also up 23 per cent.

9 The biggest increase is in the General Programs
10 area. I think Don Gibson should be congratulated here. He
11 has really been out beating the bushes for matching funds.
12 Matching is up so significantly that in 1986 we are asking
13 for a record high of matching funds for the Agency at
14 11-1/2 million. This is a magnificent trend. We would like
15 to put every project on a matching basis if we could, and
16 this is something we like to see.

17 MR. KINGSTON: Questions or comments about the
18 matching report? Now, the status of fiscal funds.

19 STATUS OF FISCAL YEAR 1985 PROGRAM FUNDS

20 MR. CHERRINGTON: We are getting into a monologue
21 here. The status of program funds -- everything is going
22 well. Everything should be obligated on schedule. We don't
23 anticipate any reprogramming requests to Congress and obliga-
24 tions should occur on schedule. In fact, we are almost
25 exactly 60 per cent of the way through the fiscal year, and

1 we have obligated almost exactly 60 per cent of the program
2 funds available.

3 MR. KINGSTON: Questions or comments on that score?
4 All right. The appropriation request and the reauthoriza-
5 tion.

6 FY 1986 APPROPRIATION REQUEST AND REAUTHORIZATION

7 MR. CHERRINGTON: This has also been a month for
8 hearings. We have had three ---

9 MR. KINGSTON: Let me interrupt for just a second,
10 Steve. You have material for this as well in the folder.

11 MR. CHERRINGTON: First of all, I would like to
12 congratulate John Agresto. He is doing very well in this
13 area. He has had three hearings, and he has done beautifully,
14 a real pro at this. So far, we have had the Senate Appropria-
15 tions hearing; we have had the House Appropriations hearing;
16 and we have had a House Authorization hearing. The Senate
17 Authorization hearing has yet to be scheduled.

18 The Senate Authorization hearing was chaired by
19 Senator McClure of Idaho. Dale Bumpers was in there for a
20 while. The main issues: we discussed our request to have
21 new construction authority in our Challenge Grant Program.
22 This is something we had previously, but we believe, due
23 to an oversight either by OMB or Congress, this was tech-
24 nically taken from us and we are trying to reestablish this
25 now.

1 The funding in our Museums Program and our State
2 Programs were also discussed briefly. They brought up how
3 we monitor the pledges of our gifts. Several years ago,
4 the authorizing committee gave us the authority to match
5 certifications of gifts, and they were thinking of that a
6 little bit more since we have come back to them. They also
7 discussed our policy of awarding second-time challenge grants,
8 and Senator Bumpers came to discuss a bill that he has intro-
9 duced to begin a program something like our Summer Seminars
10 Program, and it wasn't really going anywhere, but he came
11 to give support for our own Summer Seminars Program.

12 Next, we had a House Appropriations hearing. This
13 was chaired by Representative Yates of Illinois. Congress-
14 man Regula was also in attendance. Items discussed there:
15 we discussed our policy of supporting all excellent proposals
16 at the Endowment. We discussed our panel system. Congress-
17 man Regula was concerned about the funding given to particu-
18 lar states, and of course, he was concerned about Ohio.

19 We also discussed the NEH contract policy. They
20 also brought up our preservation initiative, our success
21 in arranging private funds for media projects. All the
22 Division Directors also were asked to talk about the budget
23 for their division next year.

24 The final hearing we had is the House Reauthoriza-
25 tion hearing. This was chaired by Congressman Pat Dance (?)

1 of Montana. Also in attendance were Congressmen Bartlett
2 from Texas, Coleman from Missouri, Owens from New York,
3 and Penny from Minnesota. The main item of discussion there
4 was the length of our reauthorization. We had wanted the
5 normal five-year authorization, but Mr. Williams would like
6 this to be one year. The reason here is -- there was some
7 jockeying among the congressmen to determine the jurisdiction
8 -- the committee that would actually handle this hearing.
9 In fact, our hearing was a joint committee meeting between
10 the House Select Education Committee and the House Post
11 Secondary Committee.

12 He said that he only will have about two weeks
13 to put together a bill, so he was hoping to do a temporary
14 one-year reauthorization this year so he would have a longer
15 period to conduct full hearings leading to a five-year
16 authorization. We would actually like a five-year period
17 and so did the National Humanities Alliance and other people
18 in attendance, but it does look like it will be a one-year
19 temporary authorization.

20 Other items discussed: Congressman Bartlett, I
21 believe, wanted to know if it would be beneficial to increase
22 our matching ratio requirements here. There was a great
23 discussion of our peer review system and also the item of
24 new construction.

25 Again, the last thing we anticipate is the Senate

1 Reauthorization hearing, which has not been scheduled.

2 MR. KINGSTON: Any questions? Louise.

3 MS. KERR: Could you tell us a little bit more
4 about the Subcommittee questions that you are preparing
5 written responses for. Is that extensive?

6 MR. CHERRINGTON: Not particularly. There were
7 some items that I think they wanted to get to that they
8 couldn't because the Arts Committee hearing lasted so long.
9 I think we were supposed to get off at about eleven o'clock
10 and we didn't actually talk until about one.

11 MR. : One or two.

12 MS. KERR: What kinds of questions were they?

13 MR. CHERRINGTON: Just further questions about
14 our construction authority. Nothing out of the ordinary.

15 MS. KERR: From Yates?

16 MR. CHERRINGTON: Oh, from Yates? Again, one of
17 the main questions we had from Mr. Yates related to the
18 funding of applications from various states. They wanted a
19 break-down of how many applications submitted and the various
20 funding ratios there.

21 MR. KINGSTON: Other questions about the various
22 hearings?

23 MR. CHERRINGTON: The final thing I have to say --
24 I find this impossible -- here I am in the middle of 1985
25 and I have just been talking about the '86 budget but,

1 believe it or not, it is time to plan the '87 budget. In
2 your folder, there is a memo discussing this and a brief
3 outline of the schedule. This spring, early summer, we will
4 be having discussions within the Endowment concerning
5 priorities and initiatives we would like to do in '87. The
6 budget will go to OMB in September. Next January and
7 February, we will send the budget to Congress; hearings will
8 be held in the spring, and late summer, early fall, we hope
9 to get our appropriation but that usually doesn't happen.

10 One of the highlights for all of you is the
11 Council Budget Committee meeting. As Tom said, this will
12 be held on July 26 from 10:00 to 3:00. The Vice-Chairman
13 of the Council and the chairmen of each Council committee
14 are members of the Council Budget Committee, but we also
15 invite any other Council member to attend this. During the
16 summer, we will be sending out some materials relating to
17 this, and we hope you will attend.

18 MR. KENNEDY: Will the 1987 budget be planned with
19 a series of different funding levels as has been done in the
20 past?

21 MR. CHERRINGTON: We will be discussing that. Yes.

22 MR. KINGSTON: Other questions about the plan for
23 fiscal '87 procedures? Very good. We will move on to the
24 reports from the various Council committees and start with
25 the report from the Research Committee, which is also doing

1 double-duty overseeing our efforts in the Office of Preserva-
2 tion. Mr. Berns.

3 RESEARCH PROGRAMS/PRESERVATION PROGRAM

4 MR. BERNs: Thank you. I should say a word about
5 the display in the other room. It actually is a consequence
6 of the kind of embarrassment that the Research Division has
7 had at past Council meetings arising out of the absence of
8 any business during the public session. Mr. Ritcheson of
9 General Programs, in two consecutive meetings, brought in
10 demonstrations of the work of that committee. And that
11 particular time, at the end of one of those sessions, I
12 asked Harold Cannon if we couldn't do something like that.
13 If this division, General Programs, was going to engage in
14 show and tell, we surely could too, and the consequences are
15 in the other room.

16 Incidentally, I should think that not only the
17 Research Division, but the Endowment as a whole, should be
18 very proud of the work that has been accomplished over the
19 years by the -- well, which is on display there.

20 This business about not having any public business
21 has to be accounted for. One would think that over the
22 years the Research Division had acquired some clients that
23 would be interested in the work of the division and would
24 show up on occasion for these public sessions. After all,
25 we have funded ASSyrian dictionaries and Hittite dictionaries.

1 and one would think that occasionally there would be some
2 Assyrians and a deputation or two of Hittites to see how we
3 do our work. That has not been the case.

4 But I am happy to report that this time we had
5 some public business. In the first place, Mr. Ekman, the
6 new head of the division -- what is your official title?

7 MR. EKMAN: Director.

8 MR. BERN: Director -- announced that in the
9 August meeting he will make some detailed proposals concern-
10 ing the reorganization of the division, the reorganization
11 in part being, but only in part, being necessitated by the
12 spinning off of Harold Cannon's preservation activities.

13 Most of the time in the public session was spent
14 yesterday concerning -- was spent on the question of EVIST
15 programs. EVIST being the acronym Ethics and Values in
16 Science and Technology. This was discussed at some length.
17 There is no funding in the 1986 budget for this, and my own
18 personal reaction, having read a memorandum on this subject,
19 was that all right, let's do away with it. There has been
20 some dissatisfaction with the quality of the programs,
21 particular grants being made.

22 In part, I think we all agree that one difficulty
23 with the program had to do with the fact that we at NEH
24 were merely associating ourselves with programs that were
25 designed primarily by the National Science Foundation and

1 that there was something inadequate about this. But members
2 of Council did express a dissatisfaction with the idea of
3 putting an end to this sort of program altogether. There
4 was a strong feeling that something should be done, some
5 study should be undertaken, because there are problems,
6 and it is entirely having to do with the relationship of
7 the humanities and work in the medical profession and medicine
8 and science and technology. It would be a shame if this
9 Endowment could not somehow contribute something to the
10 solution of those problems.

11 At any rate, after a rather thorough discussion
12 of this, we decided to come to Council here this morning
13 and offer a formal proposal. This is a proposal that we
14 would like Council to vote on. In the first place, we would
15 propose that the Chairman, which is to say, the acting Chair-
16 man now -- of necessity, this will have to be done in the
17 immediate future -- the acting Chairman appoint, or as the
18 British would say, Harold, strike a committee, this committee
19 composed of members of Council as well as particular staff
20 members here, to review the NEH interest and efforts in the
21 field of humanities and science, medicine, and technology.

22 The committee to explore possible new initiatives
23 and, thirdly, to consider the desirability, or feasibility,
24 of a newly defined collaboration with NSF, and this
25 committee to report to August Council.

1 The second part of the resolution: that the
2 decision regarding NEH cooperation with NSF in this EVIST
3 program be deferred until August Council. Now, I have to
4 report here that this second part of this resolution repre-
5 sents a departure from the recommendation of staff. Staff
6 was of the opinion that we already here in the Endowment,
7 and particularly in the Research Division, had enough informa-
8 tion to make a judgment with respect to the feasibility of
9 working with NSF. That, in fact, we already know that we
10 can do what we should do and what we would want to do and
11 what we will discover at the end of this committee's work
12 that should be done we can do that under the rubric of our
13 own program of humanities, science, and technology. And,
14 therefore, further delay is not feasible. That was the
15 position of the staff.

16 This proposal that I am offering here and request-
17 ing support for represents a departure from the staff recom-
18 mendation. Mr. Chairman, that is a motion that -- and I
19 would move that.

20 MR. KINGSTON: Is there a second to the motion?

21 MR. : Second.

22 MR. KINGSTON: All right.

23 MR. BERNES: Let me just say that several people here
24 want to speak on this and not simply members of the Research
25 Division. For example, we had other members yesterday from

1 the Council, members who had an interest in this and attended
2 and spoke to the issue.

3 MR. KINGSTON: Just to be clear. The zero budget
4 for the EVIST Program is in the NSF budget. It is not in
5 the NEH budget for fiscal '86. Are there comments about the
6 proposal that people would wish to make?

7 MR. SANDOZ: Point of information. Might it be
8 advantageous to not make this NSF specific? There are other
9 agencies of the government that are doing research which I
10 think ought to be perhaps brought into this inquiry. With-
11 out trying to canvas the whole Federal operation, particular-
12 ly in medicine, you have NIH.

13 One of the great problems, I think, in our activi-
14 ties, not only in the area of science and technology, but
15 in all of our activities, we are within our fairly insulated,
16 separate agencies and bureaus. We are reinventing wheels
17 which are in rather good shape elsewhere. A certain clearing-
18 house value, it would seem to me, might be served in this
19 particular area by at least saying NSF and other relevant
20 agencies.

21 MR. BERNES: That is one of the inquiries that
22 would be made by this committee if the committee is authorized
23 to do this work.

24 MR. SANDOZ: I understood it as NSF specific from
25 what you read.

1 MR. BERNES: I don't understand that to be -- the
2 committee would undertake to investigate as to this relation-
3 ship, whether it should be maintained, changed, and so forth
4 and so on. But one of the reasons it may not be maintained
5 as it is is that we would be well advised to establish rela-
6 tions with other Federal agencies. That is entirely possible.

7 MR. AGRETO: I would not understand this as NSF
8 specific.

9 MR. KINGSTON: Leon, please.

10 MR. KASS: First, I think, a point of clarification
11 on Mr. Berns' summary. I should be corrected if I am wrong.
12 I understood that the difference between Council and staff
13 concerned only the second part of our proposal, namely, that
14 we should defer action on the specific EVIST connection,
15 the proposal that we terminate that.

16 MR. BERNES: I am sorry if I wasn't clear about that.

17 MR. KASS: I think staff was quite supportive of
18 the suggestion that we take stock of all of our enterprises
19 in the area of medicine, technology, and the humanities
20 and include, in fact, the possibility of finding some other
21 collaborative ventures other than what we have now. They
22 didn't want to tie that, however, to the proposal to defer
23 consideration of terminating the EVIST relationship. Is
24 that correct?

25 MR. BERNES: Yeah.

1 MR. KASS: May I then speak to the suggestion?
2 I think, based upon the discussion paper that staff prepared
3 for the Research Committee and our own experience in reading
4 proposals in the EVIST Program, I think all of us recognize
5 the deficiencies of the present collaboration and are willing
6 to see it at an end. We also recognize and appreciate the
7 vigorous growth of proposals in the program, Humanities,
8 Science, and Technology, the research awards that we now give.

9 It may very well be that this is broadly enough
10 defined to support all of the research that we would like
11 to sponsor in this area. Nevertheless, given that this is
12 a time where we would probably want to terminate the present
13 collaboration with NSF, and given the fact that there were
14 other kinds of support that the Endowment used to give in
15 the area of the relation between humanities and science,
16 namely, the programs in Education and Fellowships and so on,
17 we felt that this would be a fruitful time to consider what
18 the Endowment's interests and concerns and possible activities
19 might be in the whole area of humanities in relation to
20 science and technology.

21 That there was some research that we might want
22 to support that could best, and perhaps only, be done in
23 collaboration with people competent in the methods and con-
24 cepts of the sciences and that there were areas outside of
25 research that we might want to support, which, in fact, I

1 suppose we do support but without flagging -- calling atten-
2 tion to that, say, in Education.

3 And that -- there is a third reason -- Mr. Berns
4 mentioned that to this point we have been attached to a
5 program designed primarily on the outside by NSF. We thought
6 that any new collaborative ventures ought to reflect our
7 own initiative and our own best thought. For these reasons,
8 we thought it a bit wise to constitute a study group really
9 of Council and staff to advise Council and the new Chairman
10 in this area.

11 We also felt, to speak to the second part of the
12 motion, that there was really nothing to be gained for the
13 Endowment by terminating this relationship right now. Also,
14 applications have been solicited for the EVIST Program, due
15 August 1, and while there may be no money to fund those
16 applications, and while those applications are at this time
17 in the cycle going to NSF, it would seem perhaps a sign of
18 bad faith if we announced the termination of our relationship
19 while we are still in the process of preparing proposals
20 on the basis of information we have jointly sent out. That
21 explains our presentation -- second part ---

22 MR. KINGSTON: Yes, Anita.

23 MS. SILVERS: I would like to thank Walter, who
24 permitted me to join his committee and discuss this. This
25 is a program that I have been familiar with from the moment

1 I joined the National Council. There is no doubt that the
2 relationship, present relationship, is defective. In fact,
3 for five and a half years, we have been trying to repair
4 that relationship.

5 The fundamental problem, as I see it, is that
6 for some reason we have never been able to exert leadership.
7 We have always followed NSF's lead. I have complete confi-
8 dence that our staff can construct a way in which we can
9 provide leadership in this area. I think that it is more
10 productive to propose an alternative relationship before
11 we terminate the current relationship than to terminate the
12 current relationship and then begin constructing a more
13 productive relationship.

14 In addition, my understanding of that relation-
15 ship -- I may be wrong -- is, although the EVIST funding as
16 a line item for a separate program has been eliminated from
17 the NSF budget, there are some funds that have been restored
18 to the NSF budget which will now be applied throughout
19 various programs in NSF. I think that we might find a
20 smoother transition and a more advantageous way of assuming
21 leadership if we propose a substitute relationship rather
22 than simply cut off the current one.

23 August -- much more quickly than we believe, and
24 I would think that by that time we could propose something
25 constructive. Nothing seems to be lost by waiting until

1 August.

2 MR. AGRESTO: Peter.

3 MR. STANLIS: I would like to comment on Anita's
4 remark on why we haven't exerted proper leadership with the
5 Science Foundation. I think we lost sight of means and ends.
6 I think that we have to keep in mind that the end product
7 of any such relationship must be humanistic and not
8 scientific. And that the staff keep that in mind also in
9 the relationship with the sciences.

10 MS. RHOME: Question.

11 MR. KINGSTON: Frances?

12 MR. AGRESTO: Let me just make one observation on
13 this. I see no reason -- I know it is advisory to me -- but
14 I see no reason we shouldn't pass this resolution unanimously.
15 I will take it as such. I think it is a good opportunity,
16 in fact, to look over not only our relationship with NSF
17 but what we ourselves do and our own priorities and our own
18 understandings of the relationship of science and technology
19 to the humanities. So, on that score, at least the first
20 part of the resolution is, I think, unexceptional.

21 The second part where the staff -- it is not just
22 the staff, in fact, and others in planning and budget and
23 elsewhere -- did have some real hesitation about continuing
24 with our relationship through the August 1 deadline. As
25 I understand it, the last deadline we had with EVIST had a

1 grand total of six applications. I don't know how many are
2 coming in this time. If we are committed to an August 1
3 deadline with them, we will keep our commitments. There is
4 absolutely no question about that. If none of the projects
5 that come in relate to us in any way, or very few come in,
6 and we can, without any ill will, pull out of it sooner than
7 August, we may be even in a better position were we to do
8 that. But we will look into that.

9 I will certainly, however -- I take it to be the
10 will of Council as well -- I will certainly, however, set
11 up a Council/staff committee to look into the matter.

12 MR. KINGSTON: Are there any other comments? The
13 proposal, in fact, is to commission a committee to investi-
14 gate the NSF/NEH relationship and to examine other possible
15 options, deferring any break in the relationship with NSF
16 until at least the August meeting of the Council so that
17 we can seek the Council's advice.

18 All those in favor of the motion, would you just
19 simply say aye, please.

20 (A chorus of ayes was heard.)

21 MR. KINGSTON: Any opposition?

22 (No response.)

23 MR. KINGSTON: The motion carries unanimously.

24 MR. BERNES: Would it be appropriate for me to
25 report the public discussion in the Preservation Committee now?

1 MR. KINGSTON: Yes, it would.

2 MR. BERNS: Well, we had a very interesting dis-
3 cussion on the guidelines that have been designed and rede-
4 signed. Besides being interested in all this and informed
5 by the discussion that we had, we were promised a final
6 set of guidelines by, when, Harold?

7 MR. CANNON: Within the next two weeks.

8 MR. BERNS: Within the next two weeks, there will
9 be some mailings, and we will comment on those rerevised
10 guidelines. They will then be printed, and we will be in
11 business.

12 MR. KINGSTON: Any other questions? Yes, Louise.

13 MS. KERR: Would it be necessary, or could you
14 take it under advisement, as to how much of the -- budget --
15 progress of this report so we can take it into account --
16 in July.

17 MR. KINGSTON: Yes. I would hope that the Chair-
18 man would be able to start meetings with that committee
19 prior to the ---

20 MR. AGRETO: If anyone would like to serve on
21 the committee -- begin this week to nominate people from
22 Council and staff for that committee.

23 MR. KINGSTON: Other comments about the Office of
24 Preservation. Mr. Dille, do you want to report, please,
25 of the proceedings from the Education Division Committee?

EDUCATION PROGRAMS

MR. DILLE: Back home at Morehouse, we try to do business as quickly as possible.

MR. KINGSTON: I knew he would get it in.

MR. DILLE: In the public session, having no business to discuss really, John Andrews reported to us on various activities of the staff and showed us the publications that show the impact that the division is having.

There are some brochures that I think I will just hand around. I call your attention especially to the one on Dickens, "In His Time", at the University of California at San Diego and Santa Cruz. The thing is set up with -- divided by chapter headings from novels published serially by Dickens. They are almost too pat though, so I suspect they have been tampered with. I recommend you also look at the Dartmouth program on Dante and the Newberry Library program on American Indian culture.

Then, we saw the "Forum for Liberal Education." The Association of American Colleges has 14 exemplary general education programs, 11 of which have been supported in some way by the Endowment.

The "Community College Humanities Review", which is edited by two staff members from the division, Don Schmeltekopf and Glen Johnson, which includes an article, entitled, "Teaching Writing and Teaching Virtue" by Eugene

1 Garver, also of the division. That ended our public dis-
2 cussion.

3 MR. KINGSTON: Any question or comments about the
4 work of the Education Committee? All right. I will ask
5 Frances Rhome if you would report on the meeting of the State
6 Programs.

7 STATE PROGRAMS

8 MS. RHOME: In the absence of Jeffrey Hart, Chair,
9 I am giving the report. In our public meeting, we did not
10 consider any new policy matters. We did hear some very fine
11 reports of some excellent programs and assistance that the
12 staff is giving towards new chairs of state councils and
13 orientation of state members. Joining us at our public
14 meeting were members from the State Federation of Councils
15 and -- President, Walter Capps.

16 MR. KINGSTON: Thank you. Questions? Mr. Ritcheson.
17 General Programs.

18 GENERAL PROGRAMS

19 MR. RITCHESON: Mr. Chairman, no issues of general
20 policy were on the agenda for this meeting of the committee.
21 We received a report from Donald Gibson, the Division's
22 Director, on four aspects of the division's activities and
23 products over the last three months.

24 The first is media projects. Two media programs
25 of note funded by the Endowment are scheduled to be broadcast

1 on PBS between now and the next meeting of Council. "Herman
2 Melville, Banned in Paradise" is a 90-minute documentary on
3 the author's life and works that has received splendid early
4 reviews, for example, on PBS. It is scheduled to air at
5 9:00 p.m. on May 15.

6 For three weeks, beginning May 27, at 9:00 p.m.,
7 the mini-series, "Three Sovereigns for Sarah" will be shown
8 on American Playhouse. This outstanding drama focuses on
9 three sisters, distinguished matrons in the community, who
10 are caught up in the Salem witch trials of 1692.

11 Then we have program notes for "The Waverly Consort".
12 The committee was pleased to see the handsome and informative
13 program notes for "The Waverly Consort". These are one of
14 the first products and efforts by Humanities Projects for
15 Adults to elicit more programming for the history, theory,
16 and criticism of the arts. To show my colleague, Walter
17 Berns, that we are still in the show and tell business, I
18 will exhibit this very handsome brochure. Eat your heart
19 out, Walter.

20 The third item we discussed was evaluation. I
21 am very happy to report on this since I have been making
22 something of a boor of myself ever since I joined the Council
23 on this particular item, as Bill Bennett would testify if
24 he were here. We learned with satisfaction of efforts on
25 three fronts that follow through on the committee's suggestion

1 to conduct evaluation of division programs. A full and
2 detailed evaluation of the first cycle of the new Younger
3 Scholars Program was distributed to the committee. Dis-
4 cussion of the program is planned for the August meeting.

5 The division has also initiated a thorough evalua-
6 tion of its grants for workshops to enhance the interpretive
7 skills of museums and historical organization personnel.
8 This evaluation will involve an expert consultant, site visits,
9 questionnaires sent to past participants in workshops, and
10 a deliberative panel at NEH.

11 Finally, in the area of media, two series, whose
12 first programs have been funded, are being evaluated. In
13 one case, through an audience survey, to investigate the
14 program's educational value. The results of these evalua-
15 tions are needed to decide on whether to fund additional
16 programs in the series in question as well as to deliberate
17 further on general policy questions posed by the high cost
18 of funding large series.

19 Finally, awards. Among a number of awards received
20 by programs funded by the division, one is worthy of special
21 note. The prestigious Peabody Award was given recently to
22 the nine-part series, "Heritage, Civilization, and the Jews".
23 Mr. Chairman, that concludes my report.

24 MR. KINGSTON: Any comments or questions? Mr.
25 Berns, you don't have a retort?

1 MR. BERNES: No.

2 MR. KINGSTON: Professor Himmelfarb, Fellowship
3 Programs.

4 FELLOWSHIP PROGRAMS

5 MS. HIMMELFARB: First of all, I must say that
6 this committee is not entering this competition in show and
7 tell. What we did do in our meeting, however, was to review
8 the programs, procedures and programs, in the division.
9 Because we had an intensive review of these programs last
10 year, we focused on some more general questions at this
11 meeting -- how to make the programs, information about the
12 programs, available to all applicants.

13 We also considered -- we reviewed the policy that
14 had been initiated during this past year, on an experimental
15 basis, of having a final staff panel review the recommendations
16 of the initial panel rather than the interdisciplinary panel
17 of outside scholars that had been used in previous years.
18 We all agreed unanimously that the previous procedure had
19 been very unsatisfactory and that the present one was working
20 very well and we, therefore, recommended that we continue
21 the present procedure.

22 The Traveling Collections Program was the one that
23 engaged us this year, and we reviewed again the purposes
24 and nature of that program. The suggestion was made that
25 this program -- in fact, in some ways, we would like to

1 encourage applications from scholars who are at a rather
2 earlier stage in their research than has been the custom
3 until now. The comment was made that perhaps the applica-
4 tion form might be simplified to encourage such applications.

5 The staff is going to provide some guidelines
6 next time round and those suggestions will be taken into
7 account then. There were 556 applications in the program.
8 The committee is recommending 314 awards for a total of
9 \$157,000. Oh, that was closed session. I am so sorry.

10 One application of this unmentioned and unnumbered
11 number of applications -- that concludes the public ---

12 MR. KINGSTON: I hear reporters running for the
13 telephones. Are there any other comments or questions about
14 the report from the Fellowship Committee.

15 MR. : (Inaudible.)

16 MR. KINGSTON: If we may, we will have the report
17 from the Challenge Grants Committee on policy and general
18 matters. Marcus.

19 CHALLENGE GRANTS

20 MR. COHN: Yes. At the beginning of our open
21 session, the committee welcomed George Farr as the new
22 Deputy Director of Challenge Grants. George previously
23 had been Deputy Director of the Division of General Programs.
24 We also learned that Jane North, the Program Officer who in
25 the last four years has been responsible for the applications

1 from museums and historical organizations, is leaving this
2 month to become the executive director of the Columbia
3 Historical Society here in Washington. Those of you who
4 don't live in Washington will miss her. I won't and wish
5 her the very best for your new appointment.

6 The most interesting thing was the lengthy report
7 that we received from Edythe Manza of the staff, who attended
8 the special conference in Amherst, Mass., sponsored by the
9 Five Colleges Incorporated, which was the recent recipient
10 of a \$360,000 challenge grant. The Five Colleges Incorporated
11 is a higher education consortium whose members include
12 Smith, Mount Holyoke, Amherst, Amherst Colleges, and the
13 University of Massachusetts at Amherst. It is considered
14 in many ways to be a model of cooperation and coordination --
15 coordinated academic program in the world of higher education.

16 Our challenge grant is supporting, in part, the
17 costs of developing a single online computer catalogue for
18 the collections of all of the libraries of the five member
19 institutions. These collections include some 3-1/2 million
20 titles. When completed, this project is expected to enhance
21 the five libraries collective ability to coordinate acquisi-
22 tion policies, relieve duplication of collections, increase
23 access by users to their holdings, and also, of course,
24 decrease general cost.

25 The second purpose of the college grant is to

1 assist the five colleges in establishing a \$1 million endow-
2 ment whose income will support joint faculty appointments
3 in the humanities and other opportunities for professional
4 development among the humanities faculty at the five member
5 institutions.

6 Such cooperation allows for the development of
7 academic programs which would not be viable if attempted by
8 a single institution. Happily, the five colleges have met
9 with great success in obtaining private foundation grants
10 to match those of the NEH. The committee found this report
11 very interesting and agreed with the staff that this project
12 demonstrated how an NEH challenge grant can really make a
13 difference in helping humanities institutions cooperate and
14 attain more rapidly, and also more efficiently, important
15 educational goals. That is the end of my report, Mr. Chairman.

16 MR. KINGSTON: Thank you, Mr. Cohn. Is there any
17 comment or question? There being none, we will move to the
18 Emergency Grants approved in the second quarter. You will
19 find these approved grants in the front of Tab G.

20 EMERGENCY GRANTS AND ACTIONS DEPARTING FROM

21 COUNCIL RECOMMENDATION

22 MR. KINGSTON: I invite your questions or comments
23 about any of the three. Louise.

24 MS. KERR: I have two questions. First -- this
25 question is on the Indiana University -- the first grant.

1 The last sentence of the explanation talks about the importance
2 of the timetable for some future programming. It occurred
3 to me, and I was wondering with some concern, what the impli-
4 cations of this area for future grants. Is this -- do you
5 anticipate that this is the only institution that will be
6 celebrating? Have we in any way obligated ourselves? Or
7 do they expect to apply to us?

8 MR. KINGSTON: Don, do you want to comment on that
9 one?

10 MR. GIBSON: We anticipate that they will be coming
11 to us for some money to complete this project, but they are
12 also talking to a variety of other possible funders for the
13 programs. In response to your second question, they are in
14 touch with a wide variety of institutions throughout that
15 area who are considering planning, or are planning, activities
16 in this area, and they will assist in coordinating those.
17 It would not preclude others from coming into us.

18 MS. KERR: They will insist on what? I didn't
19 hear.

20 MR. GIBSON: That is exactly what I said. They
21 will be working with a wide variety of institutions and
22 helping coordinate to make sure there are no duplicative
23 activities.

24 MS. KERR: This will not in any way preempt the
25 efforts of any others with regard to this program?

1 MR. GIBSON: I assume not.

2 MS. KERR: And they do not have any kind of --
3 or other kind of understanding about future commitments?

4 MR. GIBSON: True, true. Absolutely. That is
5 always ---

6 MS. KERR: Okay. The second question has to do
7 with -- how would I put this? I have to leave this after-
8 noon at one o'clock. Therefore, yesterday, I took the
9 opportunity to look at the film, the AIM film. I urge all
10 of my colleagues, if you have not made plans to do so, to
11 see that film this afternoon, because in this instance, it
12 is my view -- in this instance, we are fortunate that at
13 least in the version that I saw we were not given credit.

14 I think, therefore, many people will not associate
15 with us. But there was a great deal of publicity given to
16 that project at the outset, and therefore, I think a lot of
17 people will associate it with this. I think you may want
18 to anticipate some of the questions that will arise. I urge
19 all the Council members to see that movie.

20 MR. AGRESTO: I am almost certain we are given
21 credit for it even if the credit is at the beginning or
22 the credit is at the end. If not ---

23 MS. KERR: In this version, it was not there.

24 MR. AGRESTO: It would have to be that we were
25 given credit.

1 MS. KERR: Then I missed it. Then I really urge
2 you to see it.

3 MR. AGRESTO: There was an article passed around --
4 while we are on the subject of the AIM grant -- the film
5 will, in fact, be aired on the 27th of June, 26th of June
6 on Public Broadcasting, June 26. So if you don't see it
7 here, you can probably catch it there.

8 In your packet of mailings, there was an article
9 in Current Magazine where the vice-president for news and
10 programming at PBS, in fact, talks about the show and how
11 pleased he was to receive the show and how pleased he is
12 to show the show. I actually have it here. I won't bother
13 to read it, but you may want to look at that as well. That,
14 in fact, we are getting not only strange, or questionable,
15 initial publicity but some very good publicity from PBS
16 itself.

17 MR. KINGSTON: Yes, Anita.

18 MS. SILVERS: I have also seen the film -- committee
19 meeting. I did want to raise a policy issue having to do
20 with it -- schedule it -- some way of addressing that policy.
21 This was a proposal that did not go through regular -- pro-
22 cess and the argument, as I recall, that was given for it
23 was that it was to provide a balanced point of view in
24 respect to the PBS Vietnam series. I am not an historian
25 and have no way of assessing historical claims about the

1 Vietnam. What I could not understand is why suddenly South
2 America turned up in the middle of this film that we funded.
3 In fact, there was a pitch that seemed to me to be directly
4 a pitch for a public policy stance in the future.

5 Now, I happen to be one of the Council members that
6 does not think it always improper for us to be involved in
7 funding projects that address public policy, but I know there
8 are other people who do think it is always improper. And I
9 think that it might be important to assess that section of
10 this film, because I found the relationship -- I understand
11 the steps that were made to suddenly start talking about
12 South American, Central America -- but I found that a little
13 bit disturbing since they are in very, very different parts
14 of the world. All the -- that I looked at -- grant -- never
15 ever mentioned Central America ever.

16 It seems to me that if we funded one thing and
17 they produced something else that we do have a complaint
18 coming.

19 MR. KINGSTON: Any other comments or questions
20 about this?

21 MR. SCHAEFER: If we don't -- not available today,
22 will there be other opportunities to see the film?

23 MR. KINGSTON: June 26, of course, on Public
24 Television.

25 MR. SCHAEFER: But before that?

1 MR. KINGSTON: This is a copy that has been given
2 to the Endowment. I suppose we could arrange for some
3 showing for you here.

4 MR. SCHAEFER: And there is no cassette version
5 or no way to receive it?

6 MR. KINGSTON: Don, can you answer that?

7 MR. GIBSON: I didn't hear the question. I am
8 sorry.

9 MR. KINGSTON: Is there some cassette version?

10 MR. GIBSON: The version we have is a cassette
11 version. I suppose we could arrange to have it copied for
12 people if they would wish to have it.

13 MR. SCHAEFER: Well, the only statement that I would
14 like to make is I consider myself a conservative. I still
15 believe in motherhood, Walter Cronkite, Dan Rather, and
16 Valentine's Day. I apologize that I was here -- arrived a
17 little bit late in the morning. In fact, I am probably
18 unique in this panel, because I am one of the few people
19 in the room who was not on the short list to become the
20 new Chairman of the National Endowment for the Humanities
21 and wondered if anyone has the authority -- I mean, the
22 one non-partisan thing that we do have is Valentine's Day
23 and many of our spouses enjoy our company in that particular
24 day. This is the second time, or second consecutive year,
25 that an Endowment meeting has been scheduled on Valentine's

1 Day. I wonder if the Acting Director, or the new Director,
2 might have any authority, since they do have the authority
3 to issue emergency grants on accuracy in media, of emergency
4 grants to issue a change of date. Would there be any love
5 lost if we changed our date away from Valentine's Day?

6 MR. KINGSTON: We are sending out a mailing on
7 the dates. We haven't set them. So, you have a chance to
8 comment further.

9 MS. CRESIMORE: Getting back to the film, will the
10 film be shown right after lunch or will it be shown at
11 two o'clock?

12 MR. KINGSTON: We will show it right after lunch.
13 We will know in a little while when that will be. We will
14 move up the time of the showing. Other comments or questions
15 that you would like to raise either about the emergency
16 grants approved or about the AIM grant?

17 All right. There are two departures from Council
18 recommendations also listed in Tab G. Both of those departures
19 are technical adjustments. They are for grants that the
20 Council recommended, but the amount is changed. Do you want
21 to question those or have any comment about them. Now is
22 the time to do so.

23 MR. AGRESTO: Does this get counted in the record
24 that I departed from Council twice? Will I see that come
25 back to haunt me in the public press?

1 MR. KINGSTON: It comes back as a departure, doesn't
2 it, Steve? Yes. It is a departure from Council recommenda-
3 tions.

4 MR. CHERRINGTON: Actually, these would not, because
5 these are just minor adjustments.

6 MR. KINGSTON: The meeting will be closed to the
7 public at this point, and therefore, we will take eight and
8 one half minutes for coffee break while the public members
9 leave.

10 (Whereupon, at 10:06 a.m., a brief recess was
11 taken.)

12 MR. KINGSTON: The meeting is now closed to the
13 public at this point. Returning to the agenda, in Tab G,
14 we will look first at the Emergency Grant requests that were
15 not approved. Altogether, there are five. There were two
16 in the booklet that you received. There are three addi-
17 tional write-ups in the folder; if you have not pulled those
18 out at this time, maybe you should take a look at them.

19 Are there any questions or comments about the
20 Emergency Grant requests that were not approved? All right,
21 there were no applications disapproved in consequence of
22 a Council recommendation to approve. So that is not an issue.
23 Let's move on to the reports on applications from the vari-
24 ous divisions, if we may. We will start with Research
25 Programs. Mr. Berns.

RESEARCH PROGRAMS

1
2 MR. BERNES: The Research Programs final motion is
3 in -- is gold colored -- and you should have it in front
4 of it. A few words before I move the motion.

5 In our closed session yesterday, our committee
6 discussed the budget implications of the increasing success
7 of grantees in raising funds to be matched with Federal
8 funds and noted that the accumulated effect of the commit-
9 ments by the Endowment in recent years will mean that
10 approximately \$1.1 million of fiscal year 1985 out-right
11 funds will be needed -- will have to be converted to matching
12 funds in order to cover these commitments, commitments that
13 have been made.

14 Approximately \$1.9, just short of \$2 million, of
15 fiscal year 1986 out-right funds will have to be converted
16 to meet this need, and the staff described their plans to
17 bring this matter under control by the end of fiscal year
18 1986.

19 Secondly, the committee considered a large number
20 of applications and discussed particularly about a dozen
21 in two categories, Tools and Additions. Incidentally, the
22 motion that you have before you does not depart from staff
23 recommendations in any respect, as I recall, although we
24 certainly had a spirited discussion as to whether that would
25 be the case.

1 Initially, some of us were skeptical about the
2 significance of some of the Tools projects for the creation
3 of linguistic dictionaries in obscure languages, languages
4 that have no written material in them ever. I raised the
5 question, I confess, as to the necessity for a dictionary
6 in a language in which nothing has ever been written. We
7 discussed that at some length, and I was, I confess, persuaded,
8 and the committee was persuaded, of the necessity and the
9 propriety of proceeding as the staff had recommended.

10 We were also initially concerned that some of the
11 Additions projects that were extremely good but were not
12 being recommended for support were being judged too harshly,
13 but in the end, the committee concluded that the staff had
14 weighed all these considerations very carefully indeed and
15 the committee is, therefore, recommending action on proposals,
16 as I say, in exactly the way the staff had suggested at the
17 outset of the draft motion.

18 I move the adoption of whatever the appropriate
19 language is, I move it.

20 MR. KINGSTON: It has been moved and seconded to
21 adopt the motion before you, the goldenrod copy. We have
22 received a question, a comment, from one Council member not
23 present. I will let the Chairman read the telegram.

24 MR. AGRESTO: Just as I was walking down here today,
25 a Western Union man came up to me and thrust this in my hands.

1 MR. KINGSTON: If I may, John, the application that
2 is under question here occurs on page 49 of the motion. It
3 is FC-20060, Center for Advanced Study in the Behavioral
4 Sciences.

5 MR. AGRESTO: A letter from Stanford, California.
6 "Regret cannot attend meeting. Why rush on FC-2002982?"
7 I have a slightly different number than Tom's, but I think
8 we know the proposal renewal for \$720,000. "Ask deferral.
9 Not complaints against the Center's method of selecting
10 fellows. Please read to whole Council this telegram before
11 Council's vote on renewal. I have no conflict of interest.
12 Rita Ricardo-Campbell, Hoover Institution." Since she asked
13 me to read it, I have read it.

14 MR. BERNES: Mr. Chairman, I think, as you say, it
15 is the center item on that particular page, and it is part
16 of our motion for recommendation. We are recommending
17 \$160,000 out-right and \$200,000 match for a total of \$360,000.

18 MR. KASS: Could we confirm that we are talking
19 about the same proposal?

20 MR. KINGSTON: I think -- yes. The number, Rich,
21 in the telegram is FC, which is the Center's proposal, of
22 course, 2002982. Maybe David Coder knows. That may be the
23 number of the old grant.

24 MR. CODER: Yes. That is the old grant. That is
25 the one being renewed. You will see that number in the

1 lower right-hand corner there in their entry. We are talking
2 here about FC-20060.

3 MR. BERNS: You see, it is there. As Dave just
4 pointed out, that other number is there in the corner. No.
5 There is no question about we know what she is talking about.

6 MR. AGRESTO: Center for Advanced Study in Behavioral
7 Sciences.

8 MR. KINGSTON: Louise.

9 MS. KERR: You said something about she thought
10 there were questions raised about the selection procedures.
11 Is that correct?

12 MR. BERNS: All I know is what John read in that
13 telegram.

14 MR. KINGSTON: Do you want to comment about the
15 issue of selection to the extent ---

16 MR. EKMAN: I think I will ask Dave Coder to
17 comment on it.

18 MR. CODER: The Center is unique ---

19 MR. KINGSTON: Excuse me, Dave. Please come up
20 to the table; otherwise it doesn't pick up ---

21 MR. CODER: The Center is unique among the Centers
22 for Advanced Study in that rather than accept applications
23 from scholars it invites scholars. It has a rather extensive
24 system, scouting system, if you will, by which it asks people
25 for nominations of scholars who would be suitable to come to

1 the Center. It vets these nominations using committees of
2 scholars in a lot of different fields. The Board of Trustees
3 of the Center, using the ratings rankings of these panels
4 of scholars, then declares scholars eligible to be invited
5 to the Center.

6 They are -- scholars have been informed of this
7 and asked which year they would like to come. Then they are
8 invited to the Center as it is convenient for them and as
9 their projects and interests mesh with the projects and
10 interests of other scholars who would be interested in coming.

11 MR. KINGSTON: I think it is fair to say, too, at
12 the Center, though they don't advertise the fact, that
13 scholars may nominate themselves for consideration and
14 eligibility.

15 MS. KERR: Is this related at all to the criticisms
16 that were made when I was on this committee, now almost five
17 years ago, that up to that point there were almost no women,
18 almost no scholars under the age of, at that time, I think,
19 35 or 40, and no minorities? Is the result of that selection
20 procedure the same? What is the criticism of that procedure?

21 MR. KINGSTON: The actual criticism that has been
22 raised in some quarters about the election procedure is that
23 it seems to be in camera. There isn't overt application
24 announcement. There may be other members of the Council who
25 would like to comment on the procedures because they know it

1 better.

2 MR. CODER: There are, in fact, large numbers of
3 women and minority scholars at the Center. Whether a differ-
4 ent perception of that is at the root of questions about the
5 procedure, I don't know.

6 MS. KERR: This isn't even a question for dis-
7 cussion.

8 MR. CODER: No.

9 MR. RITCHESON: Mr. Chairman, a communication from
10 any member of this Council must always be heard with respect,
11 but when a Council member raises objections in his or her
12 absence to a general proposal, then I think that Council
13 member is obliged to state reasons. Unless you have edited
14 her telegram, which I do not believe you have done, Rita
15 has given no substantial reason whatsoever except to urge
16 we avoid unseemly haste. We are put in the curious position
17 of having then to read her mind about her objections, and
18 my vibes don't reach to Stanford this morning.

19 MR. KINGSTON: Anita, did you have a comment?

20 MR. SILVERS: Well, I was going to address the
21 point, because there are plenty of women there now. In
22 fact, the chairperson -- I am just going to say I don't have
23 to say anything.

24 MR. AGRESTO: Can we leave it at this. I will
25 almost certainly go by whatever the recommendation of Council

1 is on this, but I will take the proposal out myself and read
2 it from beginning to end. That will, I think, in some ways --
3 at least it will get a second reading, at least by me, but
4 I think we should not hold up on a vote on this as we should
5 not hold up a vote on any of them today. Rich.

6 MR. EKMAN: Council members may need to know that
7 this unusual way of selecting fellows was something that site
8 visitors and panelists all commented on, but after their
9 deliberations, came to the conclusion that the proposal was
10 excellent despite that unusual procedure.

11 MR. KINGSTON: And to be fair, of course, in the
12 commentary, there are those who believe that this is, in
13 fact, an ideal way of selecting fellows for this particular
14 Center. Gwen.

15 MS. GRIEST: The comment is, is it not true, that
16 this year there have been modifications since the last time
17 when you were on, Louise, because at that time, you may
18 remember, we withheld a grant because we were concerned that
19 the Center was not sharing with the Endowment certain of
20 its methods and procedures. They have now been open with
21 the Endowment about these, and our site visitors did have
22 the opportunity to look at records and discuss this fully
23 so that we are now satisfied.

24 MR. KINGSTON: Are there any other comments or
25 questions about any of the items on the motion from the

1 Research Division? Anita.

2 MS. SILVERS: I wanted to ask something about an
3 item that is being deferred on page 48, National Academy of
4 Sciences proposal. I am sure I was just a bit curious about
5 the National Academy of Sciences is proposing a program
6 having to do with humanities programs. In the past, some
7 of us in some of the disciplines have been a little bit con-
8 cerned when SSRC runs programs because their accounts of
9 the humanities may not reflect the structure of the humani-
10 ties disciplines. Is that what is being deferred or has
11 that all been taken care of?

12 MR. EKMAN: First, a point of clarification. Then
13 I would ask Dan Jones to speak to it. This is, in fact, a
14 consortium involving ACLS and other organizations. The
15 National Academy of Sciences is the official applicant, but
16 it does involve organizations squarely in the humanities
17 in the project as well.

18 As for the reasons why the proposal is deferred,
19 I would ask one of my colleagues to speak to that.

20 MR. : We are taking it to August Council.
21 There is no other reason than the panel was held just a
22 couple of weeks ago. You will have a full report on it in
23 August.

24 MR. KINGSTON: Other comments or questions about
25 any of the items in the motion? George.

1 MR. KENNEDY: I should be recorded as not voting
2 on RE-20423, Rhode Island Historical Society. I don't think
3 anybody could guess I have a conflict of interest, but there
4 is a hidden one.

5 MR. KINGSTON: I will record you as being absent
6 from the vote. Frances.

7 MS. RHOME: Similarly, I want to be very certain
8 that RE-20499 reflects that I abstained from the voting.

9 MR. KINGSTON: And the applicant there is?

10 MS. RHOME: The Indiana University of Indianapolis.

11 MR. KINGSTON: Other comments or questions?

12 MS. TAYLOR: May I ask a general question?

13 MR. KINGSTON: Yes, indeed.

14 MS. TAYLOR: In the affirmation of grant requests,
15 do we consider the endowment of the institution that are
16 establishing whatever it is they are establishing or attempt-
17 ing? In other words, it was called to my attention recently
18 that Harvard has over a billion dollars plus in endowments
19 and why should we give them anything, anything at all, to
20 a university that has an endowment of that size when so many
21 colleges and universities do not have that kind of largesse.
22 at their disposal. Do we ever make that a factor in our
23 consideration of any grant request?

24 MR. KINGSTON: Yes, it is, if we are talking about
25 such things as challenge grants where the endowment is a

1 directly relevant factor in the grant. Of course, it becomes
2 an item of consideration. If, however, we are talking about ---

3 MS. TAYLOR: --- match the funds or ---

4 MR. KINGSTON: No, you can't. They wouldn't be
5 matching funds from the endowment at all. Much challenge
6 grant funds would be set aside to increase the size of the
7 endowment. However, in most cases, we are supporting projects
8 of one kind or another. Those projects might or might not
9 be supported by endowed funds, depending on the context of
10 the institution that you look at. Each application comes,
11 obviously, each institutional application, comes, obviously,
12 with an institutional context. The panels do regard that
13 context, the ability of an institution to carry out a project,
14 the ability of an institution to come up with matching funds
15 if there is a matching component. It depends entirely on
16 what the project is whether the institutional endowment is
17 a factor or not.

18 MS. TAYLOR: It what?

19 MR. KINGSTON: It would not preclude an applicant's
20 consideration.

21 MS. TAYLOR: Does it ever come up as a factor in
22 our consideration?

23 MR. KINGSTON: I am sorry. I didn't hear you.

24 MS. TAYLOR: Does it ever really come up as a
25 factor in our consideration on applications of what the

1 parent organization has available?

2 MR. KINGSTON: It depends again on what is proposed.
3 But, certainly, there are times when it does come up for
4 consideration. Roland.

5 MR. DILLE: But not frequently really. We don't
6 say Harvard ought not to get it because it already has enough.
7 I often have thought that, but I have never dared say that.

8 MS. TAYLOR: I think they would probably -- very
9 loud if we did make it a factor in our consideration. That
10 you are out because you have already got so much. But it
11 suddenly occurred to me that I don't ever remember hearing
12 that ever in connection with the analysis of an individual
13 request. There is no policy on it. We simply take it grant
14 by grant.

15 MR. KINGSTON: No universal policy. It again
16 depends on the context of the applicant. Other questions or
17 comments about the motion from the Research Division? There
18 being none, those in favor of the motion, please say aye.

19 (A chorus of ayes was heard.)

20 MR. KINGSTON: Opposed?

21 (No response.)

22 MR. KINGSTON: Unanimously carried. The report
23 and motion from the Division of Education Programs. Mr.
24 Dille.

25

EDUCATION PROGRAMS

1
2 MR. DILLE: We accepted the recommendations of our
3 remarkable staff, and I move their acceptance by this group.
4 This is the lime green ---

5 MR. : Lime green?

6 MR. DILLE: Lime green.

7 MR. KINGSTON: Are there any questions or comments
8 about the items on the Education Division's motion? All
9 right. There being none, those in favor of the motion,
10 please signify by saying aye.

11 (A chorus of ayes was heard.)

12 MR. KINGSTON: Opposed?

13 (No response.)

14 MR. KINGSTON: And that carries unanimously.

15 MS. TAYLOR: I think ---

16 MR. : Mr. Chairman, could she please use
17 the microphone.

18 MS. TAYLOR: I hate to be in the position of the
19 old lady who didn't know what she thought until she heard
20 what she had to say, but in asking this question, do we make
21 the endowment of an institution a factor in our considerations
22 in regards to the grants, I gather we do not. But I wonder
23 if we should not make it a factor in our consideration, and
24 if somewhere in our policy statement, we ought to make it a
25 general policy that we will make it a factor in our

1 consideration in giving and that should come up regularly.

2 MR. AGRESTO: We can discuss this, not only now,
3 but we can discuss this next time. Perhaps even we could
4 put this on the agenda if you would like. There is no doubt
5 when panels meet one question that does arise very often is,
6 is this not the kind of activity which would normally,
7 naturally, and in a everyday fashion take place even without
8 our help. If the answer to that is yes, if this is something
9 an institution just would do and they are just asking for
10 money but without it they would carry it out on their own,
11 that generally puts that proposal at a much lower priority.

12 MS. TAYLOR: It is ---

13 MR. AGRESTO: But I think we have not done in the
14 past, and I take it there is good reason not to do this,
15 but it is still a matter for discussion, if you wish, is
16 to say, well, let's compare. Haverford has a great proposal;
17 Oberlin has a good proposal. Who has the higher endowment?
18 That doesn't seem to be an appropriate question when you are
19 looking at a proposal. So, we have taken the -- is the
20 proposal itself worth funding and is it something that would
21 not be done if we didn't fund it? Those are the kinds of
22 questions we have asked and we want to continue to ask. But
23 we can open it up for discussion.

24 MS. TAYLOR: I think it should be a factor in our
25 consideration. You had the Getty Museum, for instance, and I

1 hope I don't step on anybody's toes, but one reads that they
2 have an enormous amount of money available to them for the
3 development of the Getty Museum. We had some request here,
4 and I don't care how worthy it was, I think it should be a
5 factor in our consideration that we would consider the monies
6 available to the institution, or it may be somebody within
7 that institution that has no direct access to the money who
8 still has a fine idea.

9 But I still say, when we say we will make it a
10 factor in our consideration, that we might be in a position
11 to say, why don't you ask your university to support it?
12 It is a fine project, and we heartily recommend it. But
13 based on the fact that you have got a couple of billion
14 dollars endowment, go to the head office and see what they
15 say. If they say no, then come back.

16 MR. KINGSTON: Let me make myself clear. There
17 are times when the endowment and its uses indeed are relevant
18 factors in some proposals, but that is not a blanket applica-
19 tion or blanket question here. We realize, too, that many
20 institutional endowments, particularly endowments of educa-
21 tion, are generally restricted. There are specific uses
22 for those funds and the income from them. Sometimes that
23 simply means that a new project should be funded regardless
24 of whatever the gross size of the endowment is.

25 MS. TAYLOR: When is the appropriate time to bring

1 something like this up, John, as a policy ---

2 MR. AGRESTO: This is not inappropriate. We can
3 talk about it now. We could also talk about this in open
4 session. This is general public policy as well. I have no
5 objection to continuing the discussion for a while longer.
6 I know Kathleen wants to speak.

7 MS. TAYLOR: I have probably -- too much.

8 MR. AGRESTO: No, no, no. Kathleen wants to speak
9 to it, and Roland did as well.

10 MS. KILPATRICK: I just wanted to comment that,
11 while I think this question should be something of a factor
12 in consideration, I personally would have serious philosophical
13 problems with a well-defined needs test and that is what
14 you are suggesting.

15 MS. TAYLOR: I have doubts about that too. That
16 is why it is troublesome to me.

17 MS. KILPATRICK: I do think applications ought
18 to be considered primarily on the basis of merit.

19 MS. TAYLOR: I agree.

20 MR. RITCHESON: I want to associate myself with
21 Miss Kilpatrick's statement, speaking as a representative
22 of a terribly under-endowed institution.

23 MR. KINGSTON: Roland.

24 MR. DILLE: I would suggest that you ask staff to
25 lay out the issue and bring it before the committee next time.

1 I think, in the end, Tom, there will be no debate, but I
2 think everybody ought to know what the issue is, what the
3 standards are, and surely, what we know about what Congress
4 desires, which is different things on different days, of
5 course. But I think for new people on the committee -- I
6 know I was rather troubled by the need to underwrite year
7 after year Harvard curricula revisions. It seems to me that
8 was a thing that they might have been able to do themselves.
9 The question does come from that forum.

10 So, it is not simply that the rich get richer.
11 It often happens that the rich have people who write very
12 good proposals.

13 MS. TAYLOR: But I think that that is a good example
14 of us funding a review of the Harvard curricula ---

15 MR. DILLE: Well, I have -- the other problem that
16 arises is that it is so easy for a challenge grant to
17 requested by institutions that have a very large development
18 program, but I think the Challenge Grant staff has always
19 been very good about making sure the people who didn't have
20 that kind of a staff knew how to get one together for the
21 purposes of the challenge grant.

22 What I am really saying is the issue really comes
23 before us in various ways and has been worked at and developed
24 over a long time, but I think it is worth everybody sort of
25 knowing what the issue is. That is an impossible request to

1 the staff, but I still think it is a good thing.

2 MR. KINGSTON: I think what we will do is put this
3 item on the general policy discussion of each of the Divi-
4 sional committees and ask staff to address their experience
5 with it and so forth, and we will report back during the
6 public session in August and open the debate again then if
7 that is acceptable.

8 MS. TAYLOR: I want to say, too, I support Kathleen
9 -- on merit, always on merit. But I just think we should
10 have that factor considered. Whatever you all decide, or we
11 decide, is an appropriate time ---

12 MS. SILVERS: I wonder if you would be willing to
13 ask each committee to provide a definition of under-endowed,
14 endowed, and over-endowed. I am somewhat curious ---

15 MR. : One thing I don't -- myself -- is
16 under endowed.

17 MR. AGRESTO: Walter?

18 MR. BERNIS: Have we exhausted that subject because
19 I want to change it.

20 MR. AGRESTO: I think I can just say that I am very
21 happy that this did, in fact, come up, not only because this
22 is an issue that should be reviewed every now and then, but
23 for new Council members it is something which they should be
24 part of the deliberation of. I think we will, in fact,
25 instruct all of the Divisions in the open sessions of their

1 meetings next time to raise it for discussion at least 15-20
2 minutes, a half hour. Thank you. Yes, Walter.

3 MR. BERNES: This is a bit late because we have
4 already voted on this. But I wonder if someone in the Educa-
5 tion Programs Division would explain an item on page 9.
6 EH-20534, an exemplary project, "Nazi Anti-Semetic Films:
7 Primary Documents for Use in Higher Education." What is that
8 thing?

9 MR. KINGSTON: John, do you want to comment?

10 MR. ANDREWS: Yes. There is a collection, I think,
11 unique, certainly very rare, of propaganda films that were
12 used in Nazi Germany. These have been made available to
13 this institution. What they would like to do is prepare
14 them in such a way that they can become teaching materials
15 for courses on modern European history.

16 They are presented in an edited form, or they are
17 proposed in such a way, that they would be presented in an
18 edited form that would establish an historical context for
19 them so that when they are shown, students would have a
20 context for viewing them. The staff reviewed this proposal.
21 It was considered at length, and finally, we felt that it
22 was a proposal that was fully worthy of funding.

23 MR. LAXALT: They are, of course, accompanied by
24 critical analyses.

25 MR. ANDREWS: Yes. That is right.

1 MS. TAYLOR: Why is it limited to Nazis? Why not
2 Soviets or totalitarian?

3 MR. ANDREWS: Well, it just happens that this is
4 an archive. This is a collection of films that were used
5 in Nazi Germany.

6 MS. TAYLOR: Well, is it -- we have a very much
7 more immediate urgent problem with Soviet and totalitarian ---

8 MR. ANDREWS: That might come from another applica-
9 tion. But we were simply responding to a proposal for a
10 particular archive that is available at this point.

11 MS. TAYLOR: But I am saying, does this limit them
12 to just that? If they are collecting films, or making them
13 available, you are not limiting them to Hitler, Nazis?

14 MR. ANDREWS: I don't think there are any limits
15 on it. All that I am saying is the applicant has proposed
16 to take a particular collection of propaganda films and
17 make them available as resources for the teaching of modern
18 European history.

19 MR. LAXALT: The archive then is valuable.

20 MR. ANDREWS: Yes.

21 MR. AGRESTO: In our pre-Council meetings, we, in
22 fact, had flashed this as one of the proposals that I did
23 want to see debated by the Council committee. Was it, in
24 fact, debated by Council committee yesterday?

25 MR. ANDREWS: We made the full proposal available to

1 committee.

2 MR. AGRESTO: Was there any discussion of it?

3 MR. ANDREWS: There was no discussion of it.

4 MR. AGRESTO: There was no discussion of it.

5 MR. ANDREWS: No.

6 MR. AGRESTO: Was there discussion of any of the
7 other proposals we flagged for the Council committee to
8 discuss?

9 MR. DILLE: We raised different questions. There
10 were very few ---

11 MR. AGRESTO: See, even now, there are still ques-
12 tions being raised about this.

13 MS. TAYLOR: Well, I should say I was called out
14 on an emergency telephone call and I missed this. I am sorry.

15 MR. ANDREWS: Yes. We did point out to the committee
16 that questions had been raised about this proposal and one
17 other. We made the full proposals available to the committee
18 to evaluate.

19 MR. AGRESTO: It would have been good and proper
20 to have had a deliberation about them. I wish that had been
21 done.

22 MR. BERNS: I bring up this point because --
23 especially at this particular time -- Bitburg and all that.
24 You and the Division should be prepared to answer questions
25 of the sort that I raised here. I have no doubt that you can

1 do so, but it is likely to be something that causes some
2 consternation in some places, particularly at this time.

3 MR. AGRESTO: The questions were raised in pre-
4 Council even apart from any particular current event. There
5 were some questions, serious questions, on the proposal itself.

6 MS. TAYLOR: What troubles me is to see this
7 Wallenberg film recently and go through the Nazi parade of
8 history and then when it getst to the point where the real
9 villain comes down the pike and puts him in a car and takes
10 him away, that is the end of the three-part series. It is
11 just when you ought to begin it. What happens to Mr. Wallen-
12 berg in the 30-40 years since. The real story is the Soviet,
13 communistic tyranny and totalitarian terrorism that is going
14 on. We go through Mr. Wallenberg's heroism during the Nazi
15 period, but there is some talk that he may still be alive
16 and that the current enemy is very clear. And they keep
17 avoiding it.

18 Sort of like this project. I wondered why in the
19 world we would want to take films that they had, Nazi
20 horror films of that type, and not update them even if we
21 are lending them to the Jewish race. It would be easy to
22 get right on into Cambodia and Afghanistan ---

23 MR. RITCHESON: Mr. Chairman, I want to speak as
24 a historian, if I may, please. What we have here is the
25 establishment of a historical record, a very tragic, tragic

1 episode in Western civilization. The proposal is perfectly
2 clear on this. We are not extending our view to tyrannies
3 of subsequent ages or earlier ages. We have here in hand
4 apparently an opportunity to fund something which will be
5 extraordinarily valuable for the historical record. I don't
6 see that this discursive kind of discussion is any good.

7 MR. LAXALT: May I say. The Nazi era is a closed
8 chapter so, therefore, it becomes history. The rest of the
9 chapter is still an ongoing thing that would be a little bit
10 difficult to analyze right now.

11 MR. AGRESTO: Roland.

12 MR. DILLE: I think I must object to the suggestion
13 that we were somehow remiss in not discussing this. I saw
14 no questions to raise. I repeat, I saw no questions to be
15 raised. That may be a limitation on my part; on the other
16 hand, it may not.

17 MR. SCHAEFER: I think that thi, you know, is a
18 specific proposal that deals with one of the most despicable
19 and unfortunate episodes in human history. It doesn't
20 preclude any other group or anyone else with expertise to
21 submit a qualified application to explore other areas. I
22 wonder what Walter means when he flagged this proposal and
23 said I wish you would elaborate on your comment when you
24 said, in light of the Bitburg controversy, that this will
25 cause consternation in some circles. What precisely do you

1 mean?

2 MR. BERNES: I say it might. It might. I have no
3 knowledge of this, and of course, my attention was drawn to
4 it. We are, in fact, providing \$60,000 out-right with \$25,000
5 match to promote the distribution of this particular film,
6 if you will. As I say, I have no question about the pro-
7 priety of this. I do think, however, because of the subject
8 matter, it is something that is likely to cause consternation
9 if it is not explained appropriately.

10 As to Wallenberg and so forth and so on, let me
11 merely say I myself have given -- delighted in giving speeches
12 in Geneva, the U.N. human rights meetings -- in asking the
13 Soviets as to what has happened to Mr. Wallenberg and asking
14 the Swedes as to why they are so embarrassed whenever the
15 subject comes up. I delight in doing that sort of thing in
16 that setting. But that is not our purpose here.

17 Here is an archival project, important in its own
18 way, and it should be supported. I don't object to that
19 at all. I am merely saying, in this particular time, because
20 of this particular subject, we, as an Endowment, should be
21 prepared, fully prepared, to answer certain questions when
22 they come up. That is all. I must say I am sorry I raised
23 the subject.

24 MR. KINGSTON: Anita.

25 MS. SILVERS: This reminds me -- we always have the

1 problem of how do we deal with material that is objectionable
2 in itself but needs to be treated as an historical document.
3 I do recall a very long discussion we once had about a
4 translation of a pornographic Chinese novel, and we spent
5 a great deal of time determining what we would say to the
6 congressman who discovered that we were making pornography
7 available in English. Nobody ever raised a question.

8 MS. : Retroactively, I would like to
9 object to that.

10 MR. KINGSTON: Charles, please. Charles.

11 MR. RITCHESON: I am -- a point about this already
12 and I want to go on.

13 MR. KINGSTON: The next motion, or next report,
14 comes from the Division of State Programs. Frances, would
15 you ---

16 STATE PROGRAMS

17 MS. RHOME: Yes. Contrary to our calendar, I am
18 Ms. Hart. I am Ms. Rhome. We can't wait to tell Jeffrey --
19 the state programs are the ones on the pristine white sheet.
20 I would like to make some explanation regarding the state
21 programs that are being considered, because the Council should
22 understand the purpose of these exemplary projects that we
23 have in the humanities coming from these various state
24 committees.

25 This purpose is a special competition to enable

1 state councils to assume a more active and a visible role
2 in the intellectual life in their state by undertaking high
3 caliber, larger scale projects. The competition is intended
4 to give recognition to those projects of an imaginative and
5 an exemplary nature. But at the same time, the project must
6 exemplify high quality humanities programming within the
7 state and very definitely be singularly cultural for that
8 state. That is the reason for our state committees.

9 The Division of State Programs received 23 applica-
10 tions from state humanities councils for these exemplary
11 project awards. Of these 23, 8 are being recommended for
12 funding. You will find these on page 1 and page 2 of our
13 final motion, going from S-020609 through S-020631 and a
14 little description of these projects for a general statement.

15 Seminars for Secondary School Teachers in the
16 State of Maine; An Historical Program for Secondary School
17 Teachers in Rhode Island; Lectures and Symposia, delightful
18 things on the household tales of the Brothers Grimm, in
19 Delaware; and The Mexican Legacy of Texas. Of all people to
20 stumble on a Mexican word, when I was born in Tucumcari,
21 New Mexico. Few people can say that, nobody in their right
22 mind.

23 Reading and Discussion Programs from Alabama and
24 South Dakota and a Film Discussion Series in New York; a
25 Radio Series in Washington. You can see the scope, then, of

1 these remarkable projects. May I point out that the committee
2 considered every application in great detail. Staff did ask
3 the committee to pay particular attention to the Alaska
4 Publication Project because of concerns that had been raised
5 by the panel over the appropriateness of a publication series
6 for a state humanities council.

7 The committee agreed that the publication of books
8 of interest to the population of the state was certainly
9 appropriate, particularly in a state that had such vast
10 distances between cities. But the committee also felt this
11 particular application was premature, because the manuscripts
12 had not been completed or reviewed, and therefore, recom-
13 mended disapproval at this time.

14 On the committee, we have two members who wanted
15 to have it shown that they abstained in the vote on our
16 recommendation and that was the item regarding North Carolina's
17 application and also the one on Nevada's application. Mr.
18 Chairman, I vote acceptance of this report.

19 MR. KINGSTON: The report of the State Programs
20 Committee is before the floor. Are there any questions
21 about this motion? Anita.

22 MS. SILVERS: I do want -- I am wondering whether
23 at some point the committee might not want to take a look
24 again at this program.

25 MS. RHOME: The Alaskan program?

1 MS. SILVERS: No. The Exemplary Awards Program.
2 With only 23 applications from a field which numbers a few
3 more than 50 -- right -- I am beginning to wonder is the
4 number of applications changed at all from the -- I am wonder-
5 ing why people don't apply and whether this is an appropriate
6 stimulus for excellence with so few applications.

7 MS. BERLINCOURT: There are two points. We are
8 going to be studying Exemplary Awards this next year, but
9 we changed the deadline. We moved it ahead about three months
10 and we really pushed the states this year so that the applica-
11 tions were down.

12 MR. KINGSTON: Other comments or questions? If
13 not, the motion ---

14 MR. SANDOZ: Tom.

15 MR. KINGSTON: Ellis.

16 MR. SANDOZ: I just noticed here again we have
17 two turn-downs on bicentennial related projects of Pennsylvania
18 origin. Perhaps some others -- I just glanced over the list.
19 I am not sure there are any in the approved Exemplary list
20 related to the bicentennial. I wonder when we are going to
21 start celebrating the bicentennial a little more vigorously
22 perhaps. The turn-down list of other divisions that we have
23 gone through, there were a number of such proposals.
24 Admittedly, you have to deal with these applications on the
25 basis of the most meritorious applications, and yet, we are

1 advertising that we are asking and we are wanting to celebrate
2 the bicentennial and yet, when it comes time to support
3 projects that are being submitted, it seems to me that they
4 are getting very tough sledding indeed. It is somewhat
5 paradoxical even if I understand most of the reasons why
6 there is this problem.

7 MS. BERLIN COURT: Last year, Ellis, there were indeed
8 of the Exemplary Awards some bicentennial projects. In the
9 last two years, the states have supported at least 45 projects.
10 There were flaws in both these applications.

11 MR. AGRESTO: We can circulate -- in fact, I thought
12 we had circulated to Council members the list of projects
13 that have been funded through the Bicentennial Program. They
14 number now, at least in money, over \$8 million in the short
15 life of this program. The Bicentennial Program has not been,
16 I think, overlooked or undervalued either in terms of our
17 interest or in terms of the response from the field.

18 MS. RHOME: This is another point, too. When we
19 do receive the proposals that are flawed, those states are
20 given an opportunity to rectify the difficulties there and
21 resubmit a proposal. So, they are not dead unless the state
22 chooses not to go ahead.

23 MR. KINGSTON: Charles.

24 MR. SANDOZ: The paucity of applications in this
25 particular competition may be a meaningful statistic.

1 MR. RITCHESON: A question, Mr. Chairman, if I may.
2 It is a related subject in any event. It is obvious that the
3 Commission for the Bicentennial of the Constitution has not
4 moved forward with that speed and alacrity we would like to
5 see. In short, it is non-existent. I wonder if this Council
6 is in any position at all to make representations in the
7 appropriate quarters about this. Would a motion or would a
8 resolution of this Council be helpful?

9 MR. AGRESTO: My honest opinion is that it would
10 not be.

11 MS. RHOME: We have not yet voted on the motion
12 on the floor.

13 MR. AGRESTO: I will come back to this.

14 MR. KINGSTON: We will come back to this. Are
15 there other comments or questions about the items on the
16 motion? All those in favor of the motion for State Programs,
17 signify by saying aye.

18 (A chorus of ayes was heard.)

19 MR. KINGSTON: Opposed?

20 (No response.)

21 MR. KINGSTON: It passes unanimously.

22 MR. AGRESTO: Steve Cherrington tells me that one
23 time, in fact, this Council did vote to recommend such a body
24 and still, despite our fine words, nothing has come of it
25 yet. My honest opinion is that another recommendation of the

1 Council will have exactly the same effect.

2 MS. KERR: Would you like to try for the ---

3 MR. KINGSTON: The next report will be from the
4 Division of General Programs. Charles.

5 GENERAL PROGRAMS

6 MR. RITCHESON: Mr. Chairman, the committee reviewed
7 195 applications, requesting \$15.4 million. We recommended
8 38 applications. With those of you with computers can
9 easily see that this is 19 per cent of the applications at
10 a cost of approximately \$2.5 million.

11 Among those we were unable to fund -- and this
12 may be under the general rubric of a voice crying in the
13 wilderness -- were 24 proposals which had very good ratings,
14 that is to say, VG's across the board. I think we were all
15 rather sad in my committee that so large a number of worth-
16 while, and indeed splendid, proposals had to be rejected.

17 We considered a full cycle of applications in
18 Humanities Projects in Museums and Historical Organizations
19 and one application each in Media, Libraries, and Humanities
20 Projects for Adults. Let me turn to the Humanities Projects
21 in Museums and Historical Organizations. The motion for
22 General Programs and the material for this is the light blue.
23 The motion for General Programs begins with applications
24 submitted to the division's Humanities Projects in Museums
25 and Historical Organizations Program.

1 Discussion on the Museums Program focused on
2 several issues relating to the quality of applications, project
3 budgets, panelist ratings, preliminary contact with applicants,
4 and checklist instructions that would be found in the guide-
5 lines. The discussion returned to some of these points in
6 connection with a number of applications throughout the
7 session.

8 Questions were raised about the recommendation not
9 to provide a half million dollars in support to the Los
10 Angeles County Museum of Art. That is GN-22669 -- for
11 implementation of a major exhibition, catalogue, and lecture
12 series to survey the development of abstract art as a vehicle
13 to convey spiritual, metaphysical, and utopian beliefs.
14 Although the committee members accepted the staff recommenda-
15 tion, they found the project concept highly innovative and
16 instructed the staff to work carefully with the Los Angeles
17 County Museum of Art to encourage a revision and resubmission
18 of the proposal at the June 10 deadline.

19 The committee sustained the staff recommendation
20 for support of 35 applications and \$2.1 million. These are
21 listed on pages 1 through 7. No support is recommended for
22 those applications found on pages 8 through 31.

23 Now, Humanities Projects in Media. We recommend
24 1 project for funding, which you will find on page 32.
25 Humanities Projects in Libraries. We recommend 1 project for

1 funding. It is on page 33. Humanities Projects for Adults.
2 One project that we recommend for funding is found on page 34.
3 Mr. Chairman, except for a personal announcement, that con-
4 cludes my report.

5 I wish to be recorded as not voting in GP-21208,
6 GN-22610, the two proposals emanating from the Los Angeles
7 County -- no, the first one from the Asian Cultural Council
8 for the Indo-U.S. Subcommittee -- and then ^{GN}GN-22610, the
9 Los Angeles County Museum of Art proposal and GM-22700 and
10 GM-22669.

11 MR. KINGSTON: Charles, the last two applications,
12 the applicants are?

13 MR. RITCHESON: The Los Angeles County Museum of Art.

14 MR. KINGSTON: Any comments or questions about the
15 items on the motion from General Programs. Louise.

16 MS. KERR: On the Museums Program, as a generaliza-
17 tion, there seems that there was a great deal of cutting
18 the budget and I would like to have some notion of the princi-
19 ple that was involved or how you went about doing it.
20 Specifically, I would like to know about -- page 3 --
21 GM-22687, and on page 5, GM-22727, the two Chicago institu-
22 tions which were apparently not cut necessarily at any
23 greater rate but at a great rate.

24 MR. GIBSON: You are asking about the Toledo
25 Museum?

1 MS. KERR: No, no. Chicago. The Art Institute and
2 the Field Museum.

3 MR. GIBSON: Okay. 22687?

4 MS. KERR: Yeah. As examples as what appears to
5 be some sort of pattern that I can't fathom.

6 MR. GIBSON: I don't think you can call this a
7 pattern or not, but we had asked the staff in this division
8 to very, very carefully analyze budgets on all applications
9 of the Media, Museums, or elsewhere and to make reductions,
10 as appropriate, if appropriate, in them.

11 In one of those instances, the panel advised and
12 we accepted it and put it to the committee. They concurred
13 with us that we fund only one aspect of the project. That
14 was the case of this catalogue for the Field Museum. We
15 funded the catalogue rather than the full range of other
16 activities which they had proposed which we did not find as
17 of high quality as the other.

18 In the case of the Art Institute of Chicago,
19 reduction is made to support those aspects of the installa-
20 tion of an exhibit on fragments of the Chicago architecture.
21 We reduced that partially with the understanding that the
22 Art Institute will be able, and has already contacted, some --
23 able to attract private sector support for part of that appli-
24 cation. So, both of these recommendations, it is the staff's
25 firm judgment, will allow the projects to go forward.

1 MS. KERR: In the case of the Art Institute, they
2 will be able to get firm support beyond the \$10,000 match
3 that you ---

4 MR. GIBSON: We anticipate that. Yes.

5 MS. KERR: And they are going to do the same --
6 with \$30,000, they are going to do the exhibit that they
7 said would cost ---

8 MR. GIBSON: For further details, I can call upon
9 -- did you wish to comment on this?

10 MS. KERR: No. That is all right. Never mind.
11 We have a bet going about what time we will finish.

12 MR. KINGSTON: Other comments or questions about
13 items on the agenda -- or on the motion?

14 MS. TAYLOR: Could you talk about ---

15 MR. KINGSTON: What about it?

16 MR. RITCHESON: What number is it, please?

17 MR. GIBSON: The Media proposal?

18 MR. : Page 32.

19 MR. RITCHESON: This is the Cathedral proposal.

20 MR. GIBSON: We were asked by the applicant to
21 provide supplemental and completion funds for a project we
22 had previously supported. The project is "Cathedral". It
23 is being produced by Unicorn Productions. It is the second
24 in a series of films based on the books of David McCauley.
25 The first of those, which has been completed and has been

1 been aired at least twice on Public Television, was "Castle",
2 which is a film using animation which describes the construc-
3 tion of a castle in medieval Wales in England. The second
4 of these is "Cathedral", which deals with the construction
5 of and the social life, context, and history of the construc-
6 tion of a cathedral in France.

7 They need some dollars in addition to those we
8 already awarded to finish this film, and we are recommending
9 it be provided.

10 MR. KINGSTON: Anita.

11 MS. SILVERS: It might be enlightening if we men-
12 tioned how many books there are in this particular series.

13 MR. GIBSON: I don't know how many.

14 MS. SILVERS: There are at least 10. There is
15 Village, every kind of building.

16 MR. GIBSON: We mentioned in open session -- Dr.
17 Ritcheson reported that one of the projects that -- the
18 evaluation project the division wishes to undertake, and
19 plans to undertake, during the next few months is an evalua-
20 tion of two major series. This is one of those series which
21 we intend to evaluate, because there are 10 books. I have
22 met Mr. McCauley and I think he is capable of producing any
23 more as long as NEH funds might be forthcoming. Therefore,
24 we intend to evaluate carefully the first two of these series
25 to make some kind of determination whether we should continue

1 support.

2 MR. KINGSTON: Other comments or questions about
3 the -- all those in favor of the motion, signify by saying
4 aye.

5 (A chorus of ayes was heard.)

6 MR. KINGSTON: Opposed?

7 (No response.)

8 MR. KINGSTON: And that has passed. The report
9 from Fellowships -- your motion is listed as a Research
10 Programs motion, but it is indeed in Fellowships.

11 FELLOWSHIP PROGRAMS

12 MS. HIMMELFARB: (Inaudible.) We received 554
13 applications. The committee has recommended 314 awards for
14 a total of \$157,000. We are not recommending 240 applica-
15 tions. The not recommended applications start on page 6.

16 One application involved policy consideration.
17 The application was highly rated, but the applicant was a
18 foreign national and was about six months short of his
19 required two-year residency requirement which we have had
20 for this program, that NEH has had. He has, however, applied
21 for permanent residency in the United States and plans to
22 remain in the country. The committee recommended approval
23 of the application. I should add that there are precedents
24 for waiving residency requirements.

25 MS. KERR: Is that requirement made at the time of

1 application or at the time of taking out the fellowship?

2 MS. HIMMELFARB: It is at the time of application,
3 which means by the time he gets the money he is probably --
4 I guess we will recommend this -- motion -- be ---

5 MR. KINGSTON: This is for the -- Collections
6 Program. These are the \$500 grants for scholars to get to
7 research institutions. Any questions or comments about the
8 motion? All in favor, signify by saying aye.

9 (A chorus of ayes was heard.)

10 MR. KINGSTON: Opposed?

11 (No response.)


12 MR. KINGSTON: That carries. Mr. Cohn, we will
13 have a report from the Challenge Committee.

14 CHALLENGE GRANTS

15 MR. COHN: At this Council, our committee was
16 asked to consider only 1 application, but it was one of
17 highly unusual scope and significance, the request from the
18 New York Public Library for a three-year challenge grant of
19 \$6 million to support the work of its research libraries.

20 Members of the Council, I am sure, will recall that
21 at our last meeting, after considerable discussion, we recom-
22 mended that future grants from the Endowment for the kind
23 of general support needed by the Library be made from the
24 Challenge fund rather than, as in the past, from the regular
25 Treasury funds. It was also resolved that the Library could

1 apply for a three-year award of up to \$6 million from NEH
2 that would in turn be matched by up to \$18 million in gifts
3 from private and other non-Federal sources.

4  The match would thus be set at a ratio customary
5 with challenge grants of 3 non-Federal dollars to every NEH
6 \$1, as opposed to earlier matching ratios of 2:1 or, on
7 occasion, 1:1. The Library would not, however, be required
8 to raise funds from new donors or increased giving from
9 previous donors in order to release Federal matching funds
10 since it was thought that an intolerable strain might be
11 placed on the Library if it were continually forced to obtain
12 new sources of support on this scale.

13 Also, of great importance in this determination,
14 was the belief that the most appropriate use for NEH challenge
15 funds given to the New York Public Library at this time would
16 be to reinforce its ongoing fund raising effort and to sus-
17 tain the newly achieved pattern of giving by its regular
18 donors.

19 The amount of this grant, if made, will, of course,
20 exceed the usual limit of the program of approximately \$1-
21 1-1/2 million in NEH over 3 years. But, on the other hand,
22 it will be somewhat lower than the yearly awards made to the
23 Library in the past, and will involve, as I have just men-
24 tioned, a higher matching requirement from non-Federal
25 sources. I want to point out and emphasize that the program's

1 current regulation that there be a two-year hiatus between
2 completing one grant and submitting another proposal will
3 be waived in this particular library's case since our inte-
4 tion has been to provide a mechanism for sustaining support
5 through the challenge funds.

6 The proposal from the New York Public Library now
7 before the Council reflects these understandings. Among the
8 activities of the research libraries to which funds raised
9 through the Endowment's challenge grant would be applied
10 are: collections development in the humanities; conserva-
11 tion and preservation; bibliographical access to the Library's
12 holdings and reference services to scholars, and of course,
13 the general public.

14 Accompanying the application for the 1984 report,
15 "Rebuilding the New York Public Library: A Plan for Recovery
16 -- and Progress" and the annual statistical report of the
17 research libraries. The staff sent this proposal for written
18 comment to 10 separate reviewers who were chosen not only
19 for their recognized distinction but also because they could
20 be engaged to discuss knowledgeably from various perspectives
21 the Library's national -- and I emphasize the word "national"
22 -- importance to the humanities.

23 In their evaluation, these reviewers were asked
24 specifically to address themselves to the following seven
25 issues: (1) the importance of the collections of the New York

1 Public Library to scholarship in the humanities; (2) the
2 significance of the research libraries -- and I want to empha-
3 size these words -- as the national and international resource
4 to the humanities -- not just the City of New York resource --
5 not just the State of New York -- but a national, inter-
6 national resource; (3) the value and quality of the Library's
7 current bibliographic and preservation activities; (4) the
8 appropriateness of the Library's goals and priorities for the
9 maintenance and improvement of its collection and reference
10 services; (5) the quality of the institution's long-range
11 financial planning; (6) the case made in the proposal for the
12 Library's need for this grant and for the place of the NEH
13 funds in the Library's financial plans, and lastly, the
14 seventh item: their sense of the Library's ability, in light
15 of its previous fund raising experiences and the qualifica-
16 tions of its staff, to realize successfully the objectives
17 specified in the proposal.

18 All of the evaluators testified to the extraordinary
19 importance of the New York Public Library's collection as an
20 national resource for scholarship in the humanities. The
21 increased significance of the Library to foreign researchers
22 was also acknowledged. It was observed, for example, that
23 the New York Public Library is now "an essential port of call
24 for foreign visitors to the United States". One scholar
25 recalled that "some years ago when a shortage of funds forced

1 the Library to reduce the hours it was open, users from as
2 far away as England and Germany were distressed."

3 Reviewers repeatedly remarked on the quality and
4 range of the Library's holdings from the unique manuscript
5 and monographic materials found in the Spencer, Berg, and
6 Schomburg collections to the extent of its general collections
7 formed, as one evaluator asserted, by "collecting policies
8 dating from 1897" that reflect a concentration on humanistic
9 and historical studies and underscore a commitment to main-
10 taining comprehensive collections in primary disciplines.

11 The major role that the Library now assumes for
12 national bibliographic control and microfilming of endangered
13 print and photographic material, as part of the cooperative
14 effort with the research libraries group, was deemed "a
15 national asset". Also praised was the Library's willingness
16 to engage in "an active participant in national and regional
17 planning for expanded preservation work".

18 The quality of the Library's cataloging was
19 described always as first-rate across the entire spectrum
20 of materials processed. The evaluators judged the goals and
21 priorities the Library had established for its work during
22 the period of the requested challenge grant and for the next
23 10 years to be admirable and appropriate, the result of a
24 comprehensive process of institutional analysis and planning.
25 Similarly, the reviewers were impressed with the extent of

1 the Library's long-range financial planning and the per-
2 suasiveness in the case made in the application for the
3 Library's need for a challenge grant. The important role of
4 the NEH funds within the Library's fiscal plan and the ability
5 of the Library's staff, based upon its previous fund raising
6 experience, to realize the financial objectives specified
7 in the proposal.

8 Finally, reiterated mention was made in this context
9 and others of the special qualities of intelligence, energy,
10 and dedication brought to the administration of the Library
11 by its current president, Kartan Gregorian. All 10 reviewers,
12 during the course of their commentary, recommended that the
13 challenge grant be awarded to the Library as requested.

14 As part of the Endowment's evaluation of this
15 application, two members of the Challenge Grant staff made
16 site visits to the Library, focusing particularly on those
17 activities and resources cited in this request for challenge
18 funding. This tour confirmed the reviewers' sense of the
19 varied usership of the Library's holdings, the remarkable
20 readiness and ability of its staff to offer help to visitors,
21 and the general aura of renewal and vitality that seems to
22 pervade all of its work.

23 Conversations with ^{Vartan}~~Kartan~~ Gregorian and others
24 members of the administrative staff reveals that the Library
25 has accpeted the recommendation made by special consultants

1 to embark on a five-year \$150 million campaign over the next
2 five years. The NEH challenge grant is considered vital to
3 the success of that particular endeavor, since it is intended
4 to protect current levels of private support for general
5 expenses, which is crucial, of course, for the maintenance
6 of library services, from being siphoned off by specifically
7 designated gifts or contributions to endowment that donors
8 often find more attractive.

9 The committee also had the opportunity to read the
10 complete application -- about that thick -- which was sent
11 to us along with a lengthy staff summary of the evaluations.
12 After some discussion, the committee unanimously agreed that
13 a strong case has been made for the awarding of this grant
14 to the New York Public Library, unusual as it is in a number
15 of respects. Mr. Chairman, I move the grant of the applica-
16 tion.

17 *end* MR. KINGSTON: Thank you. There is a motion. Is
18 there any comment about this application, discussion that you
19 wish to ---

20 MR. RITCHESON: I want to add just a little bit
21 about the actual importance of this institution. You men-
22 tioned, Marcus, the research libraries group, and I would
23 like just to expand on that briefly. The research libraries
24 group is a consortium of some 35 or 6 major research libraries
25 throughout the country. In addition, there is a recently

1 established link through satellite with the British Library
2 in Britain. These institutions are linked through computer
3 technology, and in each, there is the ability to search the
4 holdings of other consortium members. Thus, what you do
5 for the New York Public, you are doing for this entire
6 consortium, and it is not an isolated, single institution
7 we are dealing with but this whole national, indeed inter-
8 national, consortium. Therefore, it deserves our fullest
9 support.

10 MR. KINGSTON: Any other comments or questions?
11 Those in favor of the motion, signify by saying aye.

12 (A chorus of ayes was heard.)

13 MR. KINGSTON: Opposed?

14 (No response.)

15 MR. KINGSTON: George, you had a comment?

16 MR. KENNEDY: Yes. On behalf of the Jefferson
17 Committee, and the Council generally, I would like to ask Mr.
18 Agresto to extend our congratulations and appreciation to
19 all those members of the staff who worked to make the
20 Jefferson Lecture such a success this year. The arrangements
21 and the hall were, I thought, quite splendid. The colloquium
22 from last night was excellent. We appreciated the opportunity
23 to have lunch with the speaker yesterday, and all of the
24 suggestions and requests that the committee made or were
25 transmitted from other Council members seemed to be responded

1 to in a very sympathetic way. I thought it was unusually
2 successful in staff participation and organization.

3 MR. AGRESTO: I think the staff knows that that
4 was one of the most successful, if not spectacular, Jefferson
5 Lectures that we have had. On behalf of George and the
6 committee and the NEH, thank you. Thank you, Susan Metz,
7 Susan Wunderking (?), everyone who worked on it, and Public
8 Affairs and everyone else who worked on that. I know it was
9 hard work and it was well worth it. Thank you.

10 MR. KINGSTON: We are about ready to adjourn, but
11 before we do, let me say that when we do adjourn the Council
12 will have lunch in the back room as usual. It is ready to go.
13 We will move up the time for the showing for Council of the
14 AIM film. Let's move that up to 12:45. Some members of
15 staff have asked if they could sit in on that. Of course,
16 you may, but we will be showing it at 12:45, not at 2:00
17 and the showing is in this room.

18 I will entertain -- once we adjourn, we will go to
19 lunch. It is in the back room. The eating area is set up
20 in the back, and it will take a little time to get the
21 television and so forth set up in here. I will accept a
22 motion for adjournment at this point. All right. We are
23 adjourned.

24 (Whereupon, at 11:32 a.m., the meeting was
25 adjourned.)