

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

EIGHTY-FOURTH MEETING OF THE
NATIONAL COUNCIL ON THE HUMANITIES

- - - -

NATIONAL ENDOWMENT FOR THE HUMANITIES

- - - -

Friday, May 8, 1987

- - - -

Conference Room M-09
First Floor
Old Post Office Building
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>
Minutes of Previous Meeting Mr. Kingston	3
Reports	
Introductory Remarks Mrs. Cheney	3
Introduction of New Staff Mr. Kingston	10
Contracts Awarded in the Previous Quarter Mr. Kingston	11
Conflicts of Interest Policy Mr. Kingston	11
Dates of Future Councils Mr. Kingston	16
Application Report and Matching Report Mr. Cherrington	17
Status of Fiscal Year 1987 Funds Mr. Cherrington	19
Fiscal Year 1988 Appropriation Request Mr. Cherrington	20
Fiscal Year 1989 Budget Planning Mr. Cherrington	26
Committee Reports on Policy and General Matters	
Education Program Ms. Rhome	27
Fellowship Programs Ms. Himmelfarb	31
Preservation Grants Mr. Schall	31
Research Programs Mr. Berns	32

C O N T E N T S
(continued)

	<u>Page</u>
General Programs Mr. Ritcheson	34
State Programs Ms. Cresimore	40
Jefferson Lecture Mr. Chickering	41
Actions on Emergency Grant Requests Mr. Kingston	43
Actions Departing from Council Recommendations Mr. Kingston	43
Education Programs Ms. Rhome	44
Preservation Grants Mr. Schall	48
Research Programs Mr. Berns	50
General Programs Mr. Ritcheson	72
State Programs Ms. Cresimore	77
Fellowship Programs Ms. Himmelfarb	79

P R O C E E D I N G S

MR. KINGSTON: Ladies and gentlemen, the 84th meeting of the National Council on the Humanities is now in order.

MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING

MR. KINGSTON: Council members received in the mail copies of the draft minutes. Are there any additions or corrections to those minutes that you would wish to make? There being none, they will stand approved as published.

Let me announce as well that, if you did not receive a copy of the Jefferson Lecture, Susan Metts does have additional copies with her, and by all means, feel free to pick up a copy from her.

We turn to the Chairman's Report. Mrs. Cheney.

INTRODUCTORY REMARKS

MS. CHENEY: Well, I found this to be not only an enjoyable Council meeting, my observations are that it has also been an efficient and productive one. Since we have all our veteran Council members here this time, you are all well aware that this doesn't happen by accident. It happens because of the fine staff here at the Endowment. And I would like to begin this meeting by complimenting them for their fine work.

The Research Division was particularly heroic this time. What was it, 1,200 pages, Rich? An incredible amount

1 of work, much of it done in response to a need that the
2 Council Committee in Research expressed to have a little more
3 length in some of the write-ups, and this was done. It was
4 an incredible amount of work, but I think very useful for
5 all of us who try to understand the many, many applications
6 that we receive here at the Endowment.

7 Our main focus of activity, besides, of course,
8 the annual deadlines, or the deadlines that keep coming
9 along, and the Council meeting, and the managing of the
10 grant-making process, has been the Study Group on Elementary
11 and Secondary Education. The Advisory Group on History and
12 Literature has met twice now. There will be one more meeting
13 at the end of May. We also met with an Advisory Group on
14 Foreign Languages, and under the kind auspices of the Wilson
15 Center, we met with the heads of the various humanities
16 organizations and the heads of foundations that have been
17 actively supporting humanities education.

18 We are now beginning to think, as we approach the
19 final meeting of the Advisory Group on History and Literature,
20 about the form that their report, which we will be issuing
21 in the fall, will take. Part of my thinking about that went
22 into the American Council for Learning Society's speech,
23 which I gave and which I know has been distributed to the
24 Council members.

25 I have been struck time and again, in looking at the

1 state of humanities education in the elementary and secondary
2 schools by how closely related the problems that we find there
3 are with what has happened in the nation's universities. The
4 emphasis in universities on research has meant a de-emphasis
5 on teaching, and in the case of the schools, that has meant
6 a lack of interest in humanities departments in the prepara-
7 tion of those who will teach in our nation's schools.

8 Specialization of the most focused kind has meant,
9 in the case of history in particular, that the story of the
10 past has been lost. We have more facts. We have more
11 information, much of it very important, but more facts and
12 more information than we have ever had before, but it hasn't
13 been integrated in a meaningful way. It has not been inte-
14 grated in a way to be useful to educated laypeople, much
15 less to students.

16 I am reminded of T. S. Eliot's plaintive question,
17 "Where is the wisdom that we have lost in knowledge? Where
18 is the knowledge that we have lost in information?" My
19 sense is that many thoughtful people are feeling an uneasiness
20 about too much emphasis being placed on the small and the
21 particular in the humanities right now. Their uneasiness
22 isn't directed so much as mine is at the result such an
23 emphasis has on the schools, which is where mine begins and
24 where my focus continues, but simply at the situation itself.

25 Some efforts, indeed, many efforts that are highly

1 specialized, will always be important. But there should also
2 be efforts, many of them, that are large and general --
3 synthesis, as one historian puts it. There should be research
4 projects that reach many people as well as research projects
5 that reach a few colleagues.

6 We need, at the Endowment, to think how we can
7 encourage such projects, about how we can turn the general
8 concerns that are beginning to be expressed in the field into
9 applications. As the members of the Council are well aware,
10 we have a fine staff here at the Endowment, a really amazing
11 amount of hardworking brain power. You on the Council see
12 their work four times a year; I see it daily and am deeply
13 appreciative. Working with that staff, working here at the
14 Endowment, I plan, in the months and years ahead, to turn
15 attention to this problem, to look for ways to make NEH a
16 part of the solution.

17 And as a small first step, a very small first step,
18 I revised the memorandum that goes out to our panelists and
19 reviewers so that it emphasizes that the projects they recom-
20 mend for funding must be significant as well as substantial.
21 Projects should not only be of compelling quality; they should
22 be of compelling importance.

23 As we continue to put our mind against this matter,
24 here at the Endowment, I want the members of this Council also
25 to be deeply involved. I value your advice. I value your

1 wisdom, and I will be seeking both from you in the months
2 ahead.

3 MR. KINGSTON: Thank you. I should note that a
4 copy of that memorandum has been placed at each Council mem-
5 ber's table. Are there comments or questions about the
6 Introductory Remarks of the Chairman? John?

7 MR. AGRESTO: I would like to pick up and follow
8 on some of the things that Lynne just raised, looking not
9 so much at what we do here, but what I have seen in the outside
10 world in the nearly five years I have been here. And I think
11 some Council members who have been here that long, or almost
12 that long, will join me in this. So, some general observa-
13 tions on the condition of the humanities in America.

14 We tend to see things here retail. We see particu-
15 lar proposals and we discuss, fight, and come to judgment
16 on those particular proposals. But every now and then, it is
17 helpful and wholesome actually to look at things wholesale,
18 and I think the general situation, especially when we look
19 beyond the university, the general situation gives us some
20 moderate cause for optimism.

21 I think we should note that, at least when I first
22 came here, all the debates in the humanities seemed to be
23 about money. Now, all the debates are about substance or
24 about content and that is a change wholly for the better. We
25 have seen the "Back to Basics" movement and the "Excellence in

1 Education" movement take firm root and at least start to grow
2 and flower.

3 I recently -- and this is personal -- I recently
4 visited an inner-city elementary school just north of the
5 Bronx where the students in that school knew more ancient
6 history and were beginning to learn ancient Greek and were
7 starting in the same class to learn some Latin -- and this
8 was a 4th grade class. It gives us, on that score, also
9 reason for hope.

10 I think the teachers unions, and especially I want
11 to commend the AFT, have turned around significantly on many
12 issues. If you look at the columns they have been writing
13 recently, the general theme that runs through both Mary
14 Futrell's column and Al Shankler's column seems to be that
15 the best education is the best education for all people in
16 this country. And that is a theme that, I think, is superbly
17 necessary to say.

18 The AFT also began an Education for Democracy
19 program, which they are working on now, and which, I think,
20 will bear great fruit, wherein they are trying to restore
21 rational, reasonable civic education in the nation's schools.
22 I even think in the Academy, if you look, not only E. D.
23 Hersch's book and Alan Bloom's book, but even the reception
24 those books are receiving, I think there is cause for hope
25 there too.

1 And I have noticed, in my traveling around the
2 country, that even those universities that do not have core
3 curricula say they do. So, I know that we sometimes feel
4 when we are here that, you know, that the world will little
5 note nor long remember what we say here. I don't think that
6 is true. I think that, in fact, the work we do here, joined
7 up with the work that others are doing in the vineyard of
8 education, is coming to fruition. So, I think we have reason
9 at least for moderate optimism.

10 MR. KINGSTON: Jim?

11 MR. SCHALL: Mrs. Cheney, may I ask you a question
12 about your proposal, this resolution? May I ask you a
13 question with regard to this? Can you hear me? May I ask
14 you how you understand this question about a project being
15 done well and of compelling importance and quality.

16 I was talking to Harold Cannon yesterday. We were
17 talking about a think worth doing. There is a wonderful
18 passage in G. K. Chesterton that says, "If a thing is worth
19 doing, it is worth doing badly." I am wondering here -- I
20 can see that the concept of compelling importance and the
21 thing being done well could easily be interpreted in a kind
22 of a political fashion.

23 Many things that are important to be done are not
24 necessarily popular kinds of things. I am wondering in your
25 wording whether you had distinguished that in some way to be

1 rather clear on that kind of question about what would be the
2 origin of your thinking about what is of compelling importance.

3 MS. CHENEY: First of all, I see no political
4 dimension to this. I am astonished that someone might per-
5 ceive that. I don't see any political dimension to it at all.
6 I didn't have Chesterton in mind; I had Goethe in mind. He
7 once said, and he was concerned about the Academy, he once
8 said, "Soon they will only be asking is this to be done
9 well? They will not be asking is this worth doing?" So,
10 that was the origin of my thinking.

11 This is a very amorphous problem to get hold of,
12 and I think, as we move ahead in the next weeks and months to
13 think about it and to try to deal with it and to try to
14 respond to what I see as real concerns being expressed in
15 the field, one of the things that we have to put our minds
16 against, one of the matters that we have to put our minds
17 against, is defining the problem.

18 So, I tried to keep the letter on a high and more
19 general plane, partly because the problem is different from
20 division to division. The problem is different from disci-
21 pline to discipline.

22 MR. KINGSTON: Other comments or questions? If not,
23 we will move into some more mundane matters.

24 INTRODUCTION OF NEW STAFF

25 MR. KINGSTON: First of all, I don't have any new

1 staff to introduce, because there have been no new staff in
2 this last quarter arriving at the professional levels.

3 CONTRACTS AWARDED IN THE PREVIOUS QUARTER

4 MR. KINGSTON: You have, under Tab A of the Council
5 Committee book, one contract. This was a contract for the
6 group that handles logistics for the elementary and secondary
7 schools study group. Are there any questions about that
8 contract?

9 CONFLICTS OF INTEREST POLICY

10 MR. KINGSTON: If there are none, I would refer
11 you to the conflicts of interest policy, the conflicts of
12 interest resolution, which appears at the very front of the
13 Council agenda book. As you recall, we asked you to read
14 that over. If there are any comments or questions, we should
15 discuss them now.

16 About every two years, we do ask that the Council
17 adopt a conflicts of interest resolution. George?

18 MR. KENNEDY: There is at least -- is this audible
19 -- there is at least ---

20 MR. KINGSTON: Hold the mikes very close to you.
21 We still are -- with the address system. The wiring for a
22 complete new address system is now in the building, but the
23 last steps are not complete. We hope to have that complete
24 by next August.

25 MR. KENNEDY: As I recall, there are also certain

1 other conventions that are thought of as involved in conflict
2 of interest which do not appear in the conflict of interest
3 resolution. The one in particular, which we debated either
4 two or four years ago, was whether or not members of the
5 Council should write letters of recommendation for specific
6 applications, and the Council at that time voted against it,
7 though some of us thought that there were some arguments in
8 favor of it and that it didn't necessarily constitute a
9 conflict of interest.

10 I think what I am concerned about is the existence
11 of various other kinds of oral traditions, or in this case,
12 Council resolutions that aren't included within this. New
13 members of the Council, as they come on, may not be aware
14 of them. Several of us, for example, were not aware of that
15 convention, that members of the Council should not write
16 letters of recommendation for specific applications.

17 Are there some other hidden things that we don't
18 know about. In any event, should not new members of the
19 Council be informed of that particular provision?

20 MR. KINGSTON: Are you proposing that we add as
21 one of the conditions in the resolution statement that
22 members of the Council should not write letters of recommenda-
23 tion for ---

24 MR. KENNEDY: Well, it would be ironic for me to
25 do so since I was the one who tried to get it eliminated.

1 I don't think I want to move an amendment to add. Somebody
2 else could if they want to. I accepted the decision of the
3 majority on that occasion, but it was an issue of controversy.

4 MR. KINGSTON: Yes, Bob.

5 MR. HOLLANDER: One of the very few perks we get
6 as members of this Council is not having to write letters of
7 recommendation. I am not speaking in favor of the notion
8 that this be codified, however, and I think an understanding
9 coming from the Chairman's office, either verbal or in
10 writing, would, as far as I am concerned -- if we want to
11 reopen the question and vote on it, I would hope we would do
12 it as voting on a convention and not as part of this official
13 document. But I would be opposed to the motion that you
14 would get someone else to present it.

15 MR. KINGSTON: Are there other comments or ques-
16 tions about the resolution? It would seem to me that you
17 have either the option of adopting the resolution as it
18 stands now or of adding additional conditions, such as the
19 statement about refraining from writing letters of recom-
20 mendation. A motion for adoption of the resolution or any
21 amendment is in order. Yes.

22 MR. HOLLANDER: Excuse me. Before we get there,
23 could I raise the question of the language, which I remember
24 as being here the same as it was sometime in the 1970's and
25 I thought it was changed then. It is a small point, but it

1 might be a significant one if I could draw it to your atten-
2 tion. In item 1, the last sentence reads: "Council members
3 should not be designated in an application as the principal
4 investigator nor as serving in a similar role." That would
5 seem to say that he not be designated as serving, while it
6 means, I believe, that he not serve. That if there were -- a
7 very brief change -- I would recommend it as appropriate to
8 do so. "...nor should he serve in such a role."

9 You see, the way it is stated, it seems as though
10 we are simply trying to hide the fact that someone might,
11 in fact, serve in such a role. If that is a fair objection,
12 it would also require a change in item 3, in the very last
13 phrase, where it reads now "as having a similar role," it
14 should read "or should serve" -- I am sorry -- "should serve
15 in this role." Do you see the point?

16 MR. KINGSTON: Yes. Can I entertain that as a
17 motion formally? You are recommending a change in the
18 language of the existing resolution that item 1 would read,
19 in the last sentence: "Council members should not be desig-
20 nated in an application as a principal investigator nor
21 should he serve in such a role." And in item 3, it would
22 read, after the comma: "But, as noted above, a person other
23 than a Council member should be in charge of the humanities
24 aspects of the project and should be designated as the
25 principal investigator or should serve in this role."

1 MS. RHOME: I second the motion.

2 MR. KINGSTON: The motion has been made and seconded.
3 Is there a further discussion of that change in the resolu-
4 tion?

5 MS. RHOME: I do not believe that this is really
6 a change in the resolution. It simply a style change and a
7 modification of the language.

8 MR. KINGSTON: Other comments or questions? Are
9 you ready for the vote? Those in favor of the modification,
10 signify by saying "aye."

11 (A chorus of ayes was heard.)

12 MR. KINGSTON: Those opposed?

13 (No response.)

14 MR. KINGSTON: I think it would be appropriate to
15 have a motion for adoption of the full resolution as well.

16 MR. BERNS: So moved.

17 MR. KINGSTON: Mr. Berns has moved.

18 MS. RHOME: Second.

19 MR. KINGSTON: Ms. Rhome has seconded. Any dis-
20 cussion of the motion? All those in favor, signify by saying
21 "aye."

22 (A chorus of ayes was heard.)

23 MR. KINGSTON: Opposed?

24 (No response.)

25 MR. KINGSTON: The resolution, as modified, is

1 passed, and we will include the reformed language in the next
2 Council agenda booklet.

3 DATES OF FUTURE COUNCILS

4 MR. KINGSTON: The next item of earthly business
5 is the dates of future Council meetings. If you turn to
6 Tab B, you will see that we are proposing a series of dates
7 for 1988. The May meeting is, of course, the time when we
8 establish the next calendar year's meeting dates. Are there
9 any comments or concerns about those particular dates?

10 MR. STANLIS: (Inaudible.)

11 MR. KINGSTON: A motion would be in order for
12 establishing those dates as published for the next -- for the
13 1988 meetings of the Council. Mr. Stanlis has moved; the
14 second is from -- I am sorry -- Mr. Berns. Discussion?
15 Fran is smiling.

16 MS. RHOME: Well, I will be -- in order to put
17 these on my calendar.

18 MR. KINGSTON: Louise ---

19 MS. RHOME: And I will wait until the day before
20 for each time before I cancel.

21 MR. KINGSTON: Those in favor of the motion, signify
22 by saying "aye."

23 (A chorus of ayes was heard.)

24 MR. KINGSTON: Opposed?

25 (No response.)

1 MR. KINGSTON: All right. Those dates will be the
2 dates of the Council meetings in 1988. Now, I will turn the
3 comments over to Mr. Cherrington for the Application Report
4 and the Matching Report.

5 APPLICATION REPORT AND MATCHING REPORT

6 MR. CHERRINGTON: The Application Report is in the
7 brown folder. It is labeled Tab C. Every year, it seems
8 like we do something in NEH, an initiative or emphasis,
9 something like this, that is great for the humanities and
10 great for the agency, but the minute I see it I know I will
11 be explaining it for years. Because of what we did, it
12 distorts all our budget tables. These things are definitely
13 mixed blessings.

14 Last year, John Agresto's special competition for
15 Bicentennial Younger Scholars grants distorted everything.
16 It was a great idea, but applications in Younger Scholars
17 increased from 174 to 983, and I have been explaining that
18 ever since. This year, Lynne did it to me with the Bicen-
19 tennial Bookshelf program. Again, it was a fantastic idea,
20 but 848 applications with a 100 per cent funding ratio messes
21 up all of our historical statistics.

22 So, when you try to compare applications received
23 to date in '85 and '86, as the report before you tries to
24 do, you might as well forget it. It is also complicated this
25 year by a lot of changes in deadlines in the Research Division.

1 By the end of 1987, when all this sorts out, I
2 think applications agency-wide will be about the same as in
3 '86, largely due to the Bicentennial Bookshelf program.
4 In the next few months, we will be looking at all of our
5 programs in preparation for the 1989 budget submissions, and
6 in that review, we will be looking at all applications
7 received and all funding ratios. And when we do that, I
8 hope we come up with some ideas that are as successful as
9 the ones we have come up with the last few years.

10 MR. KINGSTON: Any questions about the Application
11 Report? Matching Report?

12 MR. CHERRINGTON: Okay. The Matching Report is
13 also in the brown folder. It is also labeled Tab C. Matching
14 continues to run strong here at NEH. It is helped and
15 distorted, of course, by the Bicentennial Bookshelf program.
16 It is not the money that really distorts it here. It is
17 the number of offers.

18 If you look at the chart, we will see the first,
19 third, and fifth columns all refer to the number of offers.
20 Throwing in, again, the 800 applications in there distorts
21 everything. The edition you have before you goes through
22 April 7. As we thought, a later edition -- well, I have a
23 later edition now that goes through April 30, and it also
24 shows that everything is running about the same as last year.

25 We are especially pleased with matching in Education

1 and the Office of Preservation, especially Preservation,
2 because it is a new area. We didn't know if we would be able
3 to get much matching there, and also the total effort is so
4 huge that we really do need a lot of private support here.

5 MR. KINGSTON: Any questions about the Matching
6 Report? Status of Fiscal Year 1987 Funds. Steve?

7 STATUS OF FISCAL YEAR 1987 FUNDS

8 MR. CHERRINGTON: Okay. About half the year is
9 over, and we have spent about half of our money. To give
10 you a brief update, our National Capital Arts and Cultural
11 Affairs program, you may remember the Administration proposed
12 a recission in these funds. Congress did not act on the
13 recission request so that the funds became available for
14 obligation.

15 There has been a meeting to go over the applica-
16 tions and awards should go out around next Friday.

17 We mentioned, I think, at another meeting that,
18 in January of 1987, all federal employees received a 3 per
19 cent pay raise. Provision for this had not been included
20 in our 1987 appropriation. In addition, there is a new
21 federal retirement system that will also cost the agency more
22 money. The total cost of both these items is about \$425,000.
23 Right now, Congress is working a supplemental to our '87
24 appropriation that would give us \$400,000 for these two items.

25 MR. KINGSTON: Any questions about the current

1 fiscal year? Appropriations request for fiscal '88.

2 FISCAL YEAR 1988 APPROPRIATION REQUEST

3 MR. CHERRINGTON: Now, we move into future fiscal
4 years. The first one is 1988. In the brown folder, there is
5 a memo titled, "Recent Congressional Hearings." It is
6 labeled Tab E.

7 Spring is hearing session here at the Endowment.
8 We have had four so far this year. Three involved our 1988
9 budget request and a fourth one focused on preservation,
10 specifically the Brittle Books issue.

11 The first budget hearing we had was in the Senate
12 on March 19. I mention in the memo the main topics of the
13 hearing, preservation, humanities education in the schools,
14 and so forth. The significant item, as far as I was con-
15 cerned, was that the Senate gave us 21 pages of questions
16 to answer for the record. Our response to these questions
17 was 103 pages long, which was longer than the budget itself,
18 which was 81 pages.

19 We think that because of the shift in the party
20 control in the Senate they were trying to get to know us
21 better. At least I hope that was what it was. Questions
22 they asked included the expenses of the pay raise, several
23 questions on the geographic diversity of NEH awards, the
24 student loan issue, peer review, National Capital Arts, and
25 everything else. You name it and they asked four different

1 questions about it.

2 The next hearing we had was in the House on April 8.
3 As in the past, it was a long -- it was an all-day affair.
4 Congressman Sidney Yates of Chicago was the -- presided.
5 One of the main topics of the day was the NEH review system.
6 IMS had been in there the day before, and I believe Mr. Yates
7 was concerned by an impression he got that the computer in
8 IMS has much more to do with the review system than he would
9 like.

10 We went through our review system quite thoroughly,
11 and he was very pleased with what he heard, especially that the
12 decisions along the way were made by people rather than by
13 machines. Mrs. Cheney stressed that the role of the computer
14 in the review process here is basically as a giant rolodex
15 to give us names of panelists and reviewers.

16 We also discussed the Africans television show.
17 Mrs. Cheney stressed that the issue there is that we don't
18 look at the character of the applicant. We looked at the
19 character of the application. It is the product of the NEH
20 grant that must be balanced.

21 We also discussed the National Capital ARTs program
22 again. The way it is designed at the moment it is basically
23 an arts program, and Mrs. Cheney suggested that, if the
24 program were to be continued, that perhaps the humanities
25 could be brought into it. And Mr. Yates said he would look

1 into that.

2 The division directors then dazzled Mr. Yates with
3 a truckload of products of NEH grants, books, program, even
4 a poster, and he was very impressed with that. The House
5 knows us a lot better, and they only gave us six pages of
6 questions for the record, and our response was a mere 28
7 pages.

8 They asked about the redesign of the Education
9 Division, the Bicentennial Bookshelf program, changes in the
10 Fellowship Division, et cetera.

11 On March 10, there was a public witness hearing in
12 the House. Witnesses, as usual, were very supportive of
13 NEH and its programs. Two witnesses, Professor Alan Kraut
14 of American University and Stanley Katz of ACLS, specifically
15 praised the NEH review system. Generally, witnesses called
16 for a level budget in 1988. Others called for specific
17 increases. I mention in the memo that Shirley Echelman wanted
18 to double the Office of Preservation to \$7 million, and
19 Gerald George of the American Association for State and
20 Local History recommended more funding for museums.

21 The other hearing we had was a special hearing on
22 March 3 in the House on the problem with brittle books. Mrs.
23 Cheney stressed that brittle books were definitely a problem,
24 but there were other concerns, deteriorating newspapers,
25 the need for training in preservation technologies, and so

1 forth.

2 In addition, in regard to brittle books, NEH's main
3 concern here is in preserving the intellectual content of
4 the books. We don't want to preserve 10 copies of the same
5 volume.

6 MR. KINGSTON: As you can see, spring is a busy
7 time for the Endowment vis-a-vis Congress. Are there any
8 questions about the various hearings in which we have partici-
9 pated? Fran?

10 MS. RHOME: I would be interested in the comments
11 that you did make at the time -- and I don't know whether
12 you have a summary of it -- but I wonder what kind of statis-
13 tics you had to offer from the standpoint of the brittle
14 books problem?

15 MS. CHENEY: There are statistics, but they are so
16 problematic every time I begin to talk about them I get a
17 little bit of a stomachache. All right. You start out with
18 70 million books, and you figure out how many are coming
19 on-line over the next 20 years. That gets you up to about
20 110 million. This is all -- so much guesswork is involved.
21 How am I doing so far? Oh, it is up to 114 million. Then
22 you assume that of that 114 million volumes there are going
23 to be repeats. So, you decide that over the next 20 years
24 there are going to be 11.4 million volumes endangered that
25 we need to do something about.

1 What we at NEH do is try to save the intellectual
2 content through microfilming. Steve is being very kind here
3 not pointing out to me that I have already messed up the
4 figures. The 11.4 million, in fact, even once you have got
5 it down to that, even after you have screened out multiple
6 copies, you are going to decide that all those aren't worth
7 saving. Okay? Only about a third of those are worth saving.
8 So, now we are down to 3.8 that NEH is really concerned about.

9 Half a million have already been preserved and
10 so that means that 3.3 million need to be preserved over the
11 next 20 years, which means we need to do 40,000 a year. Those
12 are figures that people interested in preservation have com-
13 piled. But everytime I go through them, as I say, they make
14 me very nervous. It is a very inexact science.

15 Fortunately, we are proceeding in a very slow and
16 orderly way, making sure, at each step, that whatever pre-
17 servation action we encourage and fund is fed into a central
18 network so that the same action won't be repeated by another
19 funder or another person interested in preservation in a
20 different place.

21 MS. RHOME: Thank you.

22 MR. KINGSTON: Charles?

23 MR. RITCHESON: Madam Chairman, I think the problem
24 of preservation is really a critical one. I am delighted at
25 the initiative of the Council in taking this -- taking at

1 least a part of this problem in hand. But those of us who
2 are responsible for large major research libraries have a
3 feeling of desperation about this. I wonder what was the
4 reaction to Shirley Echelman's suggestion that the Endowment
5 double, or ask for a double, budget in this regard?

6 MS. CHENEY: We have been asked by the Congress to
7 prepare capability statements at various levels. If we were
8 to be given \$1 million more, \$2 million more, \$3 million more,
9 what would we do and would we feel we could do it responsibly?
10 We continue to emphasize the newspapers are also important;
11 the documents are also important and that it is not simply
12 brittle books.

13 I have also, though, felt, and made the statement
14 strongly, that what you do not want is a massive infusion
15 of money up-front. That there is not yet in place -- "infra-
16 structure" is the word I began using. Now, I feel a little
17 sorry about it because it keeps coming back and back and it
18 is an ugly word. But the infrastructure is not yet in place
19 to begin with massive amounts of funding.

20 There are indeed some research universities where
21 the preservation problem has been recognized, preservationists
22 have been put on staff, plans have been set in place, where
23 NEH funding would be useful. There aren't many yet; there
24 will be more. We are also very actively involved in trying
25 to encourage the training of preservationists, because you

1 need more people who understand the problem and who know how
2 to deal with it.

3 MR. RITCHESON: Well, I congratulate you on that.
4 That is certainly a very valuable way to approach this
5 problem. I agree that massive infusions of money up-front
6 are not what was required. But any encouragement to training
7 preservationists, any encouragement at all in that way, is
8 really bread upon the waters.

9 MR. KINGSTON: Bob?

10 MR. LAXALT: No, nothing.

11 MR. KINGSTON: Other comments or questions? Do you
12 want to move to fiscal 1989?

13 MR. CHERRINGTON: Let's finish it up here.

14 FISCAL YEAR 1989 BUDGET PLANNING

15 MR. CHERRINGTON: Fiscal 1989 planning, there is
16 no memo in your folder on this. It is just hard for me to
17 believe that we are starting to be concerned with 1989, but
18 right now is always a very strange time of the year. We are
19 trying to carry out the money we have for 1987; we are
20 waiting to hear about what is going to happen in 1988; and
21 here we are planning for 1989.

22 As I mentioned a little bit ago, the first step
23 will be a review of all the programs here at the agency, and
24 I would like to stress that if any of you have any issues
25 about the budget or the programs here, please write or call

1 me, Len, John, Tom. We would really like to hear from you on
2 this issue.

3 In late July, when we send you a detailed paper,
4 which will outline the Chairman's anticipated budget plan
5 for 1989 and our concerns for each division and program
6 here -- at the August meeting, this will be discussed at
7 length.

8 The schedule for 1989 -- we submit the budget to
9 OMB in September of '87. We have an OMB budget hearing in
10 October. The budget submission to Congress will go up in
11 January or February of 1988. In the spring of 1988, we will
12 have hearings and then at some point, we get an appropriation.
13 And we never know when that is going to happen.

14 MR. KINGSTON: Comments or questions about fiscal
15 1989 planning? If there are none, we will move then to the
16 Reports on Policy and General Matters from the open sessions
17 of the respective divisional committees. Starting with
18 Education Programs, reporting for Mr. Stevens is Frances
19 Rhome.

20 EDUCATION PROGRAMS

21 MS. RHOME: Yes. In the wake of Bill Allen's
22 departure from the Council, which we were pleased to see him
23 have that appointment, but we also missed him very much, and
24 we also had Robert Stevens absent from yesterday's meeting,
25 Peter Stanlis and I were the only committee members present.

1 The committee devoted most of its open session to
2 a discussion of the division's new guidelines and a considera-
3 tion of the division's endeavors to make its grant opportuni-
4 ties more widely accessible. Jerry Martin, the chair and
5 director, said that among the most prominent features of the
6 new guidelines were these: (1) a renewed emphasis on teacher
7 preparation programs for future elementary and secondary
8 school teachers; (2) a new program to encourage academic year
9 Masterworks study groups for elementary and secondary school
10 teachers already in these positions of responsibility.

11 Mr. Martin noted that the division would soon be
12 embarking on several new initiatives on the context of the
13 recommendation of the Chairman's special Study Group on
14 Elementary and Secondary School Education in the Humanities.
15 This kind of announcement and the discussion was exceedingly
16 helpful and rich for us who were serving here in this
17 capacity.

18 Celeste Colgan told us of some of the work in one
19 of the study groups, as a matter of fact, and she commented
20 that its focus was on tradition, textbooks, and teaching.
21 She said she hoped it would have a real impact on every
22 aspect of the nation's elementary and secondary school system.
23 It is very helpful for the Board to have some of these
24 examples brought to us, because we can make better decisions
25 in policy.

1 After her remarks, Jerry Martin called for a report
2 from Carl Dolan, whom he introduced as a man whose mission
3 was to go boldly where no man had gone before. We made no
4 inferences from that remark. Mr. Dolan described some of
5 his recent efforts to introduce the Endowment to those who
6 have not heard about its opportunities. His travel to the
7 various areas of the country are very encouraging because he
8 is going to areas that are areas that need very much to hear
9 about the Endowment.

10 Among other things, he mentioned that he was meet-
11 ing with the Departments of Public Instruction -- we like to
12 hear that -- in many states, and he was spending a good time
13 encouraging specialists in -- learning programs to give more
14 attention to the humanities in their curricula planning.

15 Jerry Martin pointed out that in response to the
16 concerns raised at our February committee meeting the divi-
17 sion had changed its procedures with respect to requests for
18 additional information from applicants. Under the new pro-
19 cedures, he said the staff would no longer seek additional
20 information from applicants to Council without explicit
21 approval from such requests from the director.

22 This policy came about because there seemed to be
23 some grants who perhaps could have been said that they had
24 favorable treatment under such a process. This policy will
25 amend that. He said that in no such instances had it occurred

1 in connection with our May Council recommendations.

2 As the public session drew to a close, Mr. Martin
3 told us that the division was losing three valuable staff
4 members, and I might say that the loss of any staff members
5 from this group is indeed a loss: Jean D'Amato decided to
6 return to teaching; Ed Miller, who had accepted a position
7 as Dean of the Graduate School at the College of New Rochelle
8 in New York; and Carolynn Reid Wallace, who had accepted a
9 position as Vice-Chancellor for Academic Affairs at the City
10 University of New York, a most prestigious position.

11 We deeply regretted these losses in the division
12 and we join the staff really and truly in wishing success to
13 them in their new ventures.

14 MR. KINGSTON: Thank you, Fran. Are there any
15 questions or comments about the report from the Education
16 Division? The report from the Fellowship Committee? Bea?

17 FELLOWSHIP PROGRAMS

18 MS. HIMMELFARB: During the open session, the
19 committee conducted its customary annual review of the
20 division and the nine program officers responsible for the
21 individual programs comprised in the division gave their
22 reports.

23 If I have nothing new to report about all of this,
24 it is because we found that, in fact, all of these programs
25 were functioning very satisfactorily. I have had occasion

1 in the past to mention to you revisions that had been proposed
2 and made in the guidelines and in the administration of these
3 programs, and the current guidelines seem to be reasonably
4 satisfactory, as satisfactory as guidelines ever are.

5 I would like to take this occasion to commend the
6 staff for being very alert to problems as they emerge in
7 these individual programs and for being very thoughtful and
8 sometimes even ingenious in devising solutions to these
9 problems. Thank you.

10 MR. KINGSTON: Thank you, Bea. Are there any
11 questions or comments about the Fellowship Report? Preserva-
12 tion. Jim?

13 PRESERVATION GRANTS

14 MR. SCHALL: Mr. Chairman, the committee did not
15 have any policy issues to discuss at this open session of
16 the Council, so our session was very brief.

17 We did discuss, in general at least, mention the
18 special hearing held in March by the House subcommittee on
19 post-secondary education, which focused brittle books, as
20 we mentioned earlier. The Chair's testimony opened the
21 hearing and described not only the work of the Office of
22 Preservation in regard to the problem of brittle books, but
23 also in support of a variety of other kind of preservation
24 activity.

25 We were also interested to learn that two weeks from

1 now, the Chairman, as part of her trip to Montana, which I
2 understand is fairly near Wyoming, to attend ---

3 MS. CHENEY: (Inaudible.)

4 MS. HIMMELFARB: From the East, it looks forth ---

5 MR. SCHALL: To Montana to attend the opening of
6 the Regional Meeting of the Commission on the Bicentennial
7 of the Constitution, will present a special certificate of
8 commendation to the Montana Historical Society for its
9 completion of the Montana State Newspaper Project. We think
10 this is a very good way to signal the importance we attach
11 to the preservation of newspapers and to the United States
12 Newspaper Program.

13 MR. KINGSTON: Thank you. Any comments about the
14 Preservation Report? Research Programs? Walter?

15 RESEARCH PROGRAMS

16 MR. BERNES: Yesterday was a remarkable day in the
17 Research Division. We were visited by Mr. John Hammond of
18 the National Humanities Alliance, who, had he not already
19 been famous in that capacity, would have achieved a kind
20 of Andy Warholian fame yesterday for being the first member
21 of the public to attend the public session of the Research
22 Division. For his benefit, we actually had a little public
23 business, although I am not certain if he remarks to the
24 wider world as to what went on in our public sessions, we
25 will ever have public visitors again. It was not exactly

1 a scintillating session.

2 At any rate, Mr. Ekman reminded the committee that
3 the reason why so much of the division's annual business was
4 considered at this particular time was the desire on the part
5 of him and his staff to obtain budget flexibility across
6 program lines. That effort is succeeding. Yesterday recom-
7 mendations, he points out, were on budget and had benefited
8 from the added flexibility of moving funds across program
9 lines as the relative quality of the applications demanded.

10 We then discussed the problem featured in Mrs.
11 Cheney's memorandum, this problem, which I think affects the
12 Research Division more than any other division of the
13 Endowment, this problem of the competition, in a sense,
14 between specialized research, in our case, and synthetic
15 humanities programs.

16 To that end, we agreed, and I think we have the
17 agreement of everyone, that it would be advantageous to have
18 a meeting of senior members of the staff, members of Council
19 in this division, and Mrs. Cheney and her associated next
20 time to discuss this and work this out if we can.

21 We also asked Mr. Ekman to prepare what he describes
22 here as a background paper that would suggest criteria and
23 priorities for judging significance and breadth. That is
24 my report.

25 MR. KINGSTON: Thank you, Walter. Are there any

1 comments or questions? General Programs, Charles.

2 GENERAL PROGRAMS

3 MR. RITCHESON: Mr. Chairman, I am going to ask
4 the guidance of the chair at this point, because as a matter
5 of fact, I want to introduce a topic which does not pertain
6 to my report for General Programs. But I am advised by Don
7 Gibson that this is an opportunity to do so. The second
8 opportunity runs the risk of prolonging the session a bit.
9 I think, Chairman, I would like to raise the subject of a
10 resolution to thank President and Mrs. Reagan for their
11 hospitality of yesterday. If I am in order now, I will offer
12 a resolution; if I am not in order now, I will defer until
13 somewhat later.

14 MR. KINGSTON: A resolution of thanks is always
15 in order.

16 MR. RITCHESON: Very gracious.

17 MR. SANDOZ: May I suggest that we also have a
18 similar thanks to our Chairman, who obviously has a great
19 deal of clout and influence so that we were able to be
20 received at the White House, and we should give her a round
21 of applause.

22 (Applause.)

23 MR. RITCHESON: If I may proceed then, I would say
24 something along these lines. I have no pride of authorship
25 and doubtless there are others here who could do a more

1 finished job. But I have just scratched something out; it
2 would go like this:

3 "The National Council on the Humanities requests
4 the Chairman of the National Endowment to transmit the
5 following message to President and Mrs. Reagan. The National
6 Council on the Humanities thanks President and Mrs. Reagan for
7 their gracious hospitality of Thursday, May 6, 1987, and
8 are gratified at this testimonial of their regard for the
9 Jefferson Lectures, in particular, and the humanities, in
10 general. For its part, the Council expresses a deepened
11 commitment to serve the nation's intellectual, moral, and
12 spiritual welfare by supporting and fostering humane learning
13 and values in the United States."

14 MS. SILVERS: Second.

15 MR. KINGSTON: The motion has been proffered and
16 seconded by Anita. Is there any discussion of the resolution?

17 MR. LAXALT: Should we add anything about a statue
18 for Alexander Hamilton?

19 MR. KINGSTON: Of course, the statue for Alexander
20 Hamilton is in front of the Treasury Building.

21 MR. LAXALT: Yes ---

22 MR. KINGSTON: All of us had forgotten ---

23 MR. RITCHESON: In closed session, we might -- my
24 friend, Bob Laxalt, and I might well move renaming the
25 Jefferson Lectures.

1 MS. CHENEY: Charles, just one observation. I
2 think it was May 7.

3 MR. RITCHESON: Oh, was it? Missed a day. I was
4 so bedazzled, Madam Chairman, that ---

5 MR. KINGSTON: We will simply accept an editorial
6 revision of the motion. Any other comment or question about
7 the resolution? All those in favor, signify by saying "aye."

8 (A chorus of ayes was heard.)

9 MR. KINGSTON: Opposed?

10 (No response.)

11 MR. KINGSTON: The resolution is adopted.

12 MS. SILVERS: Excuse me.

13 MR. KINGSTON: Anita, please.

14 MS. SILVERS: May I just add a word of thanks to
15 Susan Metts and her staff for the entire organization of the
16 public events of this week.

17 MR. RITCHESON: May I return now to my ---

18 MR. KINGSTON: If you will.

19 MR. RITCHESON: If anything connected with General
20 Programs can be so described. There were no issues of policy
21 before the Committee on General Programs. Instead, we heard
22 brief reports from the Director, Don Gibson, and the Deputy
23 to the Director, Malcolm Richardson.

24 Mr. Gibson announced some news that I believe will
25 be welcome to the full Council. For some time, we have dis-

1 cussed the possibility of having members of the National
2 Council attend openings or other project events. A practical
3 difficulty has been that we have not always had enough infor-
4 mation about these events, nor have we had it in sufficient
5 time for busy Council members to attend. I am happy to say
6 that the staff of the Museums Program has compiled an
7 impressive and lengthy list of exhibits funded by the Endow-
8 ment.

9 This exhibition schedule, I might add, does not
10 cover every Endowment-funded project, rather it limits itself
11 only to those exhibits open to the public this spring. It is
12 quite an impressive document. It lists some 50 exhibits,
13 which by the end of their tours, will travel to 192 sites
14 around the country. These NEH-funded exhibits will appear
15 in 38 states and the District of Columbia, and a few of them
16 will actually be sent abroad to sites in Great Britain,
17 Canada, the Netherlands, and Mexico.

18 Don promised that these reports on project openings
19 and exhibit tours will be updated regularly. In addition
20 to this welcome news, Don called our attention to another
21 of handsome catalogues issued in conjunction with various
22 exhibitions. In deference to my colleague across the way,
23 Walter Berns, I will not exhibit all these, but I must con-
24 fess that I have to show you one of these catalogues, an
25 exceptionally handsome product, "Are We To Be A Nation?".

1 This book is the result of a project funded, not
2 by the Museums Program, but by Humanities Projects in
3 Libraries, and this serves as a companion to a splendid
4 exhibit at the New York Public Library on the drafting and
5 ratification of the United States Constitution. I should
6 mention that the American Library Association is producing
7 three smaller portable versions of this exhibit and that it
8 will be displayed in public libraries in 30 states during
9 the Bicentennial.

10 During the open session, we also heard a report
11 from Malcolm Richardson on the Columbian Quincentenary, which
12 as many of you are aware, is fast approaching in 1992. Among
13 other things, Malcolm told us about the work of the commission
14 created by Congress, whose full title is rather cumbersome,
15 but I suppose descriptive, the Christopher Columbus Quin-
16 Centenary Jubilee Commission. And if anyone works out an
17 acronym, I would like to know it.

18 In addition to nominees from the President, the
19 Speaker of the House of Representatives, and the Majority
20 Leader of the Senate, the legislation creating this body
21 also names several ex officio members, and among these, is
22 our own Chairman of the National Endowment for the Humanities.
23 Even before the commission was formed, NEH had begun
24 planning for this event, and the committee heard an account
25 of these efforts. These are now bearing fruit, and in the

1 motion before you, are several projects related to the
2 Columbian Quincentenary.

3 Finally, Don announced some staff changes. Unfor-
4 tunately, we are bidding farewell to Bridget Bradley, a
5 program officer in the Libraries Program, who is leaving us
6 to take a position with the American Library Association in
7 Chicago. Happily, however, I am also able to report some
8 good news. Wilsonia Cherry, formerly a program officer,
9 has been promoted and will now head Public Humanities
10 Projects, one of the four programs in the division.

11 Madam Chairman, that concludes my report on the
12 open session.

13 MS. CHENEY: I want to add my gratitude too to the
14 General Programs staff for putting together this snapshot --
15 making us able to take a snapshot on any given date of what
16 NEH is doing across the country in museums. It is museum
17 programming?

18 MR. RITCHESON: Yes.

19 MS. CHENEY: It is, I think, a fine way of illustrat-
20 ing to people what it is exactly we do and also letting our
21 Council members know what is happening at any given time.

22 MS. CRESIMORE: I have a question.

23 MR. KINGSTON: Yes.

24 MS. CRESIMORE: Will this updated list be distributed
25 to the Council members? Is it posted somewhere on a bulletin

1 board, or you know -- what are you planning ---

2 MR. GIBSON: We will be working with the Public
3 Affairs Office to provide that information to Council members.

4 MR. KINGSTON: Other comments or questions about
5 the report from General Programs?

6 MR. SCHALL: If it is not too distracting, could
7 you pass that catalogue around?

8 MR. KINGSTON: Report from State Programs? Jo?

9 STATE PROGRAMS

10 MS. CRESIMORE: The State Programs Committee wel-
11 comed one visitor, Dr. Ronald Benson, Executive Director of
12 the Georgia Endowment for the Humanities. During the open
13 session, staff reported on the progress to celebrate the
14 Constitution, a Guide to Public Programs on the United States
15 Constitution, prepared by the Federation of State Humanities
16 Council, under a Chairman's grant reported at the February
17 Council meeting. Publication is expected at the end of May.
18 This guide will be distributed free to the State Humanities
19 Councils and to the libraries receiving Bicentennial Bookshelf
20 awards. The committee learned that the U.S. Bicentennial
21 Commission will purchase 4,000 copies of the guide for distri-
22 bution to the state Bicentennial Commissions.

23 A brief report was given also on the meeting of
24 the chairs of the 53 state humanities councils that took
25 place at the end of March in South Carolina. Chairman Lynne

1 Cheney introduced the proceedings by delivering the keynote
2 address to the assembled group followed by Celeste Colgan
3 as the next day's luncheon speaker. Staff reported the
4 meeting to be one of the most successful, reflecting the
5 increased maturity and level of commitment to the humanities
6 on the part of the volunteer chairs.

7 No policy issues were discussed, and at this point,
8 the meeting was closed to the public.

9 MR. KINGSTON: Any comments or questions about the
10 State Report? There being none, the Jefferson Lecture
11 Committee did meet in closed session, but do you have any
12 comments ---

13 JEFFERSON LECTURE

14 MR. CHICKERING: On behalf of the committee, I
15 just wanted to express thanks to Susan Metts for overseeing
16 all of the events connected to this year's very successful
17 Jefferson Lecture.

18 MR. KINGSTON: Anita, did you ---

19 MS. SILVERS: Yes. I asked for a brief opportunity
20 to make a swan speech. One of the Endowment's objectives is
21 to enlighten and educate. The privilege of the most elevating
22 education the Endowment offers is reserved for Council
23 members. During my years as a Council member, I have been
24 fortunate to learn from the Endowment's very able and
25 talented staff, who collectively are experts in the standards

1 and the subject matter of all the humanities disciplines.
2 NEH personnel constitute, I think, a unique resource for the
3 humanities in this country.

4 Individually, I would like to thank all of the
5 staff for their great generosity and professionalism. I want
6 also to thank my fellow Council members, both those that are
7 here and those who have preceded me in departing, for your
8 warm friendships and many challenging and enjoyable discus-
9 sions. I want particularly to thank Chairman Cheney for her
10 generosity and her fresh and vigorous direction for the
11 Endowment.

12 Finally, I would like to thank all of you for the
13 patient that you have shown to me when I rode my hobbyhorses
14 excessively. As you know, throughout my Council service,
15 I felt a special obligation to urge that Council procedures
16 be adjusted to make Endowment programs accessible to the
17 public education institutions that have a special mission
18 in instilling appreciation for the humanities in first
19 generation college students and students from under-repre-
20 sented populations.

21 I appreciated being permitted some successes here;
22 more recently, I had a small success in the Younger Scholars
23 Program. And given the generosity of all those I have met
24 in association with this agency, I feel confident in commend-
25 ing these institutions and their students to you. Thank you

1 very much. I will miss all of you.

2 MS. CHENEY: We will miss you, too, Anita.

3 (Applause.)

4 MR. RITCHESON: Madam Chairman, I want just to
5 observe that swan songs have a way of turning into cygnet
6 songs. I want to make two.

7 MR. KINGSTON: Is there other business before the
8 open session of the Council? There being none, we will
9 adjourn until 10:25; at which time, we will resume in closed
10 session.

11 (Whereupon, at 10:15 a.m., a brief recess was
12 taken.)

13 MR. KINGSTON: Will you be seated, please. We will
14 resume the Council in closed session. If you refer to the
15 section in the Council agenda book, listed Emergency Grants,
16 you have there reported to you the grants requested and the
17 approvals and disapprovals for each. Are there any questions
18 about any of the emergency grants?

19 ACTIONS DEPARTING FROM COUNCIL RECOMMENDATIONS

20 MR. KINGSTON: If there are none, the next section
21 has the Actions Departing from Council Recommendations, both
22 approvals and disapprovals. Are there any questions about
23 any of those actions? If there are none, we will move on to
24 the grants before each of the respective divisions. Education
25 Programs, Mrs. Rhome.

EDUCATION PROGRAMS

MS. RHOME: Mr. Chairman, during its closed session, the Committee on Education Programs gave especially careful attention to six tagged proposals: ES-21459, which is on the first page of the green sheet that you have before us, which was from the National Council for the Social Studies proposal for a Conference to Develop and Disseminate Standards and Guidelines for Teaching History in the Schools.

We also took a very careful look at 21461, which is somewhere -- page 4, at the top of the page, from the University of Massachusetts at Amherst, proposal for a Summer Institute on Stories and the Child, and ES-21466, which is on page 1, a Central Missouri State University proposal for a Summer Institute on the Eighteenth Century as An Age of Revolutions, and ES-21452, which is page 3, near the top of the page, the Westminster College proposal for a Literature, Culture and Language Institute for High Schools Teachers of German, and finally, EH-20667, which is on page 7, the Associated Colleges of the Midwest proposal for a Summer Institute on the New History in Undergraduate Curriculum, and EH-20673, which is on the bottom of page 7, the Middlebury College proposal for a Conference on Undergraduate Teacher Education in Liberal Arts.

In all of these three instances -- but three instances -- the committee was highly satisfied with the staff

1 recommendations and voted to sustain those with no conditions.
2 But in one instance, that ES-21459, the one I first mentioned,
3 on page 1, the NCSS proposal for a Conference on Standards
4 and Guidelines for Teaching History in the Schools, we spent
5 a good time discussing whether the applicant's track record
6 in curriculum matters warranted a grant for this particular
7 purpose and whether the proposed conference would, in fact,
8 lead to better elementary and secondary school programs.

9 Jerry Martin responded to our questions in this
10 regard, and he reported that Robert Stevens had also expressed
11 concerns about the question. We eventually concluded that
12 the proposed conference did merit support, but only on the
13 condition that the project budget be reduced, and the final
14 motion reflects a budget designed to support only the publica-
15 tion and dissemination phases of the project. We believe
16 that the organization of a workshop and the other elements
17 that were contained within this report could very well come
18 from the NCSS staff itself.

19 In the second instance in which the committee
20 departed from the staff's recommendation, we voted not to
21 support the Summer Institute proposed by the University of
22 Massachusetts at Amherst. We concluded that the reading list
23 for this institute on stories and the child was too thin in
24 its attention to the traditional tales that would be con-
25 sidered as background for the contemporary stories that would

1 provide its primary focus.

2 This was a very exciting kind of a program and
3 the program itself delighted us. But we felt that the
4 readings were limited in their scope, and we moved that this
5 proposal, ES-21461, from the recommended to the not recom-
6 mended category.

7 In the third instance in which the committee failed
8 to give the staff recommendation its full support, we split,
9 one on one. There was only Peter and myself, and I thought
10 we did a very good job of compromising in most instances,
11 didn't we, Peter? In this particular one, we split, one on
12 one, on ES-21466, which was the Central Missouri State
13 University's proposal for a Summer Institute on the Eighteenth
14 Century, An Age of Revolutions.

15 You understand that my period is Renaissance. You
16 understand that Peter's period of academic excellence is in
17 the 18th century, and he expressed concern that the reading
18 list reveals a possible bias in favor of revolution. Of
19 course, I thought, gee, that would be fun. But, no, we
20 didn't go that route. For example, Burke's Reflection on
21 the Revolution in France is omitted, while Paine's Rights
22 to Man, which is the reply to Burke, is included. Moreover,
23 a number of relatively minor works are included to the
24 exclusion of more important texts that Peter felt would have
25 made a more coherent syllabus.

1 I felt more positive about the institute, which
2 covers an important period, and it had received favorable
3 reviews by the panelists. But since our vote was divided on
4 the proposal, it remains in the recommended category on the
5 final motion and will be referred for the -- recommendation.

6 I do move adoption of that motion and of the other
7 elements that are contained within our report here.

8 MR. KINGSTON: Are there questions or comments
9 about the motion?

10 MS. RHOME: Peter, would you like to make some
11 comments?

12 MR. STANLIS: Yes. One additional point concerning
13 the Eighteenth Century: An Age of Revolutions, I think we
14 also stated that the amount requested was excessive and
15 should be cut down and that we were going to leave this to
16 the discretion of the Chairman.

17 MS. RHOME: That is right.

18 MR. STANLIS: You didn't mention it, but I think
19 it should be mentioned.

20 MS. RHOME: And it should very definitely be men-
21 tioned and that this amount was the full amount that was
22 requested.

23 MS. CHENEY: I just have one matter I would like to
24 seek a little further advice from you on, the NCSS proposal.
25 I think that your decision to reduce funding was absolutely

1 correct. I am a little troubled at hanging that funding on
2 dissemination, because if our worst fears were to come true
3 and the proposals were indeed to reflect more the track
4 record of this organization than the new directions in which
5 it is purported to be heading, then it might look as though
6 the information we are disseminating was, in fact, what the
7 Endowment thought was the correct approach to elementary
8 and secondary education.

9 MS. RHOME: I may have brought that incorrectly
10 to you in the remarks as we prepared them. We wanted to
11 fund the conference and also the dissemination activities
12 that would come out of that conference, but we were reluctant
13 to fund the preparatory activities which would normally come
14 from a staff and should come, we felt, from other sources.

15 MS. CHENEY: I will look at it very carefully.

16 MS. RHOME: Take a good look at it.

17 MR. KINGTON: Other comments or questions on the
18 Education Report? We will skip over Fellowships for the time
19 being because their motion is now stuck in the xerox machine.
20 We do have some copies available. I have only a dozen copies
21 available, but I think we will try to get enough copies for
22 everyone. We have enough to work with if we need to. Let's
23 come back to Fellowships, though, and go on to Preservation. Jim.

24 PRESERVATION GRANTS

25 MR. SCHALL: The final motion for the Preservation

1 applications is in your basic gray here. We are recommending
2 18 proposals for support as a result of the second cycle of
3 Preservation applications in fiscal 1987. Of these, 8 are
4 for state newspaper projects and 10 are for other varying
5 kinds of preservation activity.

6 I would like to call the attention of the Council
7 to three of these grants. On page 1 of the motion, the
8 third project down, PS-20120, University of Missouri, we are
9 pleased that this award of a planning grant to Missouri will
10 enable a 26th state to join the United States Newspaper
11 Program. At the completion of this group of newspaper projects,
12 18,600 new titles will have been added to the National Data
13 Base, and two states, Iowa and Kentucky, will conclude their
14 participation in the program.

15 On page 4 of the motion, second project from the
16 top, 20154, University of Illinois, this planning grant to
17 the Consortium for Institutional Cooperation will inaugurate
18 a microfilming project among 11 midwestern universities,
19 which evaluators believed would be of national importance for
20 the preservation of scholarly resources in the humanities.

21 Finally, on page 3 of the motion, second from the
22 bottom of the page, 20150, the New York State Education
23 Department, this project for the microfilming of selected
24 documents relating to the social, legal, and economic develop-
25 ment of New York in 1760 to 1860 was the most highly praised

1 Preservation proposal in this round, both for the significance
2 of its material and for a plan of work that was considered a
3 model for the Archival Preservation Project.

4 Mr. Chairman, I move the adoption of this motion.

5 MR. KINGSTON: Second? Any questions or comments
6 about the report from Education? You remind me that I did
7 not formally ask for a vote on the Education motion. I
8 should have done so. May we back up for a moment and let me
9 ask for a vote on the motion from Education? All those in
10 favor, signify by saying "aye."

11 (A chorus of ayes was heard.)

12 MR. KINGSTON: Opposed?

13 (No response.)

14 MR. KINGSTON: And now on Preservation, all those
15 in favor, signify by saying "aye."

16 (A chorus of ayes was heard.)

17 MR. KINGSTON: Opposed?

18 (No response.)

19 MR. KINGSTON: It passes. Report from Research
20 Programs.

21 RESEARCH PROGRAMS

22 MR. BERNS: I have already noted we had a lot of
23 business yesterday and a lot of discussion during the closed
24 session, very good discussion. We spent a good deal of the
25 time discussing some linguistic grants we ended up approving,

1 but these would be grants that some of us would point to if
2 we wanted examples of specialized research that perhaps ought
3 not to be supported if other more synthetic, general programs
4 in the humanities could be identified.

5 I tell you I share some misgivings about these
6 things. On page 2, for example, there is a grant, RT-20764,
7 Lushootseed Research, and on page 5, a similar grant, Upriver
8 Halkomelem and Nooksack. These are languages that no one
9 can speak and in which nothing has ever been written. And,
10 therefore, I have some doubts about whether we really should
11 support them.

12 But we ended up following staff's recommendation,
13 and this is one of the things that, Rich, I think you will
14 have to persuade in a memorandum that there is merit to this
15 beyond the benefit to anthropologists and linguists. This,
16 therefore, is a bit sarcastic about it. I apologize, but I
17 am willing to be persuaded.

18 That aside, it should also be remarked that we
19 reversed staff's recommendation, I think, in seven cases
20 yesterday, which in terms of numbers is probably a greater
21 number of reversals than ever, although, as Rich points out,
22 I suspect in lieu of the large number of propositions that
23 were -- (inaudible) -- the motion contains 496 applications.
24 It is on the old gold paper of which 118 are recommended for
25 approval, 373 for disapproval, and 5 to be deferred.

1 I call your attention, on page 4, to RG-20794,
2 the Sosnoski proposal, the Vocabularies of Criticism and
3 Theory. We discussed this at some length and then the
4 committee was divided two and two. The staff had recommended
5 it for approval. We discussed it, and as I say, could not
6 come to some agreement.

7 The next one, on page 20, RT-20803, the Princeton
8 Encyclopedia of Poetry and Poetics, this had been recommended
9 for rejection. We discussed this at some length. Ellis
10 Sandoz pointed out that he uses it, this particular ency-
11 clopedia. The proposal is for the updating of it. He finds
12 it very useful. He is not persuaded of the reasons for
13 rejecting it, and we ended up recommending that the project
14 director should be given the opportunity to respond to the
15 criticisms. Therefore, we made it a deferral.

16 On page 20, RT-20853, the Completion of Family Life
17 and Conditions in the United States, this had been recom-
18 mended for approval. The committee members were divided.
19 There was a criticism by one reviewer so strong it would
20 warrant rejecting the proposal. The deferral recommendation
21 is intended to give the applicant a chance to address these
22 criticisms. So. it is a deferral.

23 On page 21, RC-21314, Wyoming -- do you have to
24 leave the room here -- Wyoming State Archives Historical
25 Public Records Project. This had been recommended for

1 approval. After considering the general policy question of
2 whether cataloguing recent state and local government records
3 ought to be eligible for NEH support, and a lot of talk about
4 whether Wyoming ought not to have done all this by themselves,
5 and without depending upon NEH money, the committee recom-
6 mended support with two conditions. The first that the cost
7 sharing needs to be increased to excess (?) of 50 per cent
8 to bring it in line with access projects of this type, and
9 secondly, that plans for the appraisal stage of the project
10 need to be detailed and approved before we can support it.

11 On page 24, RC-21383, Creating Access to the Vermont
12 Historical Society's Broadside Collection, this had been
13 recommended for rejection by staff despite very favorable
14 ratings from reviewers and panelists. The committee sensed
15 that this project had more significance than some other
16 projects, and therefore, recommended support.

17 Page 49, a biggie, RO-21392, Jack Hexter's the
18 Making of Modern Freedom, we discussed this at some length,
19 and in the end, the committee agreed with the staff's recom-
20 mendation to support this project. But we did so with a
21 divided vote, three to one. It should be noted that the
22 initial inclination of most of us was to reject this proposal
23 altogether, but the staff persuaded -- it might do some good.

24 On page 51, RO-21457, a History of Ethiopian Land
25 Tenure and Its Social Context, there was no disagreement

1 about the proposal's -- and the modifications of the people
2 who do the work. Our discussion, our misgivings, here had
3 to do with the critical conditions inside Ethiopia as to
4 whether, in fact, the work could be done. With various
5 assurances, we believe that the project is solid and should
6 be supported.

7 RO-21528, on page 67, was another biggie. This
8 project had been recommended for support. We were not per-
9 suaded, however, that a large national center on this particu-
10 lar subject, Rhetoric of Inquiry, was warranted, so we recom-
11 mended rejection of the proposal by a vote of three to one.
12 This is a major reversal of staff recommendation.

13 The next one, RH-20812, on page 74, is also a
14 reversal of staff recommendation. In this case, the committee
15 rescued it. It had been, as I say, recommended for rejection.
16 The committee feels that panel and reviewer comments were
17 more critical than -- so we recommend approval.

18 MR. KINGSTON: I am sorry, Walt, which one is that,
19 the number?

20 MR. BERNES: That is 20812 on page 74, St. John's
21 College, Guided Studies of Classics in Geometry and Astronomy.
22 You have the motion on this old gold paper and I move
23 adoption.

24 MR. KINGSTON: It has been moved and seconded to
25 adopt the motion. Are there questions? George, please.

1 MR. KENNEDY: Is this working?

2 MR. KINGSTON: Yes.

3 MR. KENNEDY: My question, I guess, is more of a
4 comment relates to the four projects in support of various
5 Cambridge histories of this and that, China, Latin America,
6 17th century philosophy. The background for this is that
7 I, myself, am one of the editors of the 9 volume Cambridge
8 History of Literary Criticism. We haven't sought any money
9 from anybody.

10 I feel that I am reasonably well paid for my edi-
11 torial responsibilities. I can see that an editor who
12 didn't have some of the facilities that I had available to me
13 might need some editorial help, hire somebody to put things
14 in the word processor. There are some postage and telephone
15 costs. It might be desirable to get the contributors to a
16 particular volume together. I went around and visited mine
17 instead. We thought about getting them all together but
18 decided it really wasn't practicable and probably not neces-
19 sary if we exchanged the contributions with individuals.

20 Thus, I guess I find it somewhat difficult to see
21 why \$518,333 of taxpayers' money should be used to support
22 these very worthy, indeed, authoritative projects.

23 MR. KINGSTON: Can you refer to the numbers?

24 MR. KENNEDY: I didn't write the numbers down.
25 They are -- Rick may be able to get them more quickly than I.

1 MS. RHOME: 49 was one of them.

2 MR. EKMAN: These are all listed in the Interpretive
3 Research section of the motion, which begins on page 49,
4 the positive recommendations -- on the pages following that.

5 There are a number of questions embedded in your
6 question, George, and I will try and sort them out. First,
7 there is the question of eligibility, whether a publishing
8 house, and a foreign publisher at that, ought to be an
9 eligible applicant for this sort of a project.

10 On technical grounds, Cambridge Press is an
11 eligible applicant. What is requested, of course, is not
12 anything that would give commercial advantage. It is a work
13 of scholarship and research rather than the manufacturing
14 costs themselves. One might wonder why the Cambridge Uni-
15 versity Press seems to submit so many applications for these
16 large, synthetic, multi-volume history projects rather than,
17 say, one of our familiar American university presses.

18 We speculated a lot about that among ourselves.
19 The fact is that Cambridge Press is much, much larger than
20 any American university press. It produces approximately
21 1,000 books a year, whereas the largest of the American
22 university presses produces about 300 books a year. That is
23 Chicago. Maybe there is something in the size of the opera-
24 tion that gives them an ability and an inclination to think
25 ahead and to project and design large-scale projects of this

1 sort in a way in which I think we would welcome if American
2 presses would do it more frequently.

3 As for the particular merits of the case, there
4 is -- I could outline them, but I don't think that is one of
5 the issues in your question. In all four cases, the panelists
6 and reviewers are satisfied this is a high quality enterprise
7 bringing together some of the very best scholars on this
8 particular subject in projects that are conceived in very,
9 very broad terms.

10 Indeed, it is the breadth of the conception of
11 these projects, echoing some of the things Lynne was saying
12 at the beginning of the meeting, that leads us to think that
13 are particular commendable. They do bring specialized
14 scholarship together in a way that is a very broad gauge,
15 and we hope, therefore, that the resulting books will shape
16 directions in the particular fields and broaden the horizons
17 of those who think about these fields.

18 MR. KENNEDY: I agree with everything you have said.
19 It just doesn't seem to me to address the budgetary question.
20 What are the funds for? Are they for travel? Is it possible
21 to categorize them briefly?

22 MR. EKMAN: Yes. Why don't we take them case by
23 case -- Dorothy Wartenberg -- question.

24 MR. KINGSTON: Dorothy, would you come to the table
25 and the microphone so that we can hear you?

1 MS. WARTENBERG: 21508, Frank Smith. This is an
2 application from the press itself. It is for two editorial
3 conferences. They have already had one. They have already
4 invested more in this particular history, at the beginning
5 of it, than a press normally would, and they ask for some
6 additional help.

7 MR. KENNEDY: That is a -- modest ---

8 MS. WARTENBERG: I recognize that. The Cambridge
9 History of China project has involved a great deal of original
10 research, done not only by Denis Twitchett, who is considered
11 one of the foremost, if not the foremost, scholar in Chinese
12 history. We have all gone through this quite carefully and
13 agreed that this project deserves the amount of money that
14 is going into it.

15 MR. KENNEDY: What is the money for?

16 MS. WARTENBERG: It is partly for part-time salaries
17 for the project director, two research assistants, travel
18 to England, supplies and services, and the purchase of two
19 microcomputers which save time in the end, because it is
20 cheaper to purchase the microcomputer rather than lease it --
21 and, of course ---

22 MR. KENNEDY: Cambridge will not provide the use
23 of computers for a project like this?

24 MS. WARTENBERG: Well, they provide mainframe
25 computer services. Yes. But the microcomputers are to assist

1 the editor -- the cost sharing on the part of Princeton is
2 24 per cent.

3 MR. KENNEDY: Is what ---

4 MS. WARTENBERG: 24. What is next? Oh, yes. The
5 Cambridge History of Latin American Literature is just
6 beginning. This is a point at which they -- the two project
7 directors, Pupo-Walker and (?), feel that this particular
8 project can be put in for. Again, this is for partial
9 salaries, wages -- secretaries. This is for three years,
10 not one year, and we feel they provide -- get some third
11 party gifts -- we have dealt with that. Did I have another
12 one?

13 MR. EKMAN: Page 50 ---

14 MS. WARTENBERG: There was a good deal of discus-
15 sion about the 17th century philosophy -- because some of the
16 -- the previous volumes were done with relatively little
17 support, but somebody who wrote in support of this particular
18 volume pointed out that he had worked nights and weekends
19 and had had some support -- a lot of support -- from the
20 university to do this. And one just couldn't do it that way.
21 It just wasn't possible and that the budget was a reasonable
22 one. This would support Garber for two years.

23 I am afraid I looked at the wrong page before.
24 This is core support for part-time salary for the project
25 director and for the microcomputers. It is Garber who would

1 get the microcomputers and some travel arrangements, because
2 he has a co-editor. Twitchett does not have it. He has a
3 computer -- but not a computer. That is the Chinese one.
4 And the cost sharing there is 33 per cent.

5 MR. KENNEDY: Mr. Chairman, I think my conclusion
6 is that, because of the great value of these projects, they
7 are being used as a way of fundraising that is probably not
8 strictly necessary. I think that some support of these
9 projects is well worthwhile, and if there are some costs
10 something on the order of \$9-10,000, it seems to me to be a
11 perfectly reasonable contribution, or maybe a little bit
12 more than that.

13 But it begins to be in the area of \$100,000 and
14 \$200,000 for these projects, I think we are, in a sense,
15 being taken. And I would like to be recorded as voting
16 against these projects.

17 MS. SILVERS: One of these projects I do know some-
18 thing about, and it is, of course, the 17th century philoso-
19 phy. It is a project that covers a period for which there
20 is and has been no natural organization within philosophy.
21 The Greeks and medievalists already have their organizations.
22 There are exciting things that are happening in this area
23 because, for the first time in a very long time, American
24 philosophers are working together with authors -- to look
25 historically at this period. It is a revision of our account

1 of 17th century philosophy which is much more historical,
2 which does not look at Descartes as a single -- philosophical
3 stimulus.

4 And what has happened -- this has come out, in part,
5 of a conference which the Endowment funded -- did the Endow-
6 ment fund the Spinoza conference that occurred a couple of
7 years ago? It was one of the first gatherings of scholars
8 under the leadership of American scholars from many countries
9 in this area of 17th century philosophy. I know that Dan
10 Garber is working night and day to forge a kind of collabora-
11 tion that has not existed.

12 As you know, we are always complainig in philosophy
13 that we don't get funding from the Research Division because
14 collaboration is not one of our natural modes of research,
15 and this is in a place where Dan is trying, and a number of
16 other people, are trying to forge the collaboration. And I
17 really do think that it is deserving of support. It is going
18 to make a great impact in my discipline. It cannot do that
19 if it does include this scholarship from other countries.

20 MR. KINGSTON: Charles? I am sorry.

21 MS. CHENEY: I just would like to add a comment here.
22 I think your objection is something we need constantly to
23 think about. We are not a needs-based agency, and we never
24 have been a needs-based agency. The main questions we have
25 to ask when we look at applications are two: is it worth

1 doing and does it promise to be done well? Nevertheless, I
2 think in the back of every panelist's and reviewer's mind,
3 in the back of the Council's mind, certainly in the back of
4 my mind, as I look at what we are planning to fund, I do say,
5 would it happen without us?

6 An absolutely perfect application would be one that
7 was eminently worth doing. It would have solid promise of
8 being done well, and it would also have no chance of happening
9 without us. In a less than perfect world, though, if I get
10 the first two, and if the third is a little equivocal, and
11 I think it is the case here that it is a little equivocal,
12 well, Rich is going to fix it, though, so we get applications
13 from now on that do all three of these. Right?

14 MR. KINGSTON: Charles?

15 MR. EKMAN: I should add another thing too. With
16 projects of this sort, that are very large scale, we recognize
17 that a certain amount of money we award is going to go into
18 the cost of coordination, the superstructure, as it were,
19 in a way in which it wouldn't in an individual scholarly
20 project.

21 We try to offset that by setting the terms of the
22 award in a way that maximizes both cost sharing and the use
23 of the gifts and matching component. As you can see in these
24 offers, except for the small one, the others do include
25 hefty amounts of fundraising responsibility on the part of the

1 grantee so that the burden of continuing to support for this
2 is spread well beyond the federal government.

3 MR. KINGSTON: Charles and then Bea.

4 MR. RITCHESON: I wanted just to associate myself
5 with George Kennedy's reservations about these projects. I
6 think that in almost every instance -- I will not speak about
7 the 17th century philosophy one, which may, as Anita has
8 suggested, require a greater integration or cooperation of
9 scholars -- I am not authority on that -- but almost without
10 exception, these other projects without us will still take
11 place.

12 I am troubled by this fact. We have left unfunded
13 many, many good projects because we don't have the where-
14 withal to do it.

15 MS. CHENEY: As good?

16 MR. RITCHESON: Well, that is a very real question.
17 I would say yes, yes. And I am troubled by this. I don't
18 know that I will go so far as to vote against them, but I may
19 do that in light of the discussion -- but I think this
20 requires a very close look, Madam Chairman.

21 MR. KINGSTON: Bea?

22 MS. HIMMELFARB: Yes. While our attention was
23 being called to some other applications, my eye fell upon
24 one that I would like some explanation for, and this is
25 RO-21583, page 53. This is Kenyon College, Peter Rutkoff,

1 New York Modern. Now if my memory is correct, we, in the
2 Fellowship Department, gave fellowships to both Rutkoff and
3 the co-author of this projected work, separate fellowships,
4 full fellowships, for this work. And I wonder why they are
5 requesting additional funds and whether this is consistent
6 with the original fellowship applications we received.

7 MR. EKMAN: It is true that both of the Rutkoff ---

8 MR. KINGSTON: This is page 53, the second one from
9 the bottom.

10 MR. EKMAN: It is true that both Mr. Rutkoff and
11 his co-collaboratory, Mr. Scott, have been offered fellow-
12 ships by the Fellowships Division. Rutkoff is currently
13 doing the work on his fellowship. Scott was offered the
14 fellowship but has not decided whether he will accept it or
15 not, depending on the outcome of the review process for the
16 Division of Research Programs.

17 Our offer would be an offer that would -- consist
18 of two one-year fellowships. That is the regular fellowship
19 cycle -- 27,500 -- rather than the full amount requested
20 by Rutkoff and Scott ---

21 MS. HIMMELFARB: Why didn't it go to the Fellowship
22 Division?

23 MR. EKMAN: Because it came in as a collaborative
24 project, including not only larger amounts for their salaries
25 but other costs as well. They framed the thing not as two

1 independent fellowships but rather as a project which purpose
2 was to produce this study, a finding by the end of the grant
3 period from the Research Division rather than the individual
4 fellowships, as I understand it, represented in determinate
5 stages towards that ultimate goal.

6 MS. HIMMELFARB: That makes it even more disturbing
7 than at first sight. We gave him this fellowship in good
8 faith on the assumption that they had a project; they pre-
9 sented it to us; we judged it on that basis; we assumed that
10 it could be done within the time that had been framed and
11 so on. I don't understand why they should reformulate the
12 project and ask for additional funds and not come through
13 the -- I don't understand that process at all.

14 I mean, the only thing I get from all of this is
15 that indeed there are larger sums involved. But that surely
16 is not sufficient justification for this going to the
17 Research Department. They are, in effect, getting three
18 fellowships to do this one book, which we have already
19 evaluated. We have given them the fellowships, and I don't
20 understand what are the grounds for requesting still more
21 money in addition to fellowships.

22 MR. KINGSTON: In this particular case, it was
23 one that we had supplied the background information for.
24 So, at least the division -- they were not unaware of the
25 fact that there had been funding history behind the project.

1 MS. HIMMELFARB: I am sorry. I didn't get the point
2 of your remarks.

3 MR. KINGSTON: Only that the funding history was a
4 matter of record before the committee, and Walter, you can
5 speak to the committee's deliberations ---

6 MS. HIMMELFARB: I find it disturbing unless there
7 is some -- if they have reformulated in some way, it should
8 perhaps come back -- well, I just don't want to go into
9 it any further. But there is some problem there.

10 MR. KINGSTON: Bea, in the action on this motion,
11 would you prefer us to break this particular application out
12 and vote on it separately?

13 MS. HIMMELFARB: I am sorry?

14 MR. KINGSTON: Should we break this application out
15 of the motion to vote on separately?

16 MS. HIMMELFARB: Unless we get a very satisfactory
17 explanation what this is all about and are assured that it
18 is not in conflict with the original fellowships that we
19 approved and that we have already partially funded. We have
20 approved, in fact, both applications.

21 MR. EKMAN: Bea, I cannot provide assurance to you
22 that there is absolutely no overlap between the work plan
23 of the pending Research Division application and the work
24 plan of the previous Fellowship application. I can assure
25 you that the Research Division application, however, was

1 up-front about the fact that previous support had been
2 received from the National Endowment for the Humanities,
3 and further, the panel, knowing that and reading the work
4 plan for the Research Division application, was persuaded of
5 its merit as an genuine collaborative project.

6 MS. HIMMELFARB: I remember this application and I
7 remember -- I may even have voted against it. That I don't
8 actually recall. I can't remember what my decision was
9 finally after the discussion in committee and whether I was
10 persuaded by staff on this one.

11 The objection that I raised was that I did not
12 think that this was a workable application. I thought that
13 it was an enormous ---

14 MR. RITCHESON: Excuse me, we can't really hear you.

15 MS. HIMMELFARB: Oh, I am sorry. I am just not
16 persuaded initially, on my first reading of this application,
17 that it was workable. It was an enormously ambitious
18 project. It encompassed a great many things that I think
19 could not have been done within any reasonable timespan,
20 let alone that they were prepared to give to it, and intel-
21 lectually, I have, you know, great problems with this
22 application. Perhaps, that is why I remember it so well.

23 I raised these objections. I was assured that this
24 was not the case. That this could be done originally by
25 Peter Rutkoff. The next year we got an additional application

1 for the same project. I can't again remember what my per-
2 sonal vote was on this, but the committee hadn't voted to
3 approve that. Now, we are told that perhaps the plan was,
4 in fact, not workable, or at least that is what I deduce from
5 these remarks, and that it requires still additional work.

6 You see, I think there may be an intellectual flaw
7 in this and that any number of applications, you know,
8 couldn't produce very satisfactory results. But, in any case,
9 I think this ought to be inquired into, and I would like to
10 propose that it be deferred until we can ---

11 MR. CAREY: Your memory is correct on these applica-
12 tions.

13 MS. HIMMELFARB: I am sorry?

14 MR. CAREY: Your memory is correct on these applica-
15 tions.

16 MS. HIMMELFARB: Yes. Some of us, I think, have
17 this problem with it, not just myself.

18 MR. KINGSTON: I should say that it is not altogether
19 uncommon for some applicants to apply to two divisions at the
20 same time, knowing that we know that.

21 MS. HIMMELFARB: But this is not the same and that
22 is the point. This is not the same. If it were the same
23 time, then we could properly evaluate it. Fellowship could
24 say, maybe this would be more appropriate for the Research
25 Division. That is not quite what happened. These are -- all

1 three are now in successive years. We did not even receive
2 the two co-collaborators' proposals in the same year so that
3 we could judge them simultaneously.

4 MR. KINGSTON: One fellowship request that you
5 approved in November is on hold at this point. It has not
6 been awarded because he wants to await the decision here.

7 MS. HIMMELFARB: Of course, we didn't know that when
8 we approved it.

9 MR. BERNES: May I bring this discussion to an end
10 then by offering an amendment to my original motion that
11 this would be approved -- this one be pulled out of my motion
12 and put in a category of -- until we are satisfied that all
13 your objections, Bea ---

14 MR. KINGSTON: Is there a second to the motion that
15 we pull -- let me get the number right -- RO-21583 -- out
16 of the printed motion and place it into the deferred category
17 for review ---

18 MS. CHENEY: But I am a little puzzled by whose
19 plate this ends up on. Mine? Is that correct?

20 MR. BERNES: Well, I think it should come back up at
21 the next meeting ---

22 MR. KINGSTON: It would -- if it is on the deferred
23 motion, it would go back to the committee in August for their
24 review and then they would form a recommendation at the August
25 meeting. All right. All those in favor of that motion?

1 (A chorus of ayes was heard.)

2 MR. KINGSTON: Any opposed to that motion?

3 MR. KENNEDY: I am voting against the ---

4 MR. KINGSTON: Now, let's come back to George's
5 issue ---

6 MS. CHENEY: May I make a suggestion? I think that
7 your statements were very much to the point, and I would
8 be happy to look at these grants very carefully. Moreover,
9 I know we are calling a lot on the Research Division here, but
10 it might be very useful for the Council to see next time a
11 poll, a counting, a full report of exactly how many Cambridge
12 editions we are involved are and what the funding history
13 has been and what the targeted completion dates are so that
14 we have some overall feeling for our relationship with the
15 press.

16 MR. KENNEDY: That is satisfactory to me. That
17 would be fine.

18 MR. KINGSTON: What? We didn't hear you.

19 MR. KENNEDY: The Chairman's suggestion is satis-
20 factory to me.

21 MR. KASS: Before we move on at this point, could
22 I ask George -- is the implication of your comment that
23 release time for scholars and senior staff is somehow
24 inappropriate because this thing is going to be produced and
25 this is somehow part of the accepted activity of senior

1 academics to do this? Do you think that it would be just
2 inappropriate for us to ---

3 MR. KENNEDY: Well, I certainly don't want to sub-
4 scrube that as a general opinion. But it doesn't seem to
5 me -- I guess it is a matter of size. It doesn't seem -- these
6 are projects in which no single person is writing the whole
7 book. In most books, people are writing only a chapter,
8 roughly the equivalent of a scholarly paper.

9 The editor has somewhat more responsibilities,
10 but they are largely of an editorial nature. Maybe some
11 release time in some cases. I am just reacting against what
12 seems to be the total size of the commitment to a very valuable
13 project which is, however, commercially viable.

14 MR. KINGSTON: Did you have something to say?

15 MR. LAXALT: Oh, I just wanted to be put on record
16 as abstaining from page 3, RT-20765.

17 MR. KINGSTON: RT-20765?

18 MR. LAXALT: Yes.

19 MR. RITCHESON: I want to add just one thing to
20 follow George's comments. You know, over the past 25, oh 30,
21 years, the commitments of the ordinary university professor
22 have changed considerably. We took the stand a generation
23 ago that we were being asked to teach too much and hence
24 could not do our research. Now, we have been very successful
25 in convincing university administrators that our teaching

1 should, in fact, be cut down so that now, normally, I suppose,
2 the teaching load is two courses, a general course, and
3 perhaps a graduate seminar. The implication is that, in the
4 ordinary course of events, the university professor should
5 be doing research and writing on his university's tab. I
6 think that point ought to be registered.

7 MR. KINGSTON: George, let me ask the crucial
8 question. Do you wish to move for these four applications
9 to be considered aside from the larger motion?

10 MR. KENNEDY: I don't think so. From the sense of
11 the meeting and from the nature of the question, I am essen-
12 tially asking for a budgetary review. I think, maybe, that
13 can be best accomplished in the Chairman's office.

14 MR. KINGSTON: Fine. Are there other questions
15 about applications on the motion? If not, those in favor, sig-
16 nify by saying "aye."

17 (A chorus of ayes was heard.)

18 MR. KINGSTON: Those opposed?

19 (No response.)

20 MR. KINGSTON: And the motion carries. We proceed
21 to the motion from the Division of General Programs.

22 GENERAL PROGRAMS

23 MR. RITCHESON: In the closed portion of our meeting,
24 Madam Chairman, the committee examined 145 applications
25 submitted to humanities projects in museums and historical

1 On our second question, GM-23379 -- that is page 3
2 of the motion -- entitled, "First Encounters: Spanish
3 Explorations in the Caribbean and the Southwestern United
4 States, is a traveling exhibition based on the University of
5 Florida archaeological and historical research into the
6 vogages of Columbus. The committee urged that full considera-
7 tion be given to the culture and politics of Spain, including,
8 specifically, the Basques, on the eve of the encounter.

9 I want also to mention an exceptionally large
10 request from the Carnegie Museum of Natural History. That
11 is GM-23430, page 7 of your motion. Frankly, the committee
12 was left somewhat breathless by the size of the request, a
13 modest \$1,442,000 and some odd dollars. The staff recommends
14 an award of \$650,000 in outright funds and another \$250,000
15 in matching funds for a total award of \$900,000, the largest
16 single item on the motion before you.

17 After some discussion, however, the committee
18 agreed unanimously with the staff that these costs were in
19 order for a permanent installation of this size and importance.
20 I should add that the planned reinstallation will encompass
21 nearly 600 objects, illustrating early Egyptian history, and
22 that the proposed display promises to be an exciting and
23 intellectually rewarding experience.

24 We also spent some time discussing a few of the
25 applications not recommended for funding. In the case of

1 GM-23365, an application from the New Haven Colony Historical
2 Society, page 12 of the motion, devoted to the AMISTAD Mutiny,
3 we pressed the staff for a fuller account of this re-submitted
4 project's defects. We agreed, however, that the project was
5 too vague on crucial details and that it remains too
6 descriptive to do justice to this important episode in the
7 fight against slavery.

8 On another matter, a proposal from the Metropolitan
9 Museum of Art for an exhibition devoted to Suleyman the
10 Magnificent, GM-23474, page 23 of the motion, I must confess
11 my own disappointment that we were unable to recommend sup-
12 port for this simply splendid, visually spendid, exhibit.
13 Once again, the staff explained its reasons, and I accept
14 them, reasons for urging against the project, and the
15 committee, I might say, was generally -- was unanimously
16 convinced of the recitude of their position.

17 Essentially, this exhibition simply displays art
18 objects, brilliant as they are, and beautiful as they are,
19 without providing sufficient interpretation, and as a conse-
20 quence, we concluded the public wouldn't learn much from the
21 exhibit about the Ottoman Empire as it is mounted. Even so,
22 if you have a moment, get over and see it.

23 MS. CHENEY: Charles, I would like to interrupt
24 a minute. The senior staff of the Endowment had the same
25 reaction, seeing that the Suleyman had gone down. So, we

1 took a field trip and went over to the East Wing. Don Gibson
2 was kind enough to go along with us and let us educate our-
3 selves, and indeed though stunned by the objects, conclude
4 that it was not enough of an educational experience to warrant
5 Endowment support.

6 MR. RITCHESON: That was the view of the committee
7 also, Madam Chairman. One more case, the case of GM-23467 --
8 that is page 22 of your motion -- a request from the Pierpont
9 Morgan Library. The committee proved that not all requests
10 related to the Columbian Quincentenary received funding.
11 In this instance, the Pierpont Morgan Library seeks support
12 for a temporary exhibit based on a fascinating manuscript
13 that describe the expeditions of Sir Francis Drake against
14 the Spanish colonial empire.

15 Here, too, we sustained the staff and agreed that
16 the applicant needs to provide more interpretation and a
17 more cogent rationale for some of the exhibit items. However,
18 we urged the staff to work with the applicant to encourage
19 them to make their case better next time.

20 I conclude by saying, Madam Chairman, that I enjoyed
21 tremendously working with Kathleen Kilpatrick and with Robert
22 Laxalt on our committee. We were unanimous on every single
23 vote, and if I can return to my high regard for the staff, I
24 would like to complement them especially on the prudence they
25 have shown in paring down grant requests. Congratulations to

1 them on that score too. Thank you very much.

2 MR. KINGSTON: Thank you, Charles. Any comments
3 or questions about the General motion? Those in favor,
4 signify by saying "aye."

5 (A chorus of ayes was heard.)

6 MR. KINGSTON: Opposed?

7 (No response.)

8 MR. KINGSTON: And the motion carries. We will move
9 on to the motion from State Programs. Jo?

10 STATE PROGRAMS

11 MS. CRESIMORE: The committee reviewed 28 applica-
12 tions in state and regional exemplary awards, including
13 applications for planning grants. This year, for the first
14 time, the competition was opened to applications for small
15 planning grants. These grants are intended to enable state
16 councils to undertake the research and planning required to
17 advance an major state-wide project and for projects that
18 can lead to regional cooperative programming and have the
19 potential for realizing administrative efficiencies.

20 In addition, the application from the Federation
21 of State Humanities Councils for national services was
22 reviewed. The committee was pleased with the quality and
23 the imagination evident in proposals submitted by the state
24 humanities councils in this competition and with the range
25 of important topics addressed.

1 Constitutional projects included a drama discussion
2 series, entitled, "A More Perfect Union," SO-20770 on page
3 001, specifically designed to reach rural areas in California
4 and a statewide program in New Hampshire on its role in the
5 ratification process, which is SO-20783 on page 002. As a
6 part of the program, a series of articles taken from New
7 Hampshire and New England papers in 1787 and '88 on the
8 ratification process will be published bimonthly in the
9 state's newspapers.

10 Statewide reading and discussion programs in
11 Delaware, SO-20773 on page 001, will center on Heroes,
12 Heroines, and the Heroic, while small communities in Iowa,
13 SO-20775 on page 002, will consider works of literature on
14 the theme of Sense of Place.

15 The request from the Federation for funding for
16 its 1987 annual meeting, to be held in Chicago in December --
17 that is SO-20794 -- also for publication of a bimonthly
18 newsletter, a series of research reports, and for planning
19 for the 1988 Federation meeting -- is recommended for approval.

20 So, we recommend approval of the applications
21 listed on pages 1 through 3, SO-20766 to SO-20794.

22 MR. KINGSTON: Any comments or questions about the
23 State Programs? All in favor, say "aye."

24 (A chorus of ayes was heard.)

25 MR. KINGSTON: Opposed?

1 (No response.)

2 MR. KINGSTON: That motion passes. And, now, we
3 will return to the stuck motion from the Division of Fellow-
4 ships.

5 FELLOWSHIP PROGRAMS

6 MS. HIMMELFARB: Yes. I think you now have before
7 you the complete motion. The committee considers 641 appli-
8 cations to the Travel to Collections Program and discussed
9 several of them, I think, 10 of them in detail. We are
10 recommending 229 applications for funding and disapproving
11 412 applications.

12 The 229 come to a total of -- a grand total of --
13 \$171,750. I recommend -- I move the adoption of this motion,
14 the yellow pages.

15 MR. KINGSTON: Any questions or comments about the
16 motion? All those in favor?

17 (A chorus of ayes was heard.)

18 MR. KINGSTON: Opposed?

19 (No response.)

20 MR. KINGSTON: And the motion passes. We will,
21 at this time, adjourn the Council into executive session.
22 The luncheon, of course, is down to Council members and
23 Division Directors and is scheduled for 12:30. I will tell
24 Division Directors that we, of course, don't know how long
25 the deliberations on the Jefferson Lecture will take, but I

1 will have Janet give Division Directors a call as soon as we
2 are done. We may be a little later than 12:30. If I can,
3 I will break for five minutes and then we will resume in
4 executive session.

5 (Whereupon, at 11:35 a.m., the meeting was
6 adjourned.)

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25