

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

SEVENTY-FIRST MEETING
OF THE
NATIONAL COUNCIL ON THE HUMANITIES

FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 17, 1984

9:00 A.M.

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

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

C O N T E N T S

	<u>Page</u>
Opening Remarks - Chairman Bennett	3
Minutes - Mr. Willkie	3
Introduction of New Staff - Mr. Marshall	33
Possible Graduate Fellowships Program - Mr. Marshall	40
Eligibility of State Humanities Councils - Mr. Marshall	61
Fellowship Programs - Ms. Himmelfarb	68
<i>Education Program -</i> State Programs - Ms. Kerr	78
General Programs - Mr. Ritcheson	82
Challenge Grants - Mr. Dille	92
Research Programs - Mr. Berns	92
Program and Policy Studies - Ms. Rhome	95
Application Report - Mr. Carnes	101
Gifts and Matching Report - Mr. Carnes	102
FY 1985 Appropriation - Mr. Carnes	103
Emergency Grants and Actions Departing from Council - Mr. Marshall	107
General Programs - Mr. Ritcheson	115
Fellowship Applications - Ms. Himmelfarb	126
Education Programs - Mr. Dille	130
Challenge Grants - Mr. Dille	133
Research Programs - Mr. Berns	138
Program and Policy Studies - Ms. Rhome	153

P R O C E E D I N G S

CHAIRMAN BENNETT: Good morning. Let me welcome everyone to the 71st meeting of the National Council on the Humanities. I particularly want to thank our scheduled-to-depart members of the Council for returning once more, we think, and helping us with our work.

We have no books or awards or presentations for you this morning. If this process for new Council members lingers, by the time we get there, there may be another book out in the library of American editions and, if so, we will pass it along to you. But, again, thank you for staying with us, for persevering. Let's begin. Minutes of the last meeting, Mr. Willkie.

MR. WILLKIE: The minutes of the previous meeting have been distributed to members of the Council. Are there any comments or questions with regards to those minutes?

(No response.)

MR. WILLKIE: If not, could I have a motion to ratify those minutes?

VOICE: So moved.

MR. WILLKIE: Second?

VOICE: Second.

MR. WILLKIE: All those in favor, say "aye".

(A chorus of ayes was heard.)

MR. WILLKIE: Any opposed?

1 (No response.)

2 CHAIRMAN BENNETT: Thank you. Let's go to Reports.
3 I just have one thing to say, and then we can see if John
4 has anything and then throw it open if any member of the
5 Council would like to use this time.

6 I just wanted to alert the Council. The question --
7 the question of significance is a question that, of course,
8 we are always asked, the significance of proposals that come
9 to us. It is either implicit or explicit, I think, in all of
10 our discussions, and quite properly ought to be. I wanted
11 to report that as we look again at our process, as we look
12 again at the way we review, the way we spend taxpayers' money,
13 I have asked the staff, especially, to pay more explicit
14 attention to this question of significance.

15 In an exchange of conversations and memoranda, Jeff
16 Marshall and I have concluded that it is plain that in the
17 review process we always talk about eligibility and we always
18 talk about quality. The question of significance comes up
19 here and there, often on an ad hoc basis. To try to get some
20 more insight into this question of significance, I have used
21 the Division Directors and the staff of the divisions, as I
22 often do, as a kind of thinking seminar, to advise me on this
23 question. I am happy to tell you that I had some very good
24 statements from the divisions about the questions of signifi-
25 cance.

1 We asked them to talk about significance in terms
2 of the proposals that come in to the particular division, and
3 we had some very interesting memoranda on that. If the Coun-
4 cil members, or any Council member, would like to see any of
5 these, we would be happy to pass them along to you. It has
6 helped my thinking, and I would hope, as we move along -- I
7 do not know that I can say next Council meeting or the one
8 after -- we might try to prepare a paper on this whole ques-
9 tion of significance for discussion by the Council. I just
10 wanted to report that. Yes, Anita.

11 MS. SILVERS: I just want to make a request to --
12 that such a paper be prepared or at least the Council lead
13 to that discussion -- because I think that kind of discussion,
14 I hope in public, is the sort of discussion that would convey
15 to the public the ---

16 CHAIRMAN BENNETT: Right. Right. The kind of
17 pattern which I have in mind is something like what we will
18 have this morning with the paper on the review process. Here
19 is our thinking. What does the Council think? And we can
20 go back and work on it as people see fit. But it will be
21 quite public. Thank you. John, did you have anything?

22 MR. AGRESTO: No. Nothing to add to that. Thank
23 you.

24 CHAIRMAN BENNETT: Any other Council members who
25 would like to speak? Mary Beth.

1 MS. NORTON: Mr. Chairman, I would like to raise a
2 question on the letter you wrote to the EEOC. We do have a
3 copy of it in our folder this morning because it was
4 printed in "Insight." I was upset about the letter for
5 three reasons. I wanted to raise it in the public session
6 because I thought the Council should talk about it. I would
7 very much like to list my three reasons and like to have some
8 responses from you about.

9 The first reason I was upset about it was something
10 that the Council has often spoken about and that is our
11 lack of prior knowledge of a statment like this on your
12 part. It strikes me that you have committed the agency to an
13 important position without letting the Council know that you
14 were going to do it in advance. I am not saying that you
15 should ask for our advice, but I did not appreciate reading
16 about it in the newspapers instead of having at least some
17 knowledge of it in advance. Of course, I would have preferred
18 to have the Council consulted, but even if it was not
19 proper to consult the Council at least we could have been
20 informed of it. And I know that this issue has been raised
21 over and over again here around this table by other Council
22 members about other issues. I felt it particularly
23 keenly in this instance.

24 The second has to do with your -- the way -- your
25 refusal, indeed, to comply with a Federal policy. Now, the

1 political implications of that refusal, it seems to me, that
2 it aligns the agency with a position that is identified with
3 a particular political point of view, and it has politicized
4 the agency in a way that I am distressed about. I think that
5 it has very much hurt the image of NEH, at least in the aca-
6 demic circles that I am active in, and I felt that since it
7 was a refusal to comply with what has been a standard Federal
8 policy, it is even more a substantive reason why the Council
9 should have been consulted before you did it.

10 And, last, but not least, as you probably anticipate,
11 I totally disagree with the position that you took in the
12 letter. That is my personal belief. I agree that in an ideal
13 world we would all be color and sex blind, but if as good
14 inter-disciplinary humanists we pay even slight attention to
15 current social science research on the issues of race and sex
16 and the way that the influence hiring practices and promotion
17 practices in the real world, we discover that every bit of
18 social science research indicates that the world out there
19 is not an ideal world and that there are significant differ-
20 ences in the way men and women are evaluated when they per-
21 form jobs and when they are applying for positions. And, also,
22 that there are differences in the way whites and members of
23 minority groups are evaluated when they are applying for that
24 same position, for those same positions.

25 And I would just call to your mind a study that was

1 done recently that I am sure you are familiar with in which a
2 couple of researchers sent out to academic departments look-
3 ing to hire -- sent out precisely the same resume to, I think,
4 it was 100 randomly selected departments. In one instance,
5 the person was identified as a female. In another instance,
6 the person was identified as a male, but the biographical
7 facts were precisely the same. What came back was -- the
8 response was that the man could be hired as high as the
9 associate professor level but that the woman would be hired
10 as an instructor.

11 Now, I must say, with all due respect, that with
12 the exception of the Acting Division Director's appointment
13 we made yesterday, there are no women in top policymaking
14 positions in this Endowment and that applies to members of
15 minority groups as well. Therefore, I think that it is, shall
16 we say, inadvisable for you to be somewhat holier than thou,
17 as I feel you were in the letter that you wrote to the EEOC.

18 CHAIRMAN BENNETT: Okay. Let me respond briefly
19 and maybe elaborate further if you want discussion of this.
20 In terms of informing you, I do not think it is, or has been,
21 the policy of this agency to inform the Council of its particu-
22 lar policies on hiring. We do not inform you about some 30
23 or 40 or 50, probably, reports that we send to other agencies.
24 This is not a matter normally presented to the Council for its
25 advice, for judgment, beforehand. It is an administrative

1 matter having to do with the hiring of people at the agency,
2 not a matter of policy of the Endowment in terms of its
3 grant giving activity.

4 Second, my refusal to comply was a refusal to comply
5 in part. I provided that information which I felt I could
6 in good conscience. I did not supply the information that I
7 felt I could not supply in good conscience.

8 You accused me of politicizing the agency. This
9 was not a situation that I sought. I did not call up EEOC
10 and say, "Tell me to do something because I am wanting this
11 opportunity." I had to either comply or not. It is my view
12 that to have complied would have been to politicize the
13 agency, though it would have been to politicize it in a way
14 that people are now familiar with. That is, it would have
15 been to politicize the agency in a rather conventional politi-
16 cized way which is accepted by a large number of people in
17 this society, in academic society, probably not as large a
18 number in the larger society. But it would have been politi-
19 cized just as much. I had no choice but to choose. I had to
20 do one thing or the other.

21 Let me suggest, in response both to this point and
22 to the first point, I do not think that anyone should be sur-
23 prised about my response. I have been as clear as possible,
24 I think, on this issue. I wrote a book on this issue. I
25 expressed to the Council in February, the first Council

1 meeting that I appeared before you, that I would not discrimi-
2 nate on the basis of race, sex, religious, national origin,
3 and the like. That means I will not discriminate. That means
4 I will not give somebody three points for being a woman or
5 black or white or male or whatever. Not to discriminate means
6 not to discriminate.

7 I can only presume from your third point that you
8 are accusing me of discriminating when you talk about the
9 Division Directors. If you think I have, I suggest you make
10 a case or urge someone else to make the case if they think
11 they have been discriminated against.

12 In terms of all social science research, I think
13 you are flatly wrong. Again, I wrote a book on this. We can
14 have a seminar if you would like. You and I can discuss all
15 the research, and you will find, as one can always find in
16 the social sciences, positions and findings that will support
17 any position. But it is simply not true that all social science
18 research goes one way on this, whatever the value of social
19 science research.

20 Again, my position -- I am now responding to all
21 three points -- ideal worlds and the like -- we all seek a
22 world in which people will not discriminate, will not be
23 color conscious, race conscious. It is my view the way to
24 get to that world is to act on that principle and that is
25 the principle on which I have acted.

1 Yes, Frances.

2 MS. RHOME: I guess I am pleased that you brought
3 the subject up so that we could discuss it, because I read
4 of your stand in the headlines of the Indianapolis Star at
5 breakfast. And the way that it was reported in the newspaper
6 was that you were taking a stand against affirmative action
7 and its processes.

8 I certainly believe that you have absolutely every
9 right to your own opinions, and I would also see that you are
10 bound by certain Federal regulations in administering your
11 office and also the fact that the Council did adopt some
12 three years ago an affirmative action policy in that regard.
13 And that we have been following that as we have been admini-
14 stering our program to those persons who are bringing in
15 proposals and making every effort to assure that minorities
16 and women are included in projects and things that are going
17 forward.

18 I guess I have to agree that I have difficulty with
19 this because you are a prominent person and because NEH is
20 a prominent person, to take a negative stand, as this was
21 inferred, was brought about in the papers, was difficult. I
22 do know -- as you know, I have been administering programs
23 in this line for some 15 years, and I know the regulations
24 and I know the laws upside down, backwards, and forwards, and
25 I do know that some agencies have been overzealous in

1 requesting statistical information. But I also know that in
2 the implementational process, as the regulations were
3 developed, that it was required that statistical information
4 be given as a start to see whether or not there was discrimi-
5 nation.

6 Since I have had to furnish that stuff for 15 years,
7 and found it a terrible headache, I have also discovered that
8 by so doing it it did bring up some factions that I had not
9 been aware of in our own institution such as finding salary
10 inequities that most of us did not believe were there. So,
11 it is a process to follow.

12 So, I was concerned very much from the fact that
13 the word "quota" was used. There is no place in any regula-
14 tion that requires quotas. President Nixon himself issued
15 an Executive Order, and it is still in effect, that there
16 will be no quotas and that there is not to be preferential
17 treatment on the basis of sex. The only time that quotas are
18 imposed is when there has been a court case in which the
19 court itself has found that discrimination did exist and,
20 therefore, imposed a remedy for the correction of that.

21 So, I do have some problem with it. Somehow, I
22 wish it had not been so public. I do, indeed, wish we could
23 have discussed it together.

24 CHAIRMAN BENNETT: Well, if we had discussed it,
25 again, I think we would have not been doing what was normal

1 or typical. However, I have to tell you that if we had dis-
2 cussed it I would have come out the same way because this is
3 a matter of fundamental principle and fundamental belief for
4 me. I think the publicity was, in fact, good. I believe
5 with Justice Brandeis that sunlight is the best disinfectant.
6 Let's be quite public about acts like this. Let's not be
7 covert, and let's be judged on the basis of public opinion
8 and arguments that people can make. I understand that you
9 think it was negative. I think it was positive.

10 My refusal to comply, however, Frances -- I have to
11 correct you -- was not a refusal to comply with providing
12 certain statistics. I provided the facts that I was asked
13 to submit. I was, however, also asked to submit a plan of
14 goals of hiring by race and sex, and I regard that not as a
15 headache but as an invidious and degrading exercise in which
16 I will not participate then, now, or in the future.

17 If you think there is discrimination at this agency,
18 salary inequities between people of different races or sexes,
19 that should be brought to my attention immediately. I also
20 did not refuse, nor do I reject the notion of, affirmative
21 action. The original notion of affirmative action, I think,
22 is a sound one. What I reject and what I refuse to comply
23 with was the insistence in this -- you are welcome to look at
24 it -- 30-page management directive from EEOC that asks me to
25 supply indices of under-representation as if there are some

1 assumptions of some proper mixture of race and sex in our work
2 force. And I also refuse to submit a plan of goals, which I
3 think, frankly, is a euphemism for quotas.

4 In terms of the law, there is disagreement. It
5 was the position of the Justice Department that the EEOC had
6 exceeded its authority in this matter. So, we are not alone.
7 Other comments? Mr. Neusner.

8 MR. NEUSNER: I think it is a very positive contribu-
9 tion to allow the Council to discuss the matter, as Mary Beth
10 has done. I would like to address three issues briefly.

11 First of all, Council role. The Council is not the
12 Board of Directors of the NEH. Its role has been thought
13 about a great deal by many of us over the years and with
14 successive chairmen. We are a board of advice and review.
15 The one legal power we have is that the Chairman may not make
16 a grant in excess of a given figure, which I believe is
17 \$30,000, without a Council recommendation. That is the work
18 that we do do. It is very seldome that the Council has dis-
19 cussed a wide range of policy issues, and I do not think there
20 is a legitimate complaint on that score.

21 Secondly, I think it would be valuable for the
22 Council to express an opinion, to assess the majority and
23 minority views on these questions. I would suggest, because
24 you have brought it up, Mary Beth, that you offer a resolu-
25 tion. Let it be debated in terms that you want it debated in,

1 and let's see how people think.

2 Thirdly, I think it is unfortunate that we should
3 be discussing mainly a negative issue when there are positive
4 things which this administration of the Endowment has been
5 doing and is proposing to serve minority constituencies, for
6 example, and to do good things where, within the ideals of
7 principles of this Chairman, these things can and should be
8 done.

9 Later on today, we will be having, I believe, very
10 soon, in fact, concrete proposals on educational programs,
11 fellowship programs, which will serve black colleges, for one
12 thing, and no one is claiming that this is discrimination or
13 in some way establishing quotas. There are many positive
14 things which this Chairman wants to do and is proposing and
15 has proposed. So, it is not as if we get a chance to reject
16 the position of a bigot.

17 The notion, finally, that there was some kind of
18 political gain in this action, seems to me, contrary to the
19 case. I think the prevailing sentiment of people is more
20 along lines of what you say, Mary Beth, than along the lines
21 of what the Chairman has said. I thought it was an act of
22 enormous courage on his part to phrase matters as he did and
23 to take seriously the position he outlined in a very thought-
24 ful book. So, those are the things that I think are worth
25 considering.

1 CHAIRMAN BENNETT: Louise.

2 MS. KERR: I happened to be in Washington the day
3 that this came out in the newspaper, for the Jefferson Lectern
4 Committee, and since I had not had the chance to read the
5 newspaper, somebody in the public relations office gave me
6 a copy of the letter and the statistics that accompanied the
7 letter.

8 I am kind of curious about some definitions, and you
9 asked about a dialogue. It would, I think, be helpful to --
10 at some future point -- not necessarily today, to continue
11 the dialogue. You say in your letter "...it was the glory of
12 America to proclaim to the world all men are created equal.
13 To believe in human equality and equal liberty can mean
14 nothing less than to treat white and black, male and female,
15 Jew and Gentile, as morally equal".

16 As I reconstruct those statistics, and I may be
17 off a little bit because I do not have them before me, there
18 are something like 242 people in this agency, of whom about
19 158 are women. Of those 158 women, over two-thirds of them
20 are in the bottom three categories of the agency. As I
21 recollect, the bottom category is something like 90 per cent
22 women; the next to the bottom category, 75 per cent women;
23 the category above that, something like 92.

24 In the next to the top category, let us say say,
25 GS-12 to 15, there are 33 per cent women, and up until

1 yesterday, the top category had zero per cent women. As I
2 recollect, in the one year that these statistics cover, which
3 is all under your aegis, there were 15 men, black men, in
4 the agency as of '82 and in '83, there were 12 black men.
5 The agency lost in that year six people. It lost seven black
6 people. The placement of minority women and blacks is almost
7 entirely, exclusively, in the bottom part of the agency. It
8 is my understanding that in the professional category we have
9 just lost the only black professional man in this agency. Now,
10 I am not sure, I would like some definition of what "morally
11 equal" means.

12 CHAIRMAN BENNETT: Treating people on the same
13 terms; treating people with equal respect. Are you suggest-
14 ing that these people you are talking about, this change,
15 were driven out?

16 MS. KERR: No. I am just ---

17 CHAIRMAN BENNETT: That's right. You are just
18 making a general kind of charge without any specific evidence.

19 MS. KERR: I am ---

20 CHAIRMAN BENNETT: Well, it sounds like a charge
21 to me.

22 MS. KERR: Well, it sounds like a charge to me.

23 MS. KERR: Well, then, I make no charges. I am
24 describing statistics, and I think it would probably be good
25 if you distributed those statistics to all of us and we could

1 discuss them.

2 CHAIRMAN BENNETT: I am happy to distribute all the
3 statistics, but I have to tell you ---

4 MS. KERR: I do not know what they mean. I am
5 asking you what they mean.

6 CHAIRMAN BENNETT: I have to tell you, I must say,
7 I hear a charge in that. If you have a specific charge, I
8 would like to hear it. If you wish to disassociate yourself
9 from my view, feel free to, as you have done now, or in any
10 other public forum. But if you are going to raise implica-
11 tions about what I take to be an implication of discrimination
12 on my part, have the facts to back it up. Yes.

13 MS. RICARDO-CAMPBELL: I feel I should try to speak
14 to this issue although I had not heard about it until I
15 arrived this morning. First of all, the word "men" in the law
16 is generally used in the generic sense to mean men and women.
17 This is true in the Social Security Act. It is true in lots
18 of other areas.

19 Secondly, I am at Stanford University, the Hoover
20 Institution, and in academic circles, this is a continuing
21 problem. Both sides of the issue are being debated in the
22 fashion that it is beginning to be debated here, but usually
23 not deteriorating to the level it just deteriorated to --
24 that's both sides -- initiated, I hate to say, by my good
25 friend, I hope, Louise.

1 MS. KERR: I am sorry. What did I initiate?

2 MS. RICARDO-CAMPBELL: Well, I think it is -- the
3 level of discussion deteriorated slightly when you begin to
4 use the numbers and imply without stating, and knowing the
5 facts -- you imply that these people were deliberately kind
6 of squeezed out. But let's drop that if we don't want it.

7 It seems to me that competence is the main issue
8 in hiring anybody at a level at which they have to do a job
9 that will cost -- affect expenditure of tax money of the
10 public. And this would be true if you want people hired to
11 teach people even in private universities. Stanford Univer-
12 sity has a very poor record for number of women in positions
13 of higher -- that is, tenured positions and professorships.
14 It has a very poor record for women in administrative jobs.

15 This does not mean that they have not searched.
16 I have been on search committees for the Hoover Institution.
17 We have offered jobs to women at top levels and not had them
18 accept them, in the final analysis, because the spouse, if
19 you would like that word, and I do use it all the time, and
20 my husband does equally, he will not move because he cannot
21 get a job necessarily at the pay at what he is earning.

22 That is, this is an argument that could go on all
23 day, not just the morning. I think it is important for the
24 competency to be there. I was on a Presidential Commission
25 under the Nixon period which was headed by a black woman. She

1 was a very nice woman, but she was way above her head. It
2 was embarrassing to me as a professional woman, and may I say,
3 she was saved by the white males on the committee that under-
4 stood this thing because what they did, and they did it
5 deliberately, they did her work. This was an unpaid committee.
6 It went through, and it never surfaced. And I will not
7 identify it because I have been on a lot of those committees;
8 you cannot find it.

9 What I would like to be assured is that the pool
10 from which you select people is large enough that you are
11 distributing information about vacancies here to a large
12 enough pool of Blacks, Hispanics, and women that the appli-
13 cants would come in. And that is what I would like to be
14 assured of. I do not like a quota system. I was brought up
15 in a religion in which you are discriminated against because
16 of quotas, and I think you will find a lot of people of that
17 faith, which is the Jewish faith, that will be dead against
18 quotas for that reason. They have experienced them in a
19 negative sense. Thank you.

20 CHAIRMAN BENNETT: Thank you. Other comments?

21 MR. BERNS: I would like to emphasize something
22 that Jack ---

23 CHAIRMAN BENNETT: Can you bring your microphone
24 closer?

25 VOICE: No. Walter, the other one, please.

1 MR. BERNES: I would like to emphasize something.
2 I thought your statement was an eloquent statement -- Bill's
3 statement, as Jack said, took enormous courage to make.
4 Living in Washington, being familiar with the major news net-
5 words, the nets, Washington Post, New York Times, I realize
6 how rare in this setting, how rare such a statement is. As
7 a matter of fact, in addition to you, I can only name a
8 couple of people in public positions who have publicly taken
9 this stand, and they have suffered because of it.

10 I am thinking of Linda Chavez over at the Civil
11 Rights Commission and someone like Jack Bunzel, an old-time
12 civil rights advocate, and then someone like Morris Abram,
13 who has lost his old friends, who has suffered in the press,
14 and whose record as a civil rights advocate is exceeded by
15 no one's. He had absolutely nothing to gain by taking his
16 public stand against quotas, but he did it. And he has
17 suffered as a result of it. It is so easy to go along with
18 what is so obviously the prevailing fashion.

19 The best example of this, I suppose, was in the
20 debate at Dartmouth when Phil Donahue asked the eight Demo-
21 cratic candidates if they were in favor of affirmative action,
22 and they all raised their hands. I was reminded of a kinder-
23 garten class in which the kindergarten teacher asks how many
24 students had brushed their teeth that morning, and they all
25 raised their hands.

1 One would wonder if the question had been reformu-
2 lated, and reformulated altogether accurately, what their
3 response would have been on this national television network.
4 How many of you are in favor of reverse discrimination? I
5 would like that to be put. It seems to me that it is abso-
6 lutely essential that this issue be fought out. I would like
7 a national political campaign to be fought out on it. I am
8 persuaded that there have been all kinds of things that have
9 happened in this country -- consent decrees signed on January
10 9, 1981, 11 days before the new administration came in, and
11 a consent decree signed by a judge in the District Court of
12 the District of Columbia affecting the whole civil service,
13 the whole Federal work force, and large parts of that Federal
14 work force not even being informed of the nature of the --
15 the fact of the suit.

16 What I am suggesting is that we have been moved
17 in this position where we are in favor of quotas disguised
18 in one way or another, one euphemism or another, and this has
19 been going on behind the backs of the American people, to
20 some extent. It is because of Linda Chavez, Jack Bunzel,
21 Morris Abram, and William Bennett that it might be possible
22 to put this thing now on -- bring it to the attention of
23 everybody. Let it be debated. Let it be understood for what
24 it is because it is a quota system.

25 MR. EARLY: Mr. Chairman, will you hear a comment

1 from a staff member?

2 CHAIRMAN BENNETT: Sure. Sure.

3 MR. EARLY: My name is James Early. I am the last
4 black professional male at this agency. I resent the kinds
5 of comments that I hear that would suggest that people like
6 myself come here as a result of quotas. I did not come here
7 as a result of a quota system. I came here pretty much like
8 most of the white males who come in and are administrators
9 here. Someone knew of the quality of the work that I was
10 doing and asked me to apply for a job.

11 I submitted to this agency several months ago a
12 concern about the panel process of this agency, its lack of
13 numbers in terms of women and in terms of minorities. It
14 took almost three months for me to get a response with a lot
15 of gobbledygook about -- when I simply said that I am con-
16 cerned that we are not accepting ourselves the breadth of
17 applicants out there and it can be demonstrated by looking at
18 the racial and gender composition of the panels.

19 Now, if you look at this agency, you will note, as
20 has been stated, that those numbers are for real. I suggest
21 that the agency if it really wants to seriously consider the
22 question of quality stop -- saying outright that women and
23 minorities who are here are here as a result of quotas, as a
24 result of some kind of process that says they are not equal
25 to everybody else.

1 The last point I would like to make, Mr. Chairman,
2 is that look at the review process. We have a double standard
3 here. Minority applications and applications dealing with
4 women are being reviewed to death. We all know the scientific
5 law of diminishing returns. Send an application out to six
6 people, and they say it is a very good application. Send it
7 to six more, and the quality will start to go down. Or better
8 still, rather than send it to experts in the field, send it
9 to social scientists when it is really an application dealing
10 with literature.

11 These are charges that I would make. I want to be
12 clear that it is a charge against the agency, and the agency
13 should seriously look into it. You should also talk to the
14 staff here. The staff will tell you -- they will not tell
15 you in open session but take the opportunity to sit down and
16 talk with staff about the questions of sexism, about people
17 being referred to as "that pretty little Japanese girl" or
18 "that splendid lady" or even someone saying "that deaf girl".
19 Talk to your staff and you will find out that these are true
20 charges and then do something about it.

21 And stop saying that we are here as a result of some
22 kind of an under the table process, some kind of system of
23 quotas. Now, you demonstrate to me that I am here as a
24 result of some kind of quota system.

25 MR. BERNES: May I respond to that?

1 CHAIRMAN BENNETT: Yes.

2 MR. BERNES: It seemed to me when you began -- it
3 seemed to me that you were making your charges against some
4 other members here who have spoken in the absolute opposite
5 direction of my comments. It never occurred to me that you
6 were here as a result of a quota. I never said there were
7 quotas in this agency. I heard the Chairman say that there
8 were not quotas in this agency. I did not make any charges
9 about quotas being around here. It seems to me that I am the
10 one person who is opposed to quotas. Again, it never occurred
11 to me to think that you were making your charges against me.
12 I thought you were making those charges against those people
13 who have come out in favor of quotas.

14 CHAIRMAN BENNETT: Excuse me. Yes. Go ahead.

15 MS. RHOME: I have a point of order. There was an
16 initial report here that had to do with whether or not a
17 statement was made publicly without consultation of the Coun-
18 cil. That has been answered by Jack that this issue is not
19 necessarily the responsibility of the issue. We now have
20 gotten involved in what is happening in Stanford University
21 and other areas, and we are off the point.

22 The point, the initial point, the core point, was
23 whether or not it was appropriate for the Director to issue
24 this public statement and to take this particular action,
25 and I think we have gotten beyond that area.

1 CHAIRMAN BENNETT: Let me just -- I do not want to
2 foreclose the discussion. It is obviously a matter of
3 importance to a number of people here. Let me just mention
4 that I would urge Council members to follow Mr. Early's advice
5 and talk to the staff, if they wish, about matters like this
6 so that they can make their own determinations.

7 Second, as to the composition of panels and reviews,
8 let me ask, John, I think you and I drafted the statement
9 early on to all staff about the composition of panels, panels
10 and reviewers, that dealt with this matter. Let me ask that
11 that be circulated again to the Council as pertinent to this
12 issue.

13 MR. CHICKERING: I would also like to respond to
14 Mr. Early's comment, because I understand at one level the
15 reason for his anger, and I have to say that it is an anger
16 that I feel myself. But, unfortunately, the anger he feels
17 about the implication that he, or any minority or woman, is
18 working in this agency as a result of quotas, because such
19 a suggestion, in fact, delegitimizes their professionalism
20 and their success.

21 The difficulty is that he then went on to ask the
22 question, and say that we should be asking the question,
23 about the composition of the panels. The trouble is that
24 to start doing that is to imply that only a balanced composi-
25 tion would imply non-discrimination, which is a call for

1 quotas. It is the instinct to be asking that, to be getting
2 all these statistics, which itself has created the impression
3 that Mr. Early, and others like him, are here as a result of
4 the quota system. I think he has every right to feel angry
5 about that, but I think that a lot of people are basically
6 arguing mutually exclusive positions on this.

7 CHAIRMAN BENNETT: Only with consent of Council,
8 because I do not want to suggest that I am trying to limit
9 this unreasonably, but could we have John's comment, Louis',
10 and Jack's and close it there? Would that be agreeable to
11 the Council because we do have other business. The American
12 people have wrestled with this question for a number of years,
13 and I am sure we could too. Roland.

14 MR. DILLE: I was about to speak, but I will not.

15 CHAIRMAN BENNETT: You don't -- then we will stop
16 with you. Okay? Go ahead, John.

17 MR. AGRESTO: To make our position absolutely clear
18 on this, we have not and will not hire or promote on the
19 basis of race or sex. We have not done that. We will not
20 do that. We think that is monumentally unfair to those who
21 would come into these positions and to labor under the
22 illusion that they were there because of race or sex. I
23 think Jim Early's first point is absolutely correct. He was
24 not here because of his race. He was here because of his
25 expertise. Any indication that we should act in a contrary

1 fashion would cast aspersions on him and those who follow him.

2 The same is true for the review process. We will
3 not have reviewers who are here on the basis of their race
4 or their sex -- final criteria. To do that makes it diffi-
5 cult for us to defend the conclusions we come to in our
6 review process and to defend our promotions and hirings here.
7 It would make us very ashamed.

8 CHAIRMAN BENNETT: Louis.

9 MR. HECTOR: Let me start out by disagreeing with
10 Jack and Walter and end up with agreeing with them. My own
11 personal feeling is to put it in one phrase is that the road
12 to discrimination is paved with good intention, by which I
13 mean that I personally believe that the -- worked out by
14 administrative agencies and the Federal courts over the last
15 10 years that it is the numbers that count, not the presumed
16 intent, is the only way out of our discriminatory situation
17 in the United States.

18 But that is a very debated attitude, a very debated
19 principle. The present administration feels profoundly the
20 other way. The Department of Justice has argued the other
21 way in court. The matter is up now, as Walter rightly points
22 out, probably will be an element in this year's presidential
23 election. It is certainly being fought out in the Congress
24 at the moment. It seems to me that it is a very basic, very
25 important national issue, to which the nation will address

1 itself in the months ahead. I agree with Bill, much as I
2 disagree with his statement and his position on this issue,
3 that the best course to follow is to let the American people,
4 through their democratic processes, do the best they can do,
5 because I do not think we are going to settle this very pro-
6 found disagreement at this meeting.

7 MR. NEUSNER: I did not hear the part where you
8 disagreed with me.

9 MR. HECTOR: I suppose I assumed that you were in
10 favor of letting the American people work this out.

11 (Laughter.)

12 CHAIRMAN BENNETT: Roland or Jack ---

13 MR. HECTOR: I would like to suggest -- it seems
14 to me that is the profound level we are on. I would hope so.

15 MR. DILLE: I may be in disagreement at some other
16 levels with the Chairman -- it does seem to me that what
17 we are saying is that in this agency the staff, which many
18 people respect very much -- this is a choice place of work,
19 it seems to us. Equality of opportunity to work here is not
20 demonstrated much by the figures. Now -- it seems to me,
21 requires extraordinary effort rather than quotas. And with
22 extraordinary efforts, I think one works hardest. My sugg-
23 gestion is, we have increased the number of women rather
24 markedly without ever hiring a second-best candidate, which
25 I suspect is being done.

1 But the moot point I want to make, and Bill you
2 are in generous to say that, what you did about politicizing
3 the matter. To comply or not comply may be equal to the
4 political facts when one is a political gesture, and the other
5 is not, makes some people say it politicizes and some
6 people say you are courageous. I think you carefully chose
7 your ground rules and you are very much in the right.

8 It is certainly true that very few people take
9 exception to the prevailing fashion. It would guess it
10 comes easier when one's unique statement is not altogether
11 unique since it is shared by the President of the United
12 States.

13 CHAIRMAN BENNETT: Well, if I may just indulger
14 a personal privilege there since that is about me. On this
15 issue I have found, this sounds self-serving, but I think I
16 have to say it, that I have been against prevailing fashion
17 on this in a number of environments.

18 I was against this at the University of Southern
19 Mississippi in Hattiesburg, when I continued to write edi-
20 torials about the segregated facilities, and it was suggested
21 that I be quiet about this or my contract was not going to be
22 renewed. That was, of course, unfashionable racism. If it
23 is done in Mississippi they take objection to it. When I
24 got to Harvard and found a more fashionable version of racism
25 where, again, people were segregated, and I was with one of
my proctees, a freshman, a black student and we were talking
and we went to his table, I go to a particular table

1 table for lunch -- I joined him and he said, "You can't sit
2 here. This is for the brothers." I said -- you know, I dealt
3 with this in Mississippi, and it was racism. In dealing with
4 it at Cambridge, it is racism. He said, "You had better
5 leave." I said, "I will go limp and you will have to carry
6 me out." It has been my practice, not on purpose, to be
7 against prevailing fashion, and I think if one is committed
8 to a principle, one simply has to follow that out. Jack.

9 MR. NEUSNER: I think Lou Hector is right in saying
10 that people should stand up and express their views, and the
11 majority will win. So, I would like to offer a resolution
12 for giving people a chance to express their views.

13 It takes the following form: the National Endow-
14 ment for the Humanities should neither favor nor slight any-
15 one because of race, color, national origin, religion or
16 gender. This is the advice of the Council to the President.
17 That is the resolution.

18 CHAIRMAN BENNETT: Is there a second?

19 MS. RHOME: Would you mind reading it again? I
20 know it is short, which is good.

21 MR. NEUSNER: The National Endowment for the
22 Humanities should neither favor nor slight any one because
23 of race, color, national origin, religion or gender. This
24 is the advice of the Council to the Chairman.

25 CHAIRMAN BENNETT: Do we have a second?

VOICE: Second.

MS. RHOME: Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN BENNETT: Discussion? Yes.

MS. RHOME: That is a good resolution and I think that may express the thoughts that many people are having right now. It does not speak to the fact that we do already have an affirmative action policy. It is just going to be a continuing policy. It is not encouraging unique stands by which people like Mary Barry or Jill Rukelshaus can indeed lose their careers over this issue. It doesn't get us involved in other areas either in which we have problems. It speaks just to the problem that we have here and I would like to endorse it.

CHAIRMAN BENNETT: The resolution is on the table. It has been seconded. All in favor raise your hands please. (A show of hands was seen.) Well, I will take this as the sense of the Council. All opposed. One Abstentions. Two.

MR. DILLE: Let me state, Mr. Chairman, that my negative vote is based on my belief only --

CHAIRMAN BENNETT: Thank you. All right. Shall we move on? Let me just say that this is, for those who care about this issue, it is a difficult one. I am glad we had a full discussion of it. Whatever else one may want to say or think, let's remember, as we go to our other business, that it is indeed, I think, a great opportunity to work at the National Endowment for the Humanities or for the National

1 Endowment for the Humanities as Council members do. Whatever
2 else people may think of my position, people here or else-
3 where, I want to report to you again, as we get into our
4 other work, that more notice has been taken of this agency
5 and its work and its standards, I think -- I will not say
6 than ever before -- but let me just say that it is a continu-
7 ing sense or impression. We are continuing to get ever
8 increasing numbers of requests from other agencies and
9 officials who want to know about our procedures, our panel
10 and review process, the way various offices work. The reputa-
11 tion of this agency for very good work and for a highly pro-
12 fessional standard among its staff is increasing.

13 With that, I do not say we can forget this discus-
14 sion. We should not; it is an important issue. But I hope
15 we can attack the rest of our issues, deal with the rest of
16 our issues, not distracted by it because we have other im-
17 portant business in front of us as well. Thank you very much
18 for your comments. Introduction of new staff, Mr. Marshall.

19 INTRODUCTION OF NEW STAFF

20 MR. MARSHALL: I would remind you -- turning to the
21 things that are in your folder -- I would just like to point
22 out to everyone that you have before you the quarterly report
23 called "In the News" from our public affairs office. It is
24 a remarkably varied document, I think, as most of you know
25 who have had a chance to look through it or follow it from

1 time to time. I draw your attention to it. We continue to
2 be more than ably served by the staff in public affairs, some
3 of whom are listed on the cover of the report.

4 There are two parts to the introduction of new
5 staff: one is I would simply like to reiterate for everyone
6 some internal reassignments that have taken in the last --
7 since the last Council meeting and then to turn to the four
8 new appointments since our last gathering.

9 Very briefly, then, just to run over the reassign-
10 ments that have occurred since last meeting. There is one
11 other change in the staff and shape of the agency that the
12 Chairman will mention when I am finished. Very quickly, then.
13 As you can tell, at the table, we have two reassignments
14 reflected here today. Jim Blessing is here now representing
15 and directing the Division of Challenge Grants, and Tom
16 Kingston is sitting at the table this morning as Director of
17 the Division of Fellowships. More recently, within the last
18 few days, the Chairman has asked Jeff Wallin to serve as
19 Assistant Chairman.

20 CHAIRMAN BENNETT: Assistant to the Chairman.

21 MR. MARSHALL: Sorry. Assistant to the Chairman
22 Thank you.

23 CHAIRMAN BENNETT: It is okay. It is all right.

24 (Laughter.)

25 MR. MARSHALL: And I am reading.

1 CHAIRMAN BENNETT: You got him while he was looking
2 down.

3 MR. MARSHALL: I am reading. Don Gibson will be
4 serving at our next meeting as the Director of the Division
5 of General Programs. Carol Watson will be acting as the
6 Director of State Programs.

7 In your brown folder, there is a brief statement --
8 and is our custom, I will not read what is before you -- but
9 I would like the new additions to the NEH staff to stand
10 briefly so that you can recognize them. The first mentioned
11 here is Tracy Joselson. Tracy is behind me. I would mention
12 in addition to what you have about Tracy, Tracy is responsi-
13 ble, I think, for the exceptionally high quality of the
14 minutes of the last couple of meetings. I know how difficult
15 a task that is. Anyone who has ever served as a secretary
16 for a body realizes that being both accurate and clear and
17 readable at the same time for a diverse discussion is a real
18 challenge, and Tracy has been responsible for that in addition
19 to other assignments.

20 Malcolm Richardson, I saw this morning. Malcolm,
21 thank you -- who is joining the Division of General Programs.
22 Eric Anderson, I have not seen this morning. Eric? There
23 he is. Thank you very much. He has joined us in Fellowships
24 and Seminars. Don Schmeltekopf, I did see this morning. Don?
25 Thank you -- who has joined the Division of Education Programs.

1 The report brings to your attention -- Don brings
2 to us, among other things, very useful experience in America's
3 two-year institutions. Don is from one and has been very
4 active. Don is the founder of the Community College Human-
5 ities Association, which is now active and thriving. I think
6 all of us, at one time or another before Don joined us, have
7 had -- been part of that organization, given speeches, and
8 been grateful for his energy behind that. Please, yes.

9 MS. SILVERS: I know Don and the CCHA -- prior
10 to the work that Don and his colleagues did, it was thought
11 quite widely that if one were to do -- lower standards -- and
12 I think it is thanks to Don and the CCHA that that is no
13 longer a prevalent view.

14 CHAIRMAN BENNETT: Let me just indulge, if you will
15 allow me 30 seconds personal privilege, I must make some note,
16 I wanted to make it publicly, of Wendell Willkie's departure
17 from the Endowment and a close working relationship with me
18 to his promotion, I guess, to Associate Counsel at the White
19 House. As I said at the breakfast, the White House is
20 interested in getting large numbers of this staff, but we
21 would only give them one.

22 Of all the people who have left the agency, Wendall's
23 is the most decent. I don't know why, but Jeff said that
24 the other day, and I wrote it down. Wendall was a student of
25 mine at Harvard when I was there as a tutor. He then, I

1 think, as you know, went on and had a distinguished career
2 as a Rhodes scholar, University of Chicago Law School, and
3 then a very nice position at a Wall Street law firm. It was
4 then a great joy to me when Wendall called and said that if
5 I thought he could be of help he would like to come and work
6 at the agency. He has, indeed, been of help. He has been
7 more than a legal counsel. He has been a close friend and
8 advisor, and we will miss his thoughtful and deliberate judgment
9 on many occasions. I will miss the arguments between
10 John and Wendall in my office. Maybe we can have them on our
11 own time. So, Wendall, good-bye and thank you.

12 MR. WILLKIE: Could I take just a minute to respond
13 to that? I asked Bill the other day if I could take some
14 time today to talk about all that I had learned during my
15 two years as General Counsel at the Endowment. He said, "Yes,
16 you may have one minute."

17 I would have to say in the last two years there has
18 been rarely a day gone by that I did not consider it a privilege
19 to serve in this capacity at the Endowment. I feel very
20 fortunate to have been here, and I have a great sense of
21 gratitude. That is my great feeling upon leaving. I feel
22 grateful to fellow employees and members of the Council
23 because I think that this agency, among Federal agencies, is
24 unique in terms of the intelligence, the candor, the good
25 will despite our differences, and the honest, serious

1 commitment to learn that I think prevails here.

2 I cannot express a sense of appreciation without
3 mentioning my secretary, Seresa Minter. I think, upon my
4 departure, members of the Council will discover for them-
5 selves who really the secretary of the Council. But most
6 particularly, I have to express a sense of gratitude to Bill
7 because I think that the time that he has been here this
8 agency has been up to some very exciting work. I think in
9 large measure that that is due to the rare qualities of
10 leadership that he has demonstrated, and I am not embarrassed
11 to say that.

12 I cannot mention Bill or Seresa without taking out
13 many other friends and valued associates. I expect to hear
14 from them once I have moved down the avenue, at least I hope
15 to hear from them. That may be our only chance to continue
16 to participate in policy matters as I resume a position as
17 a full-time lawyer. So, in any event, I may be leaving, but
18 I do not intend to disappear. Thank you.

19 (Applause.)

20 CHAIRMAN BENNETT: Seresa, did you want a minute?
21 Okay. She has got a job to do. Okay. Thank you very much.
22 Let's go to Graduate Fellowships Program, C., Mr. Marshall.

23 MR. MARSHALL: If I could, let me -- at the Chair-
24 man's request, I think this is a good time for us to address
25 a matter that is a point on the agenda to help the staff of

1 the Endowment arrange their day. I think that as a result of
2 the struggle yesterday at breakfast we could consider that
3 there is a motion before the Council, National Council, to
4 conduct the discussion and selection of the Jefferson Lecture
5 in executive session. The Jefferson Lecture is, I think, as
6 everyone knows, but just to be sure, is a uniquely Council-
7 designed and implemented program, and selection has always
8 been in closed session. It is so designated on the agenda
9 today.

10 But members felt that executive discussion would
11 be the best way to fulfill Council responsibility and also
12 to enhance discussion and that was the spirit of yesterday's
13 discussion at breakfast. I think this morning, since we
14 have everyone present, if we could determine that, that will
15 help the staff arrange their day. They are aware that this
16 choice is to be made this morning, and we may have one slight
17 shift in when this takes place, so that we can have the dis-
18 cussion of the Jefferson Lecture right before the lunch break.
19 Could we have discussion? George.

20 MR. KENNEDY: I will move that we meet in executive
21 session for the selection of the Jefferson Lecture.

22 MR. MARSHALL: Okay. We have a motion. The motion
23 is that the Council meet in executive session for the discus-
24 sion and selection of the 1985 Jefferson Lecturer, and there
25 is a second to the motion. Is there further discussion of

1 that? In that case, could I ask for those in favor, please
2 say "aye".

3 (A chorus of ayes was heard.)

4 MR. MARSHALL: Opposed?

5 (A chorus of nays was heard.)

6 MR. MARSHALL: Motion carried. If we can then, let's
7 keep an eye on the time as we move along. Depending on where
8 we are at that moment, it might be a good occasion to have
9 that discussion as the last item before lunch. Therefore,
10 staff can go off and return when lunch is over. Council can
11 complete the discussion and election and then move into the
12 next room for lunch themselves. Division Directors that will
13 be joining lunch, we will set the time at that moment when
14 we know roughly when that will be.

15 CHAIRMAN BENNETT: Keep moving.

16 POSSIBLE GRADUATE FELLOWSHIPS PROGRAM (TAB A)

17 MR. MARSHALL: Quickly, then, Item Tab C in your
18 agenda book. Sorry ---

19 CHAIRMAN BENNETT: Tab A.

20 MR. MARSHALL: Thank you. I did a motion, excuse
21 me, I did a memorandum to the Chairman, and I need to say
22 just one quick word about context. Members of the Council
23 will recall that in the last year, in the last fiscal year,
24 in discussion of the budget of the National Endowment, an
25 item for a Graduate Fellowship Program appeared in our budget

1 in the House of Representatives. Subsequently, in discussion,
2 the Senate did not agree, and in conference committee, the
3 item did not finally appear in our appropriation. But we
4 believe the question will arise again this year, and in order
5 to be prepared for discussion at hearings, coming up in a
6 month or so, the Chairman asked that I explore some possibili-
7 ties of a shape of a Graduate Program. We have not proposed
8 a Graduate Program in our submission to Congress. This is a
9 matter of having an item for discussion among the Council mem-
10 bers so that the Chairman can have a background if called on
11 in testimony in a few weeks to discuss this.

12 We have had one meeting. I have had one meeting
13 with some representatives of the American Association of Uni-
14 versities, who are very interested in this, and they have had
15 a chance to see the memorandum as well. There are many ideas,
16 I am sure, besides the few that I have outlined in the memo,
17 but these sketch out a few. There is another possible one,
18 for example, that we did talk about with AAU about a graduate
19 program that would be directly linked between a graduate insti-
20 tution and local two- and four-year institutions to further
21 enrich the teaching experience of people working towards a
22 Ph.D.

23 But, in summary, that is the background, the con-
24 text, for this. There has been in the past, at least, Con-
25 gressional disagreement about whether a Graduate Fellowship

1 Program is appropriate for NEH. Now, if I could, I would like
2 to start -- I was present yesterday in the Fellowships Divi-
3 sion when there was a discussion of this item. I think there
4 may have been elsewhere. Could I ask Bea if she would want
5 to report briefly on that discussion.

6 MS. HIMMELFARB: I was going to report on it in the
7 afternoon, but it would obviously be more appropriate to deal
8 with it here.

9 We read the memo with great attention and great
10 care, and we agreed on two general principles, two negative
11 principles. We agreed, as I say, on two negative principles:
12 the first, that we did not want to contribute to the inflated
13 supply of Ph.D.'s that already exists, that is, inflated rela-
14 tive to the job possibilities and the other was that we did
15 not want to provide government funds which would, in effect,
16 replace funds that were already being made available by uni-
17 versities in the course of their normal allotment of their
18 funds; that is, we did not want to absolve them of the respon-
19 sibility that they had always assumed and that the major uni-
20 versities could continue to assume.

21 Now, given those two principles, we found we were
22 most taken with Item 3 in Jack's memorandum, the support for
23 graduate study toward an M.A. degree with the obligation that
24 there be some form of teacher certification, and we did not
25 want to specify that. We would hope that it would be a more

1 generous kind of certification than the rather mechanical
2 kinds that are currently in effect. But the principle of that
3 seemed a very good one.

4 We discussed the possibility of alternative degrees
5 rather than the M.A. and fill(?) degrees; some modification
6 of a kind of an A.B.D. degree which, I think, is what we were
7 all getting at, a kind of all but dissertation degree. For
8 that purpose, we thought that graduate fellowships undertaken
9 by the Endowment would be very helpful. It would not replace
10 existing ones and would not divert young people into careers
11 that, in fact, are being closed out.

12 { The other possibility that we discussed was another
13 kind of graduate fellowship proposal, which would try to
14 attract people, older people, who might be interrupting their
15 careers or perhaps at the end of their careers and who simply
16 wanted to come back to do graduate work as a kind of extension
17 of a liberal arts education that they may not have had
18 earlier in their lives.

19 The attention there would be -- it would be made
20 perfectly clear to these people that they could not expect
21 to pursue this as a career. They, in fact, would have had
22 perfectly satisfactory careers in which they were taking
23 leaves of absence or something of that sort. I think we felt
24 that this would be very, very good for the graduate programs.
25 It would bring in people who were dedicated to the substance

1 and the content of some kind of humanistic or liberal arts
2 study without any utilitarian purpose in mind. Also, it would
3 be good for those people who did want to avail themselves of
4 that kind of opportunity.

5 Some of us at some universities have already had
6 this experience of people coming back and wanting to pursue
7 graduate study not with any intention of going out there and
8 getting teaching jobs but rather just for the sheer delight
9 of that kind of educational experience.

10 Essentially, those were the two proposals that
11 seemed to us to be the most commendable. Several of the
12 others, the community college and the senior counselor, we
13 did not examine quite in the same detail. But, obviously,
14 they would fall under those general principles that we did
15 establish.

16 CHAIRMAN BENNETT: Oh, sorry. Anita.

17 MS. SILVERS: I wanted to add another notion. I
18 am strongly in support of a program that would bring people
19 in Ph.D. programs to teach at other kinds of institutions,
20 although I recognize that would not be possible for four-
21 year institutions that are not near Ph.D. programs.

22 But I would like to warn about the problem of taking
23 this type of instructor and potentially putting persons
24 already employed out of jobs. That would only make the Ph.D.
25 market worse. Therefore, let me suggest a criteria -- study

1 award, not to the individuals -- to the institutions where
2 they would work. I think it might be the case that in the
3 humanities across the country, particularly at many two- and
4 four-year colleges that do not give doctoral programs, the
5 faculty/student ratio in the humanities is much higher than
6 it is in many other kinds of programs, including professional
7 programs.

8 I have been looking into -- for instance and have
9 discovered that precisely those institutions that need the
10 humanities the most -- faculty/student ratios in order to
11 support a professional program on pharmaceutical programs.
12 There is a very good reason for having those professional
13 programs; nevertheless, if the criteria in force -- provide
14 additional instructors to lower that -- ratios -- I think
15 that that might produce a benefit without being open to the
16 charge of putting humanists -- out of work. I want to sug-
17 gest that that criteria be investigated if the program for
18 providing additional instructors is pursued.

19 CHAIRMAN BENNETT: Yes, Jack.

20 MR. NEUSNER: On the report as we got it, the one
21 that I thought was the most important proposal was Number 6,
22 which is support for some young people for five or six years
23 from B.A. to Ph.D. I believe that the Endowment could do a
24 very good job of selection here, that we have working criteria
25 that we could apply. By contrast, I think it would be

1 exceedingly difficult to know good from bad in the second of
2 proposals that Bea spoke of for older people who want to
3 renew their education. I would never know who to say yes to
4 and who to say no to, number one.

5 Number two, as a matter of policy, I think the
6 Endowment should favor support for young people. The future
7 of the humanities in this country rests on what happens 30
8 and 40 years from now, and if we have money for graduate
9 fellowships, and we are not going to have a lot, I think it
10 should go for young people who want to devote their lives to
11 humanistic learning, teaching, and scholarship. That is a
12 strong argument for number six.

13 Also, I think we would have a very good chance of
14 ensuring national distribution in the number six proposal,
15 saying, for instance, two to each state, or something that
16 would be fair to large states and so on. We can also favor,
17 in a way I believe would be fair and just, constituencies
18 that we could identify, for instance, historically black
19 colleges, in the number six range. There are many other
20 arguments.

21 I would like to find out whether the deans of the
22 graduate schools have been consulted to any extent on the
23 proposals. The notion that we would be spending money that
24 they would then save for other purposes, I think, is not a
25 major danger. They do not have much to spend anyhow.

1 MR. MARSHALL: If I could, briefly, to answer your
2 question, we did not circulate for the reason that at the
3 moment we were simply discussing a way that the Chairman
4 could respond. I do know, though, that the graduate deans
5 have, in fact, mulled this over a lot recently. The Council
6 of Graduate Deans has had this on their agenda twice in
7 national meetings and have had extensive reports about it.
8 I believe it is fair to say they are not of one mind about
9 this, particularly with respect to the humanities. It is a
10 little clearer to them in the sciences and social sciences.

11 So, the specific issue you raised has not been put
12 to them so far as I know, or at least I do not know their
13 response. But the question of additional graduate support is
14 very strongly on their mind, and Congressman Simon and others
15 have talked to them about it.

16 CHAIRMAN BENNETT: Walter.

17 MR. BERNES: I am opposed to this Graduate Fellowship
18 Program ---

19 CHAIRMAN BENNETT: Microphone, please.

20 MR. BERNES: Sorry. I say I am opposed to the
21 Graduate Fellowship Program on various grounds. It would,
22 of course, be a major effect on the Endowment, assuming, of
23 course, that these would be administered not as a regrant
24 program, and I do not suppose there is any sentiment in favor
25 of a regrant program.

1 As someone who labored year after year at Cornell
2 University trying to select 12 persons out of a mass of appli-
3 cations, and what an onerous job that was for the faculty, I
4 know the mass of paper, the volume of paper, that such a pro-
5 gram would engender. But that is not the principle. We can
6 handle paper. It is the difficulty of making that choice.
7 It is the difficulty of making the intelligent among so many
8 applicants for so few places.

9 And, then, Jack, it seems to me that your proposal
10 runs contrary to something that Bea mentioned as a principle,
11 and a principle that I agree with. Generally speaking, I
12 think we serve no good purpose by increasing the number of
13 Ph.D.'s when there are no jobs for which Ph.D.'s -- for which
14 the degree, Doctor of Philosophy, is really required. We
15 can, of course, project into the future the employment situa-
16 tion, and I do not have the latest figures, although I do
17 follow these things with some attention in the Chronicle.

18 Such a program, I think, unless it absolved univer-
19 sities of their responsibilities for providing graduate
20 fellowships, would lead to an increase in the number of Ph.D.'s
21 at a time when there appears to be no jobs that will employ
22 them. I came down with the following suggestion. If, indeed,
23 the Endowment is going to be pushed in this direction, it
24 seems to me that the best thing we could do would be to have
25 the Graduate Fellowship Program that allowed Ph.D.'s in

1 humanities, that is to say, those people who already have
2 earned a Ph.D. in one of the humanistic disciplines, to spend
3 one year or two years with full support from a fellowship
4 granted by this Endowment, spend one or two years in a school
5 of education in order to win a certification.

6 There are a large number of unemployed Ph.D.'s now,
7 and I would, in principle, prefer to have them teaching in
8 the secondary schools than selling shoes or than have some
9 of the people who are now teaching in the secondary schools
10 teach in the secondary schools. The problem is, as we have
11 sometimes encountered it within this Endowment, is the ques-
12 tion of the inadequacy of certification requirements of the
13 states and so forth and so on. If we are pushed in this
14 direction, it seems to me that we could do something by a
15 program like I suggested.

16 Incidentally, I think it would make selection of
17 the winning candidates easier if you have the full Ph.D.
18 record before them rather than simply an undergraduate record.
19 That is to say, I think it would be easier to make a choice
20 among applicants who already have a Ph.D. than among appli-
21 cants who have only a B.A. Now, we all know, all of us who
22 have been in universities and had the task of choosing 12 out
23 of 500, 600 applications, we all know what these applications
24 look like. To exaggerate a bit, they are all straight A
25 students. They are all described as geniuses by their

1 undergraduate instructors, and the only reason the graduate
2 record examination was ever used at Cornell was as a means
3 of checking some of the assessments made by these under-
4 graduate instructors. But it is foolish to rely on the
5 graduate record exam. Well, I have said my piece.

6 CHAIRMAN BENNETT: Thank you. George Kennedy.

7 MR. KENNEDY: I think there are two reasons why a
8 program might be desirable: one being the symbolic reason,
9 that is to say, NSF does offer graduate fellowships; we do
10 not, a commitment of the Federal government to the support
11 of advanced study in the humanities as a symbol.

12 A second argument in favor might be the possibility
13 of bringing into the humanities some very first-rate students
14 who would be otherwise be attracted by going to law school
15 or something like that in the present economic conditions.
16 That is the primary motivation behind the Mellon Graduate
17 Fellowship Program, which I have been involved with in the
18 past two years.

19 I am not sure, however, that either of those argu-
20 ments are good enough. The practical disadvantages, the
21 time and effort, and money that would have to go into the
22 administration of the program would seem to me to make it of
23 marginal advantage. I guess I am, all in all, unenthusiastic
24 about it. I am especially unenthusiastic, however, about
25 point number six, as supported by Jack. That seems to me to

1 be perhaps the worst of all the things that we could possibly
2 do, and if I were accustomed to the use of -- rhetoric, I
3 would describe it as elitist, invidious, and unrealistic.

4 CHAIRMAN BENNETT: Aren't you glad you came back,
5 Jack?

6 MR. KENNEDY: Even though the distribution of the
7 candidates could be very equitably worked out, and you might
8 well discover some first-rate people, as the Mellon Program
9 has repeatedly done, from unlikely sources, still it is going
10 send them to the largest -- it must send them -- these are
11 the best people -- to the largest and best universities. We
12 are, therefore, transferring into a small number of graduate
13 programs, the very ones that are best equipped to provide
14 money themselves from private sources.

15 Secondly, it seems to me that we put the student
16 in a somewhat difficult situation by offering full support
17 for five or six years. Teaching experience is an essential
18 part of graduate study and the earning of money from teaching
19 and some sense of the realistic nature of the profession. So,
20 I would be very much opposed to this kind of complete support.
21 It also sets these students apart from every other student,
22 or most other students, within the graduate programs. It
23 creates a kind of class structure within an individual depart-
24 ment. I oppose it on those grounds. Some of the other pro-
25 grams seem to me to be interesting such as number three.

1 CHAIRMAN BENNETT: Thank you. I have Louise, Rita,
2 Mary Beth, Ellis, Bea. Then we will stop. Okay?

3 MS. KERR: Perhaps because I am on the Education
4 Committee, I tend to be more interested in a program that
5 would help us get good humanities teachers in the elementary
6 and secondary schools. I am not sure which of these would
7 serve best. I guess the sandwich (?) one, which has built-in
8 and describes some of the many features.

9 I was wondering if it would be possible, how compli-
10 cated and difficult it would be, to devise a program which
11 would encourage, perhaps, colleges and high schools to report
12 together so that a college would be required to go out and
13 have networking, and the high schools could identify the
14 teachers that would most benefit. Those are people we know
15 are interested in teaching. That sounds very complicated, I
16 don't know.

17 I am intrigued by the second idea that Gertrude
18 Himmelfarb mentioned because I think it would be on the model
19 of the old professional programs, the old journalism and so
20 on. I think the quality of life perhaps in the country might
21 get better if people had the opportunity simply to retreat,
22 think, and then bring those thoughts back. But I think, if
23 we could work out something that would allow us to improve
24 the quality of teaching in elementary and secondary schools,
25 that would be best.

1 CHAIRMAN BENNETT: Stay in order. Rita.

2 MS. RICARDO-CAMPBELL: In general, I applaud the
3 two principles that were first set forth by Gertrude, but I
4 agree with Walter Berns in that I do not see what we need
5 the program at all. My feeling is it points up what I have
6 said from the very beginning, and the first time I was at
7 this Council meeting, is we need to look at the overall allo-
8 cation of the funds by programs and what we get out of them.
9 That is, the major programs should be looked out from a bene-
10 fit/cost point of view, and I do not think that has been done.

11 That, of course, agrees with Louise in a way because
12 she is saying, "I prefer it in elementary". My preference is
13 to see, and I applaud the initiative, of having high school
14 teachers that are educated, and the extension of the summer
15 stipends to them, I think, was very important. Therefore, I
16 think sometime, and I stress as I did at the other meetings,
17 we should look at the overall allocation of funds by program
18 and then see if we need any new programs. Thank you.

19 CHAIRMAN BENNETT: Mary Beth.

20 MS. NORTON: Just to show that the lines are not
21 always drawn in the same way on this Council, I am going to
22 align myself with Jack and declare myself an elitist. I
23 speak here, in fact, as someone who was, in fact, supported
24 by a five-year fellowship when I was a graduate student at
25 Harvard during a very short period of time when Harvard had

1 that system. I have to say it was of tremendous value to me
2 and did not, I think, George, create a class structure among
3 the graduate students because nobody knew who had what kind
4 of fellowship. It might be if the fellowships came from the
5 NEH, but I am not sure.

6 I would have two comments. The first is I do want
7 to align myself as well with Walter in saying I am very leary,
8 in the first place, about NEH getting into the business of
9 doing graduate fellowships. I would be, I think, reluctant
10 to do so. But if we do, since I was the beneficiary of such
11 a program when I was a graduate student and know how valuable
12 it was to me to know that each year I did not need to worry
13 where the next year's funding was coming from -- also, I
14 might add, George, that it does not necessarily mean that
15 "TAing" is out because as part of our fellowship program we
16 were expected to TA for two of those five years. But what I
17 was assured was, for example, the year's support that I needed
18 to go to England and to do my doctoral dissertation research
19 there and so forth.

20 It was an extremely beneficial situation from my
21 standpoint, and I would, therefore, align myself with Jack in
22 saying that this is the way in which I think we should go if
23 we are going to go, but I would be leary about going anywhere.

24 CHAIRMAN BENNETT: Thank you. Ellis and then Bea.

25 MR. SANDOZ: I am very confused because I always

1 like to take my cues from various spokesmen, but the usual
2 lines -- our coalitions have totally fractured. I hardly
3 know what to say about the merits of this particular proposal,
4 but it has set me to thinking about something we talked about
5 yesterday in our committee and, that is, this.

6 One simple approach, rather than launching this
7 major new initiative, might be simply to delete the require-
8 ment in some of the ongoing programs that we do support and
9 to say, you cannot do this for any course credit or to con-
10 tribute to any program of study. I would particularly think
11 that my colleagues on the Council from the General Programs
12 Division did agree that the very attractive new program for
13 Fellowships for Younger Scholars, which we are recommending
14 on the order of 80 of these to be awarded when we come to
15 that this afternoon -- each of them has a faculty sponsor,
16 each of whom will receive on the order of \$2,000, \$2,200, to
17 do a project in the humanities, except with the stipulation
18 that it not go to any course work, completion of any course
19 requirement or degree requirement and what have you, which
20 we being academics very profoundly suspect will be something
21 of a temptation to subterfuge, since all of these are juniors
22 or sophomores at colleges and universities around the country.

23 If we are willing to entertain something of this
24 order and this magnitude, why not strike then the stipulation,
25 at least in that program, which is an undergraduate program,

1 and perhaps in the others, where you have seminars for college
2 teachers, for example -- for high school teachers, secondary
3 teachers -- where it is something of a joy to be selected
4 and a wonder to be supported and to receive and to be put in
5 touch with some of the best minds in their fields and all of
6 this kind of thing. But what they do is not permitted to
7 count toward any sort of graduate credit or graduate degree.

8 Wouldn't it be a good half-way measure, if we
9 cannot decided on this, and there seems to be a good deal of
10 valid reservation on the part of other members of the Council
11 who have spoken, simply to delete that one sentence require-
12 ment from the Younger Scholars Program, if not from the others,
13 and see how that works?

14 CHAIRMAN BENNETT: Thank you, Ellis. Bea.

15 MS. HIMMELFARB: I am afraid I am at fault in having
16 foreshortened my report. Before those two negative princi-
17 ples that I did enunciate, there was a still more negative
18 conclusion that we had come to, and that is, that we were all
19 very dubious about the propriety of having any kind of
20 fellowship proposal at all. And we did not at all endorse,
21 in principle, the idea of having any Graduate Fellowship Pro-
22 gram.

23 What we addressed ourselves to was the question of
24 what kind of Fellowship Program should we entertain if such
25 a Fellowship Program were mandated by Congress. That was the

1 background of our discussion, and I apologize for not having
2 mentioned that before.

3 I was, myself, very much taken with Walter's sugges-
4 tion that the Ph.D., the existing Ph.D.'s, be perhaps sup-
5 ported for a year in order to get whatever certification is
6 necessary, hopefully, not at teachers college institutes, but
7 elsewhere, for teaching in secondary schools. We had not
8 considered that but that is entirely in line with the kinds
9 of suggestions that were made.

10 On Jack's point, I agree with George Kennedy that
11 that has probably all the faults that we were trying to avoid
12 in a graduate program. I think one of the important factors
13 that we took into account in coming to the conclusions we did
14 was George's experience, which I wish you would have elaborated
15 upon here, with your Mellon fellowships. That is, the fact
16 that when those Mellon fellowships are distributed to stu-
17 dents, they frequently choose, most frequently choose, to go
18 to those major universities which have, in fact, always
19 assumed the obligation of supporting their graduate students.
20 In which context, Mary Beth's point was so well taken, and it
21 is absolute confirmation of this. Harvard has always made
22 that assumption. Now, sometimes they do not do it in advance,
23 so to speak, but they do always undertake to support their
24 graduate students. For us to come along and provide those
25 funds seems to me to be a rather blatant misuse of public

1 money. Was there something else? Yes.

2 MR. CAREY: Can I ask for a point of information?

3 CHAIRMAN BENNETT: Yes.

4 MR. CAREY: What are the chances of Congress man-
5 dating this?

6 CHAIRMAN BENNETT: Don't know, George. There are
7 people interested in this. Let me just remark on that
8 briefly, and then, Charles, if you want -- do you want to
9 say a word now?

10 MR. RITCHESON: Mr. Chairman, I just wanted to say
11 that I hope that serious consideration be given Walter Berns'
12 suggestion, which Bea Himmelfarb has now endorsed too, as I
13 understand her remarks, the post-Ph.D. fellowship to save
14 some existing Ph.D.'s for the teaching profession. I think
15 that is very attractive, and I would urge that serious con-
16 sideration be given that.

17 CHAIRMAN BENNETT: George, let me comment on that
18 before I answer your question. I think it raised an inter-
19 esting question, but I want to tell you how I would think of
20 it. One of the things that is going on that is very inter-
21 esting, I think, for the humanities, as well as for education
22 generally in the country, is some pretty hot debate in a num-
23 ber of state legislatures about certification itself.

24 Governor Keene of New Jersey has proposed alterna-
25 tive -- in effect, alternative forms of certification. The

1 notion that if one can establish a good education, some
2 expertise in a particular subject matter, and good character,
3 that one be certified to teach, at least on a provisional
4 basis. That is, I think we are seeing a lot of signs of a
5 kind of fracture in the certification monopoly. I think we
6 would want to at least take that into account if we were to
7 go in this direction. That is, possibly argue with a lawyer's
8 brief, alternative pleading, that if certification remains
9 the same, then we might want to provide opportunities for
10 people to get certification as it now exists.

11 But I think -- my own view, and I should be clear
12 on it, is that we should have alternative forms, or ways, of
13 being certified. So that someone who has a Ph.D. would be
14 allowed to teach for a year or two. In Virginia, now, you
15 can be certified to teach with a B.A. in a humanistic disci-
16 pline on a provisional basis. I just want to make note of
17 that.

18 George, it is hard to say. There is interest on
19 the part of a number of people in the graduate school communi-
20 ty, I think it fair to say, in us sponsoring a fellowship
21 program. They are also making efforts, as far as I know, to
22 see if the Department of Education will pick up some of these.

23 I think one conversation is worth recording, and
24 that is, the fairly extensive conversation I had with Hannah
25 Gray, who invited me to make it as public as I wish. Hannah

1 Gray, as you know, is involved in as many of these things as
2 George Kennedy, I guess, or almost as many, more maybe -- on
3 the Mellon Board, I think was President or Chair of the AAU
4 Board, and of course, her work in Chicago. It was her feeling,
5 and I just report it, that whatever the disposition of the
6 Congress here, she urged us to interpret it, her advice, in
7 a way that would tend to serve, as she put it, a number of
8 the directions and initiatives that the Endowment is taking
9 vis-a-vis secondary school, the early years of college, the
10 kinds of things we have been doing in the education programs
11 and, most recently, in the fellowship programs.

12 I mention, too, just as a fact, I think it is a
13 fact. I take what what OPPS gives me as if it is a fact.
14 I think it is a rather stunning fact. I have made mention of
15 it in a number of speeches. If you look at the number of
16 Ph.D.'s in the humanities over the last 50 years, something
17 like 55 per cent of those Ph.D.'s were granted in the '70's,
18 in that 10-year period. People then talk about a dip, going
19 into the early '80's. Well, there was a dip, and I would say
20 there had to be a dip. You could not possibly, and would not
21 possibly, want to sustain that number of Ph.D.'s.

22 We now, however, see evidence -- it is anecdotal;
23 it is impressionistic -- that, at least in a number of insti-
24 tutions, it is going back up again. I just raise that. I
25 am inclined, based on this discussion, based on Hannah Gray's

1 advice, to think, if Congress mandated, and I do not know what
2 there will be, think along the best translation of such a
3 program into efforts that we are already making to enhance
4 their effectiveness -- specific suggestions from me and
5 others. It is a complicated matter. Okay. Can we end this?
6 Thank you, Bea.

7 ELIGIBILITY OF STATE HUMANITIES COUNCILS (TAB B)

8 MR. MARSHALL: If we could turn to the next item,
9 then, in the agenda book. It is another memorandum, I am
10 afraid, from me, in this case, on the question of the eligi-
11 bility of State Humanities Councils.

12 I will not add, I think, to what I have already
13 said here. We had a brief discussion of this at the last
14 meeting. I was asked to sketch out some other alternatives
15 and some pros and cons, and I have in this memo. So, the
16 question is now open. Louise.

17 MS. KERR: The state committees discussed this.

18 MR. MARSHALL: No, because we felt that because we
19 were exploring a matter of NEH policy, we should do that
20 first. We would not implement without talking to them, but
21 we were not going to survey at this moment to find out their
22 wishes. That was the logic.

23 MS. KERR: I said the state committee discussed this.

24 MR. MARSHALL: Oh, pardon me. I thought it was a
25 question.

1 MS. KERR: No. The state committee discussed this.
2 I just wanted to let you know this because you are interested.

3 MR. MARSHALL: Oh, I am indeed. I am indeed.

4 CHAIRMAN BENNETT: Louise reports the state
5 committee discussed it. You said no. It is not very polite.

6 MR. MARSHALL: No, it is not very polite. It is
7 wrong, too.

8 MS. KERR: I was going to -- a report, a brief
9 report. It was first felt that because it was sent back
10 we were not even sure if we were supposed to discuss it, but
11 three of the four members there affirmed, or supported, your
12 document. I do not know how relevant it is, but the three
13 members are all former members of state committees.

14 CHAIRMAN BENNETT: I am dispose this way very much.
15 Right now, let me just comment, I think that the kind of
16 momentum that we are seeing in the state committees is to be
17 encouraged, and I do not really want to change anything at
18 the moment. We had an excellent meeting -- I suppose I should
19 save this for latter -- we had an excellent meeting in Dallas
20 with the chairmen of the committees and a good Federation
21 meeting. Don reported Walter Knapp is doing a splendid job,
22 and I would like to keep things as they have been at least
23 for now.

24 MS. KERR: That was our sense. If something were to
25 open that we might want to wait and assess the changes that

1 have taken place in the last two years.

2 CHAIRMAN BENNETT: May I interrupt, or take over
3 Jeff's position on Tab E. We are running way behind. Depend-
4 ing on how Council feels ---

5 MS. NORTON: May I comment? May I take one minute
6 before we go on?

7 CHAIRMAN BENNETT: Yeah. Sure.

8 MS. NORTON: I do not want to -- I was the one
9 person -- there were three at the state committee meeting
10 yesterday. But it strikes me that I would hope -- at the
11 end of the discussion, ^{Don} Bob Gibson said what was just said
12 was what was desired, that is, to take some time to assess
13 what is happening now before we make any further changes.
14 I would hope that we would keep an open mind about this.

15 And, in particular, with respect to your memo, Jack,
16 I was struck by what I saw as a contradiction in your argu-
17 ment having to do with challenge grants, because it seems
18 to me that the challenge grant is a place where we might
19 think about allowing state councils to apply for something
20 resembling challenge grants.

21 You comment on page two that eligibility for addi-
22 tional grants from the Endowment might be seen to draw state
23 councils away from their current efforts to increase and
24 expand the base of non-Federal support. But what better way
25 to get them to increase and expand their base of non-Federal

1 support than to allow them to come in for a challenge grant.
2 Even if you are right that there are few state councils that
3 are currently at the stage where they could, there are very
4 few institutions in the country as a whole that are at a
5 stage where they can apply for challenge grants.

6 So, I would hope that we could think about, in
7 terms of limited experiments, in the future and not let past
8 procedures tie us down and stop us from thinking creatively
9 about what we can do with the state councils.

10 CHAIRMAN BENNETT: Fair enough. On the next matter,
11 unless you see anything -- let me ask -- unless you see any-
12 thing egregious or glaring or that you feel compelled to
13 comment on, we reserve discussion of it.

14 This has gone back and forth. Jeff Marshall has
15 been very patient with objections at keeping -- I think this
16 is the fourth or fifth draft. This is an attempt to respond
17 to a number of Council members' questions about the review
18 process. How does it work? What is the role of the Council
19 and so on? We think we have got a document now that accurate-
20 ly reflects our view of it, our -- by that I mean, the staff.

21 If there are any -- if there is a wish to discuss
22 at some further length at another meeting or anything that
23 you see glaring or egregious. Our intent is to try to get
24 this thing right and perhaps put it in as something for the
25 ages to guide future Council members and Chair.

1 MS. SILVERS: I would like to request that this be
2 discuss at another meeting. I am not too certain of the
3 details on -- panels but there are clearly matters of the
4 review process that frustrate Council members -- at breakfast
5 a while. I think some of us would like to explore how some
6 of those frustrations can be avoided.

7 CHAIRMAN BENNETT: Okay. Could I ask you to per-
8 haps not to preclude any other vehicle, but if you would take
9 some time on this document and if you wish to comment on it,
10 we would very much like to see it.

11 MS. SILVERS: -- that are not there.

12 CHAIRMAN BENNETT: I know.

13 MS. SILVERS: It has to do with things -- occasional-
14 ly we find sweeping generalizations in reports on the
15 studies -- which just are not ---

16 CHAIRMAN BENNETT: Okay.

17 MS. SILVERS: -- I know there are some other Council
18 members. It is that kind of thing. What does the Council
19 do about that?

20 CHAIRMAN BENNETT: Okay. All right. May not be
21 pertinent to the document. Let me just say in addition to
22 that, if you could look at it, because it is something that
23 we would like to have. I think it could serve as a good
24 introduction for new Council members, for example. Thank you.
25 Yes, Walter.

1 MR. BERNS: A short comment. I do hope that you are
2 considering raising the stipend for panelists, which I think
3 is much too low.

4 CHAIRMAN BENNETT: That we are considering raising
5 the stipend for panelists, which Walter thinks is much too
6 low. Wendall.

7 MR. WILLKIE: Well, at the moment, GSA proposed a
8 regulation which would preclude compensation of anyone who
9 serves on a Federal advisory committee.

10 (Laughter.)

11 MR. WILLKIE: It is a matter of public record. We
12 have filed our objections with that proposal, and the issue
13 has been deliberated in other councils. At the moment, we
14 are relatively optimistic that we will be able to maintain
15 our present policy; however, it would be a singularly inopportune
16 time for us to increase compensation.

17 (Laughter.)

18 CHAIRMAN BENNETT: That's good. We will miss that.
19 It would be a really bad idea right now, but it is a good
20 idea in general. Thank you, Walter.

21 Shall we move to committee reports or do you want
22 a break? Do you want to take the break now? Jeff has a
23 comment and then let's take a break, three minutes, and then
24 resume.

25 MR. WALLIN: Before we break, I think everyone is

1 aware that we are having the good fortune today to be sitting
2 in a room surrounded by a series of photographs of Robert
3 Frost. These belong to part of a much larger collection by
4 Peter Stanlis. Peter, would you want to say just a word or
5 two about that collection before we break, just a minute or
6 so.

7 MR. STANLIS: The collection of photos of Robert
8 Frost ---

9 VOICE: We cannot hear you -- louder.

10 MR. STANLIS: The collection of photos of Robert
11 Frost and other writers and some family members and friends
12 was really quite unplanned. It grew like Topsy over a period
13 of 23 years. They are arranged chronologically from the
14 beginning all the way around, and they cover the whole period
15 from when he was an infant through months before his death.

16 Of course, there are large gaps in the record,
17 but there are basically three units in the collection. The
18 first part consists of six summers at Bread Loaf School of
19 English and the Writers' Conference in the late 1930's and
20 early 1940's. And then a brief period of two years when he
21 visited his daughter, Leslie, at Brockford College when she
22 was a teacher there in the English Department. Then, the
23 photos beginning there to the end cover just a two-day period
24 when I had Frost come to the University of Detroit. We gave
25 him an honorary degree, and he read his poems before an

1 audience of about 10,000 people, the largest audience he ever
2 had.

3 The photos are, I think, very valuable as iconography
4 and kind of an adjunct to anyone who has an biographical
5 interest in Frost, and many of them do have a story behind
6 them. I would be very glad, after the Council meeting is
7 over, to speak with anyone who might have a special interest
8 in any aspect of this collection.

9 CHAIRMAN BENNETT: Thank you very much. Let's
10 break -- all right, let's take until 10 of. All right?
11 Thank you.

12 (Whereupon, at 10:48 a.m., a brief recess was
13 taken.)

14 CHAIRMAN BENNETT: All right. Fellowship Programs
15 -- Bea. Thank you. Education Programs, Mr. Dille. We are
16 catching up to the schedule. State Programs. Dr. Ekman.
17 Mr. Neusner, come back. We are not done with you yet. All
18 right, Fellowship Programs, Gertrude.

19 FELLOWSHIP PROGRAMS

20 MS. HIMMELFARB: First of all, as a new member of
21 this committee, I want to take this opportunity to commend
22 the staff for the admirable patience and indulgence they
23 showed towards us. It turned out to be a very long and most
24 constructive session. It went on past five o'clock.

25 The staff had originally received something in the

1 neighborhood of 1,700 applications, which they had winnowed
2 down to 230 odd. Of those, they had alerted the committee
3 to 15 or so which they wanted us to pay special attention to,
4 which seemed problematic to them. The committee came up
5 with another 30 that they wanted to look at more closely.
6 And, in every instance, I must say, the staff member in charge
7 of that particular application was right on top of it, was
8 totally conversant with that whole application, knew exactly
9 what the panel had said and what the staff recommendations
10 had been and what the grounds for everything were. And it
11 was really quite, as I say, a very heartening experience for
12 us.

13 Particularly, may I say, we were talking yesterday
14 about only summer stipends, which amount to \$3,000 apiece,
15 and the effort and the care that was lavished on those \$3,000
16 was quite the equivalent that might have been expended upon
17 some more ambitious proposals. So, it was altogether a very
18 warming experience.

19 We first discussed the reorganization of the Divi-
20 sion. The Division is now organized in two basic units:
21 the RE ^{regrants} grants programs, which consist of seminars and center
22 programs, and direct grants, which are fellowships and stipends.
23 Now, having no knowledge whatsoever of what the previous
24 organization was like, I cannot comment on the nature of the
25 changes, but the present system seems to me to be eminently

1 reasonable.

2 We discussed the divisional calendar and planning,
3 what was to be done at each of the meetings of the Council.
4 The May meeting, which is the next meeting coming up, is
5 going to -- has no applications apparently or stipend programs
6 or anything of that sort to consider but will take the occa-
7 sion to review, in general, the goals of the programs, the
8 issues, the criteria, the eligibility qualifications, and so
9 on. We will be able to take a long, close look at all the
10 programs.

11 In connection with summer stipends, we indicated
12 some areas that we would want to explore in greater detail,
13 and we asked the committee to think about those, possibly
14 write a memo or something about some of them, and in any
15 case, I would be premature to discuss them now. But we will
16 be doing that in May and, therefore, reporting on that to
17 you then.

18 We were asked to discuss procedures for absent mem-
19 bers. Now, again, I do not know whether this is relevant
20 to all the committee's work. It apparently had come up as a
21 problem, and the committee did say that the procedure, in
22 general, for a member who could not attend the Thursday
23 committee meeting but was planning to come to the Friday
24 Council meeting, or perhaps could not attend either of these,
25 that, in general, committee members should be in touch in

1 writing, or by phone, either with the committee chairman or
2 with the Division head and simply inform that person of what-
3 ever, you know, problems or policies or whatever seemed he
4 wanted to call attention to. This would apply either, as I
5 said, to general policy issues or to specific applications.
6 His concerns would then be communicated to the committee in
7 general and would be discussed in the committee meeting. I
8 assume that the purpose of that is to preclude an unnecessari-
9 ly -- unnecessary repetition at the Council meeting later.

10 The question was raised of the grounds on which we
11 should commit the postponement of fellowships or stipends.
12 The committee reviewed the criteria and came up with the
13 following conditions under which postponement would be con-
14 sidered, would be committed. If the fellow is moving to a new
15 institution and that institution wants him to take a leave
16 of absence for a year -- wants him to teach for a year --
17 before assuming his fellowship or stipend. If the fellow has
18 a unique opportunity which cannot be postponed for a year,
19 such as work on an exhibition or something of that sort. If
20 the fellow's leave would cause a hardship for his college or
21 department because of circumstances that would unforeseen at
22 the time of his application or if the fellow has some per-
23 sonal reasons of a medical nature, ill health, maternity or
24 whatever, which would make such a leave desirable.

25 We discussed graduate fellowships, but the gist of

1 that has been well communicated here already. Then, we went
2 on to discuss a possible possible pilot program for -- no,
3 more than possible -- I think we actually emerged with a
4 recommendation on this -- program for undergraduate fellows.
5 The program that we came up with would be something of this
6 sort. It would be a summer fellowship for undergraduates,
7 what are apparently called I just discovered yesterday, the
8 rising seniors, which means the summer year between the junior
9 and the senior year.

10 These undergraduates, and not necessarily, by the
11 way, those majoring in the humanities, would attend a summer
12 seminar at some major institution, directed by presumably an
13 eminent teacher or scholar at that institution. As a pilot
14 program, we proposed offering perhaps 10 such seminars start-
15 ing in the summer of 1985. Since this gives us a very, very
16 close timetable to work with, it was decided that the staff
17 would try to draw up specific recommendations, criteria,
18 guidelines, and so on for such a program and would communicate
19 them by mail to committee members, who would, in turn, comment
20 on that. I think that last was the largest substantive issue
21 that the committee dealt with.

22 MS. RHOME: Question.

23 CHAIRMAN BENNETT: Yes.

24 MS. RHOME: How many students would you anticipate
25 could possibly take part in this particular seminar. I do

1 not know whether budget considerations would come into it.

2 MS. HIMMELFARB: Well, we had not actually worked
3 such details. I am told now that it might be as many as 100
4 or 150 for each seminar.

5 VOICE: Just the total.

6 MS. HIMMELFARB: For the total. I was worried
7 about that. Perhaps the total could amount to a total of
8 150 or so students. The staff does have more experience than
9 we did at that time with running such seminars of another
10 nature. But those details, we thought, would be better left
11 to the staff who could work them out. Then, we would review
12 them.

13 CHAIRMAN BENNETT: May I say just a moment about
14 the genesis of this because I asked Tom and Ron and other
15 members of the staff to work on it and then present it to
16 the committee.

17 When I was at the National Humanities Center, we
18 hoped to open doors of the place in the summertime for stu-
19 dents at some of the lesser known and less distinguished
20 institutions in the South to come to the center to study the
21 humanities. When we went to several foundations to seek
22 funds for this, we were told that if such students were iden-
23 tified at these institutions who were getting good grades
24 and had intellectual interest funds would be provided if we
25 would engage them in a pre-professional program for law school

1 or medical school but not the humanities because this was
2 somehow not going to be the right thing to do to get them
3 into the mainstream or whatever locution was used.

4 I guess this is a resurrection of this idea again,
5 and based in part on the success, I think, tremendous success,
6 of our summer seminar program to give students who have indi-
7 cated an interest in the humanities, but not necessarily
8 majors in humanities, an opportunity so that we can assure
9 them that no matter what else happens during their under-
10 graduate career we will guarantee them one really profound,
11 really excellent educational experience in the humanities
12 at an institution that is different from the institution
13 that they attend at present.

14 We think, in part, we by no means want to stampede
15 more people into graduate school in the humanities by virtue
16 of this. The thing should stand on its own feet, but the
17 idea here is that if some number, small, five, ten of these
18 people, decide they do want to go into graduate school, this
19 opportunity may give them the chance to get to know and to
20 meet people who would then be in a position to recommend them.

21 We found, in talking to the people at the Mellon
22 Foundation about their program, their graduate fellow program,
23 that although they are pleased with it they find that the
24 schools from which the students are recommended are the usual
25 schools, the major state universities, the Ivy League schools,

1 the Williams, Amherst, and so on. This is an attempt to try
2 to give students from other kinds of institutions this oppor-
3 tunity, not solely, or not even principally, for the purpose
4 of encouraging people to graduate school, but to give them,
5 if you will, the best that we can find for them in the period
6 of a summer.

7 MS. HIMMELFARB: I should have emphasized that.
8 Perhaps I did not make that at all clear. This is primarily
9 intended for students at the kinds of institutions where
10 such programs would not be available to them, where any kind
11 of serious work in the humanities or liberal arts was quite
12 negligible. So, it is for that kind of student in that kind
13 of institution that this is primarily intended.

14 CHAIRMAN BENNETT: Jack.

15 MS. NEUSNER: Can we so design and announce the
16 program that that particular category of applicants would
17 have an advantage in this competition or even be the only
18 ones in the competition?

19 CHAIRMAN BENNETT: We want to do that. Finding the
20 way to do that is going to be difficult. Certainly, we think
21 of the HBCU's, which I think you have already done some very
22 good work. I do not think we want to limit it to HBCU's.

23 MR. NEUSNER: But you could, for example, say that
24 you may apply only if your college library has under 400,000
25 volumes.

1 CHAIRMAN BENNETT: We do not want to encourage book
2 burning. We will talk to the Department of Education.
3 Apparently, there are all sorts of ways to describe -- the
4 locution in Title III institutions. With our target in mind,
5 we will try to find the most solicitous way of ---

6 MS. NEUSNER: Which we did, by the way, with the
7 Fellowship Program other than the senior research grants
8 when we designed that.

9 CHAIRMAN BENNETT: Yes. Anita.

10 MS. SILVERS: I think it sounds like a very exciting
11 program, and I suspect that the kind of students who come
12 from my institution are the type of student being targeted,
13 but I think I would have an awfully hard time convincing my
14 colleagues, who spend a great deal of their time with work
15 overloads, supervising -- students -- taking in -- readily
16 available for them -- to nominate students if the condition
17 was they had to make the students -- education in the humani-
18 ties -- so, perhaps, we could ---

19 MR. MARSHALL: If I could, because again I was
20 present during that discussion, it is specifically this issue
21 which the committee felt, and staff feel, requires the most
22 precise clarification because the intention here is really
23 to give guidance to the director of the seminars. What kind
24 of persons, among the applicants, are most qualified and best
25 suited for this?

1 The agreement was, Tom, am I not right, that the
2 definition, particularly this aspect of it, will be circulated
3 to the committee and so on so that we can get a good sharp
4 focus on exactly this question.

5 MS. SILVERS: So many of our students have full-
6 time jobs that they must keep for an entire year that we
7 cannot -- it is impossible -- they cannot take -- because
8 they cannot shift out---

9 MS. HIMMELFARB: I do not know what to do with a
10 student who has a full year job and simply cannot leave for
11 the summer, but we took very much into account the problem of
12 students who normally have to work in the summer in order to
13 get enough money together to support them during the course
14 of the following year. For that purpose, we would have
15 stipends that would be sufficiently remunerative so that
16 they could take that summer off and not fall behind in their
17 commitments.

18 CHAIRMAN BENNETT: Yes, Louise.

19 MS. KERR: Without opening too big a bottomless pit,
20 it occurs to me that this is such a terrific idea that you
21 might address the problem of the pre-professional student
22 on a even lower level -- for example -- which takes the merit
23 scholars and encourages them to go into liberal arts educa-
24 tion in college and avoid what we have at our school, which
25 is one-third pre-med.

1 CHAIRMAN BENNETT: Bea Himmelfarb raised this
2 yesterday. She said, "Should I raise it?" I said, "Don't,
3 it will be a bottomless pit." You are both right.

4 MS. KERR: (Inaudible.)

5 CHAIRMAN BENNETT: Can we think about that next?

6 MS. HIMMELFARB: May is the time to discuss all of
7 this.

8 CHAIRMAN BENNETT: We would like to get moving on
9 this though. It will be on an experimental basis. We would
10 like to see what works out. Who comes in. We would like to
11 proceed with this on an experimental basis. Okay. Thank
12 you. Bea, are you finished with your report? Thank you very
13 much. Education Programs, Mr. Dille.

14 MR. DILLE: I defer to Louise Kerr.

15 STATE PROGRAMS

16 MS. KERR: I would like to do the State Committee
17 because that was the longer agenda. Let me first say that
18 the committee had the good news and the bad news. The good
19 news was that we will have a new Acting Director. Those of
20 you who do not know Carol Watson, would you please stand. She
21 will be, after next week, the Acting Director of State Pro-
22 grams.

23 The bad news, for us; the good news for General
24 Programs is that Don Gibson will not be with us at our next
25 meeting. After I finish my report, perhaps you can say

1 something at that point.

2 In addition to having discussed the matters that we
3 have already talked about, the eligibility of State Humani-
4 ties Councils, we too addressed the matter of Council members
5 who are not able to be here on Thursday. We divided the
6 issue and said that some of us know long in advance that we
7 will not be here, and those items of information should be
8 communicated in writing, or by phone.

9 There are, however -- the reason I am reporting
10 to you is that Jeff Hart was not able to be here at the last
11 minute and that might be something unpredictable. We wanted
12 to be able to allow for that. We do not want to be too
13 restrictive on the fellows. So, we felt that if there was
14 someone who comes in on Thursday night or Friday to talk to
15 the committee chairman and discuss those items of information
16 just prior to the meeting and have that communicated through
17 the Chair, or those concerns -- find out what the committee
18 results were and so on. That would be helpful. We do want
19 to take into account, however, emergencies such as Jeff Hart
20 experienced.

21 We received a report on the meeting, the first, as
22 I understand it, first meeting of State Council Chairs in
23 Dallas, and the report we received was perhaps even more
24 positive than you alluded to earlier. These are the Chairs
25 of all State Committees who were brought together with the

1 entire State Division staff and, as I understand it, the
2 Chairman and the Assistant Chairman. The report we had was
3 that it was a very good meeting, very productive. You may
4 want to elucidate on that.

5 We also received copies, large copies, of the
6 Procedures Manual and NEH Guidebook for the entire committee,
7 and if any of you want to have them, I am sure we can provide
8 them for you as well.

9 We received a report on the publication plan, which
10 I cannot seem to find right now. The State Division is
11 putting together an orientation handbook, a flier, and brochure
12 describing the program to be distributed to any constituent
13 of the entire Endowment that might want to apply to state
14 programs, as well as, or in lieu of, Endowment Divisions.
15 The handbook for state programs, state committees on museum
16 programs, specifically, to enable them to know what they might
17 do and how they might do it well.

18 We were also given a brief update, a brief account,
19 if you will, of the General Accounting Office audit of the
20 state programs, which was requested, I think, in August. And
21 it is my understanding that the Division's records are in
22 such fine shape that the audit will take far less time than
23 was expected, and it is anticipated that most of the questions,
24 or if not all the questions, will be answered.

25 CHAIRMAN BENNETT: Thank you.

1 MR. GIBSON: This is unscheduled. I want to state
2 that it has been a distinct honor and pleasure to work in the
3 Division of State Programs for seven years. It has been one
4 of the high points of my life. I am leaving a highly dedi-
5 cated and professional staff, which I will miss greatly, but
6 I would also like to conclude by saying my eagerness for coop-
7 eration between General Programs and State Programs remains
8 undiminished. In fact, it has increased. We will continue
9 to cooperate.

10 MS. KERR: I have enjoyed greatly working with
11 Don. I expect we will continue to do so.

12 CHAIRMAN BENNETT: Thank you very much. May I just
13 make an announcement. Obviously, we are catching up some,
14 but we are about an hour behind schedule. I simply alert
15 Council members to that fact in case anybody wants to change
16 reservations or do whatever you think appropriate. Let me
17 again remind staff, if you do come back after lunch, please
18 stay. Don't dribble out. Sometimes it feels as the after-
19 noon drags and the staff members leaving that there are few
20 of us in the crew left on the ship. The rest are bailing out.
21 So, if staff does come back, please plan to stay. Yes.

22 MS. RICARDO-CAMPBELL: Is there any way of finding
23 out if anybody else is going to Dulles to catch a West Coast
24 plane, the 5:30 plane, that is going to leave about 4:00?

25 CHAIRMAN BENNETT: Charles and Rita can get together

1 and Roland can make up his mind. Let's move to General Pro-
2 grams, Mr. Ritcheson.

3 GENERAL PROGRAMS

4 MR. RITCHESON: Mr. Chairman, I begin by saying that
5 I have never missed Harriet Zimmerman quite so much. I send
6 that message to her as I stumbled through my first session as
7 Chair of this interesting committee yesterday. We had a very
8 lively committee meeting, discussed a great deal of material.

9 Before I come to that, let me say that we were
10 considering a censure motion against you for depriving us
11 of Jeffrey Wallin, taking him away from our committee. We
12 have enjoyed so much having Jeffrey with us and working with
13 him. I can only assume that he will do for you the superb
14 work he has done for us as well.

15 Jeffrey opened our proceedings by welcoming Ellis
16 Sandoz, who is a new member of our committee. He then
17 described the recent work of the Division, emphasizing not
18 only the workload involved in bringing in two cycles per
19 program per year but also certain specific points. Let me
20 address myself to those. First, Museums and Historical
21 Organization. Our new guidelines have just come off the
22 press. I hold in my hand a copy. Those of you wishing a
23 copy will find them in the foyer of this room. So, help
24 yourself on your way out.

25 The next regular deadline, originally scheduled for

1 April 30, has been moved to May 30 to allow applicants extra
2 time to acquaint themselves with these new guidelines. I
3 issue a reminder too that we have a special deadline on March
4 1, for which we expect a large number of applications based
5 on the volume of preliminary inquiries.

6 I turn now to Media. This session concludes the
7 first two cycles. We have received approximately 200 applica-
8 tions for the second cycle for which we are now constituting
9 panels. These applications will go to the August Council.

10 Thirdly, Special Projects. We had to announce a
11 name change. Program Development is now called Humanities
12 Programs for Adults, and Youth Programs is now called Humani-
13 ties Programs for Youth. This includes Youth Projects and
14 Younger Scholars.

15 The committee wishes to remind the Council that the
16 present session is the first Council to which applications
17 for the new Younger Scholars Program have come, and we will
18 be reporting on this more fully in the afternoon session.
19 Our committee, too, addressed the question of procedures our
20 committee would like to follow in those instances where mem-
21 bers, or a member, will be absent on Thursday or Thursday
22 and Friday of the Council, or simply wants information about
23 applications submitted to another Division.

24 In general, the committee wishes that procedures
25 remain as flexible as possible to allow Council members to

1 raise any questions and make whatever contributions he or she
2 can under the circumstances. More specifically, in the case
3 of absence for the Thursday discussion, or for the entire
4 Council meeting, we hope that Council members would submit
5 their questions to the Division Director, who would circulate
6 them to other members so that these questions could be avail-
7 able for the discussion on Thursday. The absent member should
8 not have a vote since he or she was not present for the dis-
9 cussion.

10 Secondly, in the case of the Council member wanting
11 information about a project in another Division, the committee
12 thought that such questions could be submitted either to the
13 Director of the Division or to the Chairman's office, and we
14 thought it might be appropriate for the Chairman's office,
15 perhaps the new Assistant to the Chairman, to serve as a
16 clearinghouse on these matters.

17 Finally, during the rest of the open session, the
18 committee touched on a variety of issues relating to the
19 Division's work; notably, we reaffirmed the current goals of
20 the Division of General Programs and its special emphasis in
21 media on encouraging proposals to translate into television
22 and radio literary masterpieces and projects dealing with
23 significant historical events or figures.

24 We expressed our pleasure that the current guide-
25 lines for media that govern proposals to be acted upon at the

1 August meeting of the National Council contained specific
2 language about this particular emphasis. We recognize that
3 this group of proposals, which we had before us at this meet-
4 ing, were submitted against guidelines that did not contain
5 language about this special emphasis, but even so, we were
6 gratified to see that several recommended projects in the
7 cycle do fulfill the intent of this emphasis.

8 In addition, we discussed distinctions between what
9 NEH and NEA should support in regard to the arts. NEA essen-
10 tially funds performance or creation of art. NEH will fund
11 scholars and projects dealing with history of the arts, criti-
12 cal analysis of the arts, and so on. Finally, we, as a
13 committee, expressed our thanks and congratulations to the
14 staff for the really splendid work they had done in compiling
15 their recommendations and the information provided for our
16 guidance.

17 MR. WALLIN: Just a word. I know the Council has
18 heard a great deal of praise about the staff and may not wish
19 to hear one more, but I would like to say one thing as I
20 leave the Division of General Programs.

21 I think it is particularly appropriate for me in
22 that as I told the staff some time ago I was a teacher of
23 political science before I came here, and one of the things
24 I used to speak about on occasion was the bureaucracy in
25 Washington. Frankly, I did not have very kind words for it.

1 I accepted the -- wisdom that people did not work all that
2 hard and they were overpaid and all that sort of thing.
3 Having been with the Division of General Programs for a year,
4 nothing could be further from the truth.

5 VOICE: You are underpaid.

6 MR. WALLIN: Not only underpaid. I simply was
7 astounded by the dedication, the hard work, the intelligence
8 brought to the job of the Endowment. That shock struck me
9 within a week or so of being with the Division, and I still
10 have it in fact. We could never get to you four times a year
11 without the work they put in. My only regret in going to my
12 new duties is that I will not be in close contact with the
13 staff of the Division, although I certainly hope that I will
14 be able to keep up some contact.

15 CHAIRMAN BENNETT: Let's hope you find the same
16 virtues, though.

17 MR. COHN: Will you be able to communicate to those
18 former students your new view of bureaucracy?

19 CHAIRMAN BENNETT: Yes, Rita.

20 MS. RICARDO-CAMPBELL: I am afraid this is not
21 going to be of the same humor -- but it is a comment that I
22 would like to speak to in Charles' report, that is, in
23 respect to members who are absent on Thursday in any committee.
24 May of us, or at least some of us, and I for one know my
25 calendar well ahead by a year or two, and I have been

1 consistently absent on the third Thursday of the month because
2 it has a conflict. However, I have made great effort to read
3 some of this pile of paper and have contacted, again, a very
4 capable staff member, in the spirit of what has already been
5 said, Howard Cannon, who is the staff person in charge of the
6 Division, and have my input to which he responds on the Fri-
7 day, but of course, I do not have the input of the actual
8 meeting itself very well.

9 I think it would be too bad to put any more impedi-
10 ments in front of people that have prior commitments to their
11 NEH membership -- there is enough incentive already not to
12 read all that paper -- by saying that they cannot vote on cer-
13 tain things. Thank you.

14 MR. RITCHESON: May I respond to that?

15 CHAIRMAN BENNETT: Sure.

16 MR. RITCHESON: I think the point is very well
17 made, Rita. I do not think that as a committee we feel abso-
18 lutely, unalterably attached to the recommendation. It was
19 a general sense among the committee that discussion does take
20 place, views are sharpened at the very least, new insights
21 are gained, the possibility of persuasion exists, and we
22 thought, therefore, that attendance at the session could not
23 really be replaced by thoughtful reading at a distance. I
24 think I can speak for the committee. We are perfectly willing
25 to accept without demur the ruling, or the feeling, of Council.

1 CHAIRMAN BENNETT: Anita.

2 MS. SILVERS: I think, as I said yesterday in the
3 State Education Committee, this is a very complicated matter
4 becuse each of us has different expertise. Now -- Friday --
5 expertise -- in Rita's case, I know that she has assiduously
6 read the materials. Sometimes -- has communicated with --
7 I am often in a position of trying to convey to her what
8 happened and it is outside my field of expertise. Not being
9 able to do that adequately -- in that case, I think she has
10 the right, as do all of us, to try to pursue the matter.

11 CHAIRMAN BENNETT: Jack.

12 MR. NEUSNER: I want to second Anita's comments
13 on this and associate myself with Rita's comments as well.
14 We cannot, and should not, consider abridging the right of
15 any Council member to vote on any issue. If that is the
16 policy or recommendation of your committee, I think there are
17 a number of people here who would argue against it.

18 CHAIRMAN BENNETT: George.

19 MR. KENNEDY: I agree with that in principle. In
20 practice, about the only resolution that I can think of is
21 trying to schedule a meeting with the Division Director, or
22 the Chairman of the committee, on the Friday morning for
23 people who have not been able to be there on Thursday. Now,
24 this has been done in an informal way. If the problem is a
25 more general one, or continues to be a more general one,

1 perhaps some specific provision, say, 8:45 on the morning of
2 the Council meeting, would be helpful.

3 MR. NEUSNER: It is done regularly and personally
4 also for Rita.

5 MR. KENNEDY: Our next meeting is, in fact, on a
6 Monday and Tuesday, which it will be interesting to see how
7 this affects attendance. The great disadvantage of that is
8 going to be the opportunity that Council members now have to
9 come on Wednesday afternoons and read the files. I assume
10 we are not going to be open on the Sunday.

11 CHAIRMAN BENNETT: Well, as a matter of fact, there
12 are plans to request of the National Endowment for the Arts --
13 there is a request to bring both Councils together on Sunday,
14 along with the President's Committee on Arts and Humanities,
15 and 6,000 UCLA students -- no -- for a joint meeting on
16 heavens knows what -- on arts and culture and the humanities.
17 But I think we will probably have to be open, at least part
18 of us, will be open on Sunday.

19 MR. RITCHESON: Mr. Chairman, I want to make it very
20 clear that the committee remarks were directed to those within
21 the committee, not to folks in the Council meeting. I also
22 feel, as this discussion has developed, there is perhaps a
23 very significant point we may be in danger of missing, and
24 that is, the very real value of a face-to-face meeting. I
25 think that I would be very unwilling to see any minimizing of

1 that interchange, that personal interchange. Now, it is per-
2 fectly possible for you to read the materials sent you and to
3 make a decision, which you can then write up in the form of
4 a written vote and send it to us. But I think you impoverish
5 the process, this exchange, this face-to-face exchange, which
6 is a very important ingredient in what we have to do here.
7 So, I think we must not lose sight of that.

8 CHAIRMAN BENNETT: Yes, Bea.

9 MS. HIMMELFARB: It is not only a matter of face-to-
10 face interchange. It is also a question of eliciting informa-
11 tion that simply is not available in these very brief state-
12 ments that are given.

13 CHAIRMAN BENNETT: That's right.

14 MS. HIMMELFARB: I just offer in evidence my experi-
15 ence yesterday when that information was invaluable in coming
16 to a decision.

17 CHAIRMAN BENNETT: Yes, Ellis.

18 MR. SANDOZ: I think that I would summarize what
19 Charles is saying as essentially no proxy voting. In other
20 words, if you are there for the committee meeting, you vote.
21 If you are not there, you do not vote. If you are here for
22 this meeting, you vote. If you are not, you do not vote.
23 Of course, the basis of that kind of procedure is not only
24 the procedural niceties of it but also the substantive points
25 which are -- I came into the meeting dead set against half a

1 dozen projects and was whittled away by information, persua-
2 sion, and the kinds of considerations which had not come to
3 me in my reading of the proposals. It seems to me that this
4 deliberative aspect of our activity is rather vital.

5 I think it was rather narrow grounds. Consideration
6 of opinions of those who are absent from our midst are given
7 great weight. We had one of our committee that was absent,
8 and I think he probably contributed as much to our delibera-
9 tions as if -- now, I should not say that about Leon -- he
10 would have been much more forceful had he been there. But
11 his thoughts were certainly taken into account, but we did
12 not count his votes. I think that is the narrow point of this.

13 CHAIRMAN BENNETT: The last word.

14 MS. RICARDO-CAMPBELL: I may have misunderstood.
15 I do not mind not voting on Thursday as long as I can raise
16 an issue that I am not satisfied after I talked with Mr.
17 Cannon and do intend to raise in a general policy sense from
18 the huge group of applications that I receive. I want to
19 reserve that right.

20 CHAIRMAN BENNETT: Sure. I do not think we could --
21 we simply could not live with a gag rule that said you cannot
22 or should not raise. It is the interest of efficiency, of
23 face-to-face exchange, and contributions in the committee
24 discussions that we seek. It is rather something that we
25 seek than something we are trying to prohibit. Right, Charles?

1 Are there any other comments on Mr. Ritcheson's report? Let's
2 move on to Challenge Grants, a brief report, I think. Mr.
3 Dille.

4 CHALLENGE GRANTS

5 MR. DILLE: I do not know if it pays to say anything
6 more than we thought that no one should be silenced, though
7 maybe people should be restrained. At a Friday meeting, one
8 ought not to ask questions, the answers to which could be
9 got earlier in the day. One ought not to be tedious. One
10 ought to be governed on every occasion by a sense of decorum
11 and that gag rules just are not very useful. That is where
12 we came out. That is the only thing -- to discuss.

13 CHAIRMAN BENNETT: They have recommended not a
14 chill, but a soft wafting breeze. Research Programs, Mr. Berns.

15 RESEARCH PROGRAMS

16 MR. BERNS: I should say at the outset that not
17 only am I new to the chairmanship of the Research Division,
18 but I am new to the Division itself. And on the basis of
19 some of the experiences, I have some initial impressions, but
20 however initial they are, they are very strong impressions
21 that I will briefly convey to you.

22 In the first place, I think it is impossible to go
23 through the programs that are funded by the Research Division
24 without understanding, coming to understand, the importance
25 to the humanities as whole of the work done, programs funded

1 by this Division. Secondly, the matter of the staff. Harold
2 and Majorie and their associates prepared a splendid agenda
3 for us, did all our work for us. Everything worked very
4 smoothly indeed. Well, there was one exception. We agreed
5 to not break for lunch but to have a working lunch, and we
6 sent down for sandwiches and the delicatessen downstairs,
7 wherever it was, was commanded to produce the sandwiches at
8 12:30 and they did not obey.

9 I suddenly remember something that contrasted with
10 this markedly. Many years ago, many years ago, I was serving
11 in the American Navy, sometimes under Admiral Halsey, on a
12 ship which was assigned to his fleet. It was his habit when
13 sailing east and west and so forth to send out to the ships
14 making up the fleet the somewhat cryptic command, "Make the
15 sun rise at seven o'clock". And the sun always rose at
16 seven o'clock. Now, it rose at seven o'clock because that
17 was his way of saying when the sun rises, it is seven o'clock.
18 Adjust your clocks accordingly. Well, Harold does not have
19 that sort of authority over the delicatessen.

20 We discussed, as all the other committees dis-
21 cussed, this one matter, but we discussed it as part of the
22 program and policy studies, and Frances Rhome will report on
23 that.

24 We did not do much business that is of general
25 interest to the Council and staff here. I will very briefly

1 report that we had a splendid memorandum from Majorie Berlin-
2 court concerning the way we handle, or should handle in the
3 future, some renewal applications. After consideration, it
4 was determined that the policy she suggested in that memoran-
5 dum be adopted. What it amounts to is that the applicants
6 for renewal of a grant not be required to provide all the
7 initial information and the information that would go to
8 specialized reviewers, outside reviewers. In the first place,
9 the outside reviewers are likely to report back saying we
10 thought this was a splendid program when we reviewed it 18
11 months ago. Why are you wasting our time with this again.

12 The second advantage of this, of course, is that
13 it allows the applicants to avoid a great deal of work. As
14 a matter of fact, of course, the new panel, and in almost
15 every case, it will be a new panel, will have the assessments
16 made by the reviewers in the first place. That policy, as I
17 say, was adopted.

18 The only other thing to be discussed during this
19 public part of our session were some comments made by Jack
20 Neusner, who uncharacterically had some questions to ask
21 having to do with translations. We discussed this at length,
22 satisfactory length, and to everyone's satisfaction.

23 CHAIRMAN BENNETT: Thank you. Questions? Comments?
24 Program and Policy Studies, Frances Rhome.

25

PROGRAM AND POLICY STUDIES

MS. RHOME: Yes. Thank you. We had an excellent report from the staff members who introduced not only the subject to us but some of the reports that they had going for us. For those of you who are not sure what we do in our committee, and that included some of the new persons aboard, our principal mission is to conduct or support research analysis and dissemination about the humanities rather than the work in the humanities.

In this regard, the staff members that were introduced to us by Arnem Tashdianian also included internist Andrea Ciliotta. I do not know if she is here, present, at the moment. She is going to be observing for some six weeks regarding the reports that are being made.

There are several current activities in a variety of regions that were presented to us. Internal reports and studies for management of the agency, such as a means for updating administration processes and also updating an introduction to NEH booklet for new members' use, as well as analysis of existing data on the humanities.

Currently, and this pleased us very much, there is designing of a joint survey on general education of humanities faculty in the four major fields. The reason this is important is because it is a joint survey with the American Council on Education and NEH, the two together, which will

1 provide information on the state of core requirements in the
2 humanities, that is, the current state of core curriculum as
3 it affects humanities. It should be completed in April and,
4 hopefully, will be available to the Council by the May meeting.
5 This is a very important survey that I think will be meaning-
6 ful to all of us.

7 And also nearing completion is an updated survey of
8 humanities faculty and the employment situation of the
9 humanists covering some four years; also a student quality
10 survey for a representative sample to provide the number of
11 top talented students selecting studies in the humanities.
12 And I think from the conversation and proposals that have been
13 made today it is quite apt that such studies will be helpful,
14 particularly when we start some student seminars.

15 But, of major importance, was the completed study
16 that was described to us by Arnita Jones. And this is the
17 status of women in the humanities. This is a large and
18 lengthy and profound report that came about in response to
19 inquiries in the field and numerous proposals on the subject.
20 In order to resolve the situation, a team of researchers
21 helped shape the actual proposal so that it covered all
22 facets that had been earlier proposed.

23 They demonstrated enormous interest in the field
24 from Wellesley College and the Educational Testing Service,
25 who put together the analysis of existing data, information

1 from humanities source materials, and also made 37 case
2 studies. Now, in your brown packets, on the very last page,
3 there is a summary sheet that describes this particular
4 report. It is some 400 plus pages in length to include all
5 of the data that is there involved. It is a mammoth report;
6 therefore, it is not being made and passed out indiscriminate-
7 ly at this time. But if you desire a copy, there is a page
8 at the back of that summary report, which says that I would
9 like the copies of either the test of the report and the
10 case histories -- and you should turn that into us today
11 so that we can provide you with that report.

12 The staff is to be complimented on pulling all of
13 this together. We see this as a report that is going to be
14 very popular around the country and will also perhaps answer
15 a number of questions as to where women are as far as the
16 humanities are concerned.

17 We took action regarding the committee procedures
18 that involved the members being absent and public questions
19 that then come about from those persons who are absent on
20 Thursday meetings. We came to this resolution. That it is
21 highly desirable for the member to make prior contact with
22 the Chair or the Division staff as a matter of committee mem-
23 ber responsibility. Then, on Friday morning, prior to the
24 general meeting, a resume of the activities and the discus-
25 sion can be procured. If the individual is desirous of

1 talking, then, in the general meeting, and we would assume that
2 would be the case, the member should speak first to the
3 Council Chair to get background information as to what it is
4 they wish discussed. We found that it is very difficult to
5 fix policy, and we were most eager not to abridge freedom of
6 speech, as Jack has indicated a moment ago.

7 Nevertheless, the committee emphasized the civic
8 responsibility of a member to raise questions in advance so
9 that his or her opinions can -- better discussion of the
10 committee, considering all of the documental materials before
11 them and also so that he or she can obtain a better under-
12 standing of the issues or the facts at hand. Such actions,
13 we believe, make for much more enlightened and more critical
14 activity by the committee, as you were saying, during its
15 own considerations and results in a strengthened majority
16 report to be brought to the general Council for its delibera-
17 tions.

18 We see, as a responsibility of our committee, to
19 make recommendations to the general committee and that coming
20 and stemming from our recommendation your voting, then, is
21 made in a more deliberative and thoughtful manner. And we
22 also see that in this way there need not be a repetition of
23 previous debates, which are to be avoided, if at all possible.

24 We do call to your attention that it was a member
25 of our committee that brought in all of the Robert Frost

1 things around the wall.

2 CHAIRMAN BENNETT: Thank you.

3 MS. KERR: May I ask one question about the study
4 you are going to do on the core?

5 MS. RHOME: The study we are going to do on the ---

6 MS. KERR: The study that is going to be done on
7 the core -- when you break those out, how feasible or worth-
8 while would it be to make sure that you break it out, not
9 just in private and public institutions and two-year -- the
10 reason I say that is coming from a Jesuit institution I
11 think if you were to take out all the Catholic, Jesuit, for
12 example, or sectarian institutions, and meet with the pri-
13 vate -- or separate those out, you might get a different kind
14 of balance in the numbers ---

15 MS. RHOME: That is a good point. Would you like
16 to respond to that?

17 MR. TASHDINIAN: No. That is a good point, and it
18 has never come up in connection with other kinds of studies,
19 and I think we will have to investigate that with what we
20 call the Higher Education Panel, and its composition. We
21 will look into that.

22 Let me also say, by the way, this survey is a joint
23 survey, jointly developed with our own Division of Education
24 Programs staff and OPPS. It will be carried out, though,
25 through the ACE/HEP mechanism. But that is a good point in

1 this particular study. We will look into it.

2 MR. RITCHESON: May I ask, please, what provisions
3 are there for the nationwide distribution of this massive
4 report? It is obviously very important.

5 MS. RHOME: Yes, it is.

6 MR. TASHDINIAN: I think it is indicated in the
7 memo from me to you that the -- we are presently considering
8 a request of the authors of the report to turn over the copy-
9 right to them because they have had what they consider to be
10 very promising publication feelers. If that should be done,
11 and there are some questions we have about what the implica-
12 tions are, whether we can use the material, et cetera, et
13 cetera, then it would be up to the publisher to publish and
14 distribute it as well as they might.

15 MR. RITCHESON: I feel there will be great inter-
16 est on the West Coast, I know, in this. I would like to be
17 able to say something to my colleagues.

18 MS. RHOME: Wait a minute. Which one are you asking
19 about. Arnem, he is not asking about -- are you asking about
20 the Status of Women?

21 MR. RITCHESON: Yes.

22 MR. TASHDINIAN: Yeah, that is what I thought. I
23 think it is premature at this particular point. We will get
24 information later to you about that.

25 CHAIRMAN BENNETT: Any other comments on Ms. Rhome's

1 report. Fine. We continue -- I am going to ask Bruce Carnes
2 to give us ---

3 MR. DILLE: May I say something in view of the --
4 I am the only Chair not to express appreciation to the staff.
5 I hope the staff does not undervalue my failure to be criti-
6 cal of them. I think they know how highly I do value them.
7 Their efficiency and their helpfulness is beyond my descrip-
8 tion. Some people have found me to -- coffee cup. As a
9 matter of fact, one could not hope for greater efficiency nor
10 wish for more help.

11 CHAIRMAN BENNETT: The staff now is praised by
12 acclamation. Let's go to Bruce Carnes. I am going to ask
13 Bruce to give us a summary all of the three points he is
14 slated for. Then, if we can, go to Emergency Grants. Oh,
15 I am sorry. I have confused things. In any case, Bruce
16 Carnes' three matters.

17 APPLICATION REPORT (TAB D)

18 MR. CARNES: Please turn to Tab D, the Application
19 Report, which compares actions at the first Council in 1984,
20 that is last November's Council, with actions by the Council
21 at the first Council in 1983.

22 What this report reveals is that 13 per cent more
23 applications were considered by the Council in its first
24 cycle in 1984 than in the previous year. Most of this increase
25 is due to changes in review cycles or new deadlines in four

1 programs. There have also been some increases in applications
2 to a couple of other programs, particularly Project Research
3 in Museums and Historical Organizations. I will leave it to
4 you to scrutinize the table, and if you have any questions,
5 I will be happy to discuss them with you now or at a later
6 time.

7 If you see any decreases in applications, that
8 usually in almost every case is explainable by the fact that
9 we have changed a cycle; that is all.

10 MS. KERR: Was it not also that the 1983 cycle was
11 down?

12 MR. CARNES: The 1983 cycle was essentially the
13 same as 1982, about 100 applications different.

14 GIFTS AND MATCHING REPORT (TAB E)

15 MR. CARNES: In your brown folder, you have another
16 memo from me for insertion under Tab E. This is a memo
17 reporting the status of our matching activities in fiscal
18 1984 to date.

19 As that memo indicates, we projected at the end of
20 last fiscal year that we would be doing a lot more matching
21 in fiscal '84. That is proving to be the case. The number
22 of offers receiving matching funds is up by one-third in
23 1984 compared to the same period in fiscal '83. The amount
24 of matching funds released has increased over 70 per cent.
25 We expect this to continue. Obviously, we will not be

1 releasing 70 per cent more at the end of the year, but we do
2 expect to be doing more matching throughout the entire year.

3 The table at the back of that page, attached to
4 that memorandum, indicates that we have about \$16.5 million
5 in matching offers still open. Much of that, of course, is
6 for offers that will carry on into 1985 and be matched in
7 '85, not in '84, so I do not see any problems there. Again,
8 on that one, if there are any questions about the table or
9 the information, I would be happy to discuss that with you
10 later, or now if you wish.

11 FY 1985 APPROPRIATION (TAB F)

12 MR. CARNES: Finally, under Tab F is a brief
13 memorandum concerning our fiscal 1985 budget request. This
14 was delivered to the Congress on time, February 3. Our
15 official request is \$125,475,000. The distribution of funds
16 among our programs is precisely that which was discussed by
17 all of us at precious Council meetings last summer at that
18 level of funding.

19 We expect hearings shortly. Jason is here. He
20 can answer questions for you when our hearings are to occur.
21 Basically, by the end of March is when we expect the first
22 one. Thank you.

23 MS. NORTON: I have a question perhaps best
24 addressed to Jason. The issue is the relative size of the
25 NEA and NEH budgets. I noticed that this year the recommended

1 budget, the gap, seems to be wider. For years, there was a
2 \$9 million gap, or thereabouts, or a \$10 million gap between
3 our budget and NEA's. This year, it is a much wider gap.
4 I think it is closer to 20. I wonder if there is an explana-
5 tion for that; as opposed to the absolute size, why is the
6 gap between them growing larger?

7 MR. CARNES: The gap between NEA and NEH in fiscal
8 1984, of course, is simply a matter of Congressional disposi-
9 tion. They chose to have that kind of gap. I do not think
10 we take that gap very seriously. That kind of consideration
11 is not a matter of any concern to us. But, for fiscal 1985,
12 the gap, if you want to call it that, between us and the Arts
13 Endowment is essentially the same as it was in our requests
14 in 1984. I do not see any growing ---

15 CHAIRMAN BENNETT: Mary Beth, I looked at a sheet
16 that either Arnem or Bruce had given me, NEH requests as a
17 percentage of NEA requests over the last 15 year, and it
18 does not suggest a growing gap. It is usually about 90 per
19 cent of the NEA requests, sometimes a little lower, some-
20 times higher, but you cannot chart a chronologic -- we can
21 send that to you if you want to see it. Thank you. Any
22 other comments?

23 I think, then, at this point, we will close the
24 meeting to the public. Let's everyone else, staff and Coun-
25 cil, please remain seated and we will move on to Emergency

1 Grants and Actions Departing. And, then, we will go to the
2 Jefferson Lecture. Staff should remain at this point.

3 MR. NEUSNER: I have two comments on that tab.

4 First of all, I think that ---

5 CHAIRMAN BENNETT: Which tab?

6 MR. NEUSNER: I am sorry. It is the Emergency
7 Grants. I think that when you -- Emergency Grants. I am
8 not talking about a specific one. I think that you ought to
9 give the reasons that Emergency Grants are turned down, just
10 as you do routinely on so many other things. It is a piece
11 of information which is mildly interesting.

12 CHAIRMAN BENNETT: All right.

13 MR. NEUSNER: The second comment is on the Chair-
14 man's Actions Departing from Council Recommendations,
15 specifically having to do with the research program Penn
16 State thing. In the legislation of the Endowment, sociology,
17 if I am not mistaken, is included as a humanistic field, or
18 a field with humanistic implications, right along with
19 anthropology. Therefore, it would not, in my judgment, be
20 legitimate ---

21 VOICE: Jack, we are having trouble hearing you.

22 MR. NEUSNER: I am terribly sorry.

23 VOICE: I think the problem is partly with that
24 microphone. Maybe if you could borrow the one that is
25 further down. No sir, the one next to that.

1 MR. NEUSNER: You cannot say, as far as I under-
2 stand, you cannot say that sociology, by definition, is not
3 a humanistic field. I think your other considerations are
4 perfectly ample for your action, but I think in the future
5 you should not say that we do not do it because it is
6 sociology, therefore, not the humanities.

7 I also point out you cannot say something is
8 anthropological; therefore, we do not do it. We have dis-
9 cussed this in the Research Committee with a good bit of
10 pain, and we are bound by the legislation as far as I know
11 that says that it is. If I am wrong, I will be glad to be
12 corrected.

13 MR. WILLKIE: Jack, with regard to those disciplines,
14 the statute refers to those humanistic aspects of the social
15 sciences, but there is not a specific reference to sociology.

16 MR. NEUSNER: But a humanistic aspect of the social
17 science would cover both sociology and anthropology, and I
18 think the burden of proof would be on us to show that it is
19 not.

20 MR. WILLKIE: But the problem may be with the
21 description.

22 MR. NEUSNER: Oh, I think the Chairman had ample
23 reason in his statement for other grounds, but the grounds
24 that it is sociology, therefore, we do not do it, in my judg-
25 ment, are not correct.

1 CHAIRMAN BENNETT: You would have to make a case
2 that this is a judgment call, that it is not -- that it is
3 not the humanistic aspects of sociology. I do not think we
4 want to say that all sociology is welcome.

5 MR. NEUSNER: We are in entire agreement, but I
6 think that we do not want to exclude any anthropology and
7 sociology ---

8 CHAIRMAN BENNETT: I think anthropology is men-
9 tioned specifically in the legislation, is it not?

10 MR. NEUSNER: You should see some of the stuff
11 that is coming up later today.

12 MR. MARSHALL: Could I add just one thing to
13 correct the record. Could I correct the record on just one
14 item, please. If you would turn back to Emergency Grants,
15 the very last item. We went through a process of revising
16 how we handled this information right after the last Council,
17 and the University of Oklahoma is simply an error.

18 This was not a request for an emergency grant. The
19 University of Oklahoma explored eligibility, and we indicated
20 to them that there was another way to pursue funds at the
21 Endowment. So, this is simply an error, and you could draw
22 a line through it, if you would. They did not apply for an
23 emergency grant, and we did not turn one down.

24 CHAIRMAN BENNETT: Yes, Mary Beth.

25 MS. NORTON: I wanted to express concern about the

1 fact that two of the five projects that the Chair rejected
2 this time after the Council proposed them, or supported them
3 last time, were in the area of women's studies. I find the
4 reasons that are given tendentious, to say the least.

5 I also want to make another statement here which
6 relates to an experience that I had in December at the Ameri-
7 can Historical Association Convention. It was a major topic
8 of conversation at the women's breakfast that was held one
9 of the mornings of the convention. It was officially announced,
10 shall we say, by the Chair of the Women's Committee of the
11 AHA that there was a great fear on the part of historians
12 and other scholars who had been working the field of women's
13 studies that the Endowment has become antagonistic to proposals
14 in the area of women's studies and proposed at that point a
15 maor anti-Endowment campaign on precisely this issue.

16 I just want you to know, Mr. Chairman, that these
17 kinds of actions on your part become known in the wider field
18 and that if they persist I fear that there may very well be
19 some considerable fallout from this. That is all. I have
20 no particular knowledge of these instances, of these indivi-
21 dual grant applications, but I just want you to know that
22 there is considerable talk outin the field, and it was done
23 at an official session of the AHA concerning what is going
24 on here with respect to proposals in the area of women's
25 studies. Actions like this, unless they are really carefully

1 justified, are going to bring down some problems on your head.

2 MR. ARGRESTO: We would welcome any inquiries from
3 them on our conduct and on our reasons. And we would ask
4 them to state what their objections were and to look at the
5 objections we have had to certain proposals. If you have
6 objections to these proposals that have been disallowed,
7 raise them now.

8 MS. NORTON: As I said, I have not read the pro-
9 posals. So, all I know about them is what I read in the ---

10 MR. NEUSNER: Why don't you resubmit them?

11 MS. NORTON: Well, all right.

12 MR. NEUSNER: One of the two was the lady, the
13 woman, from Santa Cruz is a resubmission.

14 VOICE: The other one is being fully funded by NSF.

15 MS. NORTON: In a way, it does not matter that it
16 is being fully funded by NSF. I just want to say, as I said,
17 I was disturbed by what was said at the AHA meeting, and I
18 say, a fairly public and official forum.

19 CHAIRMAN BENNETT: Why don't you suggest -- I don't
20 suggest that you defend me if you do not think I should be
21 defended, but why don't you suggest that they invite me and
22 make the charge in person and give me an opportunity to
23 respond.

24 MS. NORTON: I did, in fact, suggest that they talk
25 to you. I did, in fact, make that suggestion.

1 CHAIRMAN BENNETT: I am not inaccessible.

2 MS. NORTON: They may, in fact, be in touch with
3 you.

4 CHAIRMAN BENNETT: Yes, Harold.

5 MR. CANNON: Both the cases to which Mary Beth is
6 referring were of considerable difficulty, both to the staff
7 and to the committee. I think it is true to say if you look
8 at both files you will find the reservations summarized in
9 these statements on the review.

10 These are cases where you can read the reviews and
11 panel comments one way or the other, and they are certainly
12 the kind of borderline issues that staff bring to the Council
13 committee in a sense of doubt because there is division. And
14 this is where these comments come from. These comments come
15 out of the file, and they come out of the peer review.

16 Now, of course, the selection of the reviewers is
17 another question, as we well know. But we are not adding
18 additional information, or developing opinions, after the
19 Council committee has gone home. There is no suggestion of
20 that here. This is, I think, an accurate summary of what
21 we have in the file.

22 CHAIRMAN BENNETT: Other comments? Yes, Anita.

23 MS. SILVERS: This is on another one on the list,
24 the Council -- of School Officers. It raises an issue I
25 would like to pursue a little bit when we talk about that

1 whole review process. On the application -- everybody was
2 agreed -- then it was the difference of opinion and the
3 Council split. The reviewers split. Everybody split. The
4 difference of opinion had to do with -- however, on the
5 whole, all the way up through the Council committee, there
6 was a preponderance, although not a wildly enthusiastic one,
7 on the side of funding it. I believe that of nine reviewers,
8 only one was against funding. The other eight, I believe,
9 recommended for funding it.

10 I begin to worry a little bit about what happens
11 reviewers go into great detail. In my opinion, at least,
12 very honestly scored weaknesses -- and the weaknesses that
13 may weigh out are used as stronger reasons than they had
14 originally meant them. I do not think we can solve this
15 problem, I think it is interesting. I think it is important
16 for us to explore a little bit.

17 CHAIRMAN BENNETT: To respond to that is that the
18 review, and my personal review here, was as conscientious
19 as I think can be imagined. I did receive some calls from
20 Chief State School Officers after this decision was made, and
21 it was suggested, analogous to what Mary Beth was talking
22 about, that I was somehow opposed to the teaching of the
23 humanities in the secondary schools. Well, that is the job.

24 I probably, if I had not reviewed this in such
25 detail, probably would have come down the other way. The

1 more I read, the more discouraged I got. And it struck me
2 that these are Chief State School Officers. They were going
3 off too vague. They were too vague in their notion of what
4 they were going to do, and I was worried about us then having
5 to take steps to undo possible damage. I would rather see
6 them recast it, refocus, get clearer, and come back. They
7 know that we are hardly indifferent or hostile to the work
8 of the humanities in the schools. But I thought to get a
9 project that was off-base into the works would do us more harm
10 than good. I was very distressed by it.

11 MS. SILVERS: It was really split.

12 CHAIRMAN BENNETT: I know it was split. But I
13 found more compelling the objections of the reviewers. There
14 were an awful lot of sympathy votes. People said, well, it
15 is not what it should be. It does not have focus; it is
16 vague. But it is important that you State School Officers
17 address this. Well, it is important that they address it
18 well as well as address it.

19 MS. SILVERS: Are we going to -- with them. That
20 I think was a major concern that George and I had. Given
21 the state of their knowledge as -- perhaps in part reflected
22 by this proposal and given the influence that they have,
23 their offices have in devising guidelines and frameworks,
24 I think that in this case we really ought to take some posi-
25 tive steps because we have to capture their minds.

1 CHAIRMAN BENNETT: Well, I think that we want to.
2 Arnem passed me just the other day a draft of a release from
3 OPPS, Humanities Highlights, highlighting the results of the
4 study that the Chiefs did on the basis of the first grant that
5 we gave them. I think we want to publicize that to make it
6 plain, again, by an emphatic act that we are very interested
7 in the work they are doing. Otherwise, we can probably can
8 expect them to be back, can't we Arnem?

9 MR. TASHDINIAN. Yeah. Either that or I think to
10 the Education Division. At least some staff of the Education
11 Division, I understand, have made contact with them and indi-
12 cated that this does not at all, you know, indicate that we
13 do not want to work with them, that this is an important
14 group of people. It will be up to the Division of Education
15 to take this further, not my office any more.

16 CHAIRMAN BENNETT: Yes, Jack.

17 MR. NEUSNER: One of the things Anita reminded you
18 that one member of the committee strongly opposed that form
19 of the application and did urge a resubmission in a better
20 form, and there was an element of stampeding through. Well,
21 if we do not do this, this one will not be there, and they
22 will give up that office space. And that is what made it a
23 rather dubious proposition. I think everyone present on that
24 occasion would support the proposal that they bring back a
25 new thing. It does not have to be that particular principal

1 investigator, for instance.

2 CHAIRMAN BENNETT: We need to move along if we want
3 to have lunch and get a Jefferson Lecturer first. Jeff.

4 MR. MARSHALL: I would like to make this proposal.
5 If we give a half an hour to the discussion and selection of
6 the Jefferson Lecturer and then half an hour to 40 minutes
7 for lunch, the schedule called for us to resume at 1:30. I
8 think we might want to keep to that, if we can. So, I would
9 like to ask Division Directors, who will join the Council
10 for lunch, as you know, to return about 20 minutes of one
11 and ask the staff to return, as a whole, to resume the Coun-
12 cil meeting at half past one, as on the agenda.

13 At this point, the Council will go in Executive
14 Session. We will take a pause for a moment.

15 (Whereupon, at 12:12 p.m., the meeting went off
16 the record and was resumed on the record at 1:35 p.m.)

17 CHAIRMAN BENNETT: May I first ask for a show of
18 hands by Council members. Can I ask for a show -- I am
19 sorry -- a show of hands by Council members, of any Council
20 members, who have to leave by or about three o'clock -- just
21 three o'clock is what we are talking about now. Four -- all
22 right. Before three o'clock.

23 What I am going to do unilaterally is -- we have
24 three members of the Committee of General Programs who have
25 to leave before three, or at three. Bea, with your permission,

1 can we do General, then Fellowships? Okay. Let's move, then,
2 to General Programs first since three members are leaving,
3 and we will end that discussion by -- Bea, what time do you
4 have to leave? We will end that discussion, let's say, by
5 two, unless there are pressing matters. Charles.

6 GENERAL PROGRAMS

7 MR. RITCHESON: Mr. Chairman, this is the report
8 of the Committee on General Programs. The motion for
9 General Programs begins with applications submitted to the
10 Division's Program for Humanities, Projects, and Media. On
11 page three, in the first section of Recommended Proposals,
12 you will find proposal GN ---

13 CHAIRMAN BENNETT: Blue. Blue.

14 MR. RITCHESON: Blue. Yes. What did I say, green?

15 CHAIRMAN BENNETT: No. You did not say anything
16 wrong. I was helping those who ---

17 MR. RITCHESON: All right. GN-21866, Roots of
18 American Order. I want to say a word about this since this
19 proposal request to dramatize Russel Kirk's Roots of
20 American Order was originally not recommended for funding
21 because of an unfavorable rating by the panel as well as
22 negative comments by a specialist reviewer. The panelists
23 and reviewer agreed that the script failed to capture the
24 complexity and intellectual argument of Russel Kirk's thought.

25 The committee, however, voted to recommend a \$50,000

1 for script revision, and I want to lay these reasons before
2 you. One is the commemoration of the bicentennial of the
3 United States Constitution is a special initiative, and this
4 proposal could make an important contribution to that objec-
5 tive. Secondly, the script showed sufficient promise, though
6 flawed, to warrant a revision designed to be more favorable
7 to the intellectual substance of the book. Because it is
8 unusual for the committee to overturn a recommendation not
9 to fund with such a negative evaluation, we thought it
10 important for the Council to understand the reasons for the
11 committee's recommendation to fund and to offer the Council
12 the opportunity to express its view.

13 CHAIRMAN BENNETT: Want to pause there, Charles?

14 MR. RITCHESON: Yes.

15 CHAIRMAN BENNETT: Any comments on this particular
16 proposal?

17 MS. KERR: Two questions. The timing was difficult
18 for revising the script? Was it a matter of time that you
19 did not recommend revising ---

20 MR. RITCHESON: I do not think that was the issue,
21 Louise. No, I would not say ---

22 MS. KERR: Was that considered and rejected?

23 MR. RITCHESON: In our opinion, it would not be
24 difficult to revise and resubmit.

25 MS. KERR: Instead of giving it \$50,000.

1 MR. RITCHESON: Well, I am responding directly to
2 your question.

3 MS. KERR: Oh. I guess I am uncomfortable if every-
4 one was so negative that it might be easier to have them go
5 out and do a better -- unless there is a real time element --
6 it might be better to have them revise and resubmit.

7 MR. RITCHESON: I will ask Ellis Sandoz if he would
8 like to respond.

9 MR. SANDOZ: I am not sure whether the time element
10 is it. This was a very large grant that had been requested.
11 It was three 90-minute segments, Roots of Water, a dramatiza-
12 tion of Russel Kirk's work. There was considerable division
13 in the review panel, and it was on the "not recommended"
14 list.

15 We reconsidered it. We read what was there, and
16 we concluded that on two or three grounds that it ought to
17 be recommended for a rescripting grant. The main complaint
18 was attached to the script plus the failure to be truly
19 faithful to Kirk's book so that the \$50,000 is \$40,000 for
20 rescripting and \$10,000 honorarium for the collaboration of
21 Kirk himself in the preparation of the script.

22 We thought it sufficiently important, sufficiently
23 meritorious, so that ought to happen. So, that is the basis
24 of the decision. After all, this is a bicentennial flavored
25 project. There was only one other project in the main media

1 competition which went to the bicentennial. That was on the
2 Shay's Rebellion, and we felt it important, since the bicen-
3 tenial is, after all, three years hence, to try get this
4 underway. To come around to your question, in this back door
5 fashion, time is a factor in that respect.

6 MS. KERR: It would seem to me that the Chair --
7 I do not know that I could deal with this without looking at
8 the proposal as a whole, so it would seem to me that this
9 would be one that would bear extra scrutiny.

10 MR. CHICKERING: This grant -- I do not know the
11 details of it -- but it is highly consistent with a number
12 of conversations we have had last fall and summer on the
13 problem the Media Project Program has had encouraging someone
14 to put in a major effort on a major project which may or
15 may not be funded.

16 One of the principles we established was the
17 importance of trying to spend more money to encourage people
18 to put first-rate proposals to the Council and then decide
19 on them. Otherwise, people everyone's incentive would go
20 towards very small proposals, and the quality would suffer
21 substantially. So, really, the decision to do this is very
22 much in keeping with the conversations that we had last fall.

23 MR. RITCHESON: The committee did feel that the
24 basic concept was very good and very sound and should be
25 encouraged as a bicentennial initiative.

1 CHAIRMAN BENNETT: George.

2 MR. KENNEDY: I was present at the discussion of this
3 and I support the committee's recommendation. I do not think
4 that resubmit is the right answer since the script had been
5 prepared. If you want a new one, a more satisfactory script,
6 I think you need to invest some money in the project, which
7 the \$50,000 would do.

8 CHAIRMAN BENNETT: Further discussion? All right.
9 I will certainly heed Louise Kerr's advice and take a good
10 close look. Is there any sense -- that we should perhaps
11 seek additional review?

12 VOICE: It had quite a lot.

13 CHAIRMAN BENNETT: It had quote a lot. All right.
14 I will just have to look at this one closely myself.

15 MR. RITCHESON: Can I continue?

16 CHAIRMAN BENNETT: Yes, sir.

17 MR. RITCHESON: I now want to invite your attention
18 to GN-21986, Bricks Without Straw, The Life and Times of
19 Booker T. Washington. The committee was deeply impressed by
20 Booker, a film about the early life of Booker T. Washington,
21 which it screened at the November Council meeting.

22 The committee is pleased to note that we are recom-
23 mending to support the writing of scripts for a television
24 series by the same producer focusing on the adult career of
25 Booker T. Washington and the founding of Tuskegee Institute.

1 Further, the list of projects not recommended for
2 funding begins on page 8. The committee concurred with these
3 recommendations.

4 Projects recommended for deferral are on page 31.
5 I refer especially to ---

6 MR. HECTOR: Charles. On those not recommended,
7 were all those which were not approved not recommended by the
8 staff?

9 MR. RITCHESON: All of those not approved were not
10 recommended by the staff. Yes.

11 Projects recommended for deferral are on page 31.
12 GN-21905, Living American Poets: Creeley and McClure.
13 Originally recommended by evaluators for funding, this pro-
14 posal was deferred by the committee until May Council so that
15 staff may seek specialist review to comment on (1) the signi-
16 ficance of these two poets, (2) the merit of this particular
17 proposal, (3) the scale of the proposal's request in relation
18 to the significance of the poets' work.

19 Page 31, GN-21918, Pattern of the Past. This
20 radio project to create segments on the subject of archeology
21 for the program, "All Things Considered", was deferred until
22 May Council so that the committee may examine the opinions
23 of specialist reviewers about the quality and educational
24 effectiveness of the pilots. The committee itself will also
25 listen to the pilots at the May meeting.

1 Special Projects. The recommendations for the
2 Division's Programs for Special Projects begins on page 32
3 and include categories for bicentennial projects, humanities
4 projects in libraries, and program development. The committee
5 concurred with all the recommendations for rejection in each
6 of these categories.

7 Page 36. GL-20561, University of Chicago, The
8 Illustrator as Storyteller. The applicant requested \$111,548.
9 The staff recommended a grant of up to \$103,000 on the condi-
10 tion that the budget be revised. The committee raised some
11 questions concerning the relative importance of the humanities
12 content in the proposal, but they were sufficiently impressed
13 by the proposal to recommend funding for a conference on this
14 subject and an interpretive exhibit. The recommendation by
15 the committee was for \$46,000 in outright funds and \$10,000
16 in Treasury funds to be matched by the applicant.

17 Page 39. GP-21124, CUNY Lehman College, Bronx
18 Regional and Community History. The applicant requested
19 \$136,096 for this project, which represented additional
20 activity arising out of a previous NEH grant of \$173,012 in
21 1981. The staff recommended a grant of \$100,000. The committee
22 felt that the institution should seek additional outside
23 funds in support of the project, including the New York State
24 Humanities Council and private funding sources. They recom-
25 mended \$50,000 in outright funds for the project and \$25,000
in Treasury funds to be matched by the applicant.

1 The committee concurred with all the recommendations
2 made in the Younger Scholars category, beginning on page 43.
3 The committee noted with approval the interesting range of
4 topics represented among the recommended awards to 36 female
5 and 31 male younger scholars. Fifty-five colleges and uni-
6 versities in 25 states were represented among the recommended
7 applicants.

8 The committee also engaged in general discussion of
9 various aspects of this new funding category. The rule that
10 applicants should be under the age of 21, the nature of the
11 research paper which is the final product of the grant, the
12 final reporting requirements, the reasons why projects for
13 academic credit are not eligible. The list of rejected appli-
14 cations for Younger Scholars begins on page 57.

15 Museums and Historical Organizations. On page 94,
16 you will find applications recommended from the Division's
17 Program for Museums and Historical Organizations. The
18 committee agreed with these recommendations. Page 95 con-
19 tains the single project not recommended for funding.

20 Before the meeting adjourned, the committee
21 expressed its pleasure with the materials prepared by the
22 staff for the committee book and the response by staff to the
23 questions raised by the committee during the day. Mr. Chair-
24 man, that concludes my report.

25 CHAIRMAN BENNETT: Thank you very much. Any

1 discussion?

2 MR. COHN: Bill, can I add a comment?

3 CHAIRMAN BENNETT: Yes, sir.

4 MR. COHN: Bill, I have been on the Council now for
5 over three years. This is the first Council meeting -- I
6 shouldn't say Council meeting -- Division meeting -- that I
7 have attended where there was unanimity in our action. There
8 has always been up until now one person, sometimes me, who
9 dissented for some particular action. We either approved or
10 rejected or modified or deferred all the applications with
11 total unanimity.

12 I think it is due to two reasons: one, the great
13 staff work that was done, particularly the work of Jeff and
14 also our Chairman of our particular Division. He was able
15 to orchestrate it. He was able to pull together. He was a
16 statesman in getting all together and having unanimity in
17 every action which we took. It is great tribute to both the
18 staff and our Chairman.

19 CHAIRMAN BENNETT: Other comments? Yes, Louise.

20 MS. KERR: I have a question on page 35, GL-20555.
21 There was a big reduction. I was just wondered. Is that
22 a planning grant?

23 MR. RITCHESON: What was the question?

24 CHAIRMAN BENNETT: A big reduction. Did this
25 become a planning grant?

1 MR. RITCHESON: That was a reduction that was recom-
2 mended by the staff.

3 MS. NORTON: I think I have probably a similar
4 question on page 4, the second grant down. It originally
5 came in for \$1,300,000. We are giving them \$80,000. What
6 happened.

7 CHAIRMAN BENNETT: We needed the money.

8 MS. NORTON: Over 18 months. \$80,000 over 18
9 months.

10 MR. WALLIN: That was a very impressive application,
11 most promising; however, we felt on the basis of outside
12 review that the one flaw in it was a very serious one since
13 it had to do with Abraham Lincoln's argument on slavery.
14 That was enough to try and give them money to get back to us
15 with a revised script ---

16 CHAIRMAN BENNETT: Other comments?

17 MR. SANDOZ: Bill, I wanted to raise a question
18 that was mentioned by Charles. In our committee, we couldn't
19 quite figure out why it was these Younger Scholars could not
20 do their work -- why they were prohibited from getting credit
21 for doing their work in conjunction with a course or what-
22 ever. Since an inquiry was to go forward as to the legalities
23 of this, whether we might do that sort of thing or not.

24 As I mentioned this morning, when we were talking
25 about the fellowships for graduate students, apparently there

1 is no prohibition to our supporting projects or activities
2 which lead to college credit. Correct me if I am wrong. And
3 if there is not, is it worth considering that these under-
4 graduates might be able to do these projects and receive
5 credit for them in college work?

6 MR. MARSHALL: If I can address that, Ellis, you
7 are correct. There is nothing in our statute that prohibits
8 this, but in fact, we have been very clearly discouraged
9 from any kind of scholarship support, undergraduate or
10 graduate, by Congress consistently since the Endowment was
11 created. We have been expressly, explicitly told and en-
12 couraged not to do this at either level.

13 While I think we all agree that support for three
14 hours of credit for a summer project is hardly going to
15 transform undergraduate study in the United States, it is
16 still a form of scholarship. That is, if we provide support
17 for a project that an individual can earn credit for as an
18 undergraduate, it is a scholarship. The same thing would be
19 true for graduate fellowships. So, that throughout the
20 Endowment's history since the beginning, though it is not in
21 the statute, we have had Congressional expression of dis-
22 couragement for this.

23 MR. SANDOZ: Thank you.

24 CHAIRMAN BENNETT: The motion is before us. All in
25 favor, say "aye".

1 (A chorus of ayes was heard.)

2 CHAIRMAN BENNETT: Opposed?

3 (No response.)

4 CHAIRMAN BENNETT: Carried. Thank you. Let's go
5 to Fellowships, Professor Himmelfarb.

6 FELLOWSHIP APPLICATIONS

7 MS. HIMMELFARB: The committee was asked first to
8 consider the question ---

9 CHAIRMAN BENNETT: This is the yellow?

10 MS. HIMMELFARB: Yes. But before we get to this,
11 there were other points that came up. The first, most
12 important, the committee was asked to consider the question
13 of the eligibility of the John Carter Brown Library,
14 Providence, Rhode Island, as an applicant to the center's
15 regrant program.

16 The program's guidelines stipulate that a center
17 be independent, or predominantly independent of any institu-
18 tion of higher education. The library petitioned the Endow-
19 ment on the grounds that it was predominantly independent
20 in the same ways that the Hoover Institution -- are indepdent.
21 And these centers have, in fact, been regarded as eligible
22 for this regrant program. Committee members reviewed the
23 relevant facts and recommended that the library be eligible
24 to apply to the program.

25 VOICE: Do you have the name of the library?

1 MS. HIMMELFARB: The John Carter Brown Library.
2 On the applications before the committee, the committee,
3 staff committee, reviewed 1,661 eligible applications for
4 Endowment's summer stipends program. After a discussion of
5 the applications brought to the attention of the committee
6 by the staff, and also applications which committee members
7 had cited for discussion, and after reading 16 completed
8 applications, whose status had not been resolved by the
9 initial discussion, the committee recommended funding a total
10 of 231 summer stipends.

11 The committee recommended funding for one applica-
12 tion originally not recommended to the committee, and it
13 recommended against funding for seven applications that had
14 been recommended. It is this, then, that constitutes those
15 231 applications that have finally been recommended for
16 funding. Those that are not recommended for funding are all
17 the remaining applications under Tab I in your book.

18 MR. MARSHALL: Could I ask -- if it is easy --
19 could you identify the ones where there was variation so that
20 the Council and for the record.

21 MS. HIMMELFARB: Yes. FT-25185. The name is Hill.
22 The subject, St. Joan's Voices, Actresses on Shaw's Maid.

23 VOICE: Do you have page numbers?

24 VOICE: There is no page number. It is in our
25 Council book with the name of the applicant ---

1 MS. HIMMELFARB: I am sorry. Hill, Holly Hill.
2 Shall I go on? Mando, George, FT-24499, title, A Genre
3 Description of the Victorian in Modern Stage. Lanser, Susan,
4 FT-26032, Women Writers and Narrative Forms, Patterns and
5 Strategies in Fiction by French, British and American Woman,
6 1750 to 1969. Layton, Lynn, FT-24447, Narcissism in Con-
7 temporary Western Culture. Peterfroin, Stuart, FT-25063,
8 The Life of Metaphor in Literature and Science. Tucker,
9 Nancy, FT-25117, The Impact of America's Concept of Monolithic
10 Communism on Policy toward China, 1950 to 1963. Turner,
11 Frederick, FT-24736, Coesus, A Theory of Value and Literary
12 Performance for the Human Animal. Those were all originally
13 recommended, and the committee proposed not recommending
14 them.

15 The following was originally not recommended, and
16 the committee proposed recommending Kagen, Donald, FT-25589,
17 The Fall of the Athenian Empire.

18 MR. MARSHALL: Thank you very much. That helps
19 us mechanically in the next steps.

20 CHAIRMAN BENNETT: Discussion? Yes, Rita.

21 MS. RICARDO-CAMPBELL: I would like to know. At
22 the beginning, I heard John Carter Brown Library. I do not
23 even know where it is, how many books it has, or anything
24 about it.

25 MR. MARSHALL: If I could, Bea. The questions that

1 was before the committee was whether that library was eligi-
2 ble to apply. There is no application yet before us and,
3 therefore, no question. We can get information to you about
4 the nature of the library.

5 MS. RICARDO-CAMPBELL: I would like to know about
6 it.

7 MR. MARSHALL: Absolutely. I will take care of it.

8 CHAIRMAN BENNETT: Go ahead.

9 MS. NORTON: Rita, the John Carter Brown Library
10 is one of the finest libraries of early modern history in
11 the country. It is located in Providence, Rhode Island.
12 They have hundreds of thousands of volumes on colonial
13 America and Renaissance Europe.

14 MS. RICARDO-CAMPBELL: You still have not given me
15 the location. Then I can look it up.

16 MS. NORTON: It is Providence.

17 CHAIRMAN BENNETT: It is right next to the Rhode
18 Island School of Design. Further discussion? All in favor
19 of the motion, say "aye".

20 (A chorus of ayes was heard.)

21 CHAIRMAN BENNETT: Opposed?

22 (No response.)

23 CHAIRMAN BENNETT: Thank you. Education Programs,
24 Mr. Dille.
25

EDUCATION PROGRAMS

MR. DILLE: You have before you a green sheet. We differed from one or another of those recommending in the following four.

On page 5, Barnard College. The reviewers were divided, and it seemed to us, though the staff gave a qualified recommendation for funding, that concerns raised by the reviewers could best be dealt with by a revised application. So, we rejected that with the recommendation that a revision be sought.

On page 8, Eastern Kentucky University. We did concur with both the panelists and the staff, but Anita Silvers, whose field this is, raised a question and wanted to go on record as being in favor of the proposal, asked that a couple of questions be addressed both to Eastern Kentucky and other experts -- a hand is up. Anita?

MS. SILVERS: I just wanted to be on record as requesting a deferral until certain questions were raised, but I lost.

CHAIRMAN BENNETT: Not yet. We issued it for all.

MR. DILLE: On page 12, the staff recommended partial support. This is the University of Pennsylvania. The committee believed even this low level of support was not warranted. The proposal simply had not come together at all well as far as we could tell. The staff ---

1 VOICE: Despite its name.

2 MR. DILLE: Yes. We loved the name. The committee
3 did not detect any crestfallen looks on the part of the staff
4 members who made this decision. I think their recommendation
5 had been halfhearted to begin with. We are very sensitive
6 to that sort of thing. Paul Buell said, "Huh" and that was
7 sort of it.

8 On page 13, the University of Dallas. The staff
9 recommended this, although the panel had recommended against
10 funding. It seemed to us that with certain changes brought
11 about in negotiations on the amount of the money involved
12 that, despite the fact that there were certainly some justice
13 in the questions raised by the reviewers, that a lot of good
14 things would come about because of this. Would you like,
15 Bill, to comment further on this particular one? We took a
16 hard look at it.

17 CHAIRMAN BENNETT: That is what I wanted, a hard
18 look.

19 MR. DILLE: Right. It came out unanimously in
20 support of it.

21 CHAIRMAN BENNETT: Thank you. Discussion?

22 MR. HECTOR: The proposal on page 2, the documentary
23 film. Is that considered an Education Program? Why is that
24 not a Media Program?

25 CHAIRMAN BENNETT: Who will answer that?

1 MR. EKMAN: The reason why this proposal from
2 Joseph Elder at the University of Wisconsin has been con-
3 sidered to be an Education Program is that these films are
4 regarded principally as tools. They are on subjects common-
5 ly taught in classes in anthropology, religion studies, and
6 Asian studies.

7 Elder has had a number of grants from the Endow-
8 ment, from the Division of Education Programs. I am not
9 sure whether he has also had grants from other divisions
10 of the Endowment or not.

11 MR. MARSHALL: I might say just in addition on
12 that because we have had earlier grants we also have the
13 product of those grants, and both we and the reviewers have
14 been very satisfied with the films made earlier by Mr. Elder
15 on other related subjects. Is that not right, Rich?

16 MR. HECTOR: But the purpose is primarily as edu-
17 cational tools, not for public distribution.

18 MR. EKMAN: That is correct.

19 CHAIRMAN BENNETT: Further discussion? Yes.

20 MS. NORTON: I would like to make an addition to
21 Roland's report and call the Council's attention to the
22 last grant, listed on page 2, which is a supplement to the
23 Christian College Coalition, a grant that we gave some
24 months ago. Many of you who are on the Council at that time
25 recall the extremely lengthy report that I gave from the

1 Education Committee on this grant. I am happy to tell you
2 that it has been such a smashing success that they asked for
3 a supplement so they could increase the size of some of the
4 seminars they are running. I personally should say I am
5 delighted that it is working out so well.

6 CHAIRMAN BENNETT: Any further discussion? There
7 is a motion on the floor. All in favor, say "aye".

8 (A chorus of ayes was heard.)

9 CHAIRMAN BENNETT: Opposed?

10 (No response.)

11 CHAIRMAN BENNETT: Thank you, Mr. Dille. Mr.
12 Dille, would you stay on for Challenge Grants.

13 CHALLENGE GRANTS

14 MR. DILLE: We have before us two problems, two
15 questions: one was the Cooper-Union conjoined grant, which
16 we did not deal with because the Education Department had
17 not done more than -- a graph. So, it was no longer on our
18 agenda. The other has to do with the reconsideration of
19 a decision made in August of 1980 to turn down a challenge
20 grant application from the Collegiate School, a private
21 school in New York City.

22 The Collegiate School has continued to raise the
23 question about the fairness of that decision, since when
24 it applied in January of 1980 it was not forbidden to pre-
25 collegiate schools that they apply for challenge grants.

1 At the time, and I think perhaps Mary Beth will want to talk
2 about this, at the time this came before the committee, it
3 seemed to us as we thought over what had happened -- the
4 committee then decided that the best use of the money of the
5 Endowment would keep it out of the hands of pre-collegiate
6 schools. Subsequently, this became a part of the rules of
7 the foundation.

8 It seems the majority who voted yesterday to fund
9 this project, or refund it, or meet the previous request,
10 that insofar as the question of eligibility had come in at
11 all in the earlier discussion where the grant was refused
12 that we had a problem of the integrity of the system. So,
13 we decided that whatever may happen hereafter, and a lot of
14 people will complain about this, it seemed to the majority
15 that fairness was on the side of making the grant since
16 quite clearly a rule not passed was invoked prior to its
17 passage to hold this one back. Mary Beth, I think you would
18 want to talk about this.

19 MS. NORTON: Can I make the opposite argument,
20 which I made yesterday in the Challenge Grant Committee?
21 I was a part of the original Challenge Grant Committee that
22 considered this application in 1980, and I recognize the
23 possible interpretation of unfairness to the Collegiate
24 School by, in effect, retroactively declaring them to be
25 ineligible.

1 I would also point out, I think, to the Council
2 that the difficulty of giving them a challenge grant at this
3 point, which is, in effect, almost four years after their
4 original application and the original decision on their
5 grant, especially because of the other side of the interpreta-
6 tion of fairness, which is, if we give them this grant, we
7 are saying to all other private schools, only this private
8 secondary school will ever get money from this Endowment.
9 This is the way it can be interpreted and the way it will
10 sound. I think there is a fairness issue on either side
11 and the way it will be interpreted in the outside world.

12 MR. MARSHALL: If I could, could I add one other
13 dimension, because I think that -- so that we have all
14 issues here. The guidelines, if I am not mistaken, of the
15 Challenge Grant Program were, in fact, silent on the ques-
16 tion of pre-collegiate education. We had had only a few
17 applications in the past. They were scattered, and they had
18 never survived the review process.

19 We knew the issue was coming up, and when Collegiate
20 applied to us, Collegiate School applied to us, they were
21 expressly told they were eligible, and they were expressly
22 told that we would consider by review of their application
23 the question of eligibility. That was clear. We did not
24 tell them that if we decided against eligibility they would
25 then be, no matter what the review process said, would be

1 turned down. We were using them as a test case of the ques-
2 tion of competitiveness and so on.

3 Mary Beth explained the rest of the process to you.
4 They were recommended by panel. They came forward and were
5 rejected on the grounds that the policy should be not to make
6 pre-collegiate schools eligible. On the question of the
7 difficult after four years, I think that it is fair to say
8 we must ask the Collegiate School to submit a plan for the
9 use of the funds. There is no claim or argument that they
10 should -- that we should act on the original content of the
11 application -- but that the need people, I think, is still
12 clear. Their interest in this is still clear and so on.

13 It is unusual. I do not think -- our feeling is
14 that it would never come up again. No matter how the Council
15 decides on it, it is not an issue of ever coming up again.
16 It is a question of the justice to this one applicant in
17 our action in the past.

18 MS. KERR: What is the size of this grant?

19 MR. MARSHALL: \$125,000. The request was \$250,000,
20 Jim? That is for three years, and it is a challenge grant
21 so it is 3:1 matching.

22 MS. KERR: A total of \$125,000 over three years?

23 MR. MARSHALL: That is correct. Match three to
24 one.

25 MR. BERNES: Just a word to emphasize this one

1 point. I do think that this is a question of justice, and I
2 feel that emphatically. Jeff has explained the situation
3 with respect to this grant. They were acted against retro-
4 actively, it seems to me, and justice requires that we give
5 them an opportunity to submit a new grant and act favorably
6 on it when it comes.

7 CHAIRMAN BENNETT: Thank you. Further discussion.

8 MS. KERR: May I just have a clarification? Is
9 what we are considering now a request to allow them to apply
10 under the old terms or is this, in fact, an application?

11 MR. MARSHALL: This is a request to award.

12 MR. DILLE: It is only justice -- the time has
13 passed. You are not writing a check to say, we're sorry.

14 MR. MARSHALL: If I may, the one thing we need
15 to correct, though, is this motion should have a motion in
16 favor of. So, if you want to write on your piece of paper
17 something to that effect. What I have just done is to
18 indicate that the motion -- the motion is to award that
19 grant. I do not know its number. Jim, do you recall at all?

20 MS. NORTON: But it would be awarded contingent
21 on the resubmission of an application.

22 MR. MARSHALL: Absolutely so. It has that condi-
23 tion. That is right.

24 CHAIRMAN BENNETT: That is the motion. Is the
25 motion plain? That is, to reject one application in order

1 award a challenge grant, provided the information we receive
2 is satisfactory. This is to Collegiate School.

3 MR. MARSHALL: 20036.

4 CHAIRMAN BENNETT: All in favor of the motion, say
5 "aye".

6 (A chorus of ayes was heard.)

7 CHAIRMAN BENNETT: Opposed?

8 (A chorus of nays was heard.)

9 CHAIRMAN BENNETT: I think it carries. Thank you,
10 Mr. Dille. Research Programs, Mr. Berns.

11 RESEARCH PROGRAMS

12 MR. BERNS: Research Programs, whatever color.

13 VOICE: Gold.

14 CHAIRMAN BENNETT: Goldenrod.

15 MR. BERNS: May I say at the outset that serving
16 on the committee for this Division is a marvelous educational
17 experience, marvelous things going on in this world that I
18 never knew about, Afghani Apocrypha or something like that.

19 I am not sure sure what this is a reflection of,
20 but what you have here in the final motion is exactly what
21 the staff recommended. There was no deviation whatever
22 from that recommendation.

23 Several questions were raised. I raised a question,
24 and a serious question about it, but I will mention in good
25 course that I was persuaded that I was wrong. Rita, who was

1 not at the meeting, raised some questions with respect to
2 certain proposals, and we took them into consideration.
3 Perhaps she might, in her way, want to raise those questions
4 in order.

5 The final motion is divided by these categories,
6 Research Resources are recommended on pages 1 to 9 and the
7 Not Recommended from 10 to 27, and the deferrals from 28
8 to 30. I have no particular comment to make on any of those.
9 Conservation and Preservation, the recommended on page 31,
10 the deferral on page 32. I want to make a comment on that
11 recommended item on page 31.

12 This is a large sum of money. We discussed it at
13 some length. Everybody agreed that the program itself was
14 a very valuable program. It is a training program for the
15 education really, the training, of conservators and those
16 who know how to preserve things. It was said, with good
17 reason, that this is the sort of program that ought to be
18 supported by a university. It is located in Columbia Uni-
19 versity, and the question was raised why this sort of thing
20 does not come out of university funds altogether. It was
21 pointed out that, in fact, Columbia is providing \$800,000 ---

22 MR. COHN: \$992,000.

23 MR. BERNES: So, in fact, Columbia is providing
24 the lion's share of this, and there was a general agreement
25 that it was one of the things that the Research Division can

1 point to with pride, one of many things.

2 MS. RICARDO-CAMPBELL: Should I interrupt now?

3 CHAIRMAN BENNETT: Why don't you go through what
4 you suggest you go through and then let you raise questions
5 about any of them.

6 MR. BERNES: Publications, the recommended items
7 begin on page 33 and continue through page 40. Not Recom-
8 mended on the three pages, 41 through 43. I have no particu-
9 lar comment to make on those.

10 Research Material Tools on page 44. I think there
11 is only one item, and I have no comment to make on that.
12 Then, Research Material Editions, Translations. I should
13 point out in the first place that there has been a sizable
14 increase over last year in the number of applications for
15 translations, a 40 per cent increase. The figures are on
16 the order of 180 this year as opposed to 140 last year. The
17 recommended items are on page 45 to 54.

18 I want to make a comment on an item on page 52.
19 The second item listed there, University of Michigan Press,
20 which is a proposal which we highly recommend to translate
21 the war diaries of this man, Dedijs, who was at one time
22 an intimate of Marshall Tito. Well, I knew him years ago.
23 As I mentioned yesterday, the last time I saw him, well, he
24 looked like a Redskins' middle linebacker. He could throttle
25 two Nazis, one in each hand, simultaneously. He is persona

1 non grata and has been for some time in Yugoslavia, in part
2 because of his support of Jilas. He is a person who has had
3 an extremely interesting life, has been in the center of some
4 very important political affairs, and we think, with good
5 reason, that his war diaries certainly should be supported
6 with this grant.

7 In this category, the non-recommended ones are on
8 page -5 to 70 and the deferrals, 71 to 74.

9 The next category is Inter-cultural Research.
10 They are on page 75, one item. This is a response to what,
11 I think, everyone knowledgeable in this field recognizes as
12 a real need in this field. This has to do with the -- how
13 would one put it -- experts in all aspects of Soviet affairs.
14 By responding here to the ACLS and SSRC program, we are sup-
15 porting that.

16 The next item is Basic Research, beginning on page
17 56 through 80 on the recommended ones and the Not Recommended,
18 81 and 82. I have no comment to make on that.

19 The next category, Humanities, Science, and Tech-
20 nology, beginning on page 83, the deferrals on 84. This is
21 the one where I mounted a major, but futile, effort because
22 I had some real doubts about the first one on this list, to
23 grant \$65,000 to the Institute for the Study of Human Issues
24 in Philadelphia. Well, I don't want to caricature this one.

25 MR. CANNON: This is RH-20514, Joan Cassell, Moral

1 Self-Regulation Among Surgeons. I may not do this justice,
2 and I will call on David Wright, who is facing me across
3 the room and listening carefully.

4 But my construction of this is that this is a
5 project in cultural anthropology to examine the way in which
6 surgeons support each other in terms of the decisionmaking
7 process in connection with the clinical aspects of their
8 art. The cultural anthropologist is working in this case in
9 combination with a moral philosopher. With both fields, as
10 anyone on the staff will quickly recognize, are familiar
11 terms to us because they are very much in the humanities.

12 This is an area of the Humanities, Science and
13 Technology which always raises eyebrows and alerts curiosity
14 on the part of the Council members. It does mine too when
15 these applications come forward because the questions that
16 one has to raise are considerable.

17 David, do you want to add to that?

18 MR. WRIGHT: Well, only -- you characterized it
19 well. It is a cultural anthropological approach to the way
20 that surgeons use language to establish and maintain moral
21 codes or norms, and it will be carried out, I think, through
22 a participant/observation methodology. That is all that I
23 would add.

24 MS. RICARDO-CAMPBELL: May I ask a question on that
25 one?

1 CHAIRMAN BENNETT: Want to wait until we end and
2 then we will ---

3 MS. RICARDO-CAMPBELL: Well, then, I have to keep
4 on coming back to them. That is always a problem.

5 CHAIRMAN BENNETT: That is okay.

6 MS. RICARDO-CAMPBELL: Okay.

7 CHAIRMAN BENNETT: If you don't mind making notes,
8 we will come back to all of them.

9 MR. BERNES: Well, as I said, I ended up voting in
10 favor of this even though the surgeons are primarily moti-
11 vated by the fear of malpractice suits and that is what
12 these people will find.

13 The other category is Conference Development, and
14 the recommended are on pages 85 to 89; non-recommended, 90
15 96; and the deferrals, page 97. I have no particular comment
16 to make on any of those. I have concluded. Therefore, I
17 move the motion, the adoption.

18 CHAIRMAN BENNETT: Rita.

19 MS. RICARDO-CAMPBELL: I have three sets of ques-
20 tions or comments. I do not know quite what will come up.
21 I am going to take the last one up first since we just dis-
22 cussed this, Moral Self-Regulation Among Surgeons. I would
23 think it would be worth the time of people who seem to be
24 nursing along grants here -- I don't really care for that
25 attitude, but it is done -- of trying to put an economist in

1 with that group. We have an over supply of surgeons in this
2 country. We have the misuse of the words that they use among
3 themselves and to the public, and it strikes me we would be
4 doing a service towards cost containment, that is, not rising
5 quite as high as they already are, if you suggested to these
6 people of maybe making it a three-way inter-disciplinary
7 study and adding an economist. I think it then might be
8 worthwhile or add some logic to it. I hope you would consider
9 that.

10 MR. BERNES: May I respond to that?

11 CHAIRMAN BENNETT: Sure.

12 MR. BERNES: It is entirely possible, of course,
13 that despite my misgivings and reservations which haven't
14 been satisfied that something useful will come out of this.
15 As to the suggestion that of adding an economist, as someone
16 who is reaching that age where surgery is an always imminent
17 possibility, I want to keep the number of people running
18 around that room as small as possible.

19 (Laughter.)

20 MS. RICARDO-CAMPBELL: I gave a speech in Washing-
21 ton, D.C. in mid-January in which the White House was very
22 interested, and four CEO's of the few CEO's present asked
23 for copies and I will give it to you straight. What it was
24 saying that cost-effective surgery is not being used in the
25 United States. It is made to the public that all the new

1 surgery is not cost effective. That really was not true.
2 It is a misconception. And I was trying to bring into this
3 some common sense of having people learn that when physicians
4 say things they are not necessarily the end-all of a sensi-
5 ble recommendation. That is, to put it bluntly, one example
6 was -- let's see, after you have a heart attack, most
7 physicians want you to have an angiogram. At Stanford Med
8 School, it costs \$3,000 to \$5,000. You can sort out the 20
9 per cent that need it with one-tenth the expenditure of other
10 non-invasive procedures. That is not known, and I think that
11 this type of thing here, which could be used in advanced
12 technology, the science is important.

13 And that is all I am saying. To turn it down
14 fully when you can get hold of somebody that might be inter-
15 ested in tying up with people in their university. I don't
16 know Philadelphia. I think Joan Cassell used to be with
17 Kaiser, or am I wrong? I don't remember.

18 CHAIRMAN BENNETT: Okay.

19 MS. RHOME: Could I make a comment? When I first
20 read this, and I am on the committee, I felt that this was
21 a laughable sort of thing. But once I took a look at the
22 file and saw the manner in which this was going to be per-
23 formed and saw the plans for how it was going to be pursued,
24 and also discussed it with our committee as to the findings
25 that they thought would come out of a result, it ceased to

1 be a laughable matter and seemed to be a very serious thing.
2 I do not see an objection necessarily to having an economist
3 take a look at medical practice, but I think if you had seen
4 the file and the materials that we had from which we made
5 our judgment, you would see that this would, well, clutter
6 up the issue, as it were, as well as the room.

7 MS. RICARDO-CAMPBELL: Well, I wouldn't vote for
8 it the way it is presented here. I will abstain ---

9 CHAIRMAN BENNETT: Okay, Phil.

10 MR. STANLIS: I think the difficulty is that if
11 you add an economist you never conclude the operation.

12 MS. RICARDO-CAMPBELL: Maybe the conclusion wouldn't
13 be worth it so that might be just as well.

14 CHAIRMAN BENNETT: Rita, do you have any other
15 concerns?

16 MS. RICARDO-CAMPBELL: That was one of mine. I
17 will not vote for that one, and I would like to have it
18 pulled out.

19 Another concern of mine, and it isn't the particu-
20 lar grant. I feel sorry for the person applying for the
21 grant. They have been receiving annual grants since 1971.
22 I am raising as a policy issue how long do we keep on giving
23 grants to people. Aren't there any cut-off dates. Could we
24 establish a policy of saying six years is enough? '71 to
25 '84 is a long number of years. I think, despite all the

1 problems, I just don't go along with that type of thing.

2 MR. CANNON: The answer to that, I am afraid, is
3 going to sound very direct. The answer to "how long" is as
4 long as the project itself -- is considered of high signifi-
5 cance and great value.

6 CHAIRMAN BENNETT: Which one are we talking about?

7 MR. CANNON: We are talking about Patricia
8 Grimsted in the Resources category, the Harvard bibliographer,
9 who has been studying Soviet archives and repositories under
10 our finding, as Rita correctly ---

11 MS. RICARDO-CAMPBELL: If I am correct and a grant
12 has gone on and on, and it is a question of alternative use
13 of those resources for something new. There is somebody
14 new -- now, I feel sorry for the particular person. That is
15 why I did not bring it up, but I think we should consider
16 as a policy issue how many times you can keep on renewing
17 to the same person year after year after year. This is not
18 the first time I have seen it.

19 CHAIRMAN BENNETT: Frances and Louise.

20 MS. RHOME: We did discuss this for almost 40
21 minutes in our meeting regarding the renewal process and
22 how it should go through. We came to a very clear considera-
23 tion that there must be very careful monitoring at all times
24 on these long-time projects that go through. We also came
25 to the conclusion that when we initially have funded a

1 project that was going to take a long period of time that
2 at that time a great deal of consideration had to be made in
3 order to determine that, yes, this is going to take a number
4 of years in order to complete it and, therefore, the seeking
5 of panels and reviewers was even more concentrated in that
6 respect.

7 But, also, we did think that in specified instances
8 that it could be, after a period of time, request that a new
9 proposal be made. But it would have to be on an individual
10 basis. We could not make a ruling that would cover all of
11 the myriad of kinds of things that came in. As long as we
12 are asking for a progress report, an annual progress report,
13 and also a request for a new budget that indeed is being
14 reviewed every year. So, we did discuss this at great length
15 during our meeting in that regard.

16 MS. RICARDO-CAMPBELL: I am requesting that it
17 come up as a policy issue for the whole Council where more
18 people are present. Otherwise, we are developing or evolving
19 an entitlement program, something like Social Security or
20 universities.

21 CHAIRMAN BENNETT: We will take it up in front of
22 the whole Council next time in the morning. Louise?

23 MS. KERR: (Inaudible.)

24 MS. RICARDO-CAMPBELL: The third one ---

25 CHAIRMAN BENNETT: Wait. Wait. Louis wanted to

1 say a word and then Walter.

2 MR. HECTOR: Rita, just one other consideration
3 was discussed at some length in the committee meeting, that
4 is, not only should the committee take a very realistic view
5 of how long the project will go on before they approve it --
6 because in so many projects, when you are doing the Hittite
7 Dictionary, and you are half-way through, and it has taken
8 10 years, it is almost impossible to stop. You are really
9 committing future Councils, future committees, so that in
10 this kind of long-range project, the committee should take
11 a long, deep breath and think way out in the future before
12 they approve.

13 But, also, once the Endowment has started some-
14 thing, it may be awfully hard to get the first volume done
15 and in the press. But once the first volume comes out and
16 the second volume is out, the project should have developed,
17 at least in part, its own constituency. Very early on in
18 this kind of a project that is going to go on for many,
19 many years, the Project Director must be encouraged in every
20 way possible to seek sources of outside funding so that what
21 we do is we provide, in a sense, the seed money to get the
22 project started and then insist that the Project Director go
23 out and secure at least, in part, funding from other sources.

24 MS. RICARDO-CAMPBELL: Well, an economist calls
25 those past expenditures "sunk" costs, and you have got to cut

1 it away sometime. What you are doing is -- HHS, for example,
2 96 per cent of its funds are committed. They can't do any-
3 thing except with 4 per cent. Gradually, if this kind of
4 things continues, you will have the budgets within NEH
5 committed. But let me -- I think you can see that it is an
6 important thing because it is all through all the programs.

7 CHAIRMAN BENNETT: We will take it up. Anything
8 else?

9 MS. RICARDO-CAMPBELL: I have one other ---

10 CHAIRMAN BENNETT: Walter wanted to say a word on
11 this, I think. Excuse me.

12 MR. BERNS: One could agree with much of what you
13 say about the cost and so forth, Rita, but surely one of
14 the questions that has to be raised and seriously considered
15 here is whether the particular long-range project that is
16 being renewed that can stand on its own and whether this
17 Division is not funding something because of this commitment
18 to the long-range project.

19 It seems to me that one should have it clearly in
20 mind that these things are in competition with each other,
21 and I take it from my associates on the staff that we are
22 not refusing to fund projects that are superior to these
23 long-range projects that we have been renewing. But that
24 is something, I think, that has to be weighed always.

25 MS. RICARDO-CAMPBELL: I think it is very hard to

1 know whether that is actually true or not. I am not putting
2 anybody's integrity on the line. All I am saying is that
3 you have supported somebody since '71, and have been on the
4 staff, and staff people have been on, you are not going to
5 say it is not very worthwhile and continue. It may be worth-
6 while. I did not want to hit it on this particular person.
7 What I want to do, as I said, is raise a policy issue. I
8 think it is important. It is across -- it is all those darn
9 dictionaries that are scattered in lots of other areas.

10 CHAIRMAN BENNETT: Would you raise your -- would
11 you go on.

12 MS. RICARDO-CAMPBELL: The other one I was almost
13 convinced on is on page 31, I believe. It is that -- we
14 heard a great pitch for training preservationists and con-
15 servationists in archives. Until I read -- and, again, it
16 is more a policy issue than the actual item. I try to stick
17 to the large grants and policy issues.

18 This is for a three-year program at the University
19 of Columbia. What bothers me is it says the funds requested
20 will be used for part of the salaries and fringe benefits,
21 materials and supplies, and primarily for stipends for con-
22 servator students. I want to put up a great warning plaque.
23 I do not think there is an over supply at the moment of
24 this type of person trained for this type of area. But I
25 will point out to you that the medical profession is full

1 of over supply because there are stipends for medical stu-
2 dents, and when you promise stipends to people to go to
3 college, it is amazing how many people are diverted into those
4 areas.

5 It seems to me that this is the beginning of another
6 three-year round and once you have done three years, maybe
7 somebody will argue again -- give for three years, six years
8 -- all I am saying is that when you pay college students to
9 go to college, it get an over supply in that field.

10 CHAIRMAN BENNETT: Okay. Thank you. I think we
11 will take that up in part in connection with the general
12 discussion next time. Thank you, Rita. Other comments by
13 other Council members? Anita.

14 MS. SILVERS: I just wanted to know about -- and
15 conferences. It is University of Arizona, Problems in the
16 Representation of Knowledge and Belief. What -- is this?
17 It is page 90.

18 MR. CANNON: Could I have the number, please.

19 MS. SILVERS: It is RD-20444. Harold probably
20 knows all these by heart.

21 CHAIRMAN BENNETT: Harold doesn't know.

22 MR. CANNON: I haven't got it in front of me. I
23 apologize. I think John has it

24 MR. CANNON: We had a snowstorm in Washington,
25 and the panel couldn't meet. All the reviews had to be

1 collected by phone. So, we were late with reject comments
2 this time. This is the one category where that happened.
3 May I communicate with you on that, Anita, please?

4 MS. SILVERS: Yes.

5 CHAIRMAN BENNETT: Thank you, Harold. Anything
6 else? There is a motion on the floor. All in favor?

7 (A chorus of ayes was heard.)

8 CHAIRMAN BENNETT: All opposed?

9 (No response.)

10 CHAIRMAN BENNETT: Abstaining?

11 MS. RICARDO-CAMPBELL: I want to be listed as
12 abstaining.

13 CHAIRMAN BENNETT: Thank you, Mr. Berns. Finally,
14 Program and Policy Studies, Frances Rhome.

15 PROGRAM AND POLICY STUDIES

16 MS. RHOME: The uniqueness of our report is the
17 size of the report; three full pages, but please note that
18 each page is marked by number so you have no difficulty
19 in following what we have to say.

20 (Laughter.)

21 MS. RHOME: The committee approved the recommended
22 proposals, which are on the first page from OP-20167 through
23 20172, and we also approved the disapproved, or Not Recommended
24 projects, which start with pages 2 and 3, starting from
25 20157 to 20181. But the last one on page 4, A Survey of

1 Graduate Programs in the Humanities Since 1965 by James M.
2 Banner, elicited a great deal of discussion within our group,
3 and we have made a recommendation in that regard.

4 Let me explain why. This particular project, which
5 is to survey the graduate programs in the humanities since
6 1965, by James Banner, historian and scholar in residence,
7 for the Association of American Colleges, was to be a compre-
8 hensive survey of the changes in the curriculum and degree
9 requirements of graduate programs in the major disciplines
10 of the humanities in the United States since 1965. The
11 purpose was to develop a body of information that would give
12 us research into what graduate curriculums now are based
13 and presently exist.

14 This particular project proposal received outside
15 the deadline time, but it was special interest to the Educa-
16 tion Division as a contract study. But appropriately, it
17 belongs in this Division and so was referred to this group.
18 The panel reviewing the project was split in its assessment.
19 The committee found that the proposal could be most useful,
20 that the basic idea appeared to be sound but suggested that
21 a less ambitious procedure could prove more practical in
22 gaining the desired data for NEH needs.

23 The committee, therefore, agreed to reject the
24 proposal in its present form for the reasons as stated by
25 the panel and reviewers but favor instead a proposal developed

1 in consultation with OPPS and Education Division, determining
2 precisely the information required and the most feasible
3 procedures. Therefore, that particular project, then, in a
4 way, is a deferred project, or at least one that is to go
5 back for that consultation.

6 You will also notice that 20174, which is on page
7 5, is one that is deferred, and the reason for deferral is
8 that the staff wanted to gain further information before a
9 judgment could be made on this particular project. If there
10 are no questions, I move the acceptance of this lengthy and
11 profound and complex report by approving the items as men-
12 tioned.

13 CHAIRMAN BENNETT: All in favor?

14 (A chorus of ayes was heard.)

15 CHAIRMAN BENNETT: Opposed?

16 (No response.)

17 CHAIRMAN BENNETT: Thank you, Ms, Rhome. I would
18 like to thank those Council members for coming out of retire-
19 ment and coming back to this meeting. Are there any final
20 matters? Phil.

21 MR. *Schaefer* STANLIS: I think I would just like to clear
22 up one point. When Mrs. Himmelfarb talked about two or
23 three proposals that were rejected by our panel, The Fellow-
24 ship Division. it should have been noted that there was no
25 unanimity on that rejection. I, as is usually my custom,

1 went along with the staff out of personal staff affection.
2 Just wanted -- it was made clear and she said that she would
3 have brought it up that there was a mixed reaction to two
4 or three proposals.

5 CHAIRMAN BENNETT: Louis.

6 MR. HECTOR: Bill, I know this is very difficult
7 to predict, but do you have any sense of whether you will
8 want us back in May?

9 CHAIRMAN BENNETT: I don't think so.

10 (Laughter.)

11 CHAIRMAN BENNETT: Give me the weekend to think
12 about it. That is, I don't think that you will -- what is
13 the nice way to put it -- be allowed to be back -- be asked
14 to be back. We think the White House now has its nominees
15 and that they are going through FBI checks. You know that
16 takes some time, but our best guess is that they will be
17 named and nominated and confirmed in the next month or two.
18 But leave your phone number, please.

19 A motion to adjourn.

20 VOICES: So moved.

21 CHAIRMAN BENNETT: All in favor?

22 (A chorus of ayes was heard.)

23 CHAIRMAN BENNETT: Thank you very much.

24 (Whereupon, at 2:43 p.m., the meeting was
25 adjourned.)