

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 COUNCIL ON THE HUMANITIES

SIXTY-FOURTH MEETING

May 7, 1982

Shoreham Building
906 Fifteen Street, NW
Washington, D.C.

(Transcript prepared from
tapes furnished by Agency.)

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1330 VERMONT AVENUE, NW
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

A G E N D A1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25PAGE

II. Minutes (Mr. Willkie)	4
III. Reports	
A. Introductory Remarks (Mr. Bennett)	6
B. Introduction of New Staff (Mr. Marshall)	7
C. Chairman's Grants and Grants Departing from Council Recommendation (Tab A) (Mr. Willkie)	10
D. Application Report (Tab B) (Mr. Tashdinian)	12
E. Gifts and Matching Report (Tab C) (Mr. Tashdinian)	14
F. FY 1982 Program Funding (Tab D) (Mr. Tashdinian)	15
G. FY 1983 Appropriations Request (Tab E) (Mr. Tashdinian)	20
H. FY 1984 Budget Planning (Tab F) (Mr. Tashdinian)	32
I. Dates of Future Council Meetings (Tab G) (Mr. Willkie)	46
J. Access and Historically Black Colleges and Universities (Mr. Marshall)	49
K. Committee Reports on Policy and General Matters	
a. Fellowship Programs (Mr. Kennedy)	56
b. Planning and Assessment Studies (Ms. Silvers)	59
c. Special Programs (Ms. Zimmerman)	63
d. Research Programs (Mr. Hamilton)	67
e. Education Programs (Ms. Norton)	72

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1330 VERMONT AVENUE, NW

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

		3
1	f. Public Programs (Ms. Zimmerman)	83
2	g. State Programs (Ms. Silvers)	84
3	CLOSED SESSION:	
4	L. Chairman's Actions Departing from	
5	Council Recommendation (Tab H)	
	(Mr. Willkie)	110
6	IV. Fellowship Programs	
7	A. Action on Applications - ACLS	
	(Tab I)	
8	B. Action on Applications - Summer	
9	Seminars for College Teachers	
	(Tab J) (Mr. Kennedy)	162
10	V. Planning and Assessment Studies	
11	A. Action on Applications (Tab K)	
12	(Ms. Silvers)	165
13	VI. Special Programs	
14	A. Action on Applications - Youth	
	Programs (Tab L)	
15	B. Action on Applications - Program	
16	Development (Tab M)	
17	C. Action on Applications - Science,	
	Technology and Human Values	
18	(Tab N) (Ms. Zimmerman)	166
19	VII. Research Programs	
20	A. Action on Applications (Tab O)	
	(Mr. Kennedy)	189
21	VIII. Education Programs	
22	A. Action on Applications - Elementary	
23	and Secondary Education Programs	
	(Tab P)	

1 B. Action on Applications - Higher
2 Education/Individual Institutions
(Tab Q)

3 C. Action on Applications - Higher
4 Education/Regional and National
(Tab R) (Ms. Norton)

127

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

P R O C E E D I N G S

MR. : Good morning ladies and gentlemen. Mr. Willkie.

MR. WILLKIE: I believe the first order of business this morning is to note unhappily the absence of a quorum pursuant to Section 8-D of our enabling legislation, 14 members are required for purposes of conducting an official meeting.

The situation has arisen a number of times in the past, and we've been able to proceed in the absence of a quorum, and the Council proceeds to make recommendations to the chairman, and as to particular authority which the chairman needs to act, he can obtain that authority in writing from absent Council members.

Are there any questions on the absence of quorum? I believe all the Council members have received the minutes of the 63rd meeting last February. Are there any questions or comments on those minutes?

MS. : I have a correction.

MR. WILLKIE: Yes?

MS. : On page 20 of the minutes, Wendall, I am quoted as saying something which is meaningless as written.

MR. WILLKIE: That's not possible.

(Laughter.)

1 MS. : And it comes from a
2 misunderstanding of a proposition on the tape, I suspect.
3 I am quoted as saying, "National significance and efforts"
4 -- or "in" efforts, and what I said was "National sig-
5 nificance and efforts" rather than "in", but it makes
6 absolutely no sense the way it is now written.

7 "National significance and" rather than
8 "National significance in".

9 MR. WILLKIE: I suspect that is a typo. Any
10 other questions or comments on the minutes?

11 MR. BENNETT : Shall we have a motion
12 that the Council members shall always be recorded as
13 making sense and --

14 (Laughter.)

15 MR. BENNETT : -- And their sentences
16 always are --

17 (Laughter.)

18 MR. BENNETT : Thank you, Mary Beth. We
19 need a motion of approval of the minutes.

20 MS. : So moved.

21 MR. BENNETT : Second.

22 MR. WILLKIE: All in favor say "aye"?

23 (Chorus of ayes.)

24 MR. WILLKIE: All opposed?

25 Minutes are approved.

1 MR. BENNETT: I have 15 minutes for introduc-
2 tory remarks. I don't want to use them. Let me just
3 say I think we're doing well, and we will do better. I
4 would like to welcome new members of the Council, yet to
5 be confirmed by the Senate, but we know they will be
6 full-fledged soon.

7 Gertrude Himelfarb (phonetic), Walter Burns
8 (phonetic) is not here. I will tell you when he arrives
9 if he arrives. I think he will. He lives in Washington.
10 That's why he is late.

11 (Laughter.)

12 Peter Stanlys (phonetic) and Rita Ricardo
13 Kim (phonetic). Welcome.

14 I would also like to -- Walter Burns has just
15 arrived.

16 (Applause and laughter.)

17 Walter would you like to give your report
18 now?

19 (Laughter.)

20 I would like to ask -- use this time very
21 briefly to ask Cereasa Menter (phonetic) to stand. Is
22 she present? Without Cereasa there is no coffee. With-
23 out Cereasa there are no donuts. Without Cereasa there
24 is no Council meeting. Thank you, Cereasa.

25 (Applause and laughter.)

1 Certainly no General Council --

2 (Laughter.)

3 Mr. Willkie -- Mr. Marshall, I am sorry.

4 MR. MARSHALL: At this point in each Council
5 meeting we take an opportunity to introduce staff of
6 Endowment who have been at it since the last meeting. In
7 the brown folder before you is a brief biographical sketch
8 of four individuals, and I won't perform a responsive
9 reading, but I will ask the individuals to stand so that
10 you can identify them, and have a chance to talk with
11 them in the course of today and in future meetings.

12 First, Ann Brooks (phonetic). Ann joins us
13 as the new Congressional Liaison Specialist. Rich
14 Eckman (phonetic) is new at the table, though not new
15 to the Endowment. I think he's known to a great many of
16 you.

17 We're pleased to have Rich with us now as the
18 Director of Education Program.

19 Jason Hall (phonetic), also to my left, has
20 joined the staff, rejoined the staff, as Congressional
21 Liaison Officer for the Agency, also known by a number
22 of you from prior incarnation at the Endowment.

23 And Tom Kingston (phonetic). I didn't see Tom
24 this morning. He's there. Thank you, Tom. Tom Kingston
25 has jointed the staff of the Endowment as the Challenge

1 Grants Officer responsible for that program.

2 We are pleased this morning also to be able
3 to anticipate something we'll have in a little more
4 writing for you actually at the July meeting, as we have
5 with us this morning Steve Kahns (phonetic).

6 Steve is back of this pillar. Steve, would
7 you mind standing? Thank you. Steve is going to join
8 the staff of the Endowment on June 1 as the Director of
9 our new division of General Programs, involving the --
10 excuse me, General Programs, involving the merger of
11 state programs and public programs.

12 Steve is special.

13 (Laughter.)

14 Thank you. We've had too many discussions,
15 too many discussions. I know. Steve is currently the
16 Acting Director of the Humanities Program at the Rockefel-
17 ler Foundation. Prior to that he was at the Exxon Founda-
18 tion.

19 He is trained in philosophy. He's taught at
20 a number of universities. He's been Chairman at the
21 University of Vermont.

22 Very pleased that Steve will be with us the
23 first of June.

24 Now it is also true at this time that we make
25 note, although we do not do valedictories for people

1 who have left the Endowment, or some that we can at
2 least acknowledge, and I want to mention two briefly
3 this morning.

4 First is Channing Phillips (phonetic), who
5 left the Endowment at the end of April. Channing, for
6 us at least, is in an awkward position since his new
7 position has not been announced formally, and we can't
8 do it either, but Channing will be with -- this is the
9 way it will be covered in the press -- carried in the
10 press, I think, would be at a major church in New York,
11 New York City.

12 Channing has been our Congressional Liaison
13 Officer for several years. Also this morning I must
14 mention in light of general principle, that into every
15 life some rain must fall, the fact that this will be
16 the last Council meeting for Carol Huxley (phonetic).

17 Carol is leaving the Endowment. The notice
18 went just around this week to take an assignment which is
19 quite striking. She will become Deputy Commissioner for
20 Cultural Education in the State Education Department in
21 New York, and among other things, Carol's responsibilities
22 there include, and you can see the parallel immediately,
23 she will be partly responsible for the State's libraries,
24 the museums, the historical societies, the State archives
25 and the science service.

1 It's a critical position in the State. We're
2 delighted for Carol, disappointed for ourselves, we
3 acknowledge this morning.

4 (Applause.)

5 That is the end of my report.

6 MR. BENNETT: Carol, good luck.

7 MS. HUXLEY: Thank you.

8 MR. BENNETT: It has been a pleasure to
9 work with you. A lot of things I won't forget.

10 (Laughter.)

11 I think most of all the --

12 MS. HUXLEY: Nor will I.

13 (Laughter.)

14 MR. BENNETT: Most of all the tea party with
15 the Chief Justice.

16 (Laughter.)

17 Mr. Willkie again.

18 MR. WILLKIE: If you turn to Tab A in your
19 agenda books, you'll find the Chairman's Grants which
20 were awarded between January 1 and March 31 of 1982, as
21 well as the grants departing from Council recommendation.

22 Later on this morning we can discuss certain
23 applications which the Chairman disapproved, although
24 they were recommended by the Council, but those should
25 be taken up in closed session, so we'll just focus on

1 these grants at this time.

2 Are there any questions or comments?

3 MR. : The first one, the
4 grant for the partisan review -- raise any issue in a
5 grant to a participating institution or is the partisan
6 review (inaudible) --

7 We faced this a couple of times in the past,
8 and I just wondered if there was any issue here.

9 MR. WILLKIE: I am not sure. I believe it is
10 non-profit, but I could be wrong. We believe it is
11 organized as a non-profit organization. The journal, it-
12 self is, as the Kenyon (phonetic) review is and --

13 MR. : I am sure it doesn't
14 make a lot of money, but --

15 (Laughter.)

16 MS. : I think it is a circulated
17 report --

18 MR. WILLKIE: But even formally and legally, we
19 believe it is chartered as a non-profit --

20 MR. : There might be some
21 technical problem.

22 MR. WILLKIE: Certainly. Jack?

23 MR. : Could we have some guid-
24 ance or statement of policy on how Chairman's Grants will
25 be handled under this Administration, particularly

1 why we want to set aside the normal processes of Council
2 review on these particular applications as types of
3 future, such policy decisions?

4 MR. : I think that -- you recall
5 from a memorandum distributed to you that Louie Hector
6 (phonetic) intends to make a motion affecting Chairman's
7 Grants.

8 We have planned on the agenda to do that right
9 before coffee break this morning, and your question is
10 central to that issue, and if I could suggest we do it
11 at that point. It will just be 15 minutes from now, but
12 it will fit in the general question of moving the Chair-
13 man's Grant amount.

14 MR. : All right, Armand, the
15 schedule says you have 30 minutes, but Jeff says you
16 have 15, so --

17 MR. TASHDINIAN : There is a memo in the
18 Council agenda book, a routine quarterly application
19 report. I would not suggest you turn to it, or try to
20 memorize any of the figures there because the report
21 changes with each Council.

22 As mentioned in that memo though we have con-
23 tinued to try to monitor the more recent rates of the
24 applications, and that particular memo just looked at the
25 applications which went to the November and February

1 Council, and I have some further information which would
2 include applications coming to this Council, too.

3 This has been a very erratic year in terms of
4 the applications. The last six months of last year we
5 noticed a distinct decline, which continued into the
6 first four, five, six months of this year, and, therefore,
7 the applications which the November, February and even
8 this Council are handling are the results of that decline.

9 Therefore, there are many fewer applications
10 coming to you, and, therefore, many fewer applications
11 being recommended for funding. The past month has seen
12 all of a sudden in a number of programs a remarkable
13 increase.

14 As to how that -- whether or not that will
15 continue in the various deadlines we have for the rest
16 of this fiscal year, we don't know. We anticipate at
17 this time they probably will come out at the end of this
18 fiscal year with an application load of approximately, or
19 maybe slightly less than last year.

20 In terms of the funding ratios, if we were
21 to include the applications which came to this Council,
22 let's say as of Wednesday, in other words before the
23 committees met, as of Wednesday, those which were being
24 recommended for support, approximately 23 or 24 percent
25 of the applications -- November, February and this

1 Council were being recommended for support.

2 That is one or two percentage points less
3 than the overall percentage for last year. That per-
4 centage is the percentage -- what we call the competitive
5 applications in a number of programs where we are not
6 seeking -- where the applicants are not vying with one
7 another, that we have excluded that in these particular
8 totals.

9 Are there any questions about that? I'd be
10 happy to respond. Otherwise we go on to the next agenda
11 item.

12 (Pause.)

13 MR. TASHDINIAN: There is a report in the
14 folder before you on the status of our Gifts and Matching
15 Report. The gifts seem to be coming in at a good rate.
16 We are assured of releasing the full treasury appropria-
17 tion of \$8 million.

18 The -- I should mention that of the \$8.7 mil-
19 lion as shown on the sheet in that brown folder, about
20 \$1 million of that includes gifts which we had scheduled
21 to match in the next fiscal year.

22 We can always match them this fiscal year
23 if need be. In addition, we had already planned to use
24 about, oh, \$1 1/2 million or \$2 million out of definite
25 funds to match gifts, so that right now we're in very

1 good shape in terms of both our matching ability as
2 well as the assurance that the full treasury appropriation
3 will be released.

4 If there are any questions about that report,
5 I'd be happy to respond, deal with them.

6 (Pause.)

7 No. Shall we go onto the next item?

8 MR. TASHDINIAN: 1982 Program Funding. There
9 is a memorandum in the agenda book, and I have nothing to
10 add to that memorandum. We will be looking over the
11 final Council recommendations coming out of this Council,
12 and determining whether or not we should go, very soon,
13 to the Congress for the reprogramming request as we
14 discussed extensively in February.

15 We will seek a reprogramming approval, that
16 is for the new Council members I should mention, the
17 Endowment has the -- the Chairman has the authority to
18 shift about \$250,000 from one program to another program.

19 Should -- I won't go into all the details,
20 but generally if you just keep that in mind, \$250,000
21 from programs. If he wishes to exceed that amount he
22 must go to the two Congressional appropriation committees
23 and seek their approval for that shift.

24 The committees in this case simply exercise
25 the -- what we call passive veto. They don't have to

1 actively approve that change. They simply can't dis-
2 approve it specifically.

3 We expect sometime -- in that memorandum, I
4 think, I said by July -- it may well be that we will
5 wait even until the July Council before we make that
6 shift, but we know that we will want to seek about
7 \$1 to \$2 million -- \$2 to \$3 million in -- shifting away
8 from the program, the special -- excuse me, the public
9 programs division, which we know now, in view of the
10 applications which have come in against their last
11 deadline will not be able to use the full allocations
12 set aside for it at the beginning of the year.

13 Any questions, comments about that?

14 (Pause.)

15 MR. : I wanted to ask -- you
16 make reference here to proceeding for summer seminars
17 for high school students. Are we going to get to discuss
18 that in July?

19 MR. BENNETT: Hang on just a second. Go ahead.

20 MR. : The experiment this
21 year is not part of our budget for the future, and in
22 order to be able to do it in the future, we would have
23 to revise our budget with Congress and so on.

24 We have no line item for that program, and so
25 we are trying an experiment this year. July is when we

1 would see the 1984 budget material, but also, I think
2 discuss 1983.

3 MR. : Right, but as I understood
4 it we are planning it for FY 1983, the summer of 1983, and
5 I --

6 MR. : That's correct.

7 MR. : And I was curious to
8 know when we get to discuss the total program and how it
9 proceeds.

10 MR. BENNETT: Well, you would have material,
11 I presume, at the July meeting.

12 MR. : Okay.

13 MR. BENNETT: Yes, that is where we'll have
14 the list, right?

15 MS. : That's right.

16 MR. BENNETT: That's where we'll have the
17 list of seminars, and so on. That would be the occasion.

18 MR. : List of seminars?

19 MR. BENNETT: Yes.

20 MR. : But overall design plan,
21 context, purpose, role in the larger program of the Endow-
22 ment -- when do we get that?

23 MR. BENNETT: Well, we did that last time.

24 MR. : We did?

25 MR. BENNETT: Sure.

1 MR. : That was it.

2 MR. BENNETT: Well, you asked a series of
3 questions. I answered them as best I could. If there
4 are any more on your mind, we'll discuss it some later,
5 or you can write.

6 MR. : Mr. Chairman?

7 MR. : Yes?

8 MR. : I think -- I presented
9 the material, in part, last time, anyway. I think we
10 did discuss it, Jack, in the sense that we talked about
11 the kind of coverage that was going to happen, the
12 approximate scope that it was going to have.

13 There are, of course, long-range problems
14 about it. There's an enormous potential pool out
15 there, and it is -- I think it is important to do some
16 planning about what the scale of the program is going to
17 be if the pilot project is once successful.

18 We really do need to have some kind of
19 picture, but I am not sure that that can be done, until
20 you do the pilot project.

21 MR. BENNETT: Yes, fair enough. Thank you.
22 In two places -- one, we will look at the shape of the
23 specific plans for 1983 in July.

24 Second, this has got to be part of our
25 general planning for the 1984 budget, that is what part

1 of the budget should this have. Should we expand it.
2 Should we keep it small-size, but again those would be
3 tentative, I think, thoughts and recommendations,
4 pending the outcome of the first round.

5 There have been meetings already. Gueneviere
6 Gwisté (phonetic) and Jim Blessing (phonetic) hosted
7 a meeting already on this with some outside consultants,
8 and we feel confident enough, at least, to go ahead
9 with the first phase.

10 MR. : But --

11 MR. BENNETT: Yes?

12 MR. : First of all, existing
13 programs of the Fellowships Division will not be cut
14 back in order to start new programs.

15 MR. BENNETT: No.

16 MR. : Secondly, would we have
17 in July along with the budget a somewhat more elaborate
18 account of what we're doing and why, and its effect on
19 the programs of the Endowment because we really did not
20 get that in February.

21 I think the basic idea is a good one. The
22 one question we pursued in Committee as my colleague
23 Mr. Kennedy said is the total affect on the problems of
24 the high school teaching of humanities, so if we could
25 have something more elaborate than one line of figures.

1 MR. BENNETT: Sure. You will have it.

2 MR. : Thank you.

3 MR. BENNETT: Maybe we'll have it as the
4 first piece in the material that the Committee is given
5 for the July meeting. Is that okay? Okay. Thanks.

6 MR. TASHDINIAN: Anything else? Shall we
7 move to the next item, which is the 1983 Appropriations
8 Request.

9 Last Thursday the House Appropriations Sub-
10 committee on the Interior and related agencies, which
11 we are related, held its hearing on the Endowment's
12 appropriation for us for the next fiscal year.

13 I thought I'd just make a few remarks about
14 the hearing, and invite the Chairman and others who
15 were there to join in.

16 The hearing ran from about 10:00 in the morning
17 until 4:00 in the afternoon with a break for lunch.

18 The Subcommittee, of course, is headed by Sidney Yates
19 of Chicago. There were two other Congressmen who also
20 participated in part of the session, Congressman Regula
21 from Ohio and Dicks from Washington.

22 Although the hearing ran, I'd say about over
23 five hours, the number of topics were discussed were,
24 I'd say a handful. The -- it is quite clear that from
25 the direction of the questioning from Mr. Yates, who

1 led most of the hearing, that he is quite concerned
2 about the reductions proposed for 1983 and, in effect,
3 was attempting, I think, to make a record to support a
4 higher budget level.

5 The Chairman appearing as head of the agency
6 and as the chief Administration witness, of course, was
7 there in order to defend the Administration's request.
8 Mr. Yates, in his questioning, was attempting, I'd say
9 to try to develop the specific information he could about
10 what he'd consider to be the damage to the humanities
11 because of these cutbacks.

12 Therefore, a great deal of the hearing did
13 comprise what I would call, sparring between that
14 Committee Chairman and our Agency chairman. In the
15 course of his questioning, Mr. Yates took up particularly,
16 an interview, which the previous Chairman, Joe Duffy
17 (phonetic) had given to the Chronicle of Higher Educa-
18 tion, in which Mr. Duffy talked about the rapid growth
19 of the Agency in its early history.

20 I think that Mr. Duffy used the phrase, some-
21 thing like uncontrolled growth or too quick growth.

22 MR. BENNETT: Institutional growth out of
23 control.

24 MR. TASHDINIAN: Institutional growth out of
25 control, and so Mr. Yates was attempting, I think, to

1 satisfy himself and his Committee that the Agency or the
2 Endowment had, indeed, been in control during those
3 years, and would be able to use increased funds if it
4 should be so granted.

5 He pressed the Chairman, particularly, to
6 talk about what the Agency would do, should the Congress
7 vote higher amounts of money. Here I should mention that
8 the Council members -- in case those of you outside of
9 Washington who don't keep up with the day-to-day develop-
10 ments internally in the executive branch, the OMB for
11 the first time has issued a directive to all federal
12 agencies, which instruct them not to speculate about
13 increases about the President's budget requests.

14 The Agency is left free to speculate about
15 decreases from that request, but render explicit instruc-
16 tions not to discuss what would happen if you have more
17 money or to provide alternative budgets without further
18 consultation with OMB.

19 The Chairman pointed it out that that was
20 accepted reluctantly by Mr. Yates.

21 MS. : Excuse me, Armand?

22 MR. TASHDINIAN: Yes?

23 MS. : May I interrupt. Does
24 that mean that in our budget planning we will not have
25 levels --

1 MR. TASHDINIAN: We're talking right now about
2 1983, the -- once the Administration makes its proposed
3 budgets for the coming fiscal year, the agencies are
4 pledged -- the agencies have always been pledged to
5 defend that specific amount of money, no more or no
6 less.

7 However, in the past there has been a routine
8 question from the Congressional committees as to what
9 would happen if you had "x" dollars more or "x" dollars
10 left, and the agencies have been free previously to
11 respond to that request.

12 MS. : I just wanted to clarify.
13 In the past we've been instructed, have we not -- I
14 mean don't we -- didn't we in the last, for the 1983
15 budget, we did have the different levels.

16 MR. TASHDINIAN: That was for the budget
17 request we made to OMB.

18 MS. : Right.

19 MR. TASHDINIAN: And I anticipate that for
20 the request for 1984 the agency will, again, provide
21 alternate levels. Actually we had done that internally
22 anyway in previous years, and -- although we had only
23 sent to OMB a sort of top-level request.

24 Once ZBB was introduced and continuing through
25 last year, we were explicitly directed to provide alterna-

1 tive budget levels to OMB.

2 Once the President makes his decision then only
3 one level goes forth to the Congress. So for the 1983
4 budget situation situation we are discussing only that
5 one level right now.

6 The -- Mr. Yates was also concerned about
7 whether the non-federal sectors would be able to increase
8 their funding in order to make up for the decrease in the
9 federal appropriation, and many of his questions as
10 well as the other questions the other two Committee mem-
11 bers had had to do with the panel and Council role in the
12 whole review process and in the making of policy.

13 Mr. Regula's questions, I might add, had
14 to do with a couple of areas that he seems to be par-
15 ticularly concerned about. As an ex-school teacher he
16 asked particularly about what the agency was doing in the
17 area of elementary and secondary education, and seemed
18 quite pleased about the summer seminars for high
19 school teachers.

20 Also, as a legislator, he was very interested
21 in the plans for -- to develop public programming commem-
22 orating the bicentennial constitution. Mr. Dicks was
23 concerned about the reductions as they would affect the
24 state programs, and asked many, many hard questions about
25 the increase in the Agency's administrative budget, in

1 view of the overall budget decrease.

2 That is all that I was going to remark about
3 that hearing, in itself. I should mention that today,
4 right now, I guess, or in about a half-an-hour, Mr.
5 Yates' Subcommittee will hold hearings taking public
6 testimony on the impact of the President's 1983 budget
7 request for the humanities, and next Tuesday, we will
8 go before the Senate Appropriations Subcommittee to
9 discuss the budget request.

10 Bill, did you want to add to that or Jeff?

11 I anticipate that it will be a long time --
12 the appropriation for this year will be a long time in
13 coming because of the difficulties in working out between
14 the two houses an acceptable budget compromise, and then
15 because of the coming election -- so we may not know un-
16 til late in the fiscal year, after the fiscal year has
17 started as to what our precise levels of funding for
18 1983 actually will be.

19 MR. BENNETT: If I may, Jack?

20 MR. : Please.

21 MR. BENNETT: I might remind the Council,
22 because it is a matter people have written me about
23 from scholarly organizations already, about the adminis-
24 trative budget, that if you subtract as you should for
25 good comparison the \$659,000 for the move to the old

1 post office, and the \$132,000 increase in telecommunica-
2 tions which I think means telephone -- that our budget
3 increase in administration is only one percent over last
4 year.

5 The main point that needs to be stressed there,
6 that we said at the hearing, is that it really doesn't
7 follow that if you're giving away less money in grants
8 that you need fewer staff, because as I was saying at the
9 Council meeting yesterday, people tend to write in more
10 often when they have not received a grant than when
11 they have, asking for an explanation.

12 (Laughter.)

13 So the work is constant or relatively con-
14 stant no matter how much we give out, and, in fact, if
15 we give out a smaller percentage, there's probably more
16 burden on the staff.

17 I think once those figures are explained that
18 the Committee was pretty well satisfied, but it is one of
19 those things people can focus on, and say, "Look, things
20 are going down, but the administrative budget is going
21 up".

22 I would just remind the Council if they are
23 asked. Thank you. Jack?

24 MR. : I just wanted to ask
25 about the proposed budget compromise that would keep us

1 for the next budget at the same level that we now are
2 at.

3 That would appear to be to our advantage.
4 In round numbers, I think we have \$130 million, and the
5 OMB was suggesting \$96.

6 MR. : Yes, Jack, it is not clear
7 to me as to how that overall compromise would be trans-
8 lated into the actual appropriations for a particular
9 agency, so I don't think that we should count on that
10 going through.

11 MR. : But it would not be
12 -- would not be out of place to observe that the Endow-
13 ment would be better off with \$130 million than \$96.

14 MR. BENNETT: You can observe that, yourself.

15 MR. : I understand. You
16 can't --

17 MR. BENNETT: No, I can't.

18 MR. : But I think it would be
19 very good if the Council members were to say so under
20 these conditions, and to say that we think we can use
21 every penny of the present budget figure, at least
22 as effectively next year as we did this year, and we
23 think that we've done a good job with public funds over-
24 all.

25 MR. BENNETT: Is this a motion?

1 MR. : It was an "emotion".

2 (Laughter.)

3 MS. : Jack, I second your
4 emotion.

5 MR. BENNETT: All right with you if we leave
6 it at that?

7 (Laughter.)

8 MR. : Yes -- as you know, as
9 you'll find out we have tended to be rather reluctant to
10 pass motions at the Council, because we're never quite
11 certain what happens then, but I think saying so, and
12 saying that the Council -- I believe no one in this
13 room would disagree --

14 MR. BENNETT: I do --

15 MS. : I do -- yes. I would
16 just --

17 MR. : Do you want to debate?

18 MS. : No --

19 MR. : Can we disagree?

20 MR. BENNETT: Sure.

21 MR. : Okay. We disagree.

22 I can't see that we can do a decent job --

23 MS. : This is something for
24 discussion --

25 MR. : I don't know. If you

1 want to -- do you want to discuss it or not?

2 MS. : No.

3 MR. : No?

4 MS. : I don't see any point in
5 it.

6 MR. : Fine with me.

7 MS. : I would say I don't know
8 enough about what has happened in the past to know whether
9 we do a better job or the same job or a poorer job, and
10 I think it is very self-serving, that type of motion, in
11 my mind.

12 MR. : We didn't make a motion.
13 In your judgment -- do you want this discussed or not?

14 MR. BENNETT: Well, you can discuss it. I
15 would just caution before you discuss it that if
16 we do discuss it, if it comes to a motion, it is possible
17 that we could have a situation where a large percentage
18 of the Council and the Chairman -- a large percentage of
19 the Council is making a recommendation which the Chairman
20 is opposed to, and whether you think that would do the
21 agency good or not is a question I'd want to ask.

22 I think your statement of a motion or con-
23 viction on this is in the record.

24 MR. : Thank you.

25 MR. BENNETT: Thank you. Anita?

1 MR. : Can I ask that --

2 MR. BENNETT: Anita?

3 MR. : Oh, sorry.

4 MS. : Just very quickly I
5 wanted to be on record as replicating Dr. Neusner's
6 sentiment.

7 (Laughter.)

8 MR. BENNETT: Louie?

9 MR. : Was the Arts Endowment
10 cut down proportionately?

11 MR. BENNETT: Yes. Roughly, very close.

12 MR. : I understand the State
13 Council is making an all-out (inaudible) -- also that
14 there is a mandated minimum percentage that must go to
15 the states. If the states shall succeed in increasing
16 the state appropriation over that presently proposed
17 by their presentation today and all, is there a maximum
18 as well as a minimum state appropriation in the law?

19 MR. : There is only a minimum,
20 which is 20 percent of the definite program budget, and
21 it is my understanding that the testimony which will be
22 presented today by state representatives does not seek
23 an increase in the percentage.

24 It is the testimony in behalf of the Agency
25 on the entire Endowment budget, and there is not special

1 interest pleading.

2 There has been some special interest pleading
3 on the part of some individual states, but I don't think
4 that's more than three or four that have made such a plea.

5 MR. : I was just wondering about
6 the possibility that the states might be so successful in
7 their presentation that they would -- if the top ceiling
8 holds, the net result would be an even further reduction
9 in the other programs of the Endowment.

10 MR. : If I could the mathematics
11 of that are one of the reasons we believe Congress is
12 not likely to make such a change. This was pointed out
13 in the hearings last week, that that is the effect of the
14 current law, that a substantial increase in one program
15 of that kind would affect the entire agency.

16 You are right to point it out, that that is
17 the mathematics of such an event.

18 MR. : Have the other constituen-
19 cies of the Endowment such as the universities, the
20 research libraries, the scholarly centers, etc. -- have
21 they made presentations to the Committee?

22 MR. : I think that Armand may
23 have the completed list, and I am not going to be able
24 to do this accurately, but in today's testimony, that is
25 exactly the kind of groups and organizations who are

1 testifying -- the Executive Secretary, the Modern Language
2 Association, the American Association of Colleges and so
3 on, and the American Council Learned Society.

4 This is the day in which the full spectrum of
5 agencies and organizations and so on that are supported
6 by the Endowment have an opportunity. I don't mean each
7 and every one of them does, but that is the general nature
8 of the testimony.

9 MR. : Well, Jack, it seems --
10 I agree with your feeling about the budget -- with you
11 and Anita and others I am certain, but does seem to me
12 that the most effective cases made to Congress, not by
13 us who wish to spend it, but by those who can point out
14 how essential it is for them to have it available.

15 MR. : Sure.

16 MR. : That is the real key.

17 MR. : Okay.

18 MR. TASHDINIAN : On to the next item.

19 There was a brief memo in the Council agenda book, and
20 I think that almost everyone was here at the meeting yes-
21 terday morning at which time this was discussed. Let me
22 just brief the one or two people that weren't there, on
23 the planning for the budget 1984, which there is the core
24 of the Budget Committee, which comprises the Chairman of
25 the individual council committees, the chairmen of those

1 committees and -- but every and any council member is
2 invited to join that committee this time.

3 What we do ask are two things. If any
4 council members would like to commit their thoughts on
5 budget issues and questions that they would like the
6 staff to give attention to, particularly, as we move into
7 our program review sessions in the planning of the
8 1984 budget, or questions, issues they would like the
9 Budget Committee to look at when it meets in July, we
10 would very much like to have those thoughts in writing
11 by the end of May.

12 Secondly, for those of you who do plan to
13 attend the meeting, please advise Mr. Willkie at some
14 point so that we can send the material to you. We will
15 be sending material in two batches we anticipate.

16 The first batch will be fairly thick, and so
17 we would like to -- because of the amount of material
18 available, we would like to send it only to those who
19 would like to receive it rather than to every single
20 Council member.

21 That will be followed up by the summary of the
22 preliminary 1984 budget request, which the Chairman would
23 like the Council, the Budget Committee to discuss. That
24 would be 15 or 20 pages I'd say.

25 MS. : Is that memo to go to

1 you or to the Chairman?

2 MR. TASHDINIAN: No. The memo should be sent
3 to the Chairman, and we'll take care of it from there.

4 Thank you.

5 MR. BENNETT: Louie?

6 MR. : As you may be aware the
7 last enabling legislation raised the ceiling on Chairman's
8 grants to \$30,000. I think they've -- the ceiling was
9 originally, when the first legislation was passed, the
10 first appropriation was made back in the '60's was at
11 \$15,000.

12 It has been raised in successive reauthoriza-
13 tions really just to by-and-large keep up with inflation.
14 The actual text reads, "In the case of any application
15 involving \$30,000 or less, the Chairman may approve or
16 disapprove such request, if such action is taken pursuant
17 to the terms of a delegation of authority from the
18 Council to the Chairman, and provided that each such
19 action by the Chairman shall be reviewed by the Council.".

20 The purpose is, I think, understood fairly
21 clear. It is to make grants between Council meetings,
22 where there is simply not time to go through the ordinary
23 processes.

24 Some of these come up in connection with
25 international events. I remember there was a group of

1 very high-level Chinese coming over, and at the last
2 minute they decided to bring a group of Chinese scholars
3 with them, and it was desired to collect in Washington
4 a number of our own scholars on China.

5 ICA didn't seem to have the money. No one
6 seemed to have the money, and we put up the money for
7 that kind of thing.

8 You have situations where a major event is
9 taking place, which we've financed, and all of a sudden
10 at the last minute there is a shortfall of some kind, good
11 projects -- the Council has approved the project.

12 We put up a little extra money. The -- it
13 is impossible to predict what kind of emergencies will
14 arise, but I can predict one thing. As all councils
15 have done with all chairmen in the past, when they
16 read over the list of the chairman's grants, a number
17 of them are going to say, "Well, I wouldn't have made
18 that grant had it been put to us.", and others will
19 say, "Well, I think it could have waited until the
20 next council meeting.".

21 I think it is predictable that that will
22 continue on in the future as it has in the past, but
23 I think the fact that that has occurred and will occur
24 should not cause us to hamstring the office of the
25 chairman, and prevent him from acting in an emergency.

1 It seems to me that if we object to the way
2 the chairman has been handling them, the remedy is to
3 complain at the next meeting of the Council, but that
4 this power in the chairman is indispensable to the
5 operation of the Endowment, and I would, therefore, move
6 that we delegate to the chairman the power to make
7 Chairman's grants of \$30,000 or less between Council
8 meetings, and report them to the Council at the next
9 meeting.

10 MR. : Second it.

11 MS. : Second it.

12 MS. : Question of fact?

13 MR. : Yes.

14 MS. : Is there any total on
15 the overall grant?

16 MR. : Yes. The law says that
17 the total number of -- the total amount of Chairman's
18 Grants, not the numbers of awards, but the total amount
19 awarded may not exceed ten percent of the Endowment's
20 definite funds.

21 Our experience has been that -- I don't --

22 (Laughter.)

23 We've checked this for, I think, the past
24 six or seven years, and in no case have we ever reached
25 two percent of the Endowment's budget.

1 MR. : Is that right?

2 MR. : We've never reached two
3 percent. The law permits ten, but we've never reached
4 two.

5 MR. : Last year it was under
6 one percent, as a matter of fact.

7 MR. : I would, if I could,
8 I will review how they are done, and I am conducting this
9 for the moment since it affects the Chairman, just for
10 the purposes of considering the motion.

11 A request for a Chairman's grant which comes
12 to the Endowment is -- it may come to a division. It
13 may come to the Chairman directly by way of a letter, but
14 in either instance Dr. Bennett has had these requests
15 transferred immediately to the division, where a judgment
16 is requested about whether this should be funded or not.

17 I would point out to the Council, particularly
18 to new members, that there is no budget in the Chairman's
19 office, so a Chairman's grant is always lodged against
20 the division, and, therefore, you'll see in the list
21 here, that the codes and so on, identifying the division
22 and program are listed.

23 The program makes a recommendation to fund
24 or not to fund, and that recommendation comes to me. I
25 also make a recommendation to fund or not to fund, and

1 pass it to the Chairman, and only at that point is a
2 decision made.

3 We've consistently followed that since Dr.
4 Bennett came to the Endowment in each of the instances
5 before you. That is enough for the general background.
6 Jack, you had an earlier question?

7 MR. : Well, no, Mr. Hector
8 answered the question of policy very well, and I think
9 we've always operated by that principle, but in that
10 case, as I review the Chairman's Grants at any point, I
11 always wonder why is it an emergency, and why have we
12 bypassed the normal review processes.

13 I think, if I may make the suggestion, that
14 in future reports on Chairman's Grants, we be told
15 specifically on each application why was the normal
16 review process set aside. I agree that it could be.

17 When I see dates that run for a year or more,
18 and that may be appropriate, then you have to say, "What
19 made that earlier date so critical.". That was my main
20 concern on all of these.

21 I certainly have no objection, and I think
22 if the policy statement is adopted, as I believe it is,
23 then this is a very good proposal.

24 MR. : Well, we did a quick
25 poll just as you were speaking, and we can add that

1 sentence, because that question is before us as well,
2 It has been one of the Chairman's chief questions. I
3 think that has been the one asked most frequently.

4 Is there any reason this cannot go through
5 the regular review process, and most of our declinations
6 have been on those grounds rather than on questions of
7 substance.

8 MR. : But we have to vote the
9 recommendation.

10 MR. : Absolutely right, so
11 I think your point is well taken, and we'll do that.
12 Is there other discussion of the motion?

13 Yes.

14 MR. : May I ask one?

15 MR. : Yes, please, sir.

16 MR. : One question for
17 information. It seems to me that there may very well
18 be something which does not have to be done within two
19 months or one month, but has to be done within four
20 months.

21 MR. : That's correct.

22 MR. : So there is a Council
23 meeting, but there certainly is not time for the whole
24 process, the panel, the reviewers and all the rest.

25 MR. : Yes.

1 MR. : Do we have a procedure
2 whereby something can be put through the Committee struc-
3 ture and the division on an expedited basis, and is the
4 Council prepared to handle matters on an emergency
5 basis.

6 MR. : I think that is what
7 we use Chairman's Grants for.

8 MR. : The timing, I would point
9 out, is correct, that when I speak of the pressure of
10 time, or when we speak of pressure of time, it is not
11 a matter of just between Council meetings, but, in fact,
12 that the review process is --

13 MR. BENNETT: Let me add to that. I am not
14 dispositionally inclined to give these Chairman's
15 Grants, and I insist on these procedures that we send
16 to divisions and then a recommendation there, and a
17 recommendation from Jeff.

18 Then I think it is up to the responsible
19 people in the divisions to make the kind of inquiries
20 that are required. If members of the Committee would
21 make known that they would be willing to be called for
22 advice or judgment on these, I think that is fine.

23 I think that is a matter of how you've worked
24 out with your various divisions, but we might also, at
25 some point just indicate -- add a list of those requests

1 turned down so you'd get some sense of the volume
2 turned down.

3 I think it is -- you know, it is -- obviously,
4 whenever possible, the case can be made that it really
5 makes sense, we should turn it down.

6 MR. : May I ask another ques-
7 tion?

8 MR. BENNETT: Sure.

9 MR. : When are the divisions
10 more likely to produce emergency cultural crises requiring
11 immediate intervention by the Chairman, and when are the
12 divisions that are less likely to produce these?

13 MR. BENNETT: Okay.

14 MR. : I think in terms of volume
15 over the past few years, the two divisions which have
16 been most centrally involved have been research first
17 because of conferences, additions, supplements. You
18 think that is correct, Harold?

19 MR. : Yes, I was going to say
20 conferences, research conferences, is a kind of anomaly
21 within the system of Chairman's Grants in that is the
22 one category I can think of in the Endowment where there
23 is almost a built-in expectation that on occasion we will
24 use of the Chairman's Grant mechanism.

25 This is because the concept of bringing a group

1 of scholars together to plan research or to establish
2 the state-of-the-art is very often based on a happenstance.

3 If you have two or three foreign scholars
4 who happen to be leaders in this country at a certain
5 time, somebody thinks, "Wouldn't it be great to bring
6 everybody together next month to do this.", and they
7 come to the Endowment and it looks good and so forth, and
8 we go from there, but you know, there's an opportunity
9 that could be missed, and if you go through the full
10 process --

11 MR. : Go ahead.

12 MR. : The other thing I would
13 say since I am talking about research conferences, we
14 do always solicit outside review on these applications.
15 We can use mail-out. There is always time for that,
16 you know, but you will see from time-to-time that there
17 are always say three or four at any Council meeting
18 will be RD listings.

19 Those are the research conferences, and you
20 see on the second page.

21 MR. : Besides that special
22 programs, I would imagine, would also be involved in
23 this, and in the spectrum, I think it is a toss-up from
24 thereon. The differences are not great among the division.

25 MR. Stamron (phonetic)?

1 MR. STAMRON: I was going to raise the ques-
2 tion whether there is anything in our procedure which
3 would prevent you from informing the Council of these
4 emergency decisions, and what is behind them, so that
5 we don't have to wait until we actually meet and then
6 have it explained to us.

7 MR. : I think that the intention
8 in the law is to facilitate -- is for the Council to
9 decide as a general matter of administration, and that
10 is Mr. Hector's motion, that it is efficient and effec-
11 tive to make it possible for the Chairman to decide
12 quickly on these, and the Council to review, given the
13 constraints on the dollar amount of the individual
14 award and the overall amount.

15 MR. : If there's a mail-out,
16 surely you could mail something to the Council Committee
17 the very same day you mail to reviewers.

18 MR. : But that is not always
19 the case. I just said in relation to conferences, Jack.

20 MR. : I said if there is a mail-
21 out.

22 MR. : Oh.

23 MR. : I don't --

24 MR. : You said sure. Does that
25 mean we'll do it?

1 MR. BENNETT: Yes, well, I wondered, Jack,
2 do we want to make that a matter of -- do we want to
3 insist on that, or do we want to make that a matter
4 between division directors and their committee?

5 MR. : Yes, division directors
6 and their committee.

7 MR. : I, for one, would
8 prefer to have them all listed in systematic fashion so
9 that we could see them all at one time, a week or so
10 before the next Council meeting, rather than have to re-
11 ceive them piece and piece at a time.

12 MR. BENNETT: Excuse me. I would think that
13 certainly, Jack, as a matter of course, if a request
14 raised a question of policy other than the policy of
15 Chairman's Grants, themselves, that as a matter of course,
16 division directors would check with Council members.

17 MR. : Yes?

18 MS. : I would think the whole
19 point about a Chairman's Grant is that certain things
20 can and should be left to the discretion of the Chairman.
21 We're talking about a very, very small number of things
22 which are left to the discretion of the Chairman.

23 I think the notion of discretion is an important
24 one, and on principle, we should allow for that, that we
25 should not be the recipient of lots of little pieces of

1 paper which act as a constant check on the Chairman.

2 There's a very small time period we're talking
3 about. It is a small number of grants. It is a small
4 sum of money and so on, and I think the principle has been
5 well established, and it seems to work very well.

6 MR. : Yes?

7 MS. : I think it would be
8 helpful, however, perhaps once or twice for us to get
9 a full listing so that we can simply get a notion of what
10 kinds of requests are made and what kinds of decisions
11 are having to be made -- where they are allocated.

12 That would just be helpful, I think.

13 MR. BENNETT: Yes, sure.

14 MR. : I move the question then.

15 MR. : Question?

16 MR. : Further discussion?

17 MR. : Will those in favor of
18 the motion to increase the ceiling on Chairman's awards
19 to \$30,000 or less please say "aye".

20 (Chorus of ayes.)

21 MR. : Opposed?

22 Motion carried.

23 MR. BENNETT: May we proceed? We're ahead of
24 schedule. Try to get a few more things done.

25 Mr. Willkie, dates of future Council meetings.

1 MR. WILLKIE: Set forth at Tab G in the
2 agenda book, the proposed meetings, Council meetings for
3 1983. I would like to make one change in that subsequent
4 to the mailing of this memorandum.

5 It was decided by the division directors that
6 it might be best to hold the summer meeting of the
7 Council August 4 and 5, rather than July 28 and July 29.
8 With that one correction that is the recommendation for
9 Council meetings for 1983.

10 MS. : Can I have a consultation
11 with the Council members as to which date they can't
12 make, because I notice there's one in 1983 that I can't
13 make.

14 MR. WILLKIE: Yes, this is the time to see
15 that, because although we can't fix the calendar to make
16 it work for everyone --

17 MS. : I realize that, but it
18 might be more than one person.

19 MR. WILLKIE: That's quite right, and this is
20 the occasion each year in which we do that. I would also
21 like, if I could -- I am not leaving this question, but
22 I would like to point out.

23 The change that has been suggested by directors
24 is not a departure, it is a return. I think Council
25 members, the longer-term Council members are aware that our

1 meeting in the summer has typically been in August.

2 We moved it back this year, and that compresses the re-
3 view cycle quite tightly for us, and I think it is to
4 our advantage, administratively and so on, to move it
5 to August.

6 Could you tell us which date that is, and we'll
7 check to see if others on the Council also have a con-
8 flict then.

9 MS. : I have a conflict in the
10 February date.

11 MR. : I do also. I wonder
12 why you departed from the first week of the month that
13 usually prevails in February?

14 MS. : Has always been that date
15 in February.

16 MR. WILLKIE: The February problem I know from
17 the Agency standpoint, as you can imagine, is the
18 interval of holidays between the November Council meeting
19 and the next Council meeting.

20 We are confronted with a shutdown of America
21 during that period.

22 (Laughter.)

23 Certainly academic sections of the country are
24 hard to come by, and we need the extra time.

25 MR. : How about meeting very

1 early March. We have a chance of somewhat better weather.
2 February -- the February snowstorms always hit just when
3 the Council is meeting.

4 MR. WILLKIE: I guess the problem there is
5 dominoes, but let me just check and see. You see, we
6 would lose two weeks or three in that case which would
7 push our process down the road.

8 MR. : Just -- let us know.

9 MS. : From the point of view
10 of people who are waiting with baited breath to get
11 started on projects, as we push these dates further along,
12 they have shorter periods of time, because after the
13 Council makes the decision, after the Chairman makes his
14 decision, then they have to deal with the Grants Office,
15 and it does take a certain amount of time to gear up.

16 MR. WILLKIE: I guess we need the Council's
17 wish on this. I would think generally speaking and the
18 past practice would be the problem for two members would
19 probably not be sufficient to change the calendar in
20 February, but I would like to have advice about that.

21 I think we could, but I believe that -- okay.

22 MR. : (Inaudible) --

23 MR. WILLKIE: So assuming everyone has noted
24 that the summer meeting would then be held on August 4
25 and 5 rather than July 28 and 29, do we need a motion on

1 this?

2 MR. : Yes.

3 MS. : So move.

4 MR. WILLKIE: Okay. Then all in favor say
5 "aye".

6 (Chorus of Ayes.)

7 MR. WILLKIE: All opposed?

8 MR. BENNETT: Next item, Mr. Marshall?

9 MR. MARSHALL: I have a brief report despite
10 the length of time listed here. You will recall that
11 -- again a bit of review. President Reagan signed an
12 executive order last year for a White House Initiative
13 affecting historically black colleges and universities
14 in the nation.

15 Each agency is required to prepare a plan.
16 At the last Council meeting that the division committees
17 reviewed suggestions toward a plan for that division.
18 The Chairman has on his desk now a plan for the entire
19 agency built upon these portions.

20 It was put together by a small committee
21 working in the Endowment, and I think within the next
22 week or so, two weeks, we will have that agency plan
23 in circulation for you and for the members of your
24 staff.

25 My report is simply that we are moving along

1 on that schedule, and you should have the agency plan
2 rather than the bits and pieces of it within the next
3 two weeks.

4 MS. : Jeff?

5 MR. MARSHALL : Yes.

6 MS. : At the last meeting our
7 Committee made a recommendation, I suppose, that had
8 to do with consultation.

9 MR. MARSHALL : Yes.

10 MS. : What was done with that?

11 MR. MARSHALL : We've done two things
12 with the -- thank you for reminding me. We've done two
13 things in the interim.

14 We have written to the Office of the White
15 House Initiative, itself, to ask if they have information
16 about those needs and interests on the part of the
17 historically black colleges and universities -- if they
18 have information they can share with us.

19 That is first, because we thought rather than
20 duplicate efforts which may have taken place, we'd in-
21 quire. We have not yet heard. If we don't have a reply,
22 I think we'll assume that there is no information, and
23 we'll proceed from there.

24 Secondly, you'll see in the plan there are sug-
25 gestions for -- there's a slight modification, I think,

1 for what was suggested, and what is suggested in the
2 plan is the convocation of a seminar, workshop, in which
3 individuals in the administration in teaching of the
4 humanities and historically black colleges and universities
5 who are very strongly committed to it, that they have
6 a record of it, and they've articulated that.

7 We brought together to discuss the state-of-the
8 humanities in the universities, and the interest of
9 students today to serve several purposes, both advise us
10 and also to provide some leadership for this interest
11 within this range of colleges and universities.

12 We also have suggested that there be some
13 systematic visits by the staff to historically black
14 colleges and universities throughout the United States.

15 MS. : Is part of the seminar
16 intended to also respons specifically to the plan with
17 regard to their needs and the possibility that they could
18 implement those plans?

19 MR. MARSHALL: We assume -- I think the plan
20 has as the key feature in it, that it is always changing.
21 It confesses in the early paragraphs that ideally under
22 any circumstance you would plan, you would survey data,
23 you would test, and then you would implement, but we must
24 do all those simultaneously, because the initiative
25 requires us to and so on, so we presented a plan but we

1 assume we'll continue to need to revise that as we learn
2 from experience from our programs, but also systematically
3 through such testing.

4 MS. : The second question that
5 I have is -- has to do with the November resolution,
6 which I think early on Chairman Bennett suggested might
7 be discussed at this meeting, but I guess we won't be
8 able to do that.

9 Do we have plans for further discussion of
10 that resolution?

11 MR. MARSHALL : Yes, but you're right
12 about not this meeting. The President's request -- we
13 simply had to respond to that immediately, but the
14 task force which put together the little ad hoc committee,
15 that put together the agency plan from the things that
16 you saw in February, also stated that we were trying to
17 provide in the plan activities which could be portable,
18 that is which were useful for this specific audience,
19 but also for a larger one as well, and that we could
20 build the larger question of -- none of us like this
21 term very much -- technical assistance against this
22 particular document as background.

23 All we've really done is said we'll take
24 care of this task which is before us right now, and then
25 we go --

1 MS. : Well, I was only
2 concerned because I know we will be doing planning for the
3 budget --

4 MR. MARSHALL: Right.

5 MS. : And as you know the
6 budget is reflective of philosophy and I wanted to make
7 sure we were reminded of that.

8 MR. MARSHALL: Yes.

9 MR. : I think that this is
10 extremely important and a great idea -- at the last meet-
11 ing or the meeting before it was mentioned that most of
12 the historically black colleges are in the southeast.

13 Are you going to concentrate on that area?
14 Are there other areas where they are historically black
15 colleges, and are you going to take precautions to reach
16 as many as possible?

17 MR. MARSHALL: There are several questions in
18 there. I think the answer is yes, all of them, but I
19 would recapitulate. There are historically black
20 colleges and universities outside of that area, but
21 by-and-large the great proportion of them aren't.

22 We do not plan, at the moment, necessarily
23 regional workshops. We have done that in the past, but
24 because we are a national agency that makes sense, but
25 when you have a focus on specific institutions, I don't

1 think that is systematically -- that is a necessary thing
2 to do, at least not to have one for every Health and
3 Human Services district in the United States, anything
4 like that.

5 The plan speaks both to specific institutions
6 and to generic categories. I think when you'll see it,
7 you'll see we both address the question of the fact that
8 though we have a title for this group of institutions,
9 it includes everything from a 400-person church-related
10 private, a liberal arts college to the Atlanta University
11 complex.

12 The needs and our response to them is vastly
13 different from time-to-time, so we've got to be aware
14 of both as we go.

15 MR. BENNETT: There are several features of
16 the recommendation that I think are noteworthy. Let me
17 just mention one, because I think it reveals some ingeni-
18 ous thinking on the part of staff, the committee who
19 worked on this.

20 Suggestion, for example, that we hold some
21 of our summer seminars on some of these campuses, which
22 I think is a very welcome idea.

23 The notion that all we can do is keep extend-
24 ing ourselves and saying "You are welcome to apply." to
25 individuals in institutions is one thing, and then when

1 we sponsor something we don't go to those institutions,
 2 we go to Stanford, we go to Harvard. Norton has requested
 3 that after The suggestion that we ask them if we could
 4 hold one of our activities on their campus is a way of
 5 suggesting that the importance and significance may not as
 6 lead to an application or set of applications in the
 7 short run, but in the long run may have more to do with
 8 the sense of, what we say, self-esteem than simply
 9 badgering people to submit application. Policy and General
 10 Matters. I want to thank the members of that committee
 11 for that and other, I think, very thought.

12 MR. KENNEDY: That's Well -- The Committee
 13 wishes to MR. BENNETT: We could do a couple of reports
 14 or we could reward the Council by taking a break now. the
 15 Why don't we take a break now, come back at 10:15, and then
 16 get into Committee reports. closes session, since it
 17 might be a (Short break.) discuss it without some dollar
 18 signs or MR. BENNETT: Mr. Willkie?

19 MR. WILLKIE: It appears that the Fellowship's
 20 Committee memorandum has been distributed to members of
 21 the Council, simply to those sitting at the table. I a
 22 would remind everyone that actually this probably should
 23 have been distributed after lunch. high school teachers.

24 This is not public information, and should be
 25 kept in the possession of members of the staff and mem-

1 bers of the Council.

2 MR. BENNETT: Mary Beth Norton has requested
3 that after lunch or whenever we begin actions, that
4 education go first. There are a number of questions,
5 at least one question that has been suggested we have as
6 many members of the Council present as possible.

7 If there are no objections I'd like to accede
8 to that request.

9 Okay. Committee Reports on Policy and General
10 Matters. In the absence of Charles Hamilton, George,
11 you are reporting, Mr. Kennedy.

12 MR. KENNEDY: Thank you. The Committee
13 wishes to make a recommendation which is appropriate as
14 a matter of policy and general matter. I will make the
15 recommendation, but my suggestion is that the discussion
16 of it might be deferred to closes session, since it
17 might be difficult to discuss it without some dollar
18 signs or without some specific references.

19 In reviewing the policy on what future budge-
20 tary decisions should be made by the Committee, recommenda-
21 tions should be made by the Committee, we engaged in a
22 discussion of the summer seminars for college teachers and
23 the projected summer seminars for high school teachers.

24 Summer seminars for high school teachers will
25 begin as a pilot program with a modest sum, and we wish

1 to recommend to the Chairman that a line item should be
2 provided for it in the future.

3 The Committee would, however, like to have
4 an opportunity to review the scope and methods and the
5 guidelines of the program. The summer seminars for
6 college teachers is slated for a budgetary cut of about
7 30 percent. there, but in the opposite end of the life
8 cycle, the Committee inquired into the effectiveness of
9 the program and its place in the total efforts of the
10 Endowment. We found the summer seminar for college
11 teachers very highly rated by participants.

12 We found that they reached about 600 persons
13 a year of all races, both sexes, all regions of the
14 country, often at a critical stage in the development of
15 the participants' careers. titious and jejune.

16 We found that they provide a seed ground for
17 the career development of teachers and scholars in the
18 humanities. For example, some 35 percent of successful
19 applicants for other fellowships had earlier in their
20 careers attended summer seminars.

21 Our conclusion was that there is a life cycle
22 in the work of humanists. If they enter an NEH program,
23 such as the summer seminars, in the early years of their
24 professional career, they are most apt to go on to
25 successful teaching, curricular development and research

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1330 VERMONT AVENUE, NW

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

1 and to leadership roles in making the humanities avail-
2 able to the wider public.

3 The Committee deplores the proposal to cut
4 back on the summer seminars. They are one of the founda-
5 tions on which the success of NEH programs is built.
6 We unanimously recommend to the Chairman that cuts be
7 made not there, but in the opposite end of the life
8 cycle, in public programs.

9 Otherwise the ember of humanistic learning
10 will lose its fire.

11 (Laughter.)

12 The foundations on which good teaching and
13 research are built will gradually erode, and those
14 public programs which are undertaken will become increas-
15 ingly superficial, repetitious and jejune.

16 MR. BENNETT: George, I -- if I may interrupt
17 you. I don't think this is appropriate for --

18 MR. KENNEDY: All right.

19 MR. BENNETT: -- For this part of the meeting.
20 This has to --

21 MR. KENNEDY: It was a policy recommendation.

22 MR. BENNETT: But this has to do with budget
23 matters and the internal setting of budget and policy,
24 which should be considered in a closed session I thought.

25 MR. KENNEDY: That concluded my remarks.

1 MR. BENNETT: Oh, right on time.

2 (Laughter.)

3 MR. BENNETT: Anita?

4 MS. SILVERS: During our Committee meeting
5 Mr. Hector said to me in some surprise, "I didn't know
6 you were interested in numbers.". As a teacher of
7 philosophy in a setting which is not parapetetic, my
8 ability to afford students who want to study Plato,
9 the opportunity to study Plato, often depends on my
10 knowledge of statistics.

11 The purveying of education and culture in
12 this country is institutionalized, and we would be
13 naive to believe that excellence is a sufficient condi-
14 tion for the survival of work in the humanities when that
15 work goes on in institutional settings.

16 Most institutions encompass more than the
17 humanities, and in the war of all against all for survival,
18 excellent work in the humanities is pitted against excellent
19 work in a variety of other endeavors from physics to
20 football, all competing for existing resources.

21 There are many anecdotes, but relatively few
22 hard facts about the -- about how the humanities are
23 situated out there, and about how competitive they are or
24 can be with other educational and cultural enterprises.

25 I think it important for the survival of the

1 humanities that we construct a better picture of what is
2 the case, and I think that the NEH's Evaluation and
3 Assessment Studies Program is the initiator of many of
4 the studies we need to produce that picture.

5 Through the work of this program the humanities
6 community is beginning to build a picture of how humani-
7 ties programs and humanists fare in institutional settings.
8 As Dr. Neusner puts it in a letter I'd like to quote,
9 "One of our purposes is to help people gain perspective
10 on the size and shape of learning.". I like that phrase.

11 I hope you don't mind I borrowed it. Our
12 Committee --

13 MR. : I borrowed it. I don't
14 know why you shouldn't.

15 (Laughter.)

16 MR. : A good writer borrows
17 it. A great writer steals.

18 (Laughter.)

19 MS. SILVERS: Our Committee heard status
20 reports on three studies now either being planned or
21 already underway. The first study is ACE's higher
22 education panel to ask educational institutions about
23 the amount, uses and sources of funds expended on the
24 humanities.

25 This is the most ambitious study HEP (phonetic)

1 has undertaken and field tests show that institutions
2 probably will have to involve at least two separate of-
3 fices on a campus in gathering the data required for
4 response.

5 From an institutional point of view I can't
6 emphasize enough how important it will be to know about
7 the financing of the humanities in higher education.
8 This is information that nobody has had up to this
9 day.

10 The result of this first study will, among
11 other things, help delineate the universe of givers for
12 the humanities, and, therefore, will mesh with the
13 second study, one being done in response to a mandate
14 of Public Law 209 on the use of gifts and matching funds,
15 that is Treasury funds.

16 Dan Shactor (phonetic) has designed a survey
17 which comprises an essential element of the study. This
18 is a survey of directors of 580 NEH projects which
19 received offers of matching funds between 1978 and 1980.

20 We will find out a lot about their fund-raising
21 experiences from this survey. There will be a second
22 stage of the investigation in which case studies of the
23 sample of projects will be developed.

24 I am particularly interested to learn -- this
25 is something -- I will be a user of this information. I

1 will be particularly interested to learn how technical
2 institutions and normal schools, institutions with little
3 tradition in the humanities help or hinder fund-raising
4 efforts for humanities projects, and I believe there
5 will be a variety of users who will have other interests
6 in this study.

7 Finally, some of you may have seen the
8 advertisement announcing the special competition for
9 proposals to use existing data to study conditions in the
10 humanities.

11 Anita Jones prepared an excellent program
12 solicitation, and there have been 250 inquiries already.
13 The closing date for applications, I believe, is June 15.
14 This is a project to see how cost-effectively we can
15 gather information by extending the uses of data which
16 already have been collected, either as the result of
17 federally funded studies or as a product of standard
18 institutional research programs.

19 That is the end of the report.

20 MR. BENNETT: Thank you. Mr. Tashdinian,
21 would you like to respond? Comment?

22 MR. TASHDINIAN: She said it quite well I
23 thought.

24 (Laughter.)

25 MR. BENNETT: Thank you. Jeff wanted to say

1 to both Anita and Jack Neusner that you are both welcome.

2 (Laughter.)

3 MR. BENNETT: Harriett Zimmerman, Special
4 Programs.

5 MS. ZIMMERMAN: Public session of the
6 special programs portion of the agenda included short
7 reports on the two special initiatives which will be
8 coming to the August Council.

9 The first is a special deadline for planning
10 grants for the 200th Anniversary of the United States
11 Constitution. The staff reported that an impressive
12 number of inquiries and exciting range of preliminary
13 project ideas have been received.

14 One of the especially good things about this
15 initiative is that it is attracting the interest of
16 scholars in a wide range of disciplines including
17 jurisprudent, religion, classics and literature; areas
18 in which we would like to do more work than has been
19 done in this program.

20 We think that this should prove to be an
21 important new effort of the Endowment. The second special
22 deadline is in major youth projects with an emphasis on
23 children's media.

24 This deadline will be an experiment to test
25 potential for such projects, and the interest there is in

1 producing such work. There appears to be significant
2 interest, and we will look forward to seeing what this
3 effort will produce.

4 MR. BENNETT: Thank you.

5 MR. : Question?

6 MR. BENNETT: Yes.

7 MR. : Is this the only deadline
8 for the bicentennial observance? There will be a subse-
9 quent deadline?

10 MS. ZIMMERMAN: Yes.

11 MR. : Okay, thank you.

12 MR. : Also other programs
13 throughout the Endowment under their normal deadline,
14 and within their normal programs will be receiving applica-
15 tions pertaining to the bicentennial as well as other
16 subjects.

17 MR. BENNETT: We haven't even said what the
18 -- that is we haven't come down solidly on what the
19 year is -- whether it is 1787 or 1789 --

20 (Laughter.)

21 In any case -- we don't want to alienate some
22 people before, you know, before they even get a chance.

23 MS. : Are we adjudicating that?

24 MR. BENNETT: No, we are not.

25 (Laughter.)

1 MR. BENNETT: Certainly not today. We're going
2 to wait until we get all our new Council members and all
3 their expertise, and maybe we'll adjudicate it, but
4 in any case, George, it will go on, we hope, for some
5 time.

6 We really are very heartened by the response,
7 and I particularly want to thank the staff people for
8 their efforts at appropriate outreach here.

9 Research programs -- George -- Jack?

10 MR. : Can we hope for special
11 appropriations for programs above and beyond the normal
12 ones for this occasion as was the case, I believe, for
13 the bicentennial of the --

14 MR. BENNETT: Jeff?

15 MR. : The circumstance at the
16 moment -- the answer is we don't know yet because the
17 Congress has before it several bills at the moment in
18 respect to this. The White House had not determined yet
19 which -- where its directions will be or where its
20 support will come.

21 There really is such a variety of options
22 available at the moment, that we're not sure what will
23 occur as a result. That is one of them though that --

24 MR. : But we think that the
25 Endowment is an especially appropriate agency for this

1 activity and the notion of special projects and special
2 programs, in particular, is just superb.

3 In many ways it is an example of what we
4 like to call the applied humanities.

5 MR. BENNETT: Yes. That is right. At the
6 same time if the federal government, as a whole, gears
7 up to do something on the bicentennial, we would at
8 least like to first consider whether we would like to be
9 the lead agency for all activities.

10 That's right, but we -- the meeting I mentioned
11 rather cryptically before -- Carol Huxley and I met with
12 the Chief Justice, this was an attempt on our part --
13 Carol's idea to get the Chief Justice to perhaps say
14 a few words maybe at the Madison Library or at the
15 Supreme Court about our efforts.

16 I might just take a minute, and say a word
17 about that meeting. Apart from Carol's drinking a lot
18 of tea --

19 (Laughter.)

20 -- You don't turn down tea when the Chief
21 Justice keeps pouring it.

22 (Laughter.)

23 It was -- as a student of American political
24 philosophy, it was really a very pleasant thing to see
25 because he said he would be happy to come forward, but

1 he said, "You know, I really shouldn't move unless the
2 other branches move, too. It is nice the way these
3 things are in the bones."

4 (Laughter.)

5 He said, "So you'll have to check with the
6 legislative branch and the executive branch." Well,
7 that meant that we had to wait a while, but as Jeff said
8 there are several initiatives going on in several places,
9 but I think everyone recognizes that we won't be ignored
10 in any case.

11 MR. : Teapot Dome --

12 (Laughter.)

13 MR. BENNETT: What?

14 (Laughter.)

15 MR. BENNETT: Don't ask.

16 MR. : Teapot Gnome -- historical
17 reference.

18 MR. BENNETT: Historical reference. Okay. Edu-
19 cation Programs --

20 MR. : Research.

21 MR. BENNETT: I am sorry. That wasn't the re-
22 search report. I am sorry. Mr. Kennedy?

23 MR. KENNEDY: The research committee reviewed,
24 and approved several staff suggestions. We agreed that
25 word process composition of research should be encouraged

1 in the future, and provision for it should be allowed in
2 budgets.

3 Similarly, more publications should be expected
4 to be in microform, and less in printed volumes. We
5 recommend the creation of separate budget line items
6 for archeology and for the U. S. Newspapers Project, on
7 the ground that these are activities distinct from other
8 divisional programs.

9 I would like to say a word in particular about
10 the U. S. Newspaper Report. This has hitherto been a
11 part of research tools. This project is an effort to
12 bring bibliographical control, to preserve and to
13 provide access to the deteriorating back runs of impor-
14 tant newspapers across the country.

15 Newspapers were generally printed on high
16 acid paper -- are often in crumbling condition, but they
17 provide invaluable historical data, even the advertise-
18 ments as was pointed out.

19 There is no adequate index of them. The
20 Organization of American Historians rated a project such
21 as this as its number one priority among research tools.
22 Project also has a potential for considerable public
23 interest in all 50 states.

24 MR. : Excuse me, George. Is
25 this a policy or is this a project?

1 MS. KENNEDY: Well: Policy.

2 MR. : Policy? I am not sure

3 I understand what the question -- what the import is --

4 MS. : There is no specific

5 grant at issue. KENNEDY: As you remember, Mary Beth. We

6 MS. : Oh, that is what I -- this

7 MR. KENNEDY: Yes.

8 MR. : He's explaining why

9 we think a line item is required. Kept waiting for it,

10 right. MR. KENNEDY: We feel that the project should

11 involve cooperation between NEH and state humanities

12 councils, and we recommend that the Chairman seek ways

13 of interesting the state councils in it and securing

14 their support. (Laughter.)

15 MR. BENNETT: Bet you're done?

16 MR. KENNEDY: I'm done.

17 MR. BENNETT: Okay.

18 (Laughter.)

19 MR. BENNETT: Any comment?

20 MS. : Can I ask a question?

21 MR. BENNETT: Please.

22 MS. : About the -- since I

23 know a good deal about the project, or the idea of the

24 newspaper, has the U. S. Newspapers Project gone beyond

25 the original pilot at this point or not?

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1330 VERMONT AVENUE, NW

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

1 MR. KENNEDY: Well, yes, it has in a sense,
2 because the original pilot was the State of Iowa a few
3 years ago.

4 MS. : Yes, I know.

5 MR. KENNEDY: As you remember, Mary Beth. We
6 do have the manual out of the Library of Congress at this
7 point which is what we've been waiting for. When you
8 were on the Committee that is what we --

9 MS. : Kept waiting for it,
10 right.

11 MR. KENNEDY: But it eventually appeared.
12 They managed to find a newspaper to everybody's satisfac-
13 tion.

14 (Laughter.)

15 This fascinated me because I always thought I
16 knew what a newspaper was until we met with archivists
17 and found out the problem, so we are able to go ahead.
18 I think one of the reasons why the line item is important
19 is because we have built up over a period of several years
20 now a kind of constituency around the country that has
21 been anxiously awaiting the time they could put in their
22 proposals so to speak, and they expect to see results from
23 the Endowment especially now that the Library of Congress
24 is coming out with the manual.

25 We're ready to go ahead, and we'll be producing

1 guidelines this summer.

2 MS. : Right, but it is the nature
3 of the state-of-the-project right now -- is that --

4 MR. KENNEDY: One state has been done.

5 MS. : One state has been done,
6 and there are guidelines being produced to show other
7 people what to do.

8 MR. KENNEDY: The only thing I would say about
9 the one state that has been done, I think it is probably
10 fair to say they may have to go back and redo some of
11 that work in the light of the manual that the Library of
12 Congress has now produced, so although it was a useful
13 thing to have a pilot, to make it consistent now with the
14 other 49 states and their efforts, there may be some
15 other work to be done.

16 MR. : On the line item on
17 the archeology -- just a brief comment, a number of us
18 have been troubled over the years about our doing archeol-
19 ogy along with NSF and what is humanistic about it.

20 Cassie Abramowitz (phonetic) was kind enough
21 to prepare a brief statement on why it is our job and
22 also why a line item may be appropriate, why it is
23 different from other things we do within the research
24 division.

25 I think it is worth people's attention when

1 it is circulated to the Council in general. I think this
2 is a real step forward for the division.

3 MR. BENNETT: Okay.

4 MR. : That is an opinion I
5 would not have held three or six months ago, so I think
6 we've all learned.

7 MR. BENNETT: Thank you.

8 MS. : I would like to make
9 comment on that, too, as a former Chair of the Research
10 Division Committee, that I know that every year when we
11 consider the archeological projects we always had great
12 difficulty because they were thrown in with the rest
13 of basic research, and it was always difficult because
14 they were so different in nature and quality from the
15 other basic research proposals that we were considering,
16 that it would be -- speaking as a veteran of having to
17 make those decisions, it would be extremely useful to
18 have a separate line item for archeology projects.

19 MR. BENNETT: Thank you. Now Education Programs.

20 MS. NORTON: In our policy discussion yesterday
21 morning we -- I say we advisedly since I was the only
22 official member of the Committee present.

23 Walter Burns came in at literally the last
24 minute, and was an active participant in the discussion,
25 but the rest of the Education Committee deserted me

1 yesterday so when I say -- as I say "we", I was talking
2 to the staff most of the time.

3 The two chief topics of the policy discussion
4 yesterday were first of all redesign in Education
5 Division programs. Rich Eckman (phonetic), the Director
6 of the Division reported on extensive staff discussions
7 that had been occurring over the last few months about
8 a possible way to reorganize the basic divisions within
9 the Education Division.

10 The Committee offered some suggestions to
11 the staff on the outline that we were presented. The
12 new programs are roughly, but only roughly comparable
13 to the current divisions within the education programs,
14 that is there is one section which would focus on
15 individual institutions as there is now, but the new
16 way of proceeding would be somewhat more broad than
17 the current way we consider things, where now we are
18 primarily concerned or almost entirely concerned with
19 the curriculum improvement.

20 Instead of doing simply curriculum improve-
21 ment we would be open to other types of applications
22 under the new scheme. A second division roughly compar-
23 able to what is now called higher education regional and
24 national, which would be specifically for the preparation
25 and dissemination of exemplary curricula, that could be

1 used throughout the nation in different colleges and
2 universities, and a third division on elementary and
3 secondary education, similar to the one we have now,
4 but again with some new emphasis including more stress
5 on assisting individual teachers rather than simply on
6 collaborative projects which is what we now emphasize.

7 Also we assessed adding two additional
8 programs to the division, one that would be involved
9 with what we might call non-traditional education, which
10 would stress, in particular, quality of non-traditional
11 education and reducing the cost of non-traditional
12 education by which I mean the whole question of adult
13 education reaching under-served populations with higher
14 education.

15 The feeling of the division is that in the
16 past decade the emphasis has been entirely on widening
17 access to education through the production of things like
18 tele-courses and so forth, and that what is necessary
19 now is to move from the question of simply widening
20 access to improving quality of such courses and reducing
21 the cost.

22 The idea would be to encourage application that
23 would be directed towards improving the quality of
24 such non-traditional programs and improving the cost-
25 effectiveness of such non-traditional programs.

1 In addition, we were informed that there has
2 been some discussion between the Education Division and
3 the Research Division concerning the possible production
4 of teaching materials based on the results of recent
5 research grants.

6 The idea would be to bring Education Division
7 people together with Research Division people to see what
8 types of things had been funded in recent years that
9 might possibly have curricular implications and to foster
10 the development of curricular material from recent
11 grants that have been given in research, in particular,
12 and perhaps even fellowships, although that has not
13 been discussed as systematically as research.

14 We would not, however, be involved in funding
15 those, but rather simply serving as a -- mostly would
16 not be involved in funding such things, but simply
17 serving as a conduit to put scholars in touch with
18 publishers and so forth who might possibly be interested
19 in becoming involved in such projects.

20 The second -- so that is the -- those are the
21 rough plans for reorganizing the division. The timing
22 of the reorganization which the staff is quite excited
23 about would be that the new procedures might possibly
24 be in place as early as this Fall, although for at least
25 the last two deadlines of the year, we'd have to run

1 the current projects -- the current divisions as well
2 as the new ones, because we can't change horses in the
3 middle of stream with respect to current grant deadlines,
4 but as of January 1 the new organization would be in
5 place.

6 The second major topic we discussed at
7 the policy session was at the direction of the chairman,
8 where we talked on the basis of an excellent memo pre-
9 pared by Mike Marty (phonetic) about the rising number
10 of projects in computer-assisted humanities instruction
11 that the division has been receiving and what precisely
12 we should be doing about those if anything.

13 We decided that there is no point in especially
14 encouraging or discouraging such computer-based projects,
15 As Mike Marty pointed out in his memo, many times the
16 unsuccessful projects seem to be, as he put it, an
17 answer in search of a need rather than a need in search
18 of an answer, and as people start with the computer,
19 and then try to figure out some way to use it in humani-
20 ties rather than the other way around, which is the way
21 it should be.

22 We were talking about how we could foster
23 people starting from a humanistic need and using the
24 computer to that end rather than starting with a computer
25 and trying to figure out some way to use it for humanities

1 purposes.

2 We decided, however, it was probably wishful
3 thinking to think that we could write the guidelines in
4 such a way that we could prevent all the answers in
5 search of the need people from applying. In any event we
6 decided that we should be open to computer-assisted
7 humanities projects, as computer-assisted instruction
8 in the humanities, but that these projects obviously
9 had to stand on their own merits in that they must
10 clearly be a tool to reach a humanistic end, rather than
11 an end in and of itself to try to justify large amounts
12 -- large federal grant, and I think we have pretty much
13 decided that we would have to go on as before in a --
14 but in a -- perhaps we'll redraft the guidelines, and
15 specifically mention computer projects in the guidelines
16 but in a very restricted way, that is to suggest that
17 to potential applicants would be interested in seeing
18 computer projects only in a certain limited range of
19 areas such as, for example, the use of computers to
20 aggregate data in social history instruction or the
21 use of computers for foreign language practice or some-
22 thing like that.

23 That is areas where we think it is clearly
24 warranted and justified to use such things. We have
25 not quite decided precisely what we would do, but in any

1 event we decided that we did not want to either discourage
2 or encourage such applications in general.

3 MR. BENNETT: Thank you.

4 MS. : In order I can think
5 through the inter-relationships between the many
6 programs and would also exist within the United States,
7 I didn't quite understand the first part, not the
8 computer part, that is fully understandable, and involv-
9 ing adult education-type programs as non-traditional.

10 Coming from a state where we have 100
11 community colleges all of which are looking for things
12 to do and having a tremendous number of adult education
13 programs, how would you -- would you be encouraging
14 them to submit grants on humanities or --

15 MS. NORTON: We don't really encourage them.
16 We would not be necessarily encouraging them to submit
17 grants, but we would be open to grant proposals from
18 them in areas of humanities education. I don't know,
19 perhaps you want to talk about this, Rich.

20 MR. : Thank you, Mary Beth.
21 The Division of Education Programs has, in the past,
22 offered grants to institutions of higher education
23 including universities, undergraduate colleges and
24 community colleges for two distinct kinds of purposes.

25 One is to help an institution do what makes

1 sense for itself, judged in its own institutional context.
2 The other has been to help an institution to do something
3 that serves a larger interest in the teaching of a
4 particular subject throughout a region or a nation.

5 So-called non-traditional organizations
6 in education have been eligible to apply in any of those
7 grant categories, and, indeed, they have. The rationale
8 for those applications in the recent past has usually
9 been to widen access to education for a portion of the
10 population which the application usually argues have
11 not had access to higher education before.

12 It is our judgment on the staff that after
13 a number of years of doing business in that way, it is
14 appropriate for the Endowment to focus its interest
15 in serving those non-traditional institutions in
16 education, but to do it in such a way as to identify
17 a particular program that would be open especially for
18 those organizations, but to say that more than only
19 continuing the effort to widen access, the Endowment
20 is especially interested in receiving applications that
21 foster a higher quality instruction, more rigorous
22 instruction and at the same time, instruction that is
23 cost-effective.

24 MS. : Could I hope that some
25 of these types of grants might replace the highly esoteric

1 types of grants that seem to come into the research
2 fellowship end, or is this an addition?

3 MR. : I think that is --

4 MR. BENNETT: So --

5 (Laughter.)

6 MS. : I wanted to raise it.

7 MR. BENNETT: That is really one --

8 MS. NORTON: The divisional budgets are
9 separate and are not exchangeable.

10 MR. BENNETT: Anita and then Jack.

11 MS. : I do want to say for the
12 record, there are 107 community colleges in California.
13 Rich, are you focusing in, when you say non-traditional,
14 community colleges are very, very traditional, I guess.

15 In fact, the first one in California started
16 in the 19th Century in order to prepare students in
17 Fresno to go to Stanford, but are you talking now about
18 the non-baccalaureate objective programs within perhaps
19 traditional institutions?

20 MR. : Yes. The use of the
21 term "non-traditional" is one that I borrowed from the
22 accepted practice in Dupont Circle. It is not a term I
23 coined. It would include that as well as any other
24 effort to provide education in an unusual format, that
25 is a format other than the residential full-time under-

1 graduate instruction, and that as you know is a very
2 wide range of --

3 MS. : Yes, quite.

4 MS. NORTON: In other words it could include
5 things like correspondent's courses.

6 MR. BENNETT: Mr. Neusner -- oh --

7 MR. : Perhaps an example would
8 be helpful here. As you know a great many courses have
9 been designed in the last decade using television or
10 radio as the principal means of instruction. To create
11 a course like that is a fairly expensive proposition.

12 The course, if it is going to be useful once
13 it has been designed should reach a very large number of
14 people. Despite all the money spent on such courses,
15 despite all the time and effort expended, often traditional
16 institutions of education feels reluctant to regard those
17 courses that would -- as equivalent in quality to their
18 own traditional courses.

19 Our hope is that through the Endowment's
20 efforts we can assist in the efforts to insure that those
21 courses achieve a certainty of quality that will enable
22 them to be fully reputable in higher education for all
23 kinds of people whatever the means or medium of instruc-
24 tion.

25 MR. : It appears that two

1 divisions are undergoing very radical revision in their
2 basic program. As the Committee chairperson spoke I was
3 reflecting that we're hearing lots of new ideas and new
4 initiatives.

5 I find it very helpful if at a future meeting
6 we could have a picture of the Education Division as it's
7 emerging with some explanation of various items, because
8 a lot of these items are not self-evident to those of
9 us who have not served on that Committee.

10 I think the same thing is going to apply
11 in public programs in its future guise, and if we could
12 take some time at a future Council meeting on the Educa-
13 tion Division and then at a meeting beyond that on
14 public programs, it would help all of us -- it would
15 educate all of us.

16 MR. BENNETT: Sure. All right. Yes?

17 MS. : It appears to me --

18 I think one of the things that is going to be helpful for
19 me and critical, I think, to the Committee and to the
20 staff of the Education Division with regard to the
21 non-traditional is to have -- to assume that there is
22 going to be an evolving definition but that the definition
23 of non-traditional institutions or programs or projects
24 or people or whatever it is you're focusing on is going
25 to be very difficult.

1 There are a number of universities that have,
2 standard traditional universities that have non-traditional
3 branches, and I think for you to be able to sort it out
4 or for the people to be clear on who is eligible, it is
5 going to be very difficult.

6 MS. NORTON: I think the issue here is not
7 to such that applications would have to come from
8 "non-traditional institutions" but rather that the
9 institution would be proposing to educate people in a
10 "non-traditional" way.

11 MR. BENNETT: Okay. Thank you very much.
12 Public programs. Harriett Zimmerman.

13 MS. ZIMMERMAN: For those of you who
14 attended the Council in meeting, we will remember that
15 public programs, having very few applications in that
16 round, spent most of its time discussing policy questions.

17 Conversely at this Council session, since
18 it was the first time that public and special programs
19 were put together and also because of the way the applica-
20 tion deadlines fell out, we had a very heavy round in
21 both committees and also a number of very difficult
22 decisions to wrestle with.

23 As a result we did not have any policy dis-
24 cussion in the public programs. We felt we had covered
25 our policy issues in February.

1 MR. BENNETT: Thank you. State Programs,
2 Anita Silvers.

3 MS. SILVERS: The State Program Committee had
4 no business to conduct. Louise Kerr and I did go over
5 to the Federation meeting yesterday morning, and each
6 of us would like to convey some of our impressions to
7 you.

8 Being at the meeting reminded me of what a
9 beautiful and romantic conception it is to bring persons
10 whose loyalties and knowledge are regional, and who are
11 articulate in the humanities together in the same
12 room.

13 I found the discussion very stimulating.
14 There were many good illustrations of the exploration
15 of principle as it applies to policy, and I think that
16 these explorations are important and are enlightening,
17 and these are explorations that the Council, itself,
18 ought to engage in.

19 One of the subjects of discussion had to do
20 with what constitutes the humanities. How do we know
21 that something is in the humanities or that something
22 is not in the humanities.

23 I think the Chairman, and I may be guilty of
24 misinterpreting his position, and I am sure you will
25 correct me if I am -- I think he is inclining or at

1 least indicated that he inclined toward an intuitionist
2 position or at the very least a Cartesian rationalist
3 position.

4 He's having to think about that.

5 (Laughter.)

6 I think for that kind of a position to be
7 useful he needs some paradigms to sharpen our conceptions.
8 Now I personally have little trouble with the notions
9 of history, literature, classics and philosophy. I am
10 fairly sure that I can come up with paradigms, and can
11 get other people to agree with me about what the cores
12 of those disciplines are.

13 They are humanities. I have always believed
14 that if a humanistic social science appeared on my door-
15 step I would not recognize it as such. I do not know
16 what a humanistic social science is even though that
17 is specified in the legislation.

18 That should be something that concerns us.
19 I think it might be useful at some time to engage in
20 some discussions about that, at least to help me clarify
21 what humanistic social sciences are, and I think it is
22 important.

23 There have been lots of discussions about what
24 is in the humanities and what is not. I think pedagogical-
25 ly it doesn't do tremendously much good to read other

1 people's debates about this. I think you have to
2 participate in it, and I think it would be useful for
3 us to continue to remind ourselves by engaging in that
4 process.

5 The second matter that I think it also might
6 be useful for the Council to explore, the -- I think
7 both the state committees -- I am not trying to speak
8 for them. This is just my impression. Both the state
9 committees and the chairman would like to have an early
10 warning system developed to make -- to alert everybody
11 to sensitive issues.

12 I think there is agreement that the humanities
13 sometime will deal with sensitive issues. That is to
14 be expected, but we ought to have some awareness when
15 a sensitive issue might arise.

16 The problem, of course, is how are we going
17 to know what is a sensitive issue, and frankly what con-
18 stitutes propaganda and what does not. I was reminded
19 of the cause celebre of about three or four years ago
20 when the main committee funded a project in which A Man
21 For All Seasons, the film, A Man For All Seasons was
22 shown, and then there was discussion by the humanists
23 in a kind of town meeting forum all over the State of
24 Maine.

25 This provoked a huge amount of controversy.

1 Yes, I know everybody is looking at me and saying, "How
2 could that possibly happen.", but it did, and whether or
3 not A Man For All Seasons is propaganda, I suppose, depends
4 upon your point of view, what you take for granted is
5 non-controversial and what you think is argumentative.

6 Again, I think it would be very useful for
7 us to explore this notion a little bit, and try to get
8 ourselves clear on what we will consider to be sensitive,
9 and what we will consider to be non-sensitive regardless
10 of whether somebody is going to complain about it.

11 That is the end of my report, and I think
12 Louise has some other comments.

13 MS. : The meeting that Anita
14 refers to yesterday was a meeting at which the Chairman
15 had a dialogue with the State Committees, and I think
16 they thoroughly appreciated it, and I did, because it
17 sets a precedent, and perhaps I would suggest that it
18 is an instruction to us.

19 He suggested that he -- he said that he
20 will be going to meetings in the states, and I think that
21 I would encourage especially the new members to visit and
22 become acquainted with their State Committees for purposes
23 of finding out what they are doing, and to get ideas, and
24 to find out what, in fact, -- what -- how the money is
25 being spent, but in a more substantive way, find out how

1 the humanities are being conveyed to the public.

2 I would remind you again as we were reminded
3 this morning that there is a mandate to us, and we are
4 required by law to give 20 percent of our funds to the
5 states.

6 This is our Federalism program, and I think
7 it is incumbent upon us not only to be aware of that, but
8 to evaluate it in some way, and to offer suggestions, and
9 to receive reports.

10 The Federation of State Programs has been
11 very active in coordinating efforts in providing of
12 communications, network for them, and there has been
13 great improvement in the State Programs over the last few
14 years.

15 Basically, that is all that I would say
16 except to reiterate that I think that if you, in your
17 own states, were to participate in those programs and
18 become aware of the state efforts, that that is perhaps
19 one way we could stretch our dollars, to have many of the
20 programs, for example, in the research division you were
21 talking about, or coordinating efforts between research --
22 I guess it was education research -- it seems to me that
23 that is an effort that could go through the states as
24 well.

25 The new research that is emerging should be

1 conveyed as quickly as possible to the states, and there
2 should be a dialogue among all the programs for us. That
3 might be very helpful.

4 MR. BENNETT: Don, did you want to --

5 MR. : A minor point just for
6 the record, just so they don't have to take the blame for
7 it. The meeting was not a Federation meeting, but
8 rather conducted by the Division of State Programs.

9 MS. : Sorry about that.

10 MR. BENNETT: Walter?

11 MR. : Simple question. What
12 is the formula by which the funds are distributed among
13 the states?

14 MR. BENNETT: Don?

15 MR. : The formula for the
16 distribution of funds?

17 MR. : Yes.

18 MR. : The authorizing legisla-
19 tion contains a funding allocation formula whereby if
20 \$200,000 of the funds available shall -- \$200,000 shall
21 be distributed equally to each entity, of the funds
22 remaining, beyond that, 44 percent shall be distributed
23 equally to the eligible committees.

24 Twenty-two percent shall be distributed
25 according to population, and the remaining 34 percent, and

1 again of the funds remaining, is distributed at the
2 discretion of the Chairman.

3 MR. : That sounds like more
4 higher mathematics than could be conceivable, and I think
5 just a point for the new Council members, that is designed
6 in part to be a reflection of our practice over the
7 years, emerging practice over the years, and in part,
8 Congressional interest to recognize both the House and the
9 Senate perspectives on this question.

10 There's a flat amount to each state, in addi-
11 tion a recognition of the variation according to popu-
12 lation, and then also in addition, gives some money
13 available to the Chairman for his discretion.

14 MS. : Does every state always
15 apply for the moneys that they might get?

16 (Laughter.)

17 MR. : If I could also point out
18 very briefly, in order to receive those funds, a
19 state must file with the Endowment and obtain the approval
20 of the Chairman of a compliance plan, demonstrating that
21 that Committee is in full compliance with the accountabil-
22 ity provisions.

23 MS. : I might also point out
24 that the states include four territories, and the money
25 is divided amongst them as well.

1 MR. : Secondly, if that
2 compliance money is approved, a state must submit a
3 prpoposal for full review, presenting a plan which the
4 Chairman finds adequate, that it is conducting an
5 adequate program in the humanities.

6 Unless those two are satisfied, we do not
7 have the authority to provide funds for that Committee.

8 MR. BENNETT: Mr. Neuster, Mr. Stanley?

9 MR. NEUSTER: I wonder, Mr. Gibson, whether
10 you could summarize everything you've just said now
11 and have it made available to the new members of the
12 Council.

13 MR. GIBSON: Certainly, certainly.

14 MR. NUESTER: I think that is very necessary
15 information that we should have.

16 MR. : Beyond the financial
17 accountability, how much guidance do we actually give
18 the state councils and committees overall? What kinds
19 of policies do they hear from -- do they hear from us?
20 I don't think it is fair to anybody, not to them and not
21 to our Chairman and not to any of us to take a media
22 event as the occasion for the discussion of policy, let
23 alone the definition of the humanities, which we're not
24 going to have too much new to say on.

25 I'd really like to know first of all what do

1 we tell them besides accountability of funds, things like
2 that.

3 MR. : I can provide the
4 funding guidelines which we provide for the committees,
5 not funding guidelines, excuse me. It is out of the
6 criteria for their proposal. I can summarize those,
7 however, quite briefly.

8 A committee in order to receive funding must
9 present to us a proposal for a two-year period. In that
10 proposal the state council or state committee is expected
11 to describe in detail their program or the previous
12 two years including a listing of individual grants,
13 and the discussion of how they were or were not in the
14 humanities.

15 In addition to that a state is expected to
16 state a plan for the subsequent two years, and that
17 plan shall include an evaluation of its past record,
18 an explanation and description of the needs and resources
19 of that state, a description of how their plans for the
20 following two years are in response to the needs and
21 resources of the state, a clear sense of their goals and
22 objectives in that regard, their program development or
23 promotional procedures, their grant-making procedures,
24 and their evaluation procedures.

25 That is what is reviewed.

1 MR. : These are all things
2 which are programmatic in a general sense. When you
3 come here we know we have education programs and research
4 and so on.

5 Do they have types of programs that we could
6 identify as a division, a division of this and a division
7 of that, because otherwise how do you know good from
8 bad except on an ad hoc basis?

9 MR. : Under the terms of the
10 authorizing legislation, states have programmatic
11 independence. They are expected to demonstrate to us
12 again that they are responding to the needs and resources
13 of the individual state, and that they are conducting a
14 quality humanities program.

15 They have the freedom to select the areas
16 which they will emphasize or the areas which they will
17 fund at all. Most states are primarily funding programs
18 designed to foster increased public understanding and
19 appreciation of the humanities.

20 There is an emerging interest albeit quite
21 small, an emerging interest in a few other areas of
22 activity. Some committees, for example, are funding
23 projects related to elementary and secondary education.
24 Some of them are funding projects specifically dealing
25 with local history or other aspects of that.

1 Some states do have their specific funding
2 categories and others do not.

3 MR. BENNETT: Jack?

4 MR. : Seems to me that the
5 present system probably not by design is very shrewdly
6 worked out in this respect.

7 (Laughter.)

8 They get a certain amount of money just by
9 being a state. We can't withhold that unless they just
10 don't keep any books or their books don't balance.
11 That gives them a taste of honey. They know what the
12 federal money is like, but they can't get the rest
13 unless they apply to the Endowment, and they get very
14 sensitive as to what kind of thing the Endowment is
15 interested in.

16 It is the fact that they do get a certain
17 amount. I suppose that is inevitable although Congress
18 is going to demand that basic amount, but there is
19 enough discretionary amount so that they are very
20 sensitive to the wishes and thoughts of the Endowment.

21 MS. : One thing that we haven't
22 mentioned is that although the state has a certain
23 allocation, there is no guarantee that a particular group
24 of people, the Council or the Committee will receive that
25 grant.

1 The legislation makes it possible for two
2 competing groups both to apply. It is possible. It has
3 not happened yet, but it might. This is a fairly new
4 program -- for two groups to compete, and then the
5 Endowment would have to make a decision competitively.

6 In addition, I think that that practice has
7 grown up because on the whole similar kinds of programs
8 get done in more than one state. It is possible to
9 compare how well or badly that program is being pursued
10 by seeing how it is done in other states, and I think
11 that the Endowment stamp and also the panel that reviews
12 the program, the proposals, has -- they both have been
13 known to mention that to states who may not be doing
14 as well as they might.

15 MR. : As I reflect on the
16 problems of the state committees, it seems to me they
17 don't have the professional support of program officers
18 who are experts in various types of activities, educa-
19 tion programs and the like that we do, that the Council
20 does and so on.

21 It is really difficult for them. If we
22 relied so heavily as we do on professional staff in
23 knowing good from bad in public programs or education
24 programs and the like, it seems to me those committees
25 likewise are apt to need the same type of help and not be

1 getting it.

2 I think there is a -- I think more attention
3 is needed to providing programmatic guidance to the
4 states than we have given up until now. It seems to
5 me just an area of chaos -- not chaos --

6 MR. BENNETT: No, I don't think so -- let
7 me -- Don, go ahead, and then I'd like to.

8 MR. : I would like to respond
9 to that in two ways. One, of course, the states do have
10 professional staffs themselves.

11 MR. : I know.

12 MR. : And many of them are
13 highly qualified and very thoughtful people. Secondly,
14 the division of state programs does have, at this
15 point, six program officers, who in themselves are highly
16 trained and skilled in the disciplines of the humanities,
17 and have experience in public activities as well.

18 They travel extensively with and communicate
19 frequently with the programs. They are not giving --
20 we are not allowed by law, nor do we wish to, tell the
21 states what they should do. I mean, "You should be fund-
22 ing in this area or that area.", but our program
23 officers do provide them with significant advice, infor-
24 mation and analysis about the programs of the Endowment,
25 about definitions of quality, about how to craft programs

1 better, and they share information that they have gained
2 from other states.

3 We intend, in fact, have approved plans to
4 expand our activities in that are extensively.

5 MR. : I have a concrete sug-
6 gestion based on the reference to the development of
7 education programs. I think this could be a model for
8 others.

9 When the states are going into, let us say,
10 education programs. Let's make accessible to them our
11 education staff, and ask them to include reference to
12 our program officers where they are doing programs of a
13 type the Endowment is doing.

14 MR. : I think it is an excellent
15 suggestion, and we met with 30 representative state
16 committees Wednesday afternoon with the staff of the
17 Division of Education for precisely that purpose.

18 MR. : And public programs.

19 MR. : Yes, true.

20 MR. : And public programs, because
21 the staff of the state committees are tending to be
22 generalists, whereas at the national level we have the
23 support of specialists.

24 MR. : Yes, we have met with
25 public program staff, and did that yesterday afternoon.

1 MR. BENNETT: Mr. Stanley, yes, sir?

2 MR. STANLEY: I appreciate the need of
3 allowing great discretionary powers to the states in
4 determining which programs they're going to pursue, but
5 at the same time it seems to me we have the obligation
6 to make it clear that their programs should be in the
7 humanities, and not in something else.

8 Now that, of course, immediately means that
9 we have to have a workable definition of the humanities
10 that can be acceptable on a wide basis, and that becomes
11 increasingly important that we make clear perhaps
12 through specific examples what are and what are not
13 acceptable humanities programs.

14 MR. BENNETT: Yes. Let me just make a couple
15 of comments.

16 I was going to say it is hard to drop an
17 indictment against the whole country, but I decided not
18 to say that. I think that is -- is that Burke?

19 MR. : That is Burke, yes.

20 (Laughter.)

21 MR. BENNETT: Well, I said it, and I got it
22 right. All right, and it would be hard to drop an
23 indictment, I think, against the states either. It isn't
24 chaos.

25 For the most part, the problems they have are

1 the problems that we have, and I tried to make that
2 point yesterday.

3 Apart from the questions that the states were
4 -- some representatives of the states were asking me,
5 the thing I was trying to stress and stress right off
6 is that I regard, and, indeed, must regard, but feel
7 disposed to regard as well, the state programs as part
8 of the National Endowment for the Humanities, and that
9 they should recognize that I recognize that, and, there-
10 fore, I think this calls for greater cooperation and
11 collaboration of the state division, our program officers
12 with other people at the Endowment and with the people
13 at the states with people who -- to whom we are providing
14 funds through other grants through the agency.

15 That means meetings like the staff of our
16 Education Division had with the representatives of the
17 states. It means, as Harold Cannon offered at a meeting
18 a couple of weeks ago, to make known the names of some of
19 the very good people who have received grants from the
20 Research Division or from the Fellowship Division, to be
21 used as speakers in the states.

22 It, indeed, requires continuing attention
23 to their activities, because although it is quite right
24 that they have the freedom to direct their programs by
25 their own lights, I have the responsibility, by law, to

1 ensure that their programs are in accord with the purposes
2 of the agency.

3 That means, I think, more than one discussion
4 with the states and the directors about their work. I
5 do want to mention -- I stressed yesterday at the meeting,
6 not in a defensive style, I hope, but that since I got
7 to the Endowment, when people asked me for a good
8 example of a program funded by NEH, I have been using
9 the example of the program in Vermont, where scholars
10 were leading discussions of books with citizens.

11 The citizens read the books, had discussions
12 and got to keep the books -- simple straightforward
13 program. I was telling the state people that I told
14 everyone I could find about this.

15 I told Judy Neiman so she'd write it up in the
16 Humanities. I told editors of Humanities Report. I
17 grabbed passers-by in the street --

18 (Laughter.)

19 -- And told them, but this was of less interest
20 to them than the example I used of a program that was
21 not in the Humanities.

22 That is --

23 (Laughter.)

24 That's okay. We keep coming up with the
25 same principle. It is like people wanting responses to

1 grants that were turned down -- applications were turned
2 down rather than not, but that is all right.

3 I think, I hope they've come away from that
4 meeting with recognition of my interest in what goes
5 on in the states and with some sense that we do regard
6 them truly as part of this agency and want them to
7 -- and always, both the work of our staff and the
8 individuals and groups, institutions that we fund,
9 to use them as a source for collaboration.

10 Yes, sir?

11 MR. : Thanks for amplifying
12 my point so well. On the matter of Burke, I think the
13 exact quotation is "I do not know the means of drawing
14 up an indictment against --".

15 (Laughter.)

16 MR. BENNETT: Thank you very much.

17 MS. : Mr. Chairman?

18 MR. BENNETT: That's what happens. Some credit
19 for courage anyway.

20 (Laughter.)

21 Yes, go ahead.

22 MS. : Since in my previous
23 incarnation I sat for almost four years on the committee
24 that dealt with state committees, I would like to comment
25 that the states, in fact, are quite responsive even to

1 our unofficial suggestions, so for example, when we
2 had a case that we dealt with of a state that was cer-
3 tainly not performing in any respect up to our standards,
4 we discovered that there were quite a few things that
5 we could do, that we were quite capable of affecting a
6 great change by the nature of our personal contact with
7 them, by the nature of our reporting, by the nature of
8 simply insisting on some very specific practices that,
9 for example, our criticism of their programming be dis-
10 tributed to the entire member of the Committee, and not
11 just to the Director and the Chairman of the Committee as
12 was the case in one state.

13 There are a number of ways that we have
14 at our disposal of making our will known, and I would
15 also like to comment in response to your last comment
16 about what kinds of things people tend to pick up, that
17 there is unfortunately, it seems to me, a tendency to
18 generalize about lots of things that this Endowment does
19 or has done in the past, and that it has also been
20 my experience that, having sat here a while and under
21 different Administrations -- that is both Republican and
22 Democrat -- that it is really best when looking at the
23 work of the Endowment or committees, to look specifically
24 on a project-by-project basis.

25 Then one really does seem to get the sense

1 of what is going on here. I don't think that generaliza-
2 tions really serve us very well, even though I am making
3 one.

4 (Laughter.)

5 It really is not my understanding of proper
6 academic way, intellectual way of approaching the work
7 that we do, but rather our job as I understand it, is to
8 look project-by-project, and to see whether or not any
9 individual grants stands or falls on its merits, and
10 whether or not each one does or does not meet the
11 standards that we have set here as to what constitutes
12 proper grants in the humanities.

13 MR. BENNETT: Right. Thank you.

14 MR. : Would it be helpful at
15 all if it were made known to the states why we turn down
16 certain grants, and why we made certain grants, in terms
17 of giving them guidelines, rather than the general
18 matters we've been talking about?

19 In other words trying to be specific in order
20 to give them the guideline.

21 MR. BENNETT: Don?

22 MR. : I think it is a very
23 interesting suggestion, and one we should think about.

24 MR. BENNETT: I think it is -- yes, the
25 question I asked the people in the states yesterday

1 when they asked about access to the Endowment, people
2 at the Endowment, was the staff here at the Endowment,
3 Don Gibson and the program officers -- "Do they answer
4 their phone when they called.".

5 The answer was "yes". Now I think also that
6 they read -- I know they read because I talked to them
7 about it. I know they read our publications. They
8 read humanities. They see the kinds of grants we're
9 funding, and I take it they feel welcome.

10 Maybe they should be particularly encouraged
11 to ask about --

12 MR. : Mr. Chairman, taking it
13 a step further. Do they also have information about the
14 grants that we refused to fund in order to give them
15 a guideline? Do they have to follow this?

16 MR. BENNETT: Yes. I understood the point.
17 They certainly -- well, they certainly could have, in
18 general, information about that if they ask.

19 MR. : In general we could
20 provide some information, but there is a problem imposed
21 by the Privacy Act under -- that we do not release that,
22 but we could provide some general information.

23 We're doing some other things just to mention
24 one minor point, and it would take a second. State
25 committees are funding lots of films and lots of

1 exhibits these days, and have been for a number of years.

2 We're trying to put together a package of
3 materials dealing with not just the guidelines that our
4 media program and our museum program use, but also the
5 orientation of a staff for considering an exhibit or the
6 orientation of a staff for considering media.

7 The questions that the program officers in
8 media or the program officers in museums ask themselves,
9 the checklist they have to deal with an exhibit -- we'll
10 be sending it to them not saying that they have to do
11 this, but to provide them with some professional advice
12 on how they handle a media application or a museum
13 application.

14 MR. BENNETT: Yes, Carol?

15 MS. : In a program development
16 particularly, but also in youth programs we use whenever
17 appropriate state directors on the panels, and I would
18 encourage this as the practice whenever it is appropriate
19 because it is a very helpful thing to them to see how
20 we go about our business and what sorts of things do and
21 don't get funded in all parts of the Endowment.

22 MR. BENNETT: One of the -- just the last
23 art -- one of the reasons I like that program in Vermont,
24 and I promise this is the last time I'll talk about it,
25 is that it started as a state program and then became part

1 of a public program. That is -- we had here an excellent
2 example of collaboration where, in effect, we took their
3 idea, and that is nice to happen, too, that is the
4 learning can take place both ways.

5 One other thing. Louise had a point, sorry?

6 MS. : Well, I was going to make
7 that point, but in a larger way. I think it is -- you
8 were saying that from the staff point of view that you
9 are trying to have access available, but I want to
10 reiterate that I think Council members, I think, also have
11 the responsibility to know what's going on and to be
12 able to evaluate.

13 I think that it is incumbent upon us to
14 understand that a good many of our ideas have come from
15 the state and many of the programs from the states haven't
16 won awards. The Day after Trinity, for example, and
17 Babies in Banners, among the media programs, although a
18 good many of the others -- I think that -- obviously
19 I am pushing the idea of the states.

20 I think it is critical that the Council mem-
21 bers become as informed as possible for whatever reasons
22 they want to become informed, but it is critical.

23 MR. BENNETT: Yes.

24 MS. : Before we go too far
25 down the road in thinking about state councils as needing

1 our guidance and help. I think we ought to remember that
2 they are a very good anecdote to deracinated Washington,
3 and that the councils are extraordinary because there
4 are highly qualified scholars and highly qualified
5 members of the public who volunteer an awful lot of
6 their time, to supplement staff work, and to really make
7 personal contributions to work in the humanities in
8 their states, and the state councils are a vehicle for our
9 delivering that kind of, if you like the word volunteerism.

10 I think it is very, very important for the
11 Committee to recognize that.

12 MR. BENNETT: Except for the necessary --

13 (End side one, tape one.)

14 (Begin side one, tape two.)

15 assumption of the deraci -- derac -- never mind.

16 (Laughter.)

17 MR. : The arts people have been
18 extraordinary successful in getting money from state
19 legislatures so that the state and federal money is
20 produced from really very extensive state arts programs.

21 Is there any movement at all, or is there
22 any progress at all in getting states to appropriate
23 money for the humanities?

24 MR. : A number of the states are
25 approaching state governments in a variety of ways.

1 Some for funding, some for more cooperation and
2 education between them. Very few states, however, have
3 received extensive funding.

4 I think it is now four states which have
5 received appropriations. Virginia received a direct state
6 appropriation for a resource center. Minnesota received
7 appropriation for its program development efforts in rural
8 areas of Minnesota, and Florida has received some money
9 and Alaska received some money and a few others.

10 The total is less than \$1 million at this
11 point.

12 MR. BENNETT: Carol?

13 MS. : Well, I think the difference
14 between structure between the Arts Endowment and here is
15 really the difference in that aspect -- that the arts
16 councils are agencies of the state government.

17 MR. (Daughter) : State appropriates a certain
18 amount of money. It can become a state agency as I under-
19 stand it.

20 MR. : Correct.

21 MR. : But that inducement hasn't
22 led them to put up that amount of money.

23 MR. BENNETT: I think if we stopped and thought
24 about these things, we realize we already all know them.
25 Every person who gets a grant, who serves on a panel comes

1 from one of the states, so there is talent out there. I
2 don't think there's any -- or territories -- I don't
3 think there's any question about that.

4 The warm-ups that those fellows had in
5 Virginia before they came to Philadelphia made their
6 contributions.

7 (Laughter.)

8 I think maybe a good model. I have said to the
9 state people yesterday, a couple of times, that wherever
10 I go to give a talk, lecture, I am likely to be in one
11 of the states or territories, and that I want to join
12 that visit with getting together with the local -- the
13 people from the state council.

14 In fact, I'll be doing that this week in the
15 other Washington DeMour (phonetic) Fulson --

16 MS. : Deracinated --

17 (Laughter.)

18 MR. BENNETT: Finally as far as whether I am
19 an intuitionist or Cartesian rationalist, I am reminded
20 of somebody -- I am sure it is not Burke, who said,
21 "If I knew what you meant I would either challenge you to
22 a dual or thank you."

23 (Laughter.)

24 Thank you.

25 (Laughter.)

1 Shall we take a break?

2 We should stand up for a minute, and the
3 meeting will be closed to the public at this point.

4 MR. WILLKIE: Next item on the agenda is
5 Item L. Item L is in your agenda book, and contains
6 Chairman's Action Departing from Council Recommendations.

7 The reason there are two sections in the book
8 is because as you expect, the rejections are considered
9 confidential, and, therefore, they are in this section of
10 the book.

11 Are there any questions about Tab L?

12 MR. : Can I comment on that?

13 MR. WILLKIE: Yes, please. Those Council
14 members who were present yesterday morning at the meeting,
15 the Chairman may recall that it is --

16 MR. : Sorry, Tab H grant?

17 MR. WILLKIE: Yes, it is. Tab H. I am sorry.
18 Tab H as in Harold.

19 MR. : Okay, this concerns --

20 MR. WILLKIE: Okay, excuse me. When -- let
21 me say it is again, just so everybody is -- I was confusing
22 the front for the back of this line. The information is
23 in Tab H of the yellow agenda book. I apologize.

24 MR. : Okay, this memorandum describes
25 the action taken by the Chairman departing from Council

1 recommendation in those instances where, at the February
2 meeting, the Council recommended funding a project and the
3 Chairman decided not to fund the projects in issue.

4 Those Council members who were present at
5 yesterday mornings meeting with the Chairman may recall
6 that some question was raised as to the description of the
7 application brought in special programs.

8 That's on page two of the memorandum, so
9 accordingly a revised memorandum has been distributed to
10 all Council members this morning to provide a fuller des-
11 cription of the basis, both the Council's recommendation
12 and the Chairman's decision not to fund.

13 Carol?

14 MS. : the description is perhaps
15 still not adequate in that it does not note that the panel
16 recommended this.

17 MR. : Which one are we talking about,
18 please?

19 MS. : AP20537 on page two, Lisa
20 Coda (phonetic). It was a youth grant.

21 MR. : I just would like to suggest
22 that in the future, but not for this occasion, that
23 some phrase be added on the fellowships items as well.

24 MR. : Explaining?

25 MR. : Explaining why they were not

1 funded. I am not asking on these now, although we did
2 sit on them, but I would be glad in the future if a line
3 could be stated on those, too.

4 MR. : Mr. Chairman, can I ask a
5 general question? Is there any overall general reason
6 why we have not funded these fellowships?

7 MR. : Yes.

8 MR. : Do you think general character-
9 ization?

10 MR. WILLKIE: Yes, I think there is a general
11 characteristic in all of these. In every instance there
12 was, and this does not distinguish these from other
13 fellowship applications, there was disagreement among the
14 viewers, panelists among these, but the central question
15 in each of these instances was the centrality of the
16 humanity to the project.

17 MS. : Mr. Chairman?

18 MR. BENNETT: In no case, I might say, was I
19 the first person to raise that question in the review.
20 Yes?

21 MS. NORTON : Mr. Chairman, as I suggested
22 yesterday morning with regard or coming out of the
23 problems, I suppose, that were posed by AY20537, I have
24 discussed with colleagues in the scholarly field that
25 was covered by that proposal, and I have discussed with

1 our internal Human Subjects Committee the ways that this
2 is dealt with, and the problems that re posed.

3 I would like to suggest to the Council and to
4 the Chairman, that we are now an agency which, as Anita
5 suggested earlier, often deals with sensitive subjects,
6 sensitive procedures, sensitive problems, and I think we
7 may be well-served by having a Subcommittee and/or the
8 legal council or whomever you would designate, provide
9 some guidance to us, formal guidance, that we can approve
10 or disapprove or act upon with regard to the area of
11 Research on Human Subjects.

12 I think it is particularly important for us
13 as Council members to be alerted to cases where this
14 might be true, especially in light of -- in this instance
15 this was recommended by panels. It did come to us
16 with a recommendation, and we need to know what the prob-
17 lems are, how we address them, what kind of decisions
18 we make, and further than that, I was advised by our
19 Committee in any case, our institutional committee, that
20 often times they deal with these problems by having avail-
21 able sets of procedure for doing the research that are
22 protective of the human subjects and of the researchers.

23 We might want to consider whether or not, in
24 such instances, we might want to do this so that we can
25 avoid any appearance or reality of censorship, and deal

1 with areas that we might want -- that might need to be
2 covered, that need to have research done, but that might
3 be difficult politically as well as practically for us.

4 I would like to make that as a recommendation,
5 and have Council consider it.

6 MS. : Mr. Chairman, and I would like
7 to add that we had a somewhat similar problem come up as
8 you know in one of our grant applications yesterday, that
9 is the question of whether or not -- well, let's go back.
10 Let's look at the Middletown example where the question
11 of whether or not -- when one interviewed someone who
12 was engaged or who commented that they were doing some-
13 thing illegal, one -- what was our legal -- what was the
14 legal implications of doing that, putting it -- especially
15 if one is doing it with a minor, and then one puts it on
16 the air or one publicizes it and so on and so forth.

17 As you know that was a very serious concern
18 of mine and others about that particular grant applica-
19 tion that one would -- we would be in a position of inter-
20 viewing minors who were committing illegal acts, and
21 whether or not -- what our status is.

22 I think the whole subject needs to be
23 looked into very, very carefully, and we need legal
24 counsel so that we have much more clear guidelines than
25 we have today as to just what our situation is.

1 MR. BENNETT: Yes. I agree. Let me just
2 say a word. I think you can assume -- I think we can stip-
3 ulate, since we are getting into a legal discussion with
4 legal terminology -- stipulate to the General Counsel,
5 who is already a good lawyer -- is getting up to snuff
6 on these kinds of questions, particularly.

7 (Laughter.)

8 These kinds of questions, particularly, as
9 they arise here, but there's a reason that the case method
10 is used in law school, and we have to go through them,
11 each one at a time. The issue is raised by the Lisa
12 Cotta case or some ways similar, some ways different
13 than the situation you described.

14 MS. : But I think we need guidelines.

15 MR. BENNETT: I think that's right. We do
16 need some --

17 MS. : I think there are guidelines
18 within the federal government that could speak to that.

19 MR. BENNETT: Fine. I was going to, but
20 why don't you. You know it better.

21 MS. : Well, I didn't want you to
22 (inaudible) -- at any rate there are guidelines. I've
23 sat on the National Advisory Drug Committee. We estab-
24 lished guidelines for experimental -- especially with
25 children.

1 I don't fully agree with all of them, and
2 they're for NIH and they're for social sciences and the
3 hard sciences, and I think you wouldn't have to reinvent
4 the wheel in other words.

5 MS. NORTON: But they do need to be made
6 available to us.

7 MR. BENNETT: Right.

8 MR. WILLKIE : We need oil for the wheel.
9 I think what has been requested we can provide, which is
10 a general statement on this question for the Endowment,
11 and no doubt it will grow out of the experience of other
12 agencies as well as professional organizations.

13 Oral historians are concerned with this
14 question, and have been trying to get guidelines. Anthro-
15 pologists have been concerned with this and so on, and
16 we'll draw on every source we can, including the law,
17 to put together some general statements for ourselves.

18 MR. : I think that there may be
19 questions here that are not strictly speaking legal
20 in nature. There are sort of broad policy ramifications
21 even though we may not be supporting the activity.

22 MR. : Probably the legal aspects of
23 it as well.

24 MR. BENNETT: Thank you. Yes, Mary Beth?

25 MS. : I want to go back to the issue

1 of the fellowships, of the summer stipends applications
2 that you did not approve, although they were approved
3 by the lower levels.

4 First I want to say that I have absolutely no
5 quarrel with the decisions you made about the Division
6 of Education grants, especially since I argued strongly
7 against one of them in the Committee, and was outvoted
8 by my colleagues on that one.

9 With respect to the fellowships division
10 applications I am somewhat concerned about the fact that
11 we were given no explanation as to why these particular
12 ones were turned down.

13 In addition I guess I am also concerned about
14 -- more concerned about the Chairman exercising this
15 kind of discretion which, of course, is his right, when
16 the issue is an individual fellowship, where especially
17 the stipend is, shall we say, miniscule, as opposed to
18 the major collaborative projects that are somewhat differ-
19 ent in nature.

20 One of the things that, just through chance,
21 I had taken home with me -- the list of summer stipend
22 applications, so when I got this I looked up to see what
23 the titles were, and I must say that on the face of it
24 from the titles, I did not see that these were not neces-
25 sarily centrally in the humanities.

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1330 VERMONT AVENUE, NW
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

1 For example, the first one, Herbert J. Foster
2 is a study of the -- the title is Blacks in Atlantic
3 City, New Jersey, 1850 to 1915. Now that seems to me
4 to be a perfectly -- I don't know why it was proposing
5 to carry it out, but it is obviously a topic in social
6 history.

7 Furthermore, the Sharon Murphy one further
8 down was oral histories of minority women journalists.
9 The Florence Babb Market Women and National Development
10 in Peru -- all of which -- now I admit the other -- I am
11 not quoting some of the other topics, because it does
12 seem to me just from the titles that perhaps there might
13 be more justification for that in some instances than in
14 others.

15 I guess I just was concerned that we didn't
16 have any explanation, and I am -- I guess I am deeply
17 troubled by the notion of one person's -- that is yours,
18 definition of the humanities, defining, in particular,
19 what types of individual fellowships get funded by the
20 agency.

21 I wonder if you'd speak to that.

22 MR. BENNETT: Sure. First, I think, if you
23 like we can provide a fuller record for you or for the
24 whole Council.

25 MR. : For the Committee that did

1 them because several of us were on the Committee.

2 MR. BENNETT: Why don't we -- if we have any
3 for the next time include these, or we can get them to
4 you sooner. The response here at the beginning was,
5 Mary Beth, in general, we'd want to talk about them
6 specifically.

7 You cannot -- as you, yourself said, go just
8 on the title. It is how one approaches it, the method
9 used and so on. I don't want to say that in every case
10 there were people on the review or panel process who
11 made exactly the same objection I did, but certainly in
12 most cases.

13 As to your being uncomfortable about the fact
14 it is one person, I am exceedingly uncomfortable with
15 that, too, because it is me. That is a hard choice to
16 make. I don't know what else I can say about it, except
17 we can discuss it on the individual merits of the case.

18 In all these cases I did have the advice of
19 others. It is at least two -- I have to bring Jeff along
20 too. It was his judgment as well, and in many other
21 cases, judgments from people on the staff.

22 MR. WILLKIE : I think I might say, too, the
23 reason -- we can take advice and follow it as well, about
24 not having information about this is that we have been
25 following the procedure that has been used typically

1 with fellowships and also, for in fact the other side
2 of the same coin that you are mentioning, and we can't
3 see both sides of it -- that is since it is the work of
4 an individual, we chose to just simply list names now
5 rather than go through the projects, but your argument
6 is just the flip side of that same coin.

7 We chose this, but that is why they uniquely
8 here appear without additional detail, because it is the
9 work of individuals rather than collaborative, institution-
10 al.

11 MR. : In the future we'll have
12 some explanation.

13 MR. WILLKIE: Absolutely. I think that has
14 been -- we can -- we provide that, for example, to fellow-
15 ships so that there's no --

16 MR. : The Chairman did the Committee
17 the courtesy last time of earmarking certain ones about
18 which he had advanced concern, and they include -- I
19 am not sure whether all of these were in that preliminary
20 list, but there's significant overlap between the ones
21 we especially examine, of those which he earmarked.

22 Some we did not recommend, but we did discuss
23 and then recommend a number which he has now subsequently
24 rejected. The Committee did not review these at its
25 meeting yesterday. I think if individual fellowships

1 continue to appear on rejections, I think the Committee
2 ought to go over the ones that are so rejected, and try
3 to come to some better understanding of what the principals
4 involved are.

5 MR. BENNETT: Can we make that available to the
6 Council committee before it comes or when it arrives or --
7 I take it that is -- yes, we will.

8 Anita?

9 MS. : Were there some about which
10 questions were raised, about which reviewers or panelists
11 raised the question about whether these were centrally
12 in the humanities, which the Council recommended and
13 which the Chairman approved?

14 MR. : Yes.

15 MR. BENNETT: Yes.

16 MR. : Would you be argued with, not
17 on this occasion, but on future occasions, particularly
18 in the area of fellowship where the Chairman does not
19 wish to fund and the Committee might want to discuss it
20 a little bit further?

21 In other words how negotiable would this be?

22 (Laughter.)

23 MR. BENNETT: If you got the time, I got the
24 time.

25 MR. : Got the time --

1 MR. BENNETT: Sure.

2 MR. : But there's got to be -- if
3 you've got the time we've got the --

4 MR. : Money --

5 MR. : Beer?

6 MR. BENNETT: No, that wouldn't be appropriate.

7 (Laughter.)

8 MR. : There's a --

9 MR. BENNETT: That is if your suggestion is,
10 is it possible if I am departing from Council recommenda-
11 tion.

12 MR. : Right.

13 MR. BENNETT: Or so inclined to inform you of
14 that before I make that decision.

15 MR. : Or give us a chance to go
16 over it with you on a subsequent meeting in an occasional
17 instance.

18 MR. BENNETT: Yes, but I think when you want
19 to -- I mean this suggestion like other suggestions, I
20 think -- fine. I don't want to say let's have a procedure
21 and never do it. We're setting up an awful lot of other
22 business.

23 I think, yes --

24 MR. : Well, we're finding somewhat
25 troubling is that in some instances, as Mr. Kennedy says,

1 you raised questions, we did discuss it at some length,
2 and then we see that our Council was not accepted, and
3 we accept that, but in some instances it might be helpful
4 to hear more, although I agree with you, not a regular
5 thing. God forbid.

6 MR. BENNETT: Well, the question is do you
7 want to insist that before I took action I consult with
8 -- no.

9 MS. : I think what concerns me, Mr.
10 Chairman, is the principle. I mean you mentioned the
11 issue of principle a minute ago, because this -- when I
12 saw this list with absolutely no explanation whatsoever,
13 I thought, was is this?

14 There was no indication why any of these were
15 rejected either individually or as a group, and, therefore,
16 I could only think that it looked arbitrary, and I assume
17 it is not the case.

18 MR. BENNETT: No.

19 MS. : But you didn't show us any
20 rationale for it.

21 MR. BENNETT: Sure.

22 MS. : As I say my concern is more
23 particularly with the work of individual scholars in this
24 regard, since I do think that there is -- what I want to
25 say is a different order of magnitude of some sort involved

1 with the work of an individual scholar who is obviously
2 working on something that is of great and primary interest
3 to that one person as opposed to a major collaborative
4 research project that is supposed to produce some
5 other tangible benefit, other than what is supposed to
6 be the benefit of a fellowship for independent study of
7 whatever sort.

8 I guess what I am saying is that I would
9 encourage the Chairman to exercise discretion somewhat
10 less -- that is exercise his power to reject Council
11 recommendations somewhat less with respect to fellowships
12 than with other areas.

13 MR. BENNETT: Okay, I think -- the way I'll
14 translate that, and this may or may not be happy to you --
15 in something like individual fellowships one takes and
16 must take very seriously, well, as one takes everywhere,
17 the review of experts in the field, other people that are
18 working in the field, particularly when that may not be
19 an area of expertise of mine, but I don't think I can say
20 that I should in any way qualify the authority or respon-
21 sibility I have for individual fellowships more than
22 I have for any other part of the agency or program.

23 MR. : Nor do the Council members.

24 MR. BENNETT: Yes. The appearance, I think
25 you're quite right, Mary Beth, and we will have for the

1 next meeting, not only an account, if there are any,
2 which I depart from Council recommendations from this
3 meeting, but we shall have a list in regard to these.

4 Yes?

5 MR. : You know, we're talking about
6 the proposals and really to a degree Council members rely
7 on the peer group, and I wonder if there is any correla-
8 tion between the rejection of the proposals. When you reject
9 them, do you go back to the comments of the peer group?

10 MR. BENNETT: Sure.

11 MR. : And does it get to the essence
12 of the question of the whole -- are you satisfied with
13 the whole peer group process and that -- or should that,
14 in your opinion, be strengthened?

15 MR. BENNETT: Should be strengthened. Indeed,
16 the peer review and panel review process is essential to
17 the Agency and to the integrity of the Agency, and as
18 Division Directors here know, we met and we are going to
19 strengthen the panel process.

20 That means we're going to give them more money
21 to get the people they, in their judgement, think we need
22 to serve on those panels. Again, let's not assume that
23 what is happening here is that in each case reviewers
24 say, yes, panel says yes. Council says yes, and I say
25 no.

1 There are a number of cases here, I am with the
2 panel, against the Council, or I am with reviewers against
3 the Council. You make your judgments on the basis of
4 your review. Sometimes you differ with the review that
5 has gone on before you, and my judgment is made in the
6 same way.

7 Sometimes I'm with you. Sometimes I'm with
8 them.

9 MR. : Are there proposals without
10 peer group --

11 MR. BENNETT: Pardon?

12 MR. : (Inaudible) --

13 MR. BENNETT: Yes. Okay. Thank you.

14 MR. WILLKIE: Shall we do education?

15 MR. BENNETT: Shall we do education before
16 lunch?

17 MS. NORTON : It will probably be long, Mr.
18 Chairman. I don't know --

19 You might ask the Council.

20 MR. BENNETT: How does the Council feel?

21 MS. NORTON : Most of the Council does not
22 know what I am referring to, so that's the problem. I
23 would anticipate a fairly lengthy discussion.

24 MR. BENNETT: We have a 20-25-30 minute dis-
25 cussion on the first amendment. Do you want lunch first

1 or --

2 MS. NORTON : Let's go on. I'd rather have
3 it before --

4 MR. BENNETT: Let's go on? How about, shall
5 we aim for 12:30 -- shall we say 12:30?

6 MS. NORTON : Yes, we could say 12:30, and
7 I would not like to stop the discussion in the middle,
8 that is I would like to complete the discussion.

9 MR. BENNETT: Okay.

10 MS. NORTON : Mr. Chairman, we now have the
11 motion of the Division of Education Programs in front of
12 you. Let me introduce the general motion.

13 I think what I will do, Mr. Chairman, if this
14 is acceptable to you, I will, in effect, divide the
15 motion and move everything but the case in question first,
16 and then I will introduce the case in question, and will
17 deal with that separately if that is an acceptable pro-
18 cedure.

19 Let me then deal quickly with the motion
20 as it is in front of you. The page one, we have one
21 program from elementary and secondary education not
22 recommended.

23 The Council members who were here in February
24 remembered that this was deferred in February for further
25 information. This was a grant that the Council Committee

1 was concerned about as to whether or not it was in the
2 humanities as opposed to in the arts. It turns out that
3 it is in the humanities, but that when we asked for
4 further information, there turned out to be inadequate
5 training for persons to be involved in this art apprecia-
6 tion project, so we are recommending reject with resubmit
7 on that proposal that was deferred at the February
8 Council.

9 Turn now to page three and you will see Con-
10 sultant Grants for this session. There are more disapproves
11 than the usual in the consultant grants that go over onto
12 page five.

13 It is not entirely clear why there are more
14 disapprovals. For the information of the new Council
15 members, consultant grants are deliberately not as competi-
16 tive as grants in other areas. That is these are colleges
17 which are asking for very small amounts of money to
18 bring in expert consultants to assist them with some kind
19 of problem they have.

20 We deliberately try to fund as many of these
21 as possible, as many as we think the colleges will be
22 able to make good use of. This time out of 15 projects
23 there are ten recommended for funding and five recommended
24 for rejection, which is an unusually high number.

25 The theory within the division is that perhaps

1 we now know more than we once did about what is needed
2 for a successful consultancy than we did in the past,
3 that is the reason, the most frequent reason for a turn-
4 down is that the people have come in with too vague a
5 proposal, and that they are simply not yet ready.

6 They simply haven't done the planning they
7 have to do before they could make successful use of an
8 expert consultant from the Endowment.

9 There's also a new review process involved
10 in the Consultant Grant Program. Then on page seven we
11 come to the bulk of the business for this particular
12 meeting.

13 This is Higher Education, Regional and
14 National. I will call your attention specifically to
15 three proposals that drew the attention of the Committee.

16 The first one on page seven, University of
17 South Carolina, (inaudible) American South Comes of
18 Age, a film series. This is a 15-unit television course
19 on the recent history of the South.

20 This is recommended for approval with a number
21 of conditions. I will not go into them in detail. Let
22 me just say that the Committee yesterday found problems
23 with the conception of the course structure, and so recom-
24 mended the grant with detailed conditions, and one of the
25 most important conditions being that new consultants be

1 brought in and the structure rethought before the full
2 amount of money be released.

3 I should add that there has been a pilot
4 film done for this series that we funded earlier. It was
5 really quite a successful pilot film, and the issue is
6 not having to do with the dissemination or with the
7 video capabilities of the people who are involved, but
8 rather with the way the structure of the course has been
9 conceived.

10 It was believed that with a small amount of
11 money that could be solved by simply bringing in some
12 new people to help rethink the general structure of the
13 project.

14 A second grant, I would call to your attention,
15 specially is on page ten. It is a reject that came to
16 the Committee as a recommendation for funding. It is the
17 fourth grant down on page ten, EH20216, Ethical Perspec-
18 tives, the Natural Environment and Human Opportunities
19 and annotated bibliography.

20 It came recommended at a low priority, and the
21 Committee moved to reject because the project did not seem
22 to be well thought out or sufficiently comprehensive to
23 be very useful.

24 It also was very expensive per item, because
25 it was a very small and limited biography. Furthermore,

1 it came to the attention of the Committee that a similar
2 product by the same team had recently been extremely
3 badly reviewed in Environmental Ethics Magazine, which is
4 key magazine in the field.

5 Mr. Chairman, what I would like to do at this
6 point, if there are no questions, or if there are ques-
7 tions, I'd be happy to answer them -- about the general
8 shape of the motion.

9 If not I would like to move the adoption of the
10 motion with the exception of the fourth item on page seven,
11 that is EH 20221, the Christian College Coalition, Kenneth
12 Shipp (phonetic), on which we will have a more extended
13 discussion.

14 MR. WILLKIE: I think at this point that the
15 call is for discussion of the remainder of the motion --
16 the motion, with the exception of this one item.

17 If not --

18 Yes, please?

19 MR. : General question, and I am not
20 sure it applies to the University of South Carolina.
21 It has come to my attention recently, a number of applica-
22 tions which are approved subject to, and then the subject
23 to almost amounts to -- go back and do the whole thing
24 over again.

25 MR. WILLKIE: Yes.

1 MR. : Get a new staff, get a new
2 way of doing it, and I wonder if -- it seems to me that
3 in the past, we'd say, "Good idea, but you really have
4 to do this, this, this. Go back, do it again, and then
5 resubmit.".

6 Do we accomplish anything by approving subject
7 to so many conditions that it is almost a brand new --
8 phrase that as a general proposition.

9 MS. NORTON : I would like -- yes, I can
10 answer -- I agree with you very much in general. In this
11 case there was a peculiar problem which took a great
12 deal of the Committee's time yesterday.

13 The peculiar problem has to do with the
14 conceptual genesis of the project. I think there is no
15 question about the competency of the staff. There was
16 just the belief -- the courses presented -- was presented
17 to us as an inter-disciplinary course.

18 In fact, given Mr. Bass' own background, it
19 was not, in fact, inter-disciplinary course, and there's
20 nothing wrong with his competence. It was just we thought
21 he needed the advice of some additional people. He was
22 not consulting a very wide range of people in setting
23 up the overall structure.

24 The people at South Carolina Educational
25 Television network with whom he was involved are very

1 good. There was absolutely no question that these people
2 just have a good idea and are incapable of carrying it
3 out.

4 They have a good idea. They are capable of
5 carrying it out. They just need a little more advice,
6 that's all.

7 MR. : The staff has to be satisfied
8 that they are (inaudible) --

9 MS. NORTON: That's correct. Yes.

10 MR. : I would like to add something
11 to that. I think also, Mary Beth, that this peculiar
12 situation is the consequence of the fact that you
13 were the Committee yesterday.

14 MS. NORTON: Right.

15 MR. : And that you had certain
16 objections that perhaps other members of the Committee
17 would not have had had the Senate confirmed their
18 appointment.

19 (Laughter.)

20 So we discussed this at some length, and what
21 we came up --

22 MS. NORTON: Or had other members of the
23 Committee been present.

24 Right. I am sorry. I didn't mean to inter-
25 rupt you.

1 MR. : Essentially I said what I want-
2 ed to say.

3 MS. NORTON: Okay.

4 MR. WILLKIE: Any further discussion of these
5 items? I think that in basic form, the staff of the
6 Endowment would prefer to have all conditions -- some-
7 thing would could be very easily verified, and not a
8 matter of judgment.

9 MS. NORTON: No.

10 MR. WILLKIE: It is much better if the conditions
11 are to do things which are factually verified. When you
12 get into substance, I think rejection or resubmission is
13 much better.

14 If there's no further discussion could I ask
15 for those in favor of the education motion, subject to the
16 one omission, please say aye?

17 (Chorus of ayes.)

18 Those opposed?

19 I'd like to turn to 20221.

20 MS. NORTON: Yes. What I will do here is
21 introduce the problem to the Council, and then as best
22 I can, I will then -- anyone can ask any questions they
23 want, and we can have a general discussion.

24 I would prefer to get some of the people who
25 have factual questions about where the situation is, I

1 think we should get those out of the way beforehand, and
2 perhaps anyone who wants to interrupt me at the point
3 when I am introducing it -- yes?

4 MR. : So soon --

5 MS. NORTON: Haven't even started --

6 MS. : It would be very helpful to
7 me if I could see a copy of the proposal, since presumably
8 we're talking about --

9 MS. NORTON: Well, it is very large. It is --
10 you mean the face sheet or the proposal, the folder?

11 MS. : Well, I really prefer the
12 proposal, but even the face sheet.

13 MS. NORTON: The folder is here. There it is.

14 MS. : I really would like to --

15 MS. NORTON: All right, well here is the --
16 let me explain what the situation is, and then we can
17 discuss it. I must say I felt very much at sea yesterday
18 because I was the only voting member of the Committee
19 present, and this was something I felt I needed the
20 advice of colleagues on.

21 That is one of the reasons we are coming to
22 the Council. The issue is as follows: The Christian
23 College Coalition, which has submitted the proposal for
24 workshops and national institute on Christianity and the
25 humanities is a group of 63 Fundamentalist Christian

1 Colleges from different Protestant denominations. It is
2 not denominational in any way.

3 They come from a wide variety of denominations,
4 but they are all Protestant, and they are all Fundamen-
5 talist. They have applied -- not all Fundamentalist?

6 MR. : Oh, no.

7 MS. NORTON: Okay. All right. In any event
8 they are --

9 MR. : Calvin College is just --

10 MS. NORTON: All right, in any event they are
11 all Protestant but of different denominations. They've
12 applied for money, or they originally applied for money
13 to run 16 faculty development workshops for faculty
14 from their member institutions to be followed up with
15 a national seminar to be run for four weeks in the
16 summer for the best and most active participants in the
17 individual workshops.

18 The individual workshops would be one week
19 long on a variety of different topics on the subject. The
20 general overall subject of Christianity and the humanities.
21 The Christian College Coalition has demonstrated in the
22 application great interest on the part of their
23 faculty in participating in such workshops, and it seems
24 to me as well that they clearly demonstrated a great
25 need since the faculty at these colleges usually have

1 very heavy teaching loads, poor library facilities, and
2 are frequently in isolated locations, where it is unable
3 for them to have readily contact with scholars in their
4 fields, or to have access to excellent libraries.

5 It seems to me these are faculty of colleges
6 of a sort that we would very much like to reach in our
7 attempts to rejuvenate the teaching of the humanities
8 throughout the nation.

9 Also, in theory, that is in a constitutional
10 sense there is, of course, absolutely no problem with
11 our making a grant to the Christian College Coalition if
12 the religious studies that they propose are handled from
13 a secular viewpoint.

14 However, the panel was extremely badly divided
15 on this question. In fact, there were four members of
16 the panel who read this proposal. Some of you may know
17 the Education Division has large panels, but everyone
18 does not read each proposal.

19 In this case four members of the panel read
20 it. Two gave the highest possible rating, and two gave
21 it the lowest possible rating on Constitutional grounds.
22 The original proposal had a number of very questionable
23 or what we might say disturbing phrases in it.

24 For example, the applicants spoke of their
25 desire to "integrate the Christian faith with academic

1 disciplines".

2 They said they wanted to point out "the
3 connections of faith and education", and they said they
4 wanted to "integrate religious knowledge with the cirricu-
5 lum".

6 They speak throughout about "relating Christian-
7 ity to the humanities". The staff then solicited, after
8 the panel meeting with the panel very badly divided --
9 there was just no meeting of the minds of the panel at
10 all -- two outside reviews were solicited, and both of
11 them approved.

12 There were some other questions involved with
13 the proposal, itself, which included most particularly in
14 the original proposal inadequate discussion and definition
15 of precisely what topics would be addressed in the
16 faculty development workshops in specifics, other than
17 the overall general topic of "integrating Christianity
18 and the humanities in various disciplines".

19 The staff then requested a reduced program,
20 since it was believed by the staff that 16 workshops
21 was fairly ambitious for this group, and recommended
22 as well, further information with respect to the content
23 of the workshops that were proposed.

24 The applicants returned with a proposal for
25 12 workshops and with extensive syllabi submitted with

1 respect to those 12 workshops, so we do now have further
2 information.

3 The staff also insisted that the workshops
4 had to be open to all applicants, not just to faculty
5 members at the Christian College Coalition institutions,
6 that is that if faculty members in other colleges that
7 did not belong to these institutions wanted to apply to
8 attend the workshops, that the workshops had to be open
9 to them.

10 The applicants have agreed to that condition --
11 have agreed to that with the condition that a certain
12 percentage, and this is not yet determined of the partici-
13 pants in the final national meeting come from their
14 faculties.

15 Now in this matter or in this application,
16 there are policy issues bound up with Constitutional and
17 legal issues, and yesterday afternoon the Chairman, the
18 General Counsel and Walter Burns and I and the staff
19 had a long discussion about these issues.

20 I came in on Wednesday and read the entire
21 folder. Walter had a chance yesterday afternoon to go
22 through at least part of it, although not all of it in
23 detail. I think -- all right, let's see. The ultimate
24 result of the discussion yesterday afternoon, which as I
25 say went on for some time, was as follows:

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1330 VERMONT AVENUE, NW
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

1 When I reviewed the syllabi that the workshop
2 directors had submitted, the proposed workshop directors
3 had submitted, I found nine of them perfectly acceptable
4 from my standpoint in the sense of they were dealing with
5 religious issues, but they were dealing with them in
6 terms of humanistic methodology, and did not seem to be
7 promoting any particular religious point of view.

8 However, there were three syllabi that I found
9 extremely troublesome in their approach to the ques-
10 tion, to the questions. We considered many alternatives
11 as to what to do with this application.

12 Finally, after a good deal of consideration
13 and my -- I felt very much at sea because I was the only
14 one who was able to vote yesterday, and the only one
15 really making this decision -- we finally agreed -- I
16 finally agreed with myself after debating myself at great
17 length as everybody who was at the meeting yesterday
18 knows -- to recommend reduced funding, recommend this
19 proposal but with reduced funding, that is at the level
20 that would fund the nine workshops that I think are
21 fine.

22 I think before we go on -- Wendall wants to
23 say a few things about the legal and Constitutional
24 questions.

25 MR. WILLKIE: Well, I think, Mary Beth, you've

1 hit all the right issues. I think essentially the legal
2 question here is a question of establishment of religion
3 and separation of church and state, a terribly complicated
4 doctrine, and the Supreme Court has had a hard time
5 agreeing with itself on that issue in the last ten years.

6 I think there are at least a half-dozen de-
7 cisions where they could not muster five Justices as
8 a majority, so there were a series of separate decisions,
9 but I think for the purpose of resolving simply the
10 legal question here, which is whether or not it would
11 be unconstitutional for us to fund this project -- the
12 simply question is, "Is this going to have the primary
13 affect of furthering the propagation of particular reli-
14 gious points of view, or is this primarily a secular
15 academic inquiry.".

16 That is a factual question. It is a terribly
17 complicated question. People are going to have different
18 points of view on that. I will be happy to answer any
19 question.

20 MR. : Wouldn't we have the addi-
21 tional complicating factor that if we went ahead and
22 funded it, and for some reason they did not live up to
23 the conditions that they've agreed to or we've outlined.

24 Then we'd then be accused of interfering with
25 their religious rights under the First Amendment.

1 MR. WILLKIE : Well, I think we've got a
2 particular responsibility in this instance to ensure, to
3 be satisfied in our own minds that they are not going
4 to transgress --

5 MR. : But suppose they do. Don't
6 we have the additional complicating factor that if we
7 say "No, you are now violating one of the conditions",
8 that they're going to accuse us of interfering with their
9 religious beliefs?

10 MR.WILLKIE : Well, we have continuing
11 oversight responsibilities with any grant to ensure that
12 they comply with the grant award.

13 MR. : But generally true, but in
14 a particular situation like this, the -- could be made
15 about the First Amendment.

16 MR. WILLKIE: But we are talking about federal
17 FUNDS.

18 MR. : I know that.

19 MR. WILLKIE: It is analogous to the situation
20 -- whether or not we fund something does not mean that
21 someone is entitled to the money, and if they are funded,
22 then they have to comply with certain guidelines, certain
23 procedures.

24 MS. NORTON: I think I'd like to ask first
25 whether anybody has any factual questions about my -- yes,

1 okay?

2 MR. : Down in my part of the country
3 whenever you call something a Christian School, you mean
4 it discriminates against blacks and in some cases against
5 Cubans and Catholics.

6 I take it that terminology has no relation to
7 the use of --

8 MS. NORTON: I don't think it does. My
9 impression is that it does not in any way.

10 MR. : The schools on the list are
11 open for applications -- Baylor University, Notre Dame
12 University --

13 MS. NORTON: No, no, wait. Baylor University
14 is not a participate in the Christian College Coalition.
15 They're going to be hosting one of the workshops --
16 rather a professor from Baylor University will be leading
17 one of the workshops, but that's not one of the members
18 of the Coalition.

19 MR. : But the question then is
20 are these open admission schools. Is that right?

21 MR. : I think I can address that
22 one test -- use the word in a lawyer's way is that 60
23 of the 63 institutions in the Coalition have received
24 federal funds many times in the past, including, for
25 example, (inaudible) --

1 MR. WILLKIE: I am not at all concerned about
2 the fact that the indirect benefits which accrue to these
3 colleges cause any legal problems whatever. The Court
4 has articulated quite specifically in a number of
5 instances that as long as the federal role or state role
6 supports the secular program, they are indifferent to the
7 consequences in terms of that possibly freeing up money
8 for other religious purposes.

9 That issue is resolved.

10 MS. : Mary Beth, I have a question.

11 MS. NORTON : Yes, Louise?

12 MS. : I think it is a factual
13 question with regard to the plan that the agreement that
14 they made to make these open.

15 MS. NORTON : Right.

16 MS. : Do we have an awareness -- do
17 we know what plan they expect to use or do we have some
18 sense of how effective that would be since these are in
19 isolated places?

20 MS. NORTON: We would be very careful about
21 that. Now I've neglected to say that one of the things
22 we did talk about at the meeting yesterday afternoon
23 was their agreement with our insistence that the
24 application procedure had to be open.

25 I think that certainly any recommendation from

1 this Council for funding would carry along with it the
2 condition that the staff monitor very carefully for one
3 thing the advertising for the -- the dissemination of
4 information for the workshops, the application procedures,
5 the selection procedures for people who are coming into
6 them and so forth.

7 Does that answer your question? I mean that
8 is really inherent -- that would be inherent in funding
9 as far as I'm concerned.

10 MS. : We do not have that information
11 as of yet?

12 MS. NORTON: No, because they just recently
13 agreed to this condition. There is no -- they have not
14 as of yet prepared any sort of a detailed plan for how
15 the project would be reoriented from members of their
16 own faculties to general faculty throughout the country.

17 They did have, in their original application,
18 a detailed plan for disseminating the information
19 about the workshops to their own faculties. This is
20 something we'd have to work with them -- in contact.

21 MS. : Do we have a sense -- do you
22 or the staff have a sense as to how they would respond
23 to a condition which says that you can -- are you saying
24 we can fund nine, or are you saying we fund these nine,
25 do we know yet how they would respond to the particular

1 three that you say they cannot?

2 MR. : We think we do. Our relations
3 with this applicant have been cordial all along. It is
4 customary procedure when this division awards a grant
5 for certain components of an original plan to specify
6 those components, and the vast majority of cases the
7 applicant is delighted with that resolution.

8 No one should get the impression that our
9 conversations with the applicant at any point in the past
10 few months have been hostile in any way. They've been
11 friendly, cordial, naturally flexible as they would be
12 in almost any other case.

13 MS. : I was really trying to find
14 out how critical those three which seemed troublesome
15 to you were -- how central they were to the general.

16 MS. NORTON: Let me explain that. One of the
17 things that the applicant did -- the way in which the
18 applicant generated the seminars to be offered had noth-
19 ing to do with any kind of top-down or centralized de-
20 cision from the Christian College Coalition, itself.

21 That is they followed the following procedure:
22 they circularized faculty members at their colleges
23 initially, and they said, "Which of you would like to
24 offer seminars in such procedures, on such topics, and
25 what specific topics would you propose.". They then --

1 they got 16 positive responses from the more distinguished
2 faculty of their colleges, and those responses fell into
3 a variety of areas.

4 That was the information that they then sub-
5 mitted with their original proposal. When we asked them
6 for more detailed syllabi they went back to those 16
7 people.

8 Out of those 16 people they ended up with 12
9 detailed syllabi for various reasons I won't go into, so
10 in other words there is no overall structure imposed by
11 the applicant on these seminars.

12 They also, by the way, hold the faculty at
13 their member institutions to see which of the seminars
14 they would be more interested in attending. The ones
15 that I found most objectionable sort of fell in the
16 middle.

17 They were neither the most popular nor the
18 least popular, so there seems to be little reason from
19 that standpoint as they would say, that we have to offer
20 these three particular seminars. That is just my own
21 impression.

22 MS. : What would happen -- I suppose
23 this may conceivably be a legal question as well as a
24 practical question. What would happen if we were to
25 impose that condition and fund it, and they found funding

1 elsewhere for the other three.

2 How would -- what would our liability be? How
3 would we be able to say -- could we say -- how publicly
4 could we say, "Well, we only funded these nine.".

5 MR. WILLKIE: Just as an offhand response,
6 that I wouldn't want to be bound to, but my offhand
7 reaction would be that would be fine, because there's
8 certainly a well-established tradition of the state
9 providing support for secular activities, which are
10 well-integrated into an otherwise religious college or
11 university.

12 I think based on that precedent, if we're
13 on record as supporting the ones that clearly are
14 secular and humanistic in nature --

15 MS. : They would separate the
16 programs -- say these were funded by the NEH and these
17 were not.

18 MR. WILLKIE: I might say that the discrimina-
19 tion of one part of a project from another is common
20 practice in the Endowment, and it is done in every divi-
21 sion as far as I am aware, with possible exception fellow-
22 ships.

23 Even there, I think, in centers some of the
24 fellowships are ours and some of them belong to others.

25 MR. : Yes.

1 MR. WILLKIE: I think that practice is not
2 uncommon. There's clearly an opportunity for blurring,
3 because someone participating may or may not pursue the
4 question far enough to find exactly where the dollars
5 are, but when we make a grant in support of a project,
6 it is very clearly written down what we're supporting,
7 and why.

8 I think that we would feel secure in making
9 such an offer which is partial support for an activity.
10 It is not an unusual thing. Mr. Burns?

11 MR. BURNS: I suppose the issue that Council
12 has to decide here, and unfortunately Council is not
13 in a position to decide it is this.

14 Is this a program which will improve or is
15 designed to improve instruction in the humanities in
16 Christian colleges on the one hand. If so, that is one
17 thing, or on the contrary is it a program that is
18 designed or will have the consequence of -- here I am
19 not sure what the verb would be -- of Christianizing
20 instruction in humanities.

21 Once again we come to the different situation
22 that Mary Beth was presented with yesterday -- willy-nilly
23 and I can understand her reluctance to offer counsel
24 to the Council on that particular question.

25 Is it the opinion of the Committee, meaning

1 Mary Beth, that this will improve instruction in the
2 humanities in Christian Colleges, in which case we'd cer-
3 tainly have no objection to, I suppose, or on the contrary
4 is it an attempt to Christianize the instruction in
5 humanity.

6 I have an opinion on that subject as to what
7 the consequences might --

8 MR. : Could I just --

9 MR. : Could also be both of those.

10 MR. WILLKIE: Could I just interject? I
11 don't think this is an either or decision, nor must
12 we resolve it on that basis. The Supreme Court has -- the
13 one thing they've been consistent about is their
14 three point criteria with regard to evaluating such
15 questions.

16 The second of those three is, I think, the
17 one at issue here, and the wording of the Court -- the
18 question that we must resolve is whether the principal
19 or primary affect of the aid will advance or inhibit
20 religion.

21 In that event we clearly cannot fund it. If it
22 is an ancillary result, you know, I don't think that the
23 Court has taken that kind of --

24 MR. : My (inaudible) was, of course,
25 an attempt to be specific with respect to precisely that

1 criteria.

2 MS. NORTON: I will be happy to answer the
3 question, that I think, in fact, my recommendation to the
4 Council suggests my answer to that question. The answer
5 is that in the nine seminars, the answer is the idea is,
6 in fact, your first alternative, that is improve instruc-
7 tion in the humanities in the Christian College in these
8 particular colleges or in any college now of any person
9 who chooses to attend.

10 The other three I had very, very serious
11 problems with the design of those seminars, because they
12 did, in fact, seem to me precisely the opposite, that
13 is the notion of integrating the humanities with
14 Christianity, rather than vice versa, and I think that
15 is the distinction, and that's why in the end, after
16 going back and forth about the entire project, the only
17 thing I could see to do was to, in fact, distinguish
18 among the different seminars.

19 I saw no other way to do it.

20 MR. : I think it is important here
21 to speculate as to what the consequences of this will
22 be. I make the assumption here by looking at the program
23 not as carefully as Mary Beth has -- I have no time to
24 do that, but any program that brings less qualified
25 teachers in the company of better qualified teachers,

1 is likely to improve the instruction of the humanities
2 in those places where the less qualified people are to
3 be found.

4 On that basis I think -- well, I don't have
5 a --

6 MR. WILLKIE: Anita has -- excuse me --

7 MS. : Do want to hear --

8 MR. : As I said yesterday in our
9 discussion, I think the consequence of this is likely
10 to be the improvement of the instruction of -- in these
11 various subjects -- clearly are subject to humanities
12 in these various places.

13 I think inevitably that will happen.

14 MS. : Is that to say you support
15 this recommendation?

16 MR. BENNETT: Walter, I want us to stay on
17 this discussion, but to be precise, would you say the
18 primary purpose of this program is the first rather than
19 the second?

20 MR. : Yes. The primary purpose of
21 this is to improve instruction in the humanities in these
22 places that happen to be Christian.

23 MR. WILLKIE: Anita, I think, is next.

24 MR. : Could we just clarify. Would
25 you then -- are you recommending 12 or are you agreeing

1 with this recommendation?

2 MR. : I cannot because I didn't go
3 over it.

4 MS. NORTON: He hasn't read the detailed
5 syllabi.

6 MR. WILLKIE: Anita is next, and then there
7 are two others.

8 MS. : I am having a lot of trouble
9 with the discussion that isn't going to talk about the
10 detailed syllabi, because I think that's where it is at.
11 I looked it over very briefly. A lot of them are like
12 courses, that are given in my very secular university
13 by a person who is not a Christian, and I would -- I
14 wonder, Mary Beth, can we not talk about the three of
15 which you are uncomfortable and talk about the details?

16 MS. NORTON: Well, all right, I can give you --
17 do you want the whole list or just want the three that
18 are the problems?

19 MS. : I have looked over all of them,
20 so I would just like the three that maybe other people
21 would --

22 MS. NORTON: Just let me run down the list
23 very quickly. The titles of the seminars are or would
24 be:

25 1) Christianity and Literary Theory

- 1 2) Christianity and the Arts
- 2 3) Christianity and American History
- 3 4) Christianity and Social Theory
- 4 5) Christianity in Ethics
- 5 6) Linguistic Perspectives on Language and
- 6 Christian World Views
- 7 7) Christianity and Philosophy
- 8 8) The Bible as Literature
- 9 9) Archeology and the Bible and the Prophetic
- 10 Work of the Artist

11 Those are the nine that seem to be acceptable.
12 The three that do not are:

- 13 1) Psychology in a Christian Context
- 14 2) Sociology in the Context of Ultimate
- 15 Assumptions
- 16 3) Understanding Political Ethics

17 I don't know if it is really -- let me suggest
18 something. I don't know if really the Counsel should
19 get into the details of these individual syllabi. I
20 don't really think that should be the function of counsel.

21 Maybe the counsel wants to do that. I don't
22 know.

23 MR. WILLKIE: Could we have a couple of other
24 requested comments at the moment. Mr. Schaeffer?

25 MR. SCHAEFFER: Well, I am not interested in

1 getting anti-semantic, but we do --

2 (Laughter.)

3 -- Don't want to be accused of that. There
4 are major constitutional questions being discussed, and
5 it's a shame that when the Chairman and tow were taking
6 tea with the Chief Justice, they didn't bring this
7 proposal along.

8 (Laughter.)

9 It says one of the --

10 MR. : He would have said, "I reserve
11 my decision.

12 MR. SCHAEFFER: One of the critics who is
13 disturbed writes that on page ten the colleges of the
14 Coalition are described as placing emphasis upon
15 "The fulfilling their historically religious mission.",
16 and I think this is, obviously the implication of the
17 entire proposal are so important, most of us have not
18 read it.

19 I think at minimum it should be deferred. Would
20 also love to take a poll of the lawyers on the panel, and
21 wonder what each has to say. I don't think we can vote
22 on this thing today.

23 MS. : (Inaudible) --

24 MR. WILLKIE: I think we have a -- I recognize
25 a --

1 MS. NORTON: Could I just make one comment
2 with respect to what Phil just said.

3 MR. WILLKIE: Yes.

4 MS. NORTON: The panelist comment you read
5 draws on the first, the original proposal. That has
6 been somewhat modified since, and it's not entirely
7 clear that we should -- although it is the language of the
8 original proposal that is the problem, certainly since
9 then they have, in particular, in their agreement to
10 admit people who are not members of the faculty of their
11 particular colleges, the proposal has been somewhat
12 modified.

13 To a certain extent some of the emphasis in
14 the early proposal has been deleted or at least modified
15 significantly.

16 MR. WILLKIE: Mr. Neusner.

17 MR. NEUSNER: It is a difficult and a judgment
18 call. I do favor it on a number of grounds. If this
19 proposal had come to us as it could well have from
20 state university proposing to study the relationship of
21 Christianity to literary theory, we would not have any
22 difficulty with it at all, so with almost all of the
23 other topics, I do think that the staff and the Council
24 Committee did a very good job on it.

25 The distinctions you are making are very solid.

1 If we say that you could do it if it had come to us from
2 Iowa, which has a school of religion and is a public
3 university, but you cannot do it if it comes from Wheaton
4 College because it is a Christian College, then we're mov-
5 ing in the direction of saying that only the outsider
6 can participate in the study of religious tradition.

7 The non-Jew is better at studying Judaism than
8 the Jew. The non-Christian better than the Christian.
9 We have already taken the opposite view in funding, for
10 example, the humanities and Jewish studies at Brandeis.

11 I think about five years or four years ago --
12 I don't think we could take that position, and I don't
13 think we would want to, so the issue really is the charac-
14 ter of these schools, that I don't think it is a correct
15 criteria.

16 If the issue is the excellence of the people
17 involved, I mean just to take two that I know -- Platten-
18 ger, Calvin College is probably the best philosophy of
19 religion person in the country. He's had NEH grants. I
20 have served with him, and an immensely impressive mind.

21 Ed Yamuchi (phonetic) at Miami University which
22 is a public university is an absolutely first-class
23 archeologist, and his topic is archeology and the Bible.

24 I assume that the others are of equally high
25 caliber, so the people involved are real scholars of

1 religion. The issue involved of the inter-play between
2 Christianity and the humanities is the foundation of the
3 humanities since the Renaissance.

4 That's what they were doing, and the universi-
5 ties, where they're holding these things are Bailor,
6 which is Protestant but not a member college, Notre
7 Dame, which is a Catholic University, which is not famed
8 for participating in Fundamentalism.

9 (Laughter.)

10 Also Miami University which is a public uni-
11 versity, so it seems to me that, granted it is a difficult
12 application, and people who would be against it have --
13 I can understand their views, but I definitely think that
14 it falls well within out parameters, and vote for it
15 without any reservations.

16 MR. : Mr. Chairman?

17 MR. WILLKIE: Yes -- Mr. --

18 MR. : It seems to me that the
19 constitutional -- people keep saying legal and constitu-
20 tional -- constitutional issue is a legal issue, but it
21 seems to me the constitutional issues have been fairly
22 stated by Mr. Willkie, and stated by other Council
23 members, that the members of the Committee and those
24 who have studied the application feel that it does
25 not pose any constitutional issues or that the

1 constitutional issues are -- The issue was not so much the
 2 reading list. MS. NORTON: That they can be successfully
 3 resolved, let's put it that way.

4 MR. : Yes, that they can successfully
 5 be resolved, and I just think we have to rely on the
 6 people who have really taken the time to study it all the
 7 way as opposed to the idea that every difficult applica-
 8 tion be studied by the entire Council.

9 It seems to me that the entire Council has to
 10 agree on the principles to be applied and then leave it
 11 to the Committee and the staff to apply those principles.

12 MR. WILLKIE: Any other comment? Anita?

13 MS. NORTON: : I am looking now at the --
 14 reading this proposal from one of the workshops that
 15 Mary Beth had trouble with. selection procedures for par-
 16 ticipants This is the one on Sociology and the Context
 17 of Ultimate Assumptions. I really have trouble believing
 18 that a reading list which includes Peter Burger, Tom
 19 Quewn, Plon Yee, Nick Waltersdorf and a book called
 20 "Karl Marx, a Christian Appreciation of His Life and then
 21 Thought" -- those in favor of the motion to approve
 22 this as well (Laughter) ease say "aye"?

23 I find it really difficult to think that this
 24 is going to be so -- that this would violate the consti-
 25 tutional prohibition. to thank the Council for an absolutely

1 MS. NORTON: The issue was not so much the
2 reading list as the approach as described by the Director
3 of the workshop.

4 MS. : Yes. I did take a look at
5 that, and I am not made uncomfortable by it.

6 MR. WILLKIE: I think we have a motion before
7 us of approval from the Committee. Is there further
8 discussion?

9 MS. NORTON: I just want to make sure that the
10 motion is clearly understood by everyone -- that if the
11 motion would be reduced funding for --

12 MR. WILLKIE: Nine of the 12.

13 MS. NORTON: Nine of the 12, and the motion
14 would also include the stipulation that the advertising
15 for the workshops and the selection procedures for par-
16 ticipants in them would have to be closely monitored
17 by the staff.

18 MR. WILLKIE: Fine.

19 MR. : Second.

20 MR. WILLKIE: Without further discussion then
21 if we could -- those in favor of the motion to approve
22 this as modified, please say "aye"?

23 (Chorus of ayes.)

24 MR. WILLKIE: Those opposed?

25 I'd like to thank the Council for an absolutely

1 terrific conversation. R E C E S S I O N

2 MR. BENNETT: Ladies and gentlemen, three
3 things. If you can hold on just a minute. Yes, I want
4 to -- MS. : Since you have no staff here

5 to note MS. NORTON: I want to thank the staff as well
6 for their magnificent work on this. Let me find someone

7 who knows MR. BENNETT: -- I sat in on the session yesterday.

8 I didn't say much, but I think it was a model discussion.

9 I want to congratulate the staff and the Council members
10 new and old who were there. try to make the room a little

11 more comfortable. Three things. I remind you that from the hot
12 time this meeting ceased to be public, the matters we if
13 are discussing are confidential.

14 Second, in general, I thought this morning
15 was extremely spirited, thoughtful and candid, a very
16 good session. I want to thank the Council members for
17 that. MR. BENNETT: Report from Fellowships Programs.

18 Mr. Kennis We continue this afternoon. Lunch is found
19 in my office, the big office, the Conference Room next
20 to my office for the Council members. That's the tenth
21 floor. says ACHS. The Committee recommends grants to three
22 major programs. We will resume at 1:30 p.m. Council of Learned
23 Societies Thank you. aid, their major fellowship program
24 and their (Whereupon, the hearing was recessed until
25 1:30 p.m.)

1 A F T E R N O O N S E S S I O N

2 MR. BENNETT: Chairman's Grant -- my second
3 Chairman's Grant will be the entire budget of the --

4 MS. : Since you have no staff here
5 to note this down --

6 MR. BENNETT: Pardon? Let me find someone
7 who knows what to do -- the air conditioning -- it is
8 going to get warmer in here.

9 MR. WILLKIE: I would like to start with the
10 announcement that we will try to make the room a little
11 more comfortable without getting it too hot. It is hot
12 inside, and it would be very hot in here in a hurry if
13 we didn't have it.

14 It's chilly now, and we know it, and we've
15 asked the persons responsible to see if they can adjust
16 it a little bit.

17 MR. BENNETT: Report from Fellowships Programs.
18 Mr. Kennedy.

19 MR. KENNEDY: The report looks like this. It
20 has three tabs sticking out from the side, the first of
21 which says ACLS. The Committee recommends grants to three
22 major programs offered by the American Council of Learned
23 Societies, grants in aid, their major fellowship program
24 and their research fellowships for recent recipients of
25 the PhD.

1 There has been detailed staff contact with
2 ACLS on all of these matters, and the Committee is satis-
3 fied that the program should be recommended.

4 Want to vote on the whole package or on part?

5 MR. WILLKIE: I think, unless there's a reason
6 to divide it, should we do the whole package?

7 MR. BENNETT: All right.

8 MR. WILLKIE: And we can talk about the parts
9 as we come to them.

10 MR. KENNEDY: The second part, a group of
11 summer seminars for 1983. Now this does not represent
12 the entire program of seminars for 1983. It represents
13 1983 seminars being funded out of 1982 funds.

14 As you look through it you will probably detect
15 some problems in geographical distribution is a great
16 desert west of the Allegheny's and then things pick up
17 a little bit after a while.

18 The Committee very much hopes that this can
19 be improved. It can't be entirely rectified, but it
20 can be improved. There are also -- the total distribu-
21 tion of fields is not what we would like, but that can
22 be eventually secured.

23 There is then a green paper, I guess, for the
24 Fellowship Division -- green is a bad sign, and there is
25 one summer seminar that came to us from the staff, but

1 which we have not recommended.

2 The panelists originally did not recommend
3 it either. The staff felt the matter should be re-examined,
4 and we did look into it and read the material, and we
5 concurred with the original panel decision on that
6 matter.

7 Finally, there is a single recommendation for
8 a very small sum of money, so that one additional fellow
9 can attend the fellowship in the professions being given
10 by Lawrence Friedman at Stanford.

11 That is the recommendation.

12 MR. WILLKIE: We have the motion. Is there
13 discussion of any item on it?

14 MR. : Could I ask if the rejection
15 of the reappraisal for the scientific resolution was on
16 the basis of not being sufficiently --

17 MR. : Use the mike, please.

18 MR. KENNEDY : The factors involved -- well,
19 panelists thought the topic important, but pitched it
20 too low a level for people in the history of science
21 field.

22 The --

23 MR. : It wasn't rejected?

24 MR. KENNEDY: It was not rejected as not
25 humanistic.

1 MR. WILLKIE: Can I say something? I hope
2 again it is clear again to everyone about summer seminars,
3 that these are additions to a very large -- not a large,
4 to a group of summer seminars for 1983 which have already
5 been approved and this is supplementing that original
6 cadre.

7 Are there other points or questions? If not
8 we have a motion before us. Those in favor of the
9 motion from fellowships please say "aye".

10 (Chorus of ayes.)

11 Those opposed? Motion carries.

12 We turn now to Planning and Assessment
13 Studies. Anita Silvers?

14 MS. SILVERS: I'd like to move adoption of the
15 Committee's recommendation to fund six projects for
16 planning and assessment studies. We have one minor
17 correction.

18 The computer has been under the instruction
19 of Phil Shaeffer, and it refuses to write capital "S",
20 capital "E", capital "A", capital "S" for OP 20042. That
21 is not a nautical proposal. It is the humanities and
22 state education agencies.

23 I should mention that that proposal has a set
24 of procedural conditions attached.

25 (Laughter.)

1 MR. WILLKIE: Ladies and gentlemen, we have
2 a motion. Is there discussion?

3 In the absence we have a motion before us.
4 Those in favor please say "aye".

5 (Chorus of ayes.)

6 Those opposed?

7 Motion carried.

8 MR. BENNETT: Special Programs, Harriett
9 Zimmerman.

10 MS. ZIMMERMAN: Before I get to the actual
11 discussion about the motion, I would like to comment that
12 this was, as I said this morning, the first time that
13 special and public programs sat together.

14 We also had sitting with us Professor
15 Himelfarb, who although not a voting member of the
16 Council, more than carried her weight as far as we are
17 concerned as a Committee member. Since basically collegial-
18 ity has always been our tradition here at the Council, I
19 insisted and she more than agreed to participate, that
20 she participated fully in our discussions, and I wish
21 to commend you, Professor Himelfarb for what we all felt
22 was a tremendous addition to our Committee, and we hope
23 you will stay with us.

24 Going to say it out loud in public, recording
25 you.

1 (Laughter.)

2 We had a very complicated series of issues
3 to discuss. I will move the adoption of the entire
4 motion, and then I would like to discuss some of the
5 specifics.

6 This is the youth -- let us start with youth
7 program. Youth program's business before the May
8 Council consists of the ninth cycle of funding of NEH
9 youth project, major projects grant category.

10 These are applications for funding, primarily
11 of projects, of statewide, regional or national scope,
12 with some local efforts where they appear to have inport
13 beyond the locality.

14 We will have before us at the July Council
15 applications in the planning and pilot's grant category,
16 which are awards of \$2500 and \$5000 for local humanities
17 programs for children.

18 In addition, in July we will be bringing
19 before you applications in response to the extra deadlines,
20 and those I discussed this morning.

21 In the current round 75 formal applications
22 were reviewed. We are recommending a total of 15 for
23 approval with decisions on an additional four deferred
24 until additional information can be submitted.

25 The Chairman had flagged for us several

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1330 VERMONT AVENUE, NW
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

1 applications and had given us specific points, questions,
2 and we in response to the Chairman in what we considered
3 to be his quite valid questions, prepared in each case
4 or asked the staff in each case to prepare written
5 answers which we then, in turn, looked at ourselves, and
6 which we also submitted to the Chairman at the close of
7 yesterday's business.

8 We did the same thing in public programs.
9 This followed my own predilection which I expressed to
10 the Council in our morning session yesterday morning that
11 we make every attempt where possible to do our work in
12 such a way that all the questions that need to be raised
13 or should be raised are flagged ahead of time, and,
14 therefore, as fully as possible answered before we come
15 to the point where the Council Committee must, in fact,
16 vote or act, and then the Chairman must make his proper,
17 final decision.

18 Now I would like to discuss with you those
19 particular applications and summarize for you the ques-
20 tions that the Chair raised and the answers -- the
21 decisions we reached on those issues.

22 On page one of the motion, you will find
23 AZ 21100 from the Columbia River Maritime Museum. In
24 this project the Museum wishes to help young people
25 research particular events in specific Northwest history

1 which will then be developed as historically accurate
2 plays by the youth.

3 The Chairman requested further information to
4 ensure that the emphasis would be on research rather than
5 on dramatic production. The project director responded
6 by emphasizing that history research is the primary ac-
7 tivity, and the dramatic portion is a recruitment and
8 dissemination device.

9 The schedule he provided, in fact, confirms
10 this as the majority of time is devoted to the research
11 phase with youth working almost exclusively with humanists
12 such as the director of the local historical society.

13 In addition, a far larger number of youth will
14 be involved in the research phase than in the play produc-
15 tions, and the Committee was satisfied with the response.

16 On page two you will find AZ 21119 from the
17 New Hampshire Farm Museum requesting support for a series
18 of workshops where youth interpret New Hampshire's rural
19 past. The Chairman requested an explanation of tuition
20 fees for the project.

21 Tuition fees of \$25 per child for the five-day
22 workshops are being asked of participants in order to
23 defray a portion of the direct cost of the program, which
24 could not be conducted without such fees.

25 The project director is confident that a

1 number of scholarships can be offered to the truly needy.
2 He also feels that success of this model effort will allow
3 future continuation without NEH support, that is if we
4 charge fees now, when it becomes an independent project,
5 then it will be able to go on charging fees which they
6 feel they need to do, and it will not mark a radical
7 departure.

8 Next, you look please at AZ 201150, on page
9 three, from the Latin America Youth Center for Community
10 History Project here in the District of Columbia.

11 This is a request for second-year funding, and
12 the Chairman was concerned that the products and results
13 of the current grant should justify a second award.

14 Because the current grant will not be completed
15 until September of 1982, products of this year's work are
16 not yet available. Committee members reviewed a list
17 of forthcoming products, and found them reasonable.

18 In addition, staff will inform the Chairman's
19 office of these products when they are submitted. We,
20 therefore, recommend support for second year of this
21 project.

22 In the deferral section on page four, there
23 are two which the Chairman questioned. AZ 21123 from
24 Praxis (phonetic), a research organization, requested
25 support for an oral history project for migratory farm

1 youth.

2 The Chairman requested more information on the
3 utility of this project to migratory youth. The
4 project director provided interesting information on the
5 educational methodology relationship, education methodol-
6 ogy relationship that humanists will have with the
7 youth involved.

8 While those assurances appear adequate, the
9 Committee requested additional information on the spon-
10 soring organization and previous programs they have done.
11 Additionally, we had concern that a conventional historian
12 be included in the project to review the oral history
13 materials produced by the youth, and to place those in
14 a historically accurate context before they are included
15 in a curricular for other migrant youth.

16 Staff will request additional information
17 addressing those concerns from the applicant, and present
18 that material to the Committee in July. Therefore,
19 action was deferred.

20 There is a second application among the
21 deferrals among which the Chairman requested additional
22 information -- AZ 21135 from the YMCA Center of Greater
23 New York.

24 Additional information from the applicant
25 could not be obtained by the time of the May Council.

1 Consequently the application is recommended for deferral
2 until the July meeting.

3 There is a final proposal about which the
4 Chairman had questioned, now found on page five among
5 those recommended for rejection.

6 AZ 21098 from Coe College. The Chairman
7 requested clarification of the humanities themes. Staff
8 believes that strong humanities content of the proposed
9 project remains uncertain. Extensive background infor-
10 mation on previous programs, bibliographies and resumes
11 does not promise the solid humanities program and we,
12 therefore, recommend against funding.

13 Now let's move on to program development.
14 In program development we reviewed six recommendations for
15 approval. We looked carefully at additional information
16 provided for three of the applications.

17 SERAP -- AP 20284, page 13 of the final
18 motion -- a research organization in Puerto Rico received
19 extensive review by panel, outside evaluation and staff.
20 Although we were generally satisfied, and recommended
21 approval of up to \$148,415, we did have one major con-
22 cern to be addressed by a formal condition.

23 The application is recommended on the
24 condition that SERAP involve additional scholars who
25 are not associated with the organization, and that

1 resumes be submitted for Endowment approval.

2 We also received clarification about the
3 application from the National Extension Homemakers
4 Council, AP 20289, page 13 of the final motion. We
5 are satisfied that application contains sufficient detail
6 about the content of the product, which was the Chair-
7 man's question, and recommend approval of \$153,125.

8 We did not agree with the staff recommendation
9 for application AP 20289 on page 13, the China Council
10 of the Asia Society. This organization has received
11 considerable support from program development --
12 \$400,000 in outright and \$600,000 in match over the past
13 six years.

14 While we agree with the staff that the project
15 is excellent, we believe that this is an organization
16 which clearly can rely on other sources of support, and
17 should be urged to do so.

18 Therefore, we are recommending reduced award
19 of \$100,000 feeling that -- we felt if we gave them
20 nothing, that would present them with some real difficul-
21 ties when they go to get the additional, the outside
22 funding that they do get back from Rockefeller and the
23 Ford Foundation and from others, because the question
24 would be raised why is that the National Endowment for
25 the Humanities suddenly is turning you down, that by

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1330 VERMONT AVENUE, NW
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

1 giving them \$100,000 we are saying -- we wish to say,
2 which is that "This is an excellent project, and it is
3 excellently carried out, and has had some find results,
4 but that we consider this a terminal grant for this
5 particular project.".

6 Now two issues came up with the applications,
7 which we believe are general policy considerations for the
8 agency. The issue of continuing support is one for which
9 there can be no general policy since circumstances vary
10 from one project to another.

11 However, the dilemma between sustaining
12 projects which have an important impact conflicts with the
13 concern that continuing grants will severely limit funds
14 for new activities.

15 This is a question we raised yesterday as well
16 in the Council's breakfast meeting. The second issue
17 relates to the staff monitoring of projects, and how they
18 ensure that consultants are, in fact, involved as
19 originally proposed.

20 We believe that this is an agency -- should
21 be an agency-wide concern. We've asked the staff to
22 explore ways to ensure careful monitoring of consultant
23 participation.

24 Our concern was that we be assured that when
25 we see consultants on a program, that we feel are important

1 to be there, that, in fact, those consultants are consul-
2 tants, that their advice plays some role in the implemen-
3 tation of the project, and that they frankly are not
4 simply there for window dressing.

5 We are not content with the amount of assurance
6 that we have as a general -- on a general basis for that
7 at the present time, but we did not -- that is not
8 to special programs.

9 That is something that we feel across the
10 board in the total division, and we suspect that if we
11 feel it must be the case in other divisions as well, and
12 we would like to raise it as a policy issue for the
13 entire Council instead of --

14 MR. BENNETT: May I interrupt for a question?
15 Did you have a specific recommendation or any thoughts
16 about how we might address that question of consultants?

17 MS. ZIMMERMAN: Professor, would you like to
18 answer that?

19 PROFESSOR HIMELFARB: Yes, my --

20 MS. ZIMMERMAN: Use the mike, please.

21 PROFESSOR HIMELFARB: This came out of my
22 personal experience as having been asked to be a con-
23 sultant on, in fact, an NEH proposal, and I discovered
24 that, yes, I was brought in initially and was there, and
25 made some critical suggestions about the proposal, itself.

1 Thereupon, was never again consulted.

2 (Laughter.)

3 What happened subsequently I don't know. I
4 assume that the project -- I hope that the project was
5 turned down. It seems to me that there are very, very
6 simple bureaucratic organizational ways to cope with this.

7 If consultants were notified beforehand that
8 they would be expected at the end to submit an evaluation,
9 and to explain in that report just what -- to what
10 degree they participate, to what degree their recommenda-
11 tions were taken into account, how they felt about the
12 final product, I think that that would alert them to the
13 fact that they are not merely signing their name to
14 something.

15 My second personal experience -- I have, and
16 I am sure that many of you have colleagues whom you know
17 will support any worthy cause, and, thereupon, you know,
18 associate themselves (inaudible) -- so that this proposal,
19 which I think can be implemented very easily just by
20 requirement of the very simple report at the end.

21 It will alert them to the fact that they
22 are really signing on to something that they have to
23 take seriously, but they have to take a certain amount
24 of responsibility for the final product, and also it
25 will alert the sponsoring agency that they had better not

1 just use them as Harriett said as window dressings. we
 2 take those I think those two things will be accomplished,
 3 and I must say that I then think the role of the consul-
 4 tant can be very much more significant -- that consultant
 5 can make much more important contributions.

6 MS. SILVERS: I think that it might be useful
 7 to explore this with the grants office. Before a con-
 8 sultant can be paid, there has to be a certain amount of
 9 documentation. A person has to sign off on "I was there
 10 from this point to this point. Here's how much I worked,
 11 etc., etc.". They can't take it off your taxes, but you
 12 can still. There also has to be a brief description of
 13 what was done, and I think that perhaps the grants office
 14 might develop a standard form, such that the report from
 15 the consultant would specify all those things needed to
 16 document payment, and at the same time include a content
 17 report. MR. WILLKIE: If I can. There are two issues

18 here, and MR. BENNETT: But I take it you are talking
 19 about unpaid as well as paid consultants. For example, when
 20 we make a PROFESSOR HIMELFARB: Yes. for consultants, and
 21 they, in MR. BENNETT: I don't know -- wouldn't know the
 22 quite how to articulate the test, but it would be some-
 23 thing like when someone is listed in such a way that this
 24 is to add weight to the application, that it doesn't tend to
 25 add weight unless we have this -- both pieces of advice. To

1 PROFESSOR HIMFLFARB: See the problem is we
2 take those seriously. We look at that. We assume it
3 means something. We want to make sure that it is, in fact,
4 meaning.

5 MR. BENNETT: Fair enough.

6 MS. SILVERS: It strikes me that if someone
7 is operating in this way as unpaid, they are making a
8 contribution. You can document that then, as part of the
9 cost-sharing, I believe, or as a contribution that that
10 person is giving.

11 They can't take it off your taxes, but you
12 can still say that this is a part of what the institution
13 or some institution is contributing, so you might be
14 able to use the same form, and I guess I would like to
15 put the two together.

16 MR. BENNETT: Go ahead.

17 MR. WILLKIE : If I can. There are two issues
18 here, and I think we can work with both of them and
19 keep an eye on both of them. They mix, for example, when
20 we make a recommendation in support for consultants, and
21 they, in fact, use for consultants, but they are not the
22 four that were identified initially, so we have the
23 documentation for accounting purposes, but we don't have
24 the intellectual contribution that we originally intended.

25 I think we've heard both pieces of advice. It

1 will not be difficult for us to integrate it, and we'll
2 take it up within the staff.

3 It is -- I think it is a very interesting
4 suggestion. I think others will, too, as a way to proceed.

5 MS. ZIMMERMAN: Thank you. To continue, now
6 to the Science, Technology and Human Values Program.
7 During the portion of the closed session devoted to
8 Science, Technology and Human Values, the Committee review-
9 ed applications to each of the three categories reported
10 in that program.

11 First, 14 proposals to the Inter-disciplinary
12 Incentive Awards Program were considered. This program
13 was designed to allow scholars pursuing humanity studies
14 of science to analyze a original sources and establish
15 the same dialogue with scientists by supporting individual
16 research efforts involving this sort of inter-disciplinary
17 collaboration.

18 The Committee recommends for funding the five
19 proposals on page 18 of the motion.

20 Secondly, 14 applications were also considered
21 in the joint NSF-NEH program, designed to support
22 larger-scale institutionally based research efforts
23 bringing scientists and humanity scholars into collabora-
24 tion in this area.

25 Of these the Committee concurs with the staff

1 in recommending four for funding -- conditional and
2 satisfactory response to NEH concern.

3 These four are the first four on page 19 of
4 the motion, AV 20064 to AV 20068. Among these the cost
5 of AV 20068 from Indiana University is expected to be
6 reduced as a result of the applicant's response to panel
7 concerns, and, therefore, the Committee recommends that
8 the NEH contribution to the project be limited to half of
9 the final total budget.

10 Three applications from this category are
11 recommended for deferral. On page 20 of the motion,
12 AV 20065 Harvard University, AV 20069 Knox College,
13 AV 20070 University of Chicago. Each of these proposals,
14 while highly promising requires additional staff negotia-
15 tion before they can be fully evaluated.

16 Finally, five applications were reviewed by
17 the Committee to the Sustained Development Awards
18 Program. This category is designed to recognize sus-
19 tained excellence in humanities inquiry on science or tech-
20 nology by supporting a limited number of distinguished
21 scholars for up to four years, to develop institutional
22 incentives for the inquiry, and to -- what you get for
23 reading.

24 (Pause.)

25 (Laughter.)

1 -- To pursue research. I am leaving it just
2 like that.

3 The Committee concurs with the NSF-NEH panel
4 and the staff, that none of the four new applications for
5 this award meet the standards set for this special
6 category.

7 We recommend approval only for AV 20071,
8 University of California on page 19 of the motion, which
9 represents the first renewal request for four-year
10 SDA award to Dr. Landon Winner, his work on the relation
11 between political theory and technological design.

12 I want to take a moment -- just personal
13 privilege. I would like to explain to the Council two
14 things. First of all it is absolutely against anything
15 I ever to do to read.

16 I usually speak without notes.

17 (Laughter.)

18 I did it for a very specific reason. I am
19 doing it today. I think that it is very important that
20 in the reporting of this particular program, these par-
21 ticular programs and for brand new Council members that
22 the report be extremely accurate.

23 I wanted to be sure that the Chairman's
24 questions were quoted accurately, and that the responses
25 were quoted accurately.

1 Second, this report and the report on public
2 programs will go into a bit more detail than we normally
3 would, and the reason again is because of my own personal
4 feeling about my memory of what it is like to come to
5 your first Council meeting.

6 You -- I remember that for myself, at least,
7 I had little enough sense of what my own Subcommittee to
8 which I was assigned was doing, and absolutely no sense
9 at all of what the other Committees were doing.

10 I remember that our Council book consisted of
11 nothing more than face sheets. I think it still does.
12 I know it still does on what all other committees except
13 my own were doing so that I never knew when I read those
14 face sheets at home, what was going to be recommended, and
15 what was going to be refused.

16 I can remember at my first session I spent a
17 great deal of time looking over projects that I thought
18 were perfectly awful, that it turned out I never had to
19 deal with them anyway because they were going to be
20 recommended to be disapproved.

21 They had already, in fact, been so recommended
22 to the Committee that was going to be voting on them.

23 Secondly, I think that the workings of other
24 Committees remain even for some time for new Council
25 members, quite mysterious. The kinds of questions that

1 they consider, the kinds of issues which come up before
2 them, the subtleties and problems which they face, and,
3 therefore, I felt that it was proper for us to go into
4 more detail than we might normally -- simply as a service
5 to my fellow Council members and to the new Council
6 members so that they would have a sense of what these
7 programs do particularly since these programs do seem
8 to have had a great deal of national attention lately.

9 I thought that it was worth doing for the
10 sake of clarification. I move our motion.

11 MR. BENNETT: I think that the courtesty and
12 comity behind your accuracy is noted and appreciated,
13 and not just by new Council. Thank you. Walter?

14 MR. : Ms. Zimmerman, I appreciate
15 that being a new member, being at my first meeting. I
16 only wish you had gone into somewhat more detail as to
17 AV 20061 on page 18, where we are funding \$12,000 for
18 the languages of pain.

19 That intrigues me -- ouch in the various lan-
20 guages? What does that mean?

21 (Laughter.)

22 MR. BENNETT: This is David Morris -- oh,
23 sorry --

24 MS. : Do you want to?

25 MR. BENNETT: Just what I recall. There are

1 two or three people in the country working in this area,
2 working -- two of them that I know of working closely
3 with medical schools and researchers, and I'll let
4 Carol fill in, but I think it's an investigation of
5 expressions of pain and literature.

6 The language of pain used by doctors, how
7 doctors use to describe pain, and what kind of literary
8 study and philosophical study at the same time. That
9 is rough and ready from what I remember.

10 MR. : Live and learn. Yesterday we
11 had "Dental Ethics".

12 MR. BENNETT: Yes, well that is definitely in
13 the pain --

14 (Laughter.)

15 MS. ZIMMERMAN: I should have asked whether
16 any of my fellow Committee members had any comments that
17 they would care to add -- I'd certainly welcome it now
18 or any point.

19 MR. : I have nothing to add.

20 MS. ZIMMERMAN: Marcus, Richard?

21 MS. NORTON : Mr. Chairman, I'd like to ask
22 a couple of questions. On page four, Harriett, on the
23 deferrals, from the first group, certain ears on this
24 side of the table perked up when you commented that the
25 project -- that practice is doing on migratory farmwork

1 as an oral history project. Social history booklets. Five
2 pages. It involved curriculum of some kind?

3 MS. ZIMMERMAN: Yes. has papers presented by

4 six scholars. MS. NORTON: What is that -- well, could you
5 explain it? -- various other products. (Inaudible).

6 MS. : Not formal curriculum. Committee

7 as our MS. NORTON: Like what do you mean?

8 MS. NORTON: : It is the preparation of
9 materials which can be used by the young people in
10 extra-curricular setting. In the way that it is put
11 together in a systematic way, it is curriculum. in

12 recent years. MS. NORTON: It is not a production of things
13 for school -- some people who are doing some very excellent
14 things. MS. : No, it is not, no. The radio

15 and -- we shouldn't have used the word. scholarly symposium

16 is involved. MS. NORTON: And the second question I have
17 has to do with the -- on page 13 the one that you men-
18 tioned briefly, the National Extension Homemaker's Counsel-
19 ling, the oral history of the domestic role of women in
20 20th Century American society.

21 What is that going to do precisely?

22 MS. BENNETT: The oral history portion of
23 that is completed. From that they're putting together
24 a set of booklets -- I think there's an exhibition -- is
25 there? just reviewing. The tapes that have been collected

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1330 VERMONT AVENUE, NW

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

1 MS. : Social history booklets. Five
2 pages. I am sorry -- I don't --

3 Oh, a symposium that has papers presented by
4 six scholars, papers and oral history, photographs are
5 to (inaudible) -- various other products. (Inaudible).

6 MS. : We refer to it in Committee
7 as our "apple pie and motherhood".

8 MS. NORTON: Actually, I think the notion of
9 studying the domestic role of women in 20th Century
10 American society is obviously very important, and it
11 has attracted a good deal of scholarly attention in
12 recent years, and particularly the last three or four
13 years with some people who are doing some very excellent
14 things.

15 I am glad to hear that a scholarly symposium
16 is involved in this project, because it seems to me that
17 that is the sort of thing we want to foster.

18 MS. : If I were Phil Schaeffer, I
19 would say we also serve and wait on table. That is
20 all right.

21 (Laughter.)

22 MR. BENNETT: Dr. Ricardo Kim?

23 MS. : I am sorry. Could I say one
24 more thing about that project, which I had forgotten and
25 was just reviewing. The tapes that have been collected

1 are going to be -- is it Purdue University will have
2 them?

3 MS. : There are several.

4 MS. : Several universities -- there
5 are going to be so they will be accessible to scholars,
6 as well as being used for public programs.

7 MR. BENNETT: Rita?

8 MS. : I guess I am expanding my
9 definition of humanities, humanism, and also at the
10 same time contracting it. That one did puzzle me, and
11 I'll let drop.

12 However, I am puzzled by the reason for the
13 turndown of AZ 21098.

14 MR. BENNETT: What page?

15 MS. : Five. On Human Values and the
16 Future Technological Society when there are pages 18
17 through 19 on the Ethical Human Values -- I don't know
18 precisely what they are and several grants given them
19 on the present society and maybe if we looked -- if the
20 reason was not for the substance it is okay, but if
21 it is because of the substance I'd like an explanation.

22 MS. : No, it was not. It was not
23 the subject, but it was, in fact, how it was going to be
24 dealt with, and there was insufficient involvement of the
25 humanities. It was more of a kind of futurist exposition

1 with an emphasis on procedure and techniques involving
2 young people in preparing this paper and competing for
3 that, and not sufficient reflection.

4 You're speaking of the co-college project?

5 MS. : Yes.

6 MS. : This is a project for young
7 people, and they were spending a lot of time doing things
8 but we couldn't see that most of what they were doing
9 was going to be in the humanities.

10 MS. : Then it is understandable.
11 I just couldn't quite get it. Thank you.

12 MR. BENNETT: Do we have a motion?

13 MS. : Yes. I move to adopt the
14 motion.

15 MR. BENNETT: We don't need a second.

16 MS. : No.

17 MR. BENNETT: That's it. Vote. All those in
18 favor?

19 (Chorus of ayes.)

20 Opposed? All right. Carol, you said "not
21 sufficient reflection"? You said "not sufficient reflec-
22 tion", and I just wondered if you were betraying your
23 background.

24 Three conditions for grants, serious matter,
25 sufficient reflection, full consent of the will.

1 (Laughter.)

2 Research programs, Mr. Kennedy.

3 MR. KENNEDY: The recommendations of the
4 Research Committee are, I believe, the sole document you
5 have which you have not been asked to look at. No? It
6 is public.

7 Well, it looks like -- it has a cover which
8 says "Division of Research Programs". Inside you'll dis-
9 cover there are page numbers at the top and page numbers
10 at the bottom. I will refer to page numbers at the bottom
11 of the page.

12 The ones at the top are by the various sections
13 of the report. You will also find littered throughout
14 an asterisk in the front of a grant number. The asterisk
15 denotes projects which are recommended, but are pending
16 the availability of additional funds to the particular
17 program.

18 There, in fact, exists a priority list, right
19 Harold?

20 MR. : Yes.

21 MR. KENNEDY: -- Among these asterisk items.
22 The first group of recommendations are those for research
23 tools. Those recommended extend from page one through
24 page eight, and then somewhat longer list extending from
25 page nine to 17.

1 I would like to draw your attention to one of
2 those that was not recommended. It is the last item
3 at the bottom of page nine, an application from Nancy G.
4 Evans of the Winter Tour Museum.

5 This was recommended by panel and by staff,
6 but was turned down yesterday by the Committee. I am not
7 sure that the Committee's decision was the right one,
8 and though we are transmitting this as a negative recommen-
9 dation I would like to invite Chairman to review it.

10 It involves a very able investigator, who
11 wishes to study American Windsor furniture in its histori-
12 cal background. It definitely has an intimate connection
13 with social history and the history of art.

14 As I understand it, it was the Committee's
15 view -- the study of the decorative arts in general
16 ought to be given a low priority within the funding
17 area within the humanities.

18 What bothers me about this particular applica-
19 tion is that we are not asked to fund the historical
20 study or the research which is a very important part of
21 it, but we are asked to fund the preparation of the
22 pictures, and the ultimate product is going to be, in
23 large part, a picture book, something like 800 illustra-
24 tions.

25 The Committee's judgment was negative.

1 MS. : May I?

2 MR. KENNEDY : Please do.

3 MS. : I also thought since Winter
4 Tour is supported by DuPont, Winter Tour Museum is
5 supported by DuPont, and it is very beautiful, I couldn't
6 understand why they didn't finish it and pay DuPont that
7 is for the particular publication, since they could
8 probably sell it at any rate for a fair profit.

9 MR. KENNEDY: The second set of recommenda-
10 tions that is on page --

11 MS. NORTON: Excuse me, George, do you want to
12 take questions or not?

13 MR. KENNEDY: I'd be glad to have -- I think
14 there is some policy matter in the background -- what is
15 the role of the decorative arts within the humanities.
16 If you wish to discuss that, this would be a chance to
17 advise the Chairman about it.

18 MS. NORTON: Actually I wanted to ask about
19 something else, but I would be perfectly happy to --

20 (Laughter.)

21 No, all I would say is that I agree with your
22 invitation to the Chairman to review your recommendation
23 judging by what we -- the conversation you and I had
24 over lunch about this particular proposal.

25 I do think that there are many things that

1 social historians can learn from studies of the decorative
2 arts. It just has to do with the particular way that
3 this grant proposal is formulated.

4 I don't -- I am with you on it, but I wonder
5 how much of a picture book it is, and how much of a schol-
6 arly study it is. In any event the comment I wanted to
7 make had to do with a proposal that I remember well from
8 my service on the Research Committee, and that is on
9 page seven, the Encyclopedia Eronica (phonetic), and I
10 wanted to ask what the funding situation of that is now.

11 I mean I am assuming that we're now going to
12 have to be funding this since the source of funds has
13 been cut off. Is that correct?

14 MR. : This is the one, I think, that
15 was supported by the --

16 MS. NORTON: That's correct, yes.

17 MR. : Something happened to the
18 (inaudible) --

19 (Laughter.)

20 MR. : Well, yes, because it is
21 just as eligible as, for example, the Encyclopedia of
22 Islam. It has its own reputation in scholarly circles,
23 and it has risen to the top, so to speak. There it is.

24 MR. BENNETT: What letter are we at?

25 MR. : Letter?

1 MR. BENNETT: Never mind.

2 (Laughter.)

3 MR. : I think the first master just
4 came out, so we're only at letter A.

5 (Laughter.)

6 And the Phalobie (phonetic) Foundation was in
7 there strongly beating, but they played it --

8 (Laughter.)

9 MR. BENNETT: Again initiated -- when you
10 press Harold, sometimes, on a particular proposal, whether
11 we should continue, he says, "Well, it is at the letter
12 M, you know.". It's not going to be much use.

13 MR. : Islam that is --

14 MR. BENNETT: I got you.

15 MR. : But we are anxious to
16 encourage matching for this project.

17 MR. : We are, indeed, anxious.

18 MR. BENNETT: Anita?

19 MS. SILVERS: I am not sure what policy
20 issue is being raised. Is the issue whether or not the
21 decorative arts are the proper subject of social history?

22 MR. KENNEDY: In the extreme form that would
23 be the issue.

24 MS. SILVERS: What would be a more moderate
25 form?

1 (Laughter.)

2 I am quite serious. I don't know.

3 MR. KENNEDY: What kind of emphasis within the
4 study of the decorative arts constitutes adequate evidence
5 of their fundability by this agency.

6 MR. BENNETT: Go ahead, George.

7 MR. KENNEDY: The next section is the section
8 on Research additions. That begins on page nine, and
9 including the negative recommendations, runs through
10 page 34.

11 There is one error in there. The computer
12 insists that the institution which dominates Madison,
13 Wisconsin is called Oral Roberts University.

14 (Laughter.)

15 It, in fact -- Mr. Kaminsky is located in
16 Madison, Wisconsin, and is at the University of Wisconsin.

17 MR. : Whage page?

18 MR. KENNEDY: Page 26. Right in the middle
19 of page 26. RE 20198. That should read "University of
20 Wisconsin". Origins of that mistake -- something to do
21 with dental ethics.

22 (Laughter.)

23 Are there any questions on any of the items
24 recommended in the -- among research additions or not
25 recommended under research additions? Yes, Mrs. Campbell?

1 MRS. CAMPBELL: I thought -- this is on page
2 seven, the middle of the page, "College of Charleston".

3 MR. KENNEDY: That was put --

4 MRS. CAMPBELL: No, not that one. Yes, Mark
5 Twain one -- the documentary --

6 MR. KENNEDY: The Committee recommended that
7 it be put last on the priorities of all of those which
8 might receive funding if additional funds were available.

9 MRS. CAMPBELL: I would like to say why, if
10 I could have voted, I would have voted against it. It
11 is an account, as I understand it, of the daily activities
12 of Mark Twain to be gathered together hour by hour each
13 day of his life.

14 My feeling is that if we fund this type of
15 thing for no matter how important the man is, that you
16 will get other requests for other men or women of impor-
17 tance to do the same thing.

18 MR. KENNEDY: Any other questions? Comments?

19 MR. : You drew my attention to that
20 "Oral Roberts University" project. Is there any relation
21 between this and what the National Archives -- more
22 precisely the National Historical Publications Commission
23 was doing and has been doing for years?

24 MR. : Yes, it was previously funded
25 by NHPRC.

1 MR. : And this is a continuation of
2 this?

3 MR. : Yes. You do understand what
4 has happened to the funding of NHPRC?

5 MR. : No, I don't as a matter of
6 fact.

7 MR. : Well, their budget has been
8 drastically reduced. I think they're now what about
9 \$1 million this year?

10 MR. : On a continuing --

11 MR. : Where they had \$4 million the
12 year before, so they had 25 percent of their funds, and
13 many of the projects which were previously funded by the
14 National Historical Publications and Records are now
15 coming to us for support.

16 In some cases this is not a novelty, because
17 over the years in the editing, in this category particu-
18 larly, we have joint funded many projects, where there
19 is some degree of overlap between our mandate and
20 theirs, but we do find in this cycle that more of these
21 previously supported by NHPRC projects are coming to us
22 for support, simply because the money is not in that
23 other federal pocket.

24 MR. BENNETT: What has happened to people
25 like Leonard Report -- have they moved.

1 MR. : He was the archivist that was
2 -- well --

3 MR. : He was at the Archives.

4 MR. : Yes.

5 MR. BENNETT: Okay, George?

6 MR. KENNEDY: The next session are those
7 related to basic research. That starts out on page 36,
8 and continues through page 39 with one not recommended
9 on page 40.

10 The Committee did not find any particular
11 problems among these, and they represent staff recommenda-
12 tions. There is then on page 42 a single recommendation
13 in state, local and regional studies. You do not need
14 to act on the deferrals which are on page 43.

15 These are matters that are still under negotia-
16 tion. There is a single negative recommendation on
17 page 44 for a conference, and then there remains --
18 extending from page 46 to page 48 recommendations on
19 research resources, all of which are recommended for
20 approval.

21 Finally, on pages 49 and 50 recommendations
22 relating to inter-cultural research. These are multi-
23 year projects. The second year of funding would be
24 dependent upon appropriation to the program for that
25 particular year.

1 I move acceptance of the report, and will
2 answer any questions, or refer them to someone who can.

3 MR. BENNETT: May I just comment, George?
4 The applications George just noted on page 49 and 50,
5 if Council wishes to take a particular look and note the
6 size of these grants --

7 MR. KENNEDY: Especially the last one.

8 MR. BENNETT: Yes, especially the last. In
9 light of this, and in light of the concerns raised at
10 different times by Council members about continuing
11 support for organizations, without attempting in any way
12 to prejudice the issue, I did ask for a special review
13 panel to come in to review several of these requests
14 along with some from the fellowships division.

15 The sense of the panel was the work we were
16 doing with these groups was appropriate -- several of
17 these groups listed here -- the fact that they continue
18 to come back to NEH is appropriate, and although there
19 were differences here and there, the sense was that
20 we should not offer discouragement to them.

21 Is that a fair statement, Harold, Jim?

22 MR. : Yes.

23 MR. BENNETT: But I would like the Council
24 to note because I wouldn't be surprised if they came
25 back again and again in large amounts.

1 I would be surprised if they did not come
2 back again. I just -- Council should be aware of it.

3 MR. : Add a footnote to that if I
4 may, Bill, that the panelists and reviewers on all of
5 these applications did give us their assurances that
6 what we were supporting was, indeed, very essentially
7 in the humanities.

8 On the surface with a title like Social
9 Science Research Council, I think there is a tendency
10 to think, "Well, maybe some of this isn't"-- and, indeed,
11 a great deal of the work of the Social Science Research
12 Council is not in the humanities.

13 We're not supporting that. We're picking up
14 in most of these cases anywhere between 15 and 30 percent
15 of the total operations and what they're doing in humani-
16 ties in all these cases, in fact, exceeds that.

17 There's a lot of matching going on.

18 MR. BENNETT: All right. Okay.

19 MR. : Take the SSRC grants. To
20 what extent do they specify, and do we have specific
21 information with respect to the program if we're going to
22 fund it.

23 MR. : Well, we know what their
24 continuing programs are. The various joint committees
25 for the different parts of the world, and we do have a

1 sense of what the research agendas are and the kinds of
2 awards they make for research projects as we see it.

3 They have some new initiatives and some
4 continuing previous initiatives. All of these are
5 built into their proposals which are annual events. Every
6 year, in a sense, their proposal gives us an update both
7 on what they're going to continue to do next year and
8 what are new ventures.

9 We don't make any judgments on which particular
10 scholar's project is going to get funded next year because
11 they don't know that either. It is a regrant situation.
12 We're funding them in a sense to be -- you could say
13 very loosely mini-endowments in the same sort of way
14 that ACLS fellowships category is another kind of minia-
15 ture form of endowment.

16 One of the great advantages here with this
17 farming out is that they can go and get matching funds
18 so that very often we get double the course for our
19 dollars for research in the humanities.

20 We always have to be very careful from a
21 watchdog point of view to make sure that when they
22 review applications and make decisions, the procedures
23 by which they do it and the kinds of panels they
24 organize are consistent with the sort of standards we
25 use right there at the Endowment.

1 MR. [REDACTED]: What this amounts to then is a
2 delegation of our --

3 MR. [REDACTED]: That's right.

4 MR. [REDACTED]: And of our judgment and our
5 resources. That is an easy way of our getting rid of a
6 lot of money. \$3,900,000.

7 MS. [REDACTED]: What did you say of ACLS
8 money --

9 MR. [REDACTED]: ACLS? I wouldn't be able to
10 give a figure.

11 MS. [REDACTED]: I am sorry -- what proportion
12 of their total money comes from us?

13 MR. [REDACTED]: American Council Learned
14 Society?

15 MS. [REDACTED]: About?

16 MR. [REDACTED]: Jim, do you know? Twenty-
17 five percent -- sizeable proportion.

18 MR. WILLKIE: Yes, I would think so.

19 MR. [REDACTED]: I would estimate that. That
20 sounds like a ballpark estimate.

21 MR. WILLKIE: For the full package of their
22 activities.

23 MR. [REDACTED]: Total --

24 MR. [REDACTED]: Then you'd have to break that
25 down between to what extent that support in-house projects

1 of ACLS -- to what extent they act merely as a conduit
2 for funds to others.

3 MS. : So once further removed.

4 MR. : I would say that if you took
5 25 percent, probably 20 percent of that is being used
6 as a conduit, and only five percent is staying in-house.

7 MR. WILLKIE: The point that Mr. Burns is
8 making is an important one for the Endowment, and I think
9 that we'd like to recognize something about this. Each
10 time we have a grant which is a re-grant -- what we call
11 a re-grant, that is we make money available, and the recip-
12 ient re-grants it -- grants it once again.

13 We do, in fact, delegate both resources and
14 the responsibility for making judgments, so that our
15 review focuses on two things. The process used by the
16 organization or institution which receives our money --
17 is the process a fair one? Does it promise to use
18 good judgment, peer review and so on.

19 Second, we look at the history of their
20 actual activity. That is each time they come to us
21 for funds we know specifically what they've done with
22 our funds in the preceding year, and can make a judgment
23 about whether they are supporting the humanities, whether
24 the quality work is good and so on.

25 I think that you'll find, particularly in the

1 Centers program but other places as well, when the panel
2 is unsatisfied with that, we do not, in fact, continue
3 our support.

4 When we're unhappy with either the -- that
5 is when the review process is unhappy either with the
6 way in which judgments are made or with the quality of
7 the judgments, themselves, process was fair, but the
8 quality is not good.

9 Those are the two checks we use primarily, but
10 we feel that -- as Harold has pointed out, increasing the
11 reach of our money because these dollars are often
12 matched, and also enlarging the range of judgement being
13 brought to bear to support for scholarship.

14 Beyond the range even that our own panels
15 provide is a good thing.

16 MS. : Federalism -- intellectual
17 Federalism.

18 MR. BENNETT: Jim, you wanted to --

19 MR. : In answer to Professor
20 Himelfarb's question, I can only say that in the three
21 -- two fellowship programs and grants and aid program,
22 that we support in the fellowships of division --
23 \$770,000 NEH are being matched by \$825,000 in ACLS
24 and Foundation dollars.

25 This is what -- the grants being made today

1 are offering that proportionate support. Now this is
2 just a part of the total ACLS budget, and I, for the
3 rest, wouldn't be able to say exactly what it is, but
4 I think it probably is a lower -- really lower portion
5 elsewhere than it is in the fellowship programs we're
6 supporting.

7 MR. : Bill, one more word on this.

8 MR. BENNETT: Yes.

9 MR. : Without knowing anything about
10 it -- on the question of delegation. I would assume
11 that the ACLS is -- other things being equal, more
12 capable of making the kind of judgment with respect
13 to humanities program as an organization than would be
14 the SSRC, and I would want to look and see that the
15 SSRC when it dispenses humanities money is availing itself
16 of the sort of judgements and sort of personnel that
17 are historically not at the Apex of that particular
18 organization.

19 MR. : But excuse me. All the joint
20 committees of SSRC, which are divided up by global areas
21 for Latin America and Africa and so on are, in fact,
22 joint committees for the ACLS.

23 MR. : Yes.

24 MR. : These are organizations like
25 IREX and SSRC are, in fact, children of ACLS, so they --

1 It is almost the same organization so to speak. They are
2 all based in New York for that reason.

3 As I say they are joint committees, so when
4 you talk about ACLS you are talking about SSRC and IREX
5 at the same time.

6 The spawning of CSCPRC, that is the group
7 that does People's Republic of China -- Chinese
8 scholarly exchange -- that is slightly different because
9 that is under the National Academy of Sciences, but again
10 ACLS was very largely the parent of that organization.

11 There were political reasons why that should
12 be Washington-based, when that one sprung up, but all
13 these others are, in fact, ACLS originated, and ACLS
14 still exerts a rather fatherly kind of influence over
15 those organizations.

16 MR. BENNETT: The concerns you raised, Walter,
17 are I think --

18 MR. : Maternal --

19 MR. BENNETT: -- Are quite appropriate, and
20 they are, in part, what led me not to in any way try
21 to second-guess the staff or the reviewers or panelists
22 whom we have regularly, but to bring in a panel just
23 to address the intercultural and ACLS grants, and the
24 panel was Robert Hollander and Mary Douglas, Jjles
25 Constable, Fred Olafson, Neil Cosadoy and a man from

1 Stanford whose name escapes me for the moment.

2 MS. : Arnold Rampersand.

3 MR. BENNETT: Arnold Rampersand, and they
4 reviewed just these at my request, and they, of course,
5 had extensive background information and the reports
6 of reviewers and panelists, and I think because of the
7 size of the grants and the questions you asked, these
8 are things we want to continue to look at.

9 That group was satisfied that this is a sound
10 idea.

11 MS. NORTON: I was going to ask Harold in
12 any event, but since he did convene a special panel
13 on the issue, was there any discussion at the panel or
14 has there been any further discussion or thought about
15 the status of the Hong Kong Center with respect to the --

16 MR. : Did not come up this time.
17 It was not one of the ones that was due, but whenever we
18 talk with the CSCPRC people, we are always quick to
19 ask --

20 MS. NORTON: That is what I --

21 MR. : -- Their experience is with
22 scholars going in and out of China with the Hong Kong
23 Center. Should explain we support the ACLS Hong Kong
24 Center. We had a big question a year or so ago when the
25 RC opened up as to whether that institution still served

1 a valid purpose.

2 The answer seems to be "yes". We had a visit
3 from Mary Gollock about a month back, and they seem to
4 feel that their scholars are still using it on the way
5 in and on the way out, and that is because there's still
6 a time limitation, usually three months and at the most
7 six months the time scholars can spend (inaudible) --

8 In addition to which the sheer availability --
9 newspapers particularly is a great feature. That is
10 a question that will carefully be reconsidered when we
11 get the next renewal application.

12 MR. BENNETT: Okay? There's a motion? All
13 those in favor?

14 (Chorus of ayes.)

15 Opposed? Thank you, George. Thank you very
16 much.

17 Public programs. Ms. Zimmerman.

18 (End of tape two, side one.)

19 MS. ZIMMERMAN: This afternoon we had a number
20 of very interesting issues to consider in terms of specific
21 projects. The Chairman sat with us for a good part of the
22 discussion on our media project, and we had two members of
23 the Committee voting, Marcus Pone and myself.

24 In one case we split, and there were several
25 other times when issues were very hotly contested, so I

1 would certainly like to urge my fellow Committee members
2 both voting and non-voting, that if at any point they
3 wish to contribute the discussion of any specific
4 grants, they certainly should feel free to do so.

5
6
7 (Continued on next page.)
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

1 I think we ought to move the adoption of the
2 entire motion.

3 MR. : Fine.

4 MS. ZIMMERMAN: And then I will consider them
5 specifically.

6 Museum and Historical organizations program.
7 For this round the program consider 109 applications.
8 Twenty-seven of them are being recommended for support.
9 Two of the projects were specifically examined, in light
10 of certain questions which were posed by the Chairman.

11 P.M -- Project PM 20806 on page two of the
12 motion is from the Washington Park Zoo, and requests
13 support for interpreted exhibition analyzing the histori-
14 cal, cultural relationship between humans and elephants.

15 The Chairman asked that we be certain that
16 this will be a humanities exhibit.

17 (Laughter.)

18 MR. : Non-partisan?

19 MS. ZIMMERMAN: Yes, non-partisan. Elephants.

20 (Laughter.)

21 Thank you. The staff provided the Committee
22 with further information drawn from the proposal, itself,
23 and from reviewer and panelists assessments, which clearly
24 attest to the central use of the humanities and the
25 appropriateness of theme, resource and design.

1 The part which deals with the humanities is
2 actually going to be even housed separately from the
3 living exhibit.

4 (Laughter.)

5 MS. SILVERS : You mean from the humans, of
6 course.

7 MS. ZIMMERMAN: From the living exhibits --
8 from the elephants. No, the humans will be led into
9 that part. It is the other part where the elephants
10 won't --

11 You can see what kind of a day it was.
12 Phillip?

13 MR. : (Inaudible) --

14 MS. ZIMMERMAN: No, Phillip.

15 (Laughter.)

16 MS. ZIMMERMAN: Moving right along the
17 Committee believes that this is an application which
18 merits support, and, therefore, recommends full funding.
19 The question of humanities content and zoo programming
20 has come up before.

21 This is not -- for those of you who are new,
22 this is the not the first, and I am sure it will not
23 be the last exhibit of this kind, and we have done them
24 very successfully on occasion in the past, and where
25 we can be assured that, in fact, issues central to the

1 humanities are being raised and dealt with by scholars
2 in the humanities and that the zoo is a perfectly appro-
3 priate place to do that kind of thing as long as it's
4 done in the way that meets our standards.

5 Now Project PM 20819 on page three of the
6 motion is from the American Association for State and
7 Local History. The proposal requests planning support to
8 organize major but scholarly resources in the field of
9 women's studies, and develop seminars and training
10 materials on this subject for museums and historical
11 societies.

12 The Chairman asked if this planning was going
13 to make a substantive contribution to the work of these
14 institutions. The evaluation of panel and reviewers,
15 examined by the Committee, support the project fully, and
16 believe that it will be important in creating a connection
17 between existing scholarship and appropriate use in
18 historical organizations and museums.

19 The Committee agreed, and recommended funding
20 at the reduced level of \$15,000 which reflects the nor-
21 mal ceiling for planning grants in our program.

22 Now on the Libraries Program. In this round
23 the program considered 27 proposals, nine of which we
24 are recommending for support.

25 I am pleased to report that we are recommending

1 support for a supplemental request by the Massachusetts
2 Library Association.

3 This is PL 20190 on page 17 of the motion.
4 This project grows out of a very successful project and
5 later statewide efforts to support reading and discussion
6 programs in libraries.

7 The supplemental request of \$56,623 to a grant
8 made at the November Council will now move this excellent
9 program to 50 additional communities in New Hampshire and
10 Massachusetts.

11 On Project PL 20813, page 17 of the motion,
12 from the Southern Regional Library Association. The
13 Chairman asks that the project themes, environment,
14 continuity and change are going to be examined more
15 nearly through the social sciences than the humanities.

16 A fuller study of the themes, the approach to
17 be used, and the specific bibliographic and scholarly
18 resources gave the Committee a thorough sense that this
19 will, indeed, be humanities projects.

20 The Committee recommended that the project
21 be funded. I would also like to mention that the
22 application from Kansas State University, PL20176, page
23 20 of the motion, is being deferred, pending receipt and
24 review of the bibliographic and program packages, which
25 had been supported under an earlier planning grant.

1 The Media Program. Seventy-two applications
2 were submitted, 12 being recommended for support, includ-
3 ing one technical conversion of a matching offer to
4 outright funds, that is PN 20157, page 21 of the motion.

5 Within this round, I would like to commend
6 to your attention, we are recommending a script for it,
7 for our television program based on David McAuley's
8 (phonetic) work, Cathedral.

9 Old members of the Council may remember that
10 we are currently supporting the production of one of his
11 other works, Castle, which is nearly completed, and
12 reported to be outstanding.

13 It is PN 20723 on page 20 of the motion. I
14 would like to mention at this moment something that I
15 don't know whether or not all Council members are aware.
16 We have an in-house -- tapes of many, if not all -- do
17 we have all?

18 We have the tapes of all of our past media
19 productions, and if there are things which members of the
20 Council would like to see, that can be arranged, so if you
21 have questions as to what kinds of things we have been
22 funding in the past, or if there was something that you
23 happened to miss, and you would like to see it, that
24 can be arranged.

25 We discovered yesterday that that was not

1 known to all members of the Council, and I think it is
2 something that everyone should know, and I advise those
3 of you who have questions or interest in the media
4 program, to please request that opportunity when you
5 have the time to do it.

6 I think you will find it a very instructive
7 and valuable, and give you some feeling of the range of
8 things that we have funded in the media program.

9 MR. : Harriett, is there a catalog
10 of the library of tapes?

11 MS. ZIMMERMAN: We have a media log, which we
12 finally were able to get into publication, which also has
13 been distributed. Well, Steve, would you like to talk
14 about the distribution?

15 MR. : First, every member of the
16 Council will receive this -- no, there is no cost to you,
17 nor is there a cost to anyone else. This is going to
18 be distributed to approximately 26 or 29,000 organizations
19 throughout the country, primarily universities, colleges,
20 schools, libraries and then a full-range of national
21 organizations which serve a variety of community groups.

22 It is also being distributed to and through the
23 State Humanities Committee. This contains not every,
24 but about 80 percent of the finished product of Endow-
25 ment support for radio and television and fill projects

1 in the humanities, supported I might add not only
2 through the Endowment's Division of Public Programs, but
3 through its Education Division for youth projects as
4 well.

5 Some 314 individual programs, radio and
6 television -- the object is again to widely make available
7 the information about the existence of this material,
8 its location and how in some easy fashion it might be
9 useable with an individualized contact.

10 Again, a copy of this will be given -- sent
11 to you for your own examination.

12 MS.ZIMMERMAN : I mentioned this whole thing
13 because Castle and Cathedral brought it to my mind that
14 at one time when we were involved in the process of
15 funding Castle, we actually viewed here the ten-minute
16 segment that they had submitted as part of their proposal
17 for funding, so that we were able to actually see what
18 the reviewers and panel had looked at when, as a sample
19 of the kind of work that was going to be carried out.

20 We have those kinds of things available to us.
21 Yesterday, for example, had we gone ahead with one par-
22 ticular one, we could have had the opportunity to view
23 a 30-minute segment for one of the proposals.

24 It may be of interest to you that you can,
25 if you wish, see that kind of thing, and also the kinds

1 of things we've done in the past, but particularly I
2 think when you see something referred to in the newspaper
3 or in other publications as examples of the work we've
4 done, I would highly recommend to you that you view the
5 product for yourself, and make your own judgment.

6 To go on. The Chairman raised various
7 questions on nine applications, and I will follow the order
8 of the motion in discussing these projects.

9 On Page 21, PN 20742, which is a post -- on the
10 Amested (phonetic) affair, based on language contained
11 within the proposal the question was, "Is this project
12 going to be a highly moralistic piece designed to
13 instruct the viewer about a frozen notion of ideology.

14 The staff provided material from the applica-
15 tion, and from the outside review, which demonstrated
16 that there is nothing in the narrative and conceptual
17 description to suggest that it will become a moralistic
18 (inaudible).

19 The Committee is comfortable with its review
20 and recommends support. Page 22, Project PN 20760,
21 California Labor History Project, the question raised
22 was whether this proposal was too much of an overview
23 and should it raise -- should it receive any support at
24 all.

25 Committee review of the additional material

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1330 VERMONT AVENUE, NW
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

1 and of the staff reasoning to limit support to scripting
2 rather than production, satisfies our concern there is
3 merit in providing script support, and we so recommend.

4 Page 22, PN 20770, radio -- project for the
5 radio on 20th Century Latin Writers. The question proposed
6 was, "Is this 13-part radio series really a literature
7 project, or is there a hidden politican slant?".

8 The staff provided full material from the
9 proposal, including one of the specific program outlined
10 on George Louie Boyaise (phonetic). The Committee had
11 a full discussion, and concluded that this would be an
12 important and valuable examination of the works of 13
13 highly regarded Latin American writers, clearly focusing
14 on their works and the universal themes in their work.

15 We, therefore, recommend to support the
16 project. We had a very lengthy discussion on this,
17 in which the Chairman participated. To be convinced
18 that there was no overly political, shall we say "slant"
19 or any such thing in the project -- to the best of our
20 ability to determine, since these authors represent
21 all sectors of the Latin American literary scene -- since
22 each program is going to be self-contained, and there
23 seemed -- as far as we are able to determine, there is
24 no theme, except the fact that they are all Latin Ameri-
25 can writers.

1 We felt comfortable that this, in fact, would
2 turn out to be one of the most exciting things that we
3 have done because it looks at an area where there are some
4 very great writers, some of whom have won great prizes,
5 who are not well-read in the United States, and as a
6 matter of fact, as one of the staff stated that even in
7 the work she had to do to review it, it had caused her
8 to do a lot of reading of authors she never had read,
9 and that is exactly what we hope we will be doing -- the
10 kind of work that we fund.

11 Next, page 23, PN 20778, a Project on Asian
12 Art and Culture in Southeast Asia. The Chairman asked,
13 in light of a split review, if there is adequate justifica-
14 tion to provide support, and at the level of \$550,000.

15 The Committee reviewed additional staff
16 material and reviewed comments, which revolved around
17 the uncamera abilities of the projected series host, and
18 the breadth and complexity of the programs.

19 All who have reviewed the application believe
20 it to be conceptually important and sound. The panel,
21 after viewing a short segment of a longer video tape
22 with the proposed host, did not find him to their
23 liking, and so reversed their decision.

24 They recommended no support. The segment that
25 they viewed was a segment of the proposed host, who was

1 an Asian, and talking about the subject of Thai democracy.
2 He is a Thai, and he was opinionated in the filmclip.

3 He was supposed to be. That was what he was
4 being asked to do. They also didn't like his laugh.

5 (Laughter.)

6 We felt that the objections were really
7 not germane to the question of whether or not this man
8 could be, should be the host narrator of a program which,
9 if it does what it claims it can do, that is illuminate
10 the various -- the art, archeology, so on and so forth
11 of South -- Southeast Asia, would be one of the most
12 exciting projects we have funded in a long time.

13 We felt that we had sufficient guarantees
14 from the scripting and so on and so forth that he would
15 not be dictating his own script. That is not the way that
16 kind of thing works.

17 He would have input. His would not be the
18 only input, and this is not a political project in any
19 sense of the word.

20 We would be happy to go into that further, if
21 there are further questions. The comment was that the
22 staff believes, and the Committee agrees that the method
23 and reason for panel recommendation was flawed, and I
24 convinced our reviewers that this would become a fine
25 series on the subject.

1 We recommended funding, but at a reduced
2 level.

3 Marcus, did you want to comment on this one?

4 MR. : I think you've covered it,
5 Harriett.

6 MS. ZIMMERMAN : Next. Page 23, PM 20779,
7 Growing Old in America. The question raised is does this
8 represent anything more than just a good short story.
9 Although projected ultimately as a series, reviewers and
10 panelists believe this to be a quality translation of
11 styles by Maryanne Richaeu (phonetic).

12 With the incorporation of an interpretive ele-
13 ment in the production, the story can stand alone, and
14 serve the larger theme of "Growing Old in America", with
15 an adjustment of conditions to assure the interpretive
16 element.

17 The Committee recommends support for the
18 project. I would like to comment on that. Our feeling
19 was, and we raised this as an issue that we feel has
20 broader implications, more than just this particular one,
21 we often find ourselves in a position of funding one
22 of something that is part of a projected series.

23 It seemed to our Committee that in a time of
24 budgetary constraint, it would be irresponsible of us
25 to fund anything that could not stand alone, because it

1 may be that there will be no further funding, or it may
2 be that scripts, two, three, four, five and six, will
3 be deemed inadequate by us.

4 Therefore, I inquired. We inquired very
5 severely into the interpretive element in the story to
6 be sure that in the script, that there would be sufficient
7 interpretive element, so that if this was the only one
8 in this series we could fund, it could stand on its own.

9 For those of you who are members of the Ameri-
10 can Short Story remember that at the end of each program
11 there was a sufficiently long segment to accomplish that
12 goal.

13 We made this a specific condition of the grant,
14 and it will be so -- the grant is conditional that that
15 be incorporated in the scripting.

16 (Problem with microphone.)

17 Anybody who successfully raised three children
18 could make themselves heard in this room without the
19 benefit of the microphone.

20 (Laughter.)

21 Page 23, PN 20782, the question was "Is this
22 project significant enough for us to fund and at this
23 level.". Staff and review material make it clear that
24 Zora Neil Houston (phonetic) and her work, a superb
25 subject for examination and treatment.

1 Budget level is appropriate to the project,
2 and the Committee recommends support. Before I get to the
3 next two, because these are really hot issues, I would
4 like to make a comment about the question of --

5 MR. BENNETT : We really need the microphone,
6 because this is recording --

7 MS. ZIMMERMAN: Oh --

8 MR. BENNETT : That is what I learned in the
9 industry.

10 (Laughter.)

11 MS. ZIMMERMAN: Before I go on I would like
12 to make a comment on the subject of conditions. It has
13 been the habit, the custom -- I don't know about other
14 committees, but in ours, that very frequently we will hear
15 or we will see that conditions will be unofficially
16 communicated to the grantee.

17 We raised the subject yesterday -- something
18 that has concerned me for quite some time, that the process
19 for condition-making should be in our opinion, in my
20 opinion, made more formal, and that the conditions be
21 a written part of the grant.

22 Therefore, our grants today, even on our
23 motion -- I particularly requested, and we agreed that
24 our grant conditions will be written in the motion, that
25 they not -- that in every case where possible, those

1 grants -- those conditions be stated in writing, and that
2 the written condition be part of the grant.

3 I feel that this is part of the whole process
4 that I have been laboring at for the last two days, that
5 is a tightening up of the entire review process. This
6 is just another little piece of it, but since it was
7 part of our discussion, and we implemented it in our
8 recommendation, I would like to bring it to your attention.

9 Now page 24, PN 20722, a film on the Work,
10 Life of Taia DeSharden (phonetic), Tim raised the ques-
11 tion, "Will the film really emphasize his ideas, or will
12 it, instead, be a sentimental or celebratory look at the
13 man and his life?".

14 The staff provided further information from
15 the proposal and treatment showing that the project is
16 designed to present and analyze his ideas. The Committee
17 members, remain split on the question of critical
18 analysis, and whether or not further parts of Taia's
19 personal life needed to be included as a context.

20 For example, the question of his participation
21 in the (inaudible) was eliminated, was not present in
22 the treatment, and that has been raised as a question of
23 panelists and outside review.

24 His views on mysticism and other issues, and
25 so forth. Now we had a very heated discussion on this.

1 We discussed the complexity of his ideas, his role as
2 a cult figure, the soppieness with which some of us
3 remembered having been taught his ideas, and our feeling
4 -- even the question as to whether or not, since it is
5 so complex, it could be done just in a 60-minute tele-
6 vision production.

7 More important whether this production gave us
8 sufficient guarantees to suit us that it would be done
9 in a sufficient way to guarantee that kind of critical
10 analysis and study.

11 First, we thought well -- first we thought
12 we were going to have a split decision. Then blessed
13 are the peacemakers, somebody -- not me -- suggested that
14 since only one of the Council members had read the
15 script, and that since the other -- I and our Committee
16 member who could not vote had not, that the best way
17 to handle it would be to defer it until the July meeting,
18 to give all of us a chance to read the script.

19 This was our final decision. It raised for
20 us again this question of adequate preparation before
21 meeting, and we have requested the staff that where it
22 looks like something is controversial, that we not only
23 have it flagged, not only have the Chairman's questions
24 raised to us, but also where, for example, in something
25 like this reading of the script is so illuminating, that

1 we be given a chance before the Council meeting to read
2 the script -- that means not the minute before, the
3 afternoon before when there's so much to do -- that it be
4 sent out to us, and we be given a chance to do the kinds
5 of thoughtful work and review that will prepare us to
6 make decisions properly at Council meetings.

7 Marcus, do you want to add anything to that?

8 MR. : Just one or two comments.

9 I was fascinated with the proposal, and actually looked
10 at the entire application, including the script. I was
11 perfectly satisfied that we should fund it. The question
12 -- Harriett and I agreed on this.

13 I have no problem at all with deferring it as
14 long as the other Council members would make every effort
15 to read the script, because I think if they read the
16 script they would be satisfied that some of the issues
17 which have been raised, have been resolved by the script,
18 itself.

19 Consequently I am all in favor of deferring
20 it, even though I tell you now -- because I have read
21 the script, I'll be voting for it at our next meeting.

22 MS. ZIMMERMAN: Gertrude, did you want to com-
23 ment on this one?

24 MS. : No. I think (inaudible) --
25 should be held over --

1 MS.ZIMMERMAN : The next one. Oh, boy. Page 25,
2 PN 20729, Style Wars-- I want to say something here be-
3 fore I go on.

4 You'll notice the description, documentary
5 on New York City Graffiti and Graffiti Writers. This
6 was really the hot issue. This is a very controversial
7 proposal. It was brought to our special attention by
8 the staff.

9 The reviewers all had positive recommendations,
10 although several had raised some questions. The panel
11 recommended its full support. The staff was divided on
12 its -- in its opinion on this project.

13 Some expressed belief that the subject and
14 projected film are both tied to and the result of the
15 work of an important range of humanity scholars. It
16 promises a valuable look at the behavior of a subculture,
17 an important expressive art form, and it is clearly
18 within the realm of urban anthropology.

19 Others maintain that while the subject, itself,
20 was an appropriate area of scholarship, treatment pro-
21 vided for the film did not promise the kind of systematic
22 approach to the issues involved, which would be needed
23 for the film not to result ultimately in a celebratory
24 or validating tone.

25 The question was also raised as to whether it

1 would be legal for federal funds to be used to support
2 a project, which was focused on activity that was
3 clearly illegal, and there's a complicating part of that
4 legal question which is, again, as in the middle town
5 experience, we would -- the project envisioned interviewing
6 on tape for filming minors who would be telling you
7 right up front that they are engaged in illegal activity.

8 We went on -- I am the one that is raising
9 those legal questions, and I am really discomforted as
10 to whether or not their rights would be protected. I am
11 discomforted in our role as a federal agency in funding
12 this project as far as the legal aspects are concerned.

13 The Council members split with one recommending
14 support, assuming the question of legality was resolved,
15 and one recommending against support regardless of the
16 legal issues.

17 Setting the legal issues aside for the moment,
18 because I have asked Wendall Willkie to look into them,
19 and tell us what the resolution of that is, I would like
20 to give you my view, and then ask Marcus -- Marcus, do you
21 want to go first?

22 MR. : You go first.

23 (Laughter.)

24 MS. ZIMMERMAN : Gertrude would you like to --
25 why don't you -- we'll let you go first.

1 (Laughter.)

2 MS. : Well, my own position was
3 quite unambiguous, unequivocal and in a sense irrelevant
4 since I was not a voting member, obviously, of that
5 panel, but I seem to have given it very freely on that
6 occasion.

7 I think from the very brief presentation that
8 we have -- all I have was a face sheet, and from that
9 face sheet, and from that face sheet, and from the
10 excerpts, from the panel and reviewers and so on, I
11 had the very distinct impression that this would result
12 in something like a romanticization, a sentimentalization,
13 a glorification and a legitimization of this "subculture"
14 which is a "legitimate" art form, all of which are very
15 highly charged words, and which signal something to me,
16 and inevitably to the views of this film.

17 There was -- at one point when I challenged
18 the balance of this, you know, I am perfectly well aware
19 of the fact that there are sociologists, anthropologists,
20 social critics and so on who do regard this as an art
21 form, indeed, a very high art form.

22 It was pointed out to me that yes, this would
23 be balanced because, and then there was a sentence which
24 I seem in the midst of all my papers not to have, but it
25 was suggested that not only would these young people who

1 were engaged in this activity be represented on film, but
2 also police officers and teachers and government officials
3 and parents -- parents or parents -- it wasn't clear
4 to me of some of these youngsters.

5 That was supposed to suggest that, yes, this
6 was a balanced presentation, and in my reading of it,
7 that simply enhances the inbalance of that presentation,
8 because what it does is give you the suggestion that
9 there are these young people engaged in a -- this was
10 another word by the way -- creative art form, who on
11 one hand, and on the other hand, all of these suppressive
12 officials, all of these establishment types, policemen,
13 teacher, schoolteachers and government officials and so
14 on -- as if these were the two interests so to speak
15 involved in this very difficult problem.

16 I suggested that there was another constituency
17 that was totally unrepresented, and for whom this very
18 important cultural phenomenon, and that is the writers of
19 the subway.

20 They're not oppressive establishment types at
21 all, and they do have a very strong feeling, I am sure,
22 about this particular activity, and they represent -- you
23 see, what was happening was this subculture was being
24 presented to us.

25 The only representatives of the culture were

1 these rather oppressive officials, and I was suggesting
2 that there are other people who have a very large commit-
3 ment in this culture of which we live, and take a rather
4 dim view of this subculture.

5 That is millions of people who have to daily
6 ride these subways, and that is just one rather small
7 point, but it is very suggestive to me that this should
8 have been represented to us as evidence of the balance
9 in this presentation, when I saw it as overwhelming
10 evidence of imbalance.

11 As I say the discussion went on and on, and
12 it raised a great many issues, and I did think that this
13 was almost inappropriate on every level for us to
14 recommend, to send out with a validation of the National
15 Endowment for the Humanities.

16 This is quite apart from the legal issue, how-
17 ever that might be resolved.

18 MS. ZIMMERMAN: Marcus, why don't you go next?

19 MR. : A) I thought we were going
20 to defer it based upon Wendall's memorandum on legality
21 of it.

22 MS. ZIMMERMAN: No. We voted -- a script.

23 MR. : Okay. Let me make it perfect-
24 ly clear. I would not be in favor of this. The memoran-
25 dum ended up by saying that we have legal problems

1 involved, so I use that by way of a preface in terms of
2 what I am about to say.

3 The fact remains that this is going on. This
4 is society. Whether we like it or not is really beside
5 the point. I am satisfied that we have an obligation
6 to communicate to the rest of America one of the social
7 processes which is going on, and that is this thing --

8 I don't like what is going on. I am opposed
9 to it, but the fact remains merely because I am opposed
10 to it intellectually, otherwise as well, I know of no
11 reason why we should avoid a controversial issue such
12 as this.

13 I have a feeling that it lurks in the background,
14 criticism which might be directed toward us for ever
15 funding this. If we're going to adopt a course of action
16 which is timorous in which we avoid a highly contro-
17 versial issue, then I think one of the functions of the
18 NEH is disappearing.

19 The mere fact that we would probably get
20 criticism from some places, really doesn't bother me,
21 because I don't want to avoid a controversial issue such
22 as this.

23 I read it a little differently than you read
24 it, Gertrude. I have not seen the actual application.
25 All I was depending upon was the material supplied.

1 I thought it was balanced. It simply wasn't a portrayal
2 of only what those who are engaged in this activity are
3 doing.

4 I do, and I repeat myself now, want to with-
5 hold any final action by us, until we see what Wendall
6 comes up with, as far as the legal implications of this.

7 MS. ZIMMERMAN: But if he came up with a
8 recommendation, that if all the legal issues were clear,
9 you would be voting to fund it, wouldn't you?

10 MR. : Absolutely.

11 MS. ZIMMERMAN: But that is what this --

12 MR. : Okay.

13 MS. ZIMMERMAN: Now I -- my concern, my
14 legal concerns I've expressed. I have some other concerns.
15 I am concerned about the balance. I felt that this was
16 a grant which looked to me like it was going to come up
17 polarized and not balanced.

18 I was persuaded by the comments of several
19 people on the staff, who have very serious concerns about
20 it -- one in particular -- and it has to do with my
21 view also of what is appropriate to do on television.

22 I , as many of you know, I am no shrinking
23 violet, and have never run away from a difficult issue,
24 and I've recommended and voted for our funding -- looks
25 into many controversial issues.

1 That's not my problem here. My problem here
2 is the way in which we look into a controversial issue.
3 I am not content with in this specific case, that the
4 look-in will be balanced, that all the interests of all
5 the parties will be properly represented.

6 Gertrude laid that out very well. That it
7 will not, in fact, tend to glorify and be celebratory
8 of an exciting arm form -- something that I might
9 actually, you know, like if I looked at it.

10 I am sure I would. I like that kind of
11 medicine. The point -- I am not convinced that there
12 is, in any way, sufficient balance in what is going to
13 be done here, and further I, who am the strongest advo-
14 cate of the media program and of what television can do
15 very well, am very concerned that this is something, this
16 kind of research -- that's really what this is.

17 It is gathering or raw material for research
18 to which then the various disciplinary scholars should
19 be applying their skills -- that the place and way to
20 do that is not on television.

21 I would have been much more content to see
22 this as an application, let's say to the Research Division.
23 Let them wrestle with it.

24 (Laughter.)

25 MR. : Harriett, I was just reminded,

1 we did one last year, which was one of my gems on rape,
2 drunkenness and homicide in a Mexican village.

3 MS. ZIMMERMAN: Right. Well, the -- now to
4 me quite honestly the place for this kind of a project,
5 which is looking into something like this is in the
6 Research Division. I am not saying that this Endowment
7 -- overbroad Endowment should not deal with these kinds
8 of issues, but rather that there are things that television
9 does very well, and things I don't feel it does as well.

10 One of them is research in the sense of research
11 into a subject like this, which has so many differing and
12 confusing aspects to it, and with all the other complicat-
13 ing problems.

14 There was nothing I found in this particular
15 proposal that gave me any feeling of comfort, that those
16 high standards of methodology would be upheld.

17 Therefore, I voted not to fund it. Now
18 leaving aside the legal issue for the moment, which if it
19 comes up against the project, will take care of the whole
20 problem, what we did, I feel, is quite appropriate in the
21 review process.

22 There's been a split all the way down the
23 line or up the line. The panel split, the reviews have
24 been split -- not really, the panels, I guess, have been
25 -- panel was not split, but there have been some critical

1 reviews.

2 The staff is strongly split with the project
3 officer in favor of it, and Myra and Steve, frankly,
4 opposed to it for different reasons, and the Committee
5 is split.

6 I am reporting this to you -- the last person
7 in whose lap we are dumping it is the Chair.

8 (Laughter.)

9 MR. : Can I just correct one -- the
10 program officer handling this has argued in defense of
11 this project in Committee Meeting to the "nth" degree.
12 It is not the same as saying that he's in favor of it,
13 per se.

14 Myra and I argued differently on the other
15 side on the basis of material as we saw it. It is not
16 the same as saying as whether we personally think we're --

17 MS. ZIMMERMAN: Well, however you want to --

18 MR. WILLKIE : We have, I think, if I may
19 a motion at this point, and -- I am not going to stop any
20 discussion. I just want to indicate the circumstance
21 as I understand it, I believe we -- unless someone sees
22 another way around this, we must consider this separately,
23 because I don't think the Council can vote split. That
24 is it may, itself, divide on this question, but I believe
25 we have to consider all the rest of the motions separately

1 from this application.

2 The recommendation is coming from --

3 MS.ZIMMERMAN : There is one more that should
4 go into the proper motion. Do you want to take questions
5 on this one now or --

6 MR. WILLKIE : We have treated everything so
7 far. Let's go on and do the rest and then come back --

8 MS. ZIMMERMAN: There's only one more, I
9 believe -- yes, there's only one more. It is just
10 something -- actually it doesn't need to -- well, it is
11 one to disapprove.

12 PN -- page 28 -- PN 20747, Neighborhood
13 Preservation. Here is an issue concerning historical
14 preservation. The question raised was "Is there enough
15 substance to justify support, or is this essentially a
16 string of on-location interviews.".

17 While the panel and reviewers recommended
18 support, the staff had some feeling that more was being
19 read into the proposal than was there. The Committee
20 upon further examination of the project believed that
21 very little in the script offered evidence that the
22 critical questions proposed by the applicant would be
23 answered or substantially addressed.

24 The Committee, therefore, recommended not to
25 support this project. At that point I would move then

1 the adoption of our motions accepting PN 20729, Style
2 Wars and that we will -- Style Wars, and that we'll deal
3 separately.

4 MR. WILLKIE : I think that's fine, and I think
5 we've got to proceed that way in a consideration motion.

6 MS. ZIMMERMAN: Thank you.

7 MR. WILLKIE : Are there questions about any
8 of the other applications? That is any of the --

9 MS.NORTON : Sorry, Phillip. This is not
10 a question. It is an observation. Rich Eckman pointed
11 out to me that he had read in a Chronicle of Higher
12 Education this week, and I just happen to have the
13 Chronicle of Higher Education in my briefcase that we
14 think it is the same Howard S. Weaver who is listed as
15 the PI in the media grants on the first page -- just
16 recently died. Is that correct?

17 We have that information. What is going to
18 be done about that?

19 MR. : That organization, the L
20 Media Design Studio was part of Yale University -- as
21 an Associate Director for that studio -- they'll carry
22 out work on this project -- more than sorry about Mr.
23 Weaver.

24 MS. ZIMMERMAN : Are there any other questions
25 on the motion? Jeff, do you want to --

1 MR. WILLKIE : Yes, I think in that case if
2 there are no further questions on this motion, saving
3 this one application, those in favor please indicate by
4 saying "aye"?

5 (Chorus of ayes.)

6 Those opposed?

7 Now we can turn to Style Wars.

8 MS. ZIMMERMAN : Bill, you sat in on the dis-
9 cussions. Is there anything you'd like to add?

10 MR. WILLKIE : Bill stepped out again.

11 MR. : Well, in that case, Mr.
12 Chairman, that is --

13 MR. BENNETT: I am not avoiding my responsibil-
14 ity, I just think I should wait until the Council --

15 Yes, Walter?

16 MR. : I do agree from my limited
17 observation here in what I've heard today, that -- and
18 from observing, indeed, the very style of this project,
19 Style Wars, that Bea was right when she suggested that
20 the inevitable effect of this would be to romanticize
21 those who engage in it.

22 That, of course, means you are romanticizing
23 those who deface public property, and I am opposed to
24 defacement of public property. In this connection I
25 remember Ned Blazer's piece -- I think the public interest

1 on this activity and how it was pointed out that similar
2 surfaces -- that is to say surfaces similar to those
3 of the subway cars are not defaced when the surfaces
4 are on the sides of privately-owned trucks, and Ned
5 then asked some of the young artists with the spray
6 cans why they don't go after the privately owned trucks.

7 This is on tape is it -- our remarks?

8 MR. BENNETT : Yes.

9 MR. : And the answer was, "Well,
10 we know that they would beat the 'mmm' of us if we tried
11 it.". I would suggest that to the subway officials in
12 New York to try the same thing.

13 (Laughter.)

14 Now I disagree that it would be timorous not
15 to fund this. On the contrary. It seems to me it would
16 be timorous to avoid making the kinds of aesthetic
17 judgment that has to be made by the National Endowment
18 for the Humanities.

19 There is a difference between that which
20 deserves to be supported, and that which does not deserve
21 to be supported, and it is one, I think -- one of the
22 characteristics of timorous individuals not to make that
23 kind of judgment.

24 This thing, I think, should not be funded.

25 MR. : I have to go to Dulles Airport.

1 I am not an ideologue. I know we're living in an age
2 of austerity, talking about budgets of \$96 million or
3 something like that.

4 To spend more than one-tenth of one percent
5 of our money on graffiti is nuts. I leave you with the
6 following message, "the graffiti project stinks" paste
7 on a subway.

8 I mean it is --

9 (Laughter.)

10 Do we have -- we don't have unlimited funds,
11 and I thought --

12 MR. BENNETT : Thanks. Other comments?

13 MR. TASHDINIAN: Can I ask a question?

14 MR. BENNETT: Yes, Louie -- Armand has a
15 question.

16 MR. TASHDINIAN: I wanted to ask a question,
17 Harriett, in the Committee -- has to do not so much with
18 the substance of this particular project, but rather the
19 process.

20 MS. ZIMMERMAN: Yes?

21 MR. TASHDINIAN: Around it, and that is granted
22 no one wants to shy away from things that are controver-
23 sial, but is there a certain, let's say, minimum amount
24 of support, reviewer support, Council support, staff
25 support, which should accompany any grant which is made

1 by the Endowment? I don't think this question has ever
2 really been discussed by the Council, but if this, indeed
3 -- if reviewer comments and staff comments and opinion
4 on this is so split, and if it is so controversial, I
5 just raised the question that that, in itself, may not
6 rule out support.

7 I simply raised that as a question for people
8 who -- who is a narrow specialist, and then the panel who

9 MS. ZIMMERMAN: It has -- as you very well know,
10 it has in the past, but I must say in all fairness, the
11 panel was in favor of this one.

12 MR. BENNETT : Not to this project --

13 MS. ZIMMERMAN : It is not to this project,
14 and, you know, I think that that simply should be --

15 MR. TASHDINIAN: Let's say if the panel had
16 been split, but a slight majority in favor. Would that
17 have offset that at all?

18 MS. ZIMMERMAN: You know, Armand, that is
19 a good question. The only problem is that in this
20 particular it begs what to me is the critical question.
21 That is the -- I must agree with Walter for other
22 reasons, the proper role of the Council, which has been
23 something which I've been really wrestling with as far
24 as my opinion is.

25 It seems to me that our proper role is to

1 properly.

2 That is exactly what I am aiming toward, so
3 I would not be persuaded by the fact that everybody
4 before me, for example, had approved it. I should turn
5 it over.

6 MR. BENNETT: Yes, other comments -- if we
7 can move along. Louie, I think was first.

8 MR. : I would just like to -- I
9 hope Gertrude and Walter won't think I am in favor of
10 glorifying graffitiists, if that is a word, but I must
11 admit that the program fascinates me.

12 I am a frequent visitor to New York, and the
13 whole graffiti phenomenon is almost unique to me -- there
14 is a little bit of it in the rest of the United States
15 and the rest of the world, but not much. It is
16 chiefly in New York.

17 It has, Walter, begun to spread to the
18 private trucks not.

19 (Laughter.)

20 I don't know what the significance of that
21 is, but I am intrigued -- is this a form of youthful
22 animal spirits? Is this a form of protest? Does the
23 amount of graffiti increase in times of social, racial
24 tension?

25 There are many different styles of graffiti.

1 Some of it is almost as good as Jackson Pollack (phonetic).
2 Some of it sort of old Popeye caligraphy.

3 What determines the style of art which -- the
4 style of caligraphy which the particular graffitiist will
5 use on a particular subway car.

6 I think as a cultural phenomena it is a
7 fascinating subject, and I sometimes think it is better
8 than throwing rocks through the windows of the subway
9 cars as a form of social protest.

10 I am not trying to glorify graffiti, but I
11 don't think we can say we don't want to talk about it,
12 that we don't want to think about it.

13 MS. [unclear]: But that is almost a perfect
14 example of what Harriett was saying when she said, "A
15 research project, fine." We know how to deal with that.
16 We can answer exactly those questions. We can address
17 precisely those issues."

18 Cannot discuss those things on TV. The impact
19 is to immediate. It is too visual. It is too overwhelm-
20 ing. You cannot seriously look at those questions by
21 way of TV, and that is the very interesting point that
22 Harriet made.

23 MR. BENNETT: George?

24 MR. [unclear]: I would like just to point out
25 that \$154,000 represents over half of the amount of money

1 that the Fellowship Committee this morning deplored, as
2 being removed from the summer seminars for college
3 teachers. A subject which proved too controversial for
4 morning discussion.

5 MR. BENNETT: No, not too controversial.
6 I was under the understanding that it was not appropriate
7 at that part of the meeting. I was, in fact, correct.
8 You were right, and I won't do that again.

9 I am sorry.

10 MR. : I was going to only make
11 one further comment.

12 MR. BENNETT: The point is noted nonetheless.

13 MR. : Gertrude, one of your replies
14 to your query or comment is that people outside of New
15 York or any metropolitan area may not know what is going
16 on in this whole graffiti phenomenon.

17 Don't we have some kind of an obligation to
18 communicate, to educate the rest of the United States
19 as to this particular phenomenon?

20 MS. ZIMMERMAN : Well --

21 MR. : Whether you call it anti-
22 social or whatever you might call it --

23 MS. ZIMMERMAN : Write a very good book, and
24 then in those terms, the --

25 MR. : You're not going to go through

1 a book to do the research.

2 MR. BENNETT: Marybeth?

3 MS. NORTON : My response to you, Marcus,
4 is that we have no particular obligation to fund any
5 given grant proposal that comes before us, especially if
6 it doesn't do what we think ought to be done, and I
7 am with Phil on this and George.

8 I just don't see any reason to spend this
9 amount of money on this particular project.

10 MR. BENNETT: Shall we go to vote. Any other
11 comments? Steve, did you want to say something?

12 MR. : No. I just hope that when you
13 do vote you'll remember I was talking about an application,
14 which proposes to do certain things, that when you deter-
15 mine which way you'd like to go on this, that your deci-
16 sion is based on natural criteria, including the fact that
17 the proposal is either going to be worthy of support or
18 found wanted, not on a range of other matters that may
19 not be pertinent to the particular application.

20 MR. BENNETT: We need a motion.

21 MS. NORTON : We don't need a motion. We can
22 vote yes or no.

23 MR. BENNETT: We --

24 MR. : Not on split.

25 MS. NORTON : Not on split, okay.

1 MR. BENNETT: We need a motion either yes or
2 no. Anyone can make it either way.

3 MR. : Well, I will make the motion,
4 Bill, to go ahead and support it.

5 MR. BENNETT: All right, the motion in favor,
6 that is that we support the project. All in favor?

7 (Chorus of ayes.)

8 MR. BENNETT: Maybe we ought to see hands.

9 MR. : Mr. Chairman, I am not entitled
10 to vote on this, I take it?

11 MR. BENNETT: That's right. All in favor?
12 One, two.

13 All opposed?

14 MS. NORTON : -- Walter, don't worry --

15 MR. : That a girl.

16 MR. BENNETT: The vote is no.

17 MR. : Fascinating that two lawyers
18 were supporting.

19 (Laughter.)

20 That tells us something about the status of the
21 law.

22 (Laughter.)

23 MR. BENNETT: Okay.

24 MS. ZIMMERMAN: Mr. Chairman, I thank you for
25 your attention and the attention of the Council, and I

1 hope that this discussion has proved informative to my
2 fellow Council members as to what goes on in our program.

3 MR. BENNETT: Thank you.

4 MS. ZIMMERMAN: I thank the staff for the
5 oustanding work that they did.

6 MR. BENNETT: Thank you, Ms. Zimmerman and the
7 staff, but I want to thank you particularly for your
8 attentiveness to my questions.

9 We're not done yet. I would like to point out
10 that Harriett Zimmerman and members of the staff worked
11 under some pressure of time. My questions came late, at
12 the second Council -- pre-Council meeting, and we're
13 going to set up a procedure so that they can come earlier.

14 For the sake of both old Council members and
15 new, I would like to make it plain that my questions are
16 questions. They are not answers. These are things which
17 I raise. I raise them for a variety of reasons.

18 Sometimes I have real doubt. Sometimes I
19 think someone else may have doubts, but I think we are
20 working toward a good process here, where we can raise
21 -- all of us, the staff, all of us on the staff and
22 Council members, the kinds of questions that are on our
23 minds, and I hope we can raise them first here before
24 they are raised for us.

25 MR. : And we welcome them, Bill.

1 MS. : We do.

2 MR. BENNETT: Okay -- somewhere else. There
3 is no agenda for state programs. I should tell you what
4 I told the Directors yesterday. I had asked Don Gibson
5 who has been serving as Acting Director of the Division
6 to serve as the permanent Director of the Division of
7 State programs.

8 (Applause.)

9 MR. BENNETT: We could take a motion for
10 adjournment, if that's what you'd like, or we can discuss
11 other things if you'd like. It is up to you.

12 Are there any other matters of pressing con-
13 cern or interest that Council matters would like to
14 discuss?

15 MR. : I move adjournment.

16 MR. BENNETT: I move adjournment. We'll be
17 meeting again in July anyway.

18 Again, let me remind all Council members they
19 are welcome to the Budget meeting in July, and our
20 next meeting of this Council is July 29-30.

21 Thank you ladies and gentlemen very much.

22 So moved. Seconded. All in favor. Yes.

23 Bye.

24 (Whereupon, the meeting was concluded.)

25