

1975

Duffey, Joseph: Humanities Chairman Nomination Hearing (September 9, 1977): Correspondence 09

Follow this and additional works at: http://digitalcommons.uri.edu/pell_neh_I_25

Recommended Citation

"Duffey, Joseph: Humanities Chairman Nomination Hearing (September 9, 1977): Correspondence 09" (1975). *Duffey, Joseph: Humanities Chairman Nomination Hearing (September 9, 1977)*. Paper 33.
http://digitalcommons.uri.edu/pell_neh_I_25/33http://digitalcommons.uri.edu/pell_neh_I_25/33

This Correspondence is brought to you for free and open access by the Education: National Endowment for the Arts and Humanities, Subject Files I (1973-1996) at DigitalCommons@URI. It has been accepted for inclusion in Duffey, Joseph: Humanities Chairman Nomination Hearing (September 9, 1977) by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@URI. For more information, please contact digitalcommons@etal.uri.edu.

September 25, 1975

To: Senator Pell
From: Stephen
Subject: Talking Points

I think that the following best summarizes the underlying reasons for your call to the White House:

1. First and most immediate is your belief that Dr. Berman has not observed the proper procedures in dealing with Capitol Hill. Perhaps a chronology of the events would be helpful.

When you introduced the bill on May 21 (with a floor statement explaining the purpose as discussion), Dr. Berman sent you a letter expressing his concern about the bill. I told him what was, essentially in your statement - that this was for discussion purposes only, and that if it became clear that it was opposed, it would, in all probability, be dropped. This was, I am sure, repeated to Joe Hagan, and was, I think, also repeated to Dr. Berman by yourself at one point.

In fact, you will remember that you met with three representatives of state humanities committees in your office in July. They were from Massachusetts, New York, and Connecticut (a Mr. Noyes). I specifically remember you saying to them that you were, in all probability, going to drop your amendment.

Mail came in totally in opposition to your amendment, and, if you will remember, we talked about dropping it. Everything was quiescent through July and August. The problems probably arose when I started to set up the hearings. In order to create

a record upon which to base a decision, I scheduled not only a panel against your amendment, but also one in favor of it. From what I can gather, Dr. Berman then galvanized his Board, which generated the document you received (attached), containing all the arguments concerning the National Science Foundation, etc.

That is when I think Dr. Berman actively started to lobby against your bill. Evidently he himself has been placing the calls, because I know that he personally called Roger Heyns, Chairman of the ACE, to testify at the hearings, but Mr. Heyns declined.

The next event was Dr. Berman's letter to you of September 16 (attached), which was concomitant with the meeting held in your office last Thursday. Perhaps the cause for that meeting was my scheduling of the anti-Berman panel and a long conversation I had with Sherman Lee. Dr. Lee and I went through all the possibilities of what could or could not be legislated. That conversation was reported to Dr. Berman. If Dr. Berman thought that I had made a commitment that your legislation would never be legislated, then that could probably be the nature of the "different impression" that Dr. Berman alludes to.

So, what seems to have happened is that the states have been writing in because of their initial concern, dating back to the introduction of the amendment. The most recent communications from members of the Council and others - the so-called heavies - come from the paper prepared by Dr. Berman's staff, which was submitted to you by Dr. Sherman Lee, coupled, perhaps, with Dr. Berman's personal appraisal of what had and had not been said.

2. Personal Mode of Operation.

Ever since he took office, there has been much talk about Dr. Berman's arrogance. This has been borne out by conversations with others who have dealt with him. Jack Gollodner tried to get something going between the labor unions and the Endowment. I set up a luncheon with them. Jack's reaction is that Dr. Berman doesn't listen and is arrogant.

Any number of people who have disagreed with Dr. Berman seem to feel that he is somewhat imperious. Hannah Gray, Provost of Yale, after her meeting with you yesterday, told me of Dr. Berman's disdain for any opinion other than his own and of his view of any criticism or questioning as a personal affront.

Mrs. Gray has evidently led the opposition to Dr. Berman in the Council. She was the one who raised the question about his telling his Council that they could not change the funding pattern since that was what OMB had approved. I think this is a good example of his mode of operation. He would make a submittal of concrete proposals to the OMB two weeks before the Council met rather than meet with the Council to get their input; thus, the Council was given to understand that it had no ^{option} other than a simple "yes" or "no" on a specific grant.

Provost Gray also spoke about her experience as a recipient of Endowment grants, of the arrogance not only of the Chairman, but also of his staff, taking their cue from him. There is a mandate from Washington, and you will either do as ~~it~~ says in the way specified, or not get funded. She said that there are many people

who would like to speak out against Dr. Berman but who are afraid to do so because they are worried about not getting money. She spoke specifically of a National Humanities Center set up at Yale, supposedly an independent body with an independent board. However, the Council's staff has insisted upon their right to have two Federal overseers sit in on that independent board's meetings, something which Dr. Gray has both opposed and not allowed.

There is also the question of Dr. Berman's lack of restraint in his actions. The meeting today, after hearing of your call to Mr. Goldwin this morning, is an example of that. He never seems to wait to think of the implications of his actions. This has occurred in the past. One example is a rather arbitrary letter he wrote to Mrs. Green when she was a member of the Appropriations Committee, which in effect told her that individual grants made by the Endowment were ⁿ not of her business.

Livy has spoken with you about instances where, in dealing with the Arts Endowment, Dr. Berman has said one thing and done another. I think that this happened in the area of museum programs, where he has attempted to get some public media/visibility for his Endowment by aiding museum shows such as the tapestry and Scythian Gold exhibits in New York City.

3. There have been some specific problem areas/grants which you have defended, one being to the Royal Shakespeare Theatre Company. This was especially galling to the labor unions since it concerned a total of a quarter of a million dollars, which Mr. Gollodner and

others thought could best be utilized by unemployed American actors.

There has also been a to-do with the university presses. They believe that the Endowment should support them to a greater extent than they are, and Dr. Berman has not agreed with their contention. I had set up meetings trying to iron out the differences so they would not become real issues. The most vocal opponent of Dr. Berman is the editor of the North Carolina press, who is a close friend of Bill Jordan on the Rules Committee. This person, after meeting two or three times with Dr. Berman, received no satisfaction. He also spoke of Dr. Berman's arrogance and total disdain for anything other than his own opinion. I was able to stop him from mounting an attack on the Endowment's appropriation simply by pointing out the danger to the humanities community in general that such an attack would have. He desisted on a point of honor and still talks against Dr. Berman.

4. The question of morale.

There has been, from what I can gather (and this was confirmed by Provost Gray), a morale problem in the Endowment - a turnover of top people - as Mrs. Gray put it, "those with any excellence left." Specifically, she spoke of two people in the museum program and one woman in public programs who, in her opinion, were excellent people and who have been replaced by individuals of a far lower level of excellence. *Roy Rosenblatt*

The one other case I do remember had to do with a William Emerson, who was Director of the Education Division. He and Dr.

Berman had very different ideas as to what should and should not be done. Mr. Emerson had strong support from the Council, but Dr. Berman eventually forced him out. What was especially unfortunate about this specific case was that Mr. Emerson was thought to have strong points not only as an academic and a scholar, but also as a human being. But, unfortunately, when his leaving was mentioned at the Endowment, the impression was left that he was forced out because he was a drunk.