



NATIONAL ENDOWMENT FOR THE
Humanities

OFFICE OF CHALLENGE GRANTS

Narrative Section of a Successful Application

The attached document contains the grant narrative and selected portions of a previously funded grant application. It is not intended to serve as a model, but to give you a sense of how a successful application may be crafted. Every successful application is different, and each applicant is urged to prepare a proposal that reflects its unique project and aspirations. Prospective applicants should consult the Challenge Grants application guidelines at <http://www.neh.gov/grants/challenge/challenge-grants> for instructions. Applicants are also strongly encouraged to consult with the NEH Office of Challenge Grants staff well before a grant deadline.

Note: The attachment only contains the grant narrative and selected portions, not the entire funded application. In addition, certain portions may have been redacted to protect the privacy interests of an individual and/or to protect confidential commercial and financial information and/or to protect copyrighted materials.

Project Title: *The Hastings Center Humanities Research Initiative*

Institution: The Hastings Center, Garrison, NY

Project Directors: Erik Parens

Grant Program: Challenge Grants

Abstract

As part of a comprehensive campaign, The Hastings Center aims to build an endowment for a major humanities research initiative and is seeking a \$500,000 challenge grant from the National Endowment for the Humanities. The initiative will strengthen and expand the Center's mission of providing a bridge between enduring ethical and philosophical questions and pressing contemporary practical questions about how we – as members of families, communities, and societies – ought to act in relation to advances in medicine, science, and technology. The Hastings Center is the first independent, nonprofit, nonpartisan bioethics research institute in the world. Since its inception in 1969, it has played a vital role in exploring such questions and disseminating new knowledge to audiences eager for it, including scholars, clinicians and other professionals, and the public. We believe that ancient questions of the humanities are always in play when we address policy or scholarly questions regarding medical and scientific developments. How ought we to live? What constitutes human flourishing? As some bioethics scholars move away from the humanities toward science-based methodologies that address practical questions about how to proceed, Hastings scholars continue to ask fundamental questions about where we *ought* to be proceeding. Hastings shaped the field of bioethics and continues to do so today. It remains firmly committed to bioethics scholarship grounded in enduring questions in the humanities.

Activities Supported: Funds of \$2 million will be used to launch The Hastings Center Humanities Research Initiative. The initiative will underwrite the endowment of a Senior Humanities Research Scholar Chair who will (1) pursue research in bioethics and the humanities, (2) advance the humanities work of fellow scholars at Hastings, and (3) create and direct a Humanities Scholar-in-Residence Program, which will give a junior humanities scholar the opportunity to study and be mentored for a semester at Hastings.

Significance to the Humanities: The initiative will build humanities leadership, nurture young scholars, create new knowledge, and communicate this knowledge to varied audiences. Junior scholars will have the opportunity to be mentored in bioethics at the institution where the field began and where groundbreaking scholarship continues. The senior humanities scholar will direct major humanities research with other Hastings humanities scholars. Scholars funded by the initiative will share their knowledge with students, fellow scholars, and the public through publications and presentations.

Fundraising Plan: Hastings has launched a comprehensive campaign and has reached nearly half of its \$20 million goal. Leading the campaign is a development director with major campaign experience and an exceptional group of volunteers which includes four Nobel laureates; past presidents of Yale, Princeton, Columbia, and Stanford; and many leaders from business and government. The Center's leadership developed a five-year plan to project what would be required to underwrite the current needs of the Center and create a new model of philanthropy. We believe that the NEH challenge grant would help leverage those already identified for possible campaign gifts, as well as help open doors for consideration from others with a passion for and belief in the importance of the humanities in informing the bioethics dialogue.

Narrative

The Hastings Center is the first independent, nonprofit, nonpartisan bioethics research institute in the world. Since its birth in 1969, the Center has aspired to be a bridge between, on the one side, the oldest ethical and philosophical questions, and on the other, the most pressing contemporary practical questions about how we – as members of families, communities, and societies – ought to act in relation to advances in medicine, science, and technology.

An interdisciplinary field of inquiry, bioethics has relied on the intellectual resources of the humanities since its inception. We in bioethics think that our field has helped to bring the questions of the humanities to life for many citizens who may have considered them to be dead. But we recognize many ways that the humanities side of the bioethics bridge can be strengthened and expanded.

In recent years many citizens – including scholars in bioethics and their funders – have adopted a cultural ethos that assumes that for an activity to be worthwhile, it has to mimic natural science or “fix” a regulatory process or a complex system such as health care. The initiative we are proposing to NEH resists that ethos. It seeks to add muscle and momentum to endeavors that ask the ancient questions of the humanities, which are always in play when we address policy or scholarly questions regarding advances in medicine, science, and technology.

The advances at issue are new -- genetic testing, neuroimaging, stem cell research, and “synthetic biology,” to name a few. But as soon as we ask what citizens or policymakers should do with respect to those advances, we reach back and revisit the

oldest and most basic of ethical questions. It is the question that Socrates taught us to make explicit: How ought we to live?

That question of course leads to myriad other questions that philosophers, historians, poets, playwrights, novelists, and other humanists have always asked: What constitutes human flourishing? What is the relation between the body and the mind? What do people owe their children, friends, neighbors, fellow citizens? What is the appropriate attitude for people to hold toward the rest of the natural world? What is the nature of human suffering? How ought we to face death?

Those questions, which do not admit of final answers, inevitably shape our practical decisions. And it is those questions to which the humanities have always spoken that bioethics can help to keep alive. They are the questions that bioethics itself must engage if it is to contribute meaningfully to our public conversations and scholarship regarding advances in medicine, science, and technology.

Over the past decade and a half, there has been a significant trend in which many bioethicists are moving away from the humanities and toward more science-based methodologies. An example of this so-called “empirical bioethics” is the use of surveys to collect data about an ethical issue. An attractive feature of this work for bioethicists and their funders is that it seems to offer “concrete” answers. When bioethicists do surveys of, say, patient attitudes toward a new medical intervention, at the end of their work they can announce a specific list of results, even if it is unclear how these results contribute to understanding *ethical* challenges associated with this intervention.

Purely practical questions about how to proceed, and purely empirical questions about how people are already proceeding, are surely important. But so are fundamental

questions about where we *ought* to be proceeding. Questions about means are important, but so are questions about ends or purposes. A National Endowment of the Humanities challenge grant will enable The Hastings Center to strengthen and expand its longstanding commitment to those ancient questions of the humanities.

We seek \$500,000 from the NEH, to be matched by \$1.5 million from private sources, to launch The Hastings Center Humanities Research Initiative. This \$2 million initiative will underwrite the endowment of a Senior Humanities Research Scholar Chair who will (1) pursue research in bioethics and the humanities, (2) advance the humanities work of fellow scholars at Hastings, and (3) create and direct a Humanities Scholar-in-Residence Program. The aim of the Humanities Research Initiative is to enlarge and deepen the Center's core commitment to humanities-based scholarship in bioethics and to nurturing leadership in this area.

A formal humanities initiative will enable The Hastings Center to connect the timely questions concerning the meaning of developments in medicine, science, and technology with the foundational questions that humanists have always asked. The initiative will allow the Senior Humanities Scholar and colleagues at Hastings to pursue significant humanities-related scholarship at a time when the case for the importance of such work cannot be taken for granted by anyone. The Humanities Research Initiative will also award a semester-long fellowship-in-residence to an early-career humanities scholar who will be chosen through an annual competition. The Humanities Scholar-in-Residence will be mentored by the Senior Humanities Research Scholar while joining in the intellectual life of the Center.

The Senior Humanities Research Scholar, in consultation with her or his colleagues, will identify the topic for each year's competition. The selection of the topic is likely to be influenced by, but by no means limited to, major research under way at Hastings. If, for example, the Senior Humanities Research Scholar was launching a project on understanding the meaning of human suffering in the context of different disease trajectories and related end-of-life decision-making, the topic might be an in-depth exploration of suffering as experienced by people with a particular disease.

Other potential topics could grow out of ongoing areas of inquiry at Hastings. For example, Josephine Johnston conducts research on controversies surrounding the use of psychotropic medications to treat children with emotional and behavioral disturbances. In that work, she has consistently come up against the foundational question about the difference between "badness" and "madness." Does the child who is acting badly deserve punishment or treatment? To answer that question requires thinking through myriad other foundational questions, such as, what is the relationship between body and mind? Determinism and free will? The Senior Humanities Research Scholar might, in consultation with Johnston, select as a topic an exploration of the bad-mad distinction.

A third topic might center on a facet of the work of Erik Parens, another humanities scholar at Hastings, concerning the meaning of using new technologies to shape ourselves and our children. Sometimes this is framed as the "enhancement" question. If, for example, there were a pill that could make healthy people feel "happy all the time," what might be the reasons for taking it, or not taking it? What might be the consequences to individuals and to communities of such a pill? Similar questions have already been asked in connection with the use of drugs such as Ritalin that are used by

healthy college students and others to help them stay focused for a big exam or project. Other times the topic of shaping ourselves and our children is framed in terms of “normalization” – for example, when the intervention in question is a surgery to make people with atypical bodies (such as dwarfs) look more normal. Regardless of the particular intervention (pharmaceutical, surgical, or cybernetic) or its aim, the foundational questions remain: What is human flourishing and what is the difference between interventions that promote it and those that thwart it? Those questions have been around at least since Homer wondered about the effects of lotus flowers that could make human beings forget everything, since Plato wondered about how the invention of writing affected our ability to think, and since the authors of Genesis wondered about the meaning of the human effort to build a tower that stretched into the sky. Such questions will continue to be important to research at The Hastings Center. (See “About The Hastings Center” for information about the research scholars and their work.)

Impact of the NEH Challenge Grant

The Hastings Center Humanities Research Initiative stands to benefit individual scholars, humanities scholarship in general, and the quality of public discourse on bioethics issues. At the individual level, junior scholars will have the invaluable opportunity to be mentored in bioethics at the institution where the field began more than 40 years ago and where groundbreaking scholarship continues. The scholar will share ideas on a daily basis with leading philosophers, legal scholars, and other influential researchers at Hastings. The scholar will also have access to an unparalleled collection of bioethics literature in The Hastings Center’s Robert S. Morison Library. In addition, the scholar will be able to conduct research and meet with scholars at Yale University’s

Interdisciplinary Center for Bioethics, under the Yale-Hastings Program in Ethics and Health Policy (described in “About the Hastings Center”). By the end of his or her residence at Hastings, the junior scholar will have a deepened and enriched understanding of the selected bioethics topic.

The Hastings Center will benefit, as well. The endowed fund will enable us to continue to be an independent source of clear thinking and new ideas. Hastings work is often far in advance of unfolding events, but looking ahead is the most difficult kind of work to underwrite with funding from outside sources. The endowed fund will free Hastings scholars to pursue the sort of visionary research that stands to make a significant contribution to humanities scholarship.

We foresee the proposed programs having multiple benefits to the wider world of the humanities. Humanities scholarship will gain from the new knowledge that emerges from humanities research supported at The Hastings Center. Hastings has the capacity to communicate this information through its flagship journal, the *Hastings Center Report*. Hastings scholars also frequently publish in other top peer-reviewed journals. In addition to traditional modes of publishing, Hastings has recently developed extraordinary capacity for disseminating bioethics research and using new media to reach scholarly and nonscholarly audiences. (See “About The Hastings Center for more information.) Humanities scholarship will also benefit from the intellectual enrichment of the junior scholar. This scholar will emerge from The Hastings Center equipped to share his or her new knowledge with students and with fellow scholars through presentations at scholarly meetings and through the publication of articles and books. The enrichment of humanities

scholarship is particularly crucial now, at a time when many universities are cutting back on their humanities programs.

The proposed Hastings Center programs also hold the promise of elevating public discourse around bioethics issues. Many bioethics topics are highly newsworthy, leading journalists to seek out scholars for interviews and for editors to publish op-eds and blog commentaries by these scholars. Humanities scholars who are well-informed about topical bioethics issues can help the public be better informed about them, too.

We will evaluate the qualitative impact of the grant by doing internal assessments of the research that it supports. Feedback from collaborators, such as those at the Yale-Hastings Program in Ethics and Health Policy, will assist with these assessments. We will also complete quarterly reports of the publications, speaking engagements, interviews, and other means of communication involving the Humanities Research Scholar Chair, the humanities scholars-in-residence, and other scholars who participate in their research.

In sum, The Hastings Center Humanities Research Initiative will be a powerful multifaceted tool for building humanities leadership, launching humanities scholars, creating new knowledge in the humanities, and communicating that knowledge to varied audiences. As such it will fortify and expand the bridge between the ancient ethical and philosophical questions of the humanities and the practical questions that arise in the context of new advances in medicine, science, and technology.

About The Hastings Center

The Hastings Center's mission is to study ethical issues in health, medicine, and the environment as they affect individuals, communities, and societies, and to disseminate knowledge about these issues to advance scholarly and public understanding.

Hastings was founded in 1969 by Daniel Callahan, a philosopher, and Willard Gaylin, a psychiatrist, who were neighbors in Hastings-on-Hudson, a suburb of New York. They were inspired to start a research center focused on ethical issues raised by what at that time was called the “new biology” – breakthroughs that were transforming medicine. The new medical tool of genetic testing, for example, raised concerns about privacy and discrimination. The first organ transplants compelled doctors and others to revisit a question that they had thought was long settled: What is death? Back then, scientists organized many conferences to examine the impact of the new biology, but no one was exploring the ethical challenges it posed in an organized way. Callahan and Gaylin aimed to do just that with their new research institution, originally named The Hastings Center Institute of Society, Ethics and the Life Sciences. It was launched with the help of a matching grant of \$15,000 in 1969 from the National Endowment for the Humanities.

From its beginning, the Center has sustained a number of deep but fertile tensions. Its scholars have always sought to make a difference in the world, to answer questions, and, where possible, to offer guidance to professions or concerning policy. But, at the same time, Hastings scholars have always been cognizant of the impossibility of definitively answering some questions that individuals face in daily life, particularly when making decisions on behalf of others. The Center has a long tradition of such scholarship, and of close collaboration with the NEH. Not long after receiving its first NEH challenge grant, The Hastings Center began offering one-year postdoctoral fellowships through the NEH Centers for Advanced Study program. This program and its tremendous influence on the field of bioethics are described in “Previous NEH Grants.”

The Hastings Center is a preeminent research institute that has launched humanities leaders. Amy Gutmann, chairwoman of the Presidential Commission for the Study of Bioethical Issues and president of the University of Pennsylvania, described the Center's role this way: "Since its founding in 1969, The Hastings Center has nurtured so many bioethics scholars and leaders that we no longer attempt to count the number of Hastings alumni and friends who are writing and teaching in bioethics centers across the nation and around the world." She made that statement to the presidential bioethics commission in December 2010, during a meeting to discuss ethical issues in synthetic biology. Two Hastings Center scholars were invited to speak at those meetings: Thomas Murray, president of the Center, and Gregory Kaebnick, a research scholar, both of whom are principal investigators on a Hastings project on synthetic biology, which is the use of genetic engineering and other means to create bacteria and other organisms that can accomplish desirable tasks, such as producing inexpensive biofuel.

As further evidence of the Center's influence, Amy Gutmann and four other members of the presidential commission are also Hastings Center Fellows, an elected association of leading researchers in bioethics-related fields. Anita Allen is the Henry R. Silverman Professor of Law and professor of philosophy at the University of Pennsylvania Law School. She is also a Hastings Center Board member. Christine Grady is the acting chief of the Department of Bioethics at the National Institutes of Health Clinical Center. She is a former Hastings Center Board member. Daniel Sulmasy, a Franciscan Friar, holds the Kilbride-Clinton Chair in Medicine and Ethics in the Department of Medicine and Divinity School and is associate director of the MacLean Center for Clinical Medical Ethics at the University of Chicago. John Arras is the

Porterfield Professor of Biomedical Ethics and Professor of Philosophy at the University of Virginia, where he directs the Program in Bioethics and is affiliated with the Center for Biomedical Ethics and Humanities at the Medical School. He is a founding member of the ethics advisory board of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, and he was an NEH Fellow at The Hastings Center in 1979 - 1980. (Letters of support from Allen and Arras are included with this proposal.)

Hastings has shaped the field of bioethics and continues to do so today. It was the model for many of today's university-based and independent bioethics centers. It has established groundbreaking standards for physicians and hospitals, created innovative bioethics curricula for groups ranging from high school students to medical students, and participated in almost every major health care debate. For example, the first guidelines on the ethical management of end-of-life care were the result of a pioneering multidisciplinary research project at the Center. Those guidelines, *Ethical Guidelines for Decision-Making About Life-Sustaining Treatment and Care Near the End of Life*, were published in 1987 and have been updated and expanded for publication this year. For its research projects, Hastings draws on a worldwide network of experts, including its Fellows, and its staff research scholars.

Six of the eight research scholars at The Hastings Center have advanced degrees in the humanities or completed a postdoctoral research fellowship in the humanities. (The other two research scholars are political scientists.) These scholars conduct independent research and lead interdisciplinary research projects.

Daniel Callahan, cofounder of the Center and now a senior research scholar, holds a PhD in philosophy. Callahan is the author or editor of 41 books on a wide range of

issues, most recently exploring ethical dilemmas posed by medical progress. In an age when skyrocketing medical costs are widely seen as unsustainable, Callahan asks, how can we set limits fairly?

Thomas Murray, President of the Center, holds a PhD in social psychology and completed postdoctoral research fellowships in the humanities as an NEH Fellow at Yale and at The Hastings Center. He has served as president of the American Society for Bioethics and Humanities and was a founding editor of the journal *Medical Humanities Review*. His most recent research has included ethical issues in newborn genetic screening and controversies in the use of technology to enhance athletic performance, which raises questions about the meaning of embodiment among other issues.

Erik Parens, senior research scholar, holds a PhD from the University of Chicago's Committee on Social Thought. He investigates how we use new technologies to shape ourselves, whether with surgery or medication or genetic technologies, and how emerging science shapes our understanding of ourselves. As a junior scholar he received two NEH summer fellowships and since arriving at the Center has received two major collaborative research grants from NEH (described in "Previous NEH Grants").

Gregory Kaebnick, research scholar and editor of the *Hastings Center Report*, holds a PhD in philosophy. Kaebnick explores questions about the values that shape our thinking about new biotechnology, and particularly in the ways that people think about nature and human nature. The NEH funded his recent project on the moral values that inform our appeals to nature (described in "Previous NEH Grants"). Kaebnick's current work focuses on these issues as they relate to the emerging field of synthetic biology.

Nancy Berlinger holds a PhD in English literature. Berlinger explores ethical challenges in the context of illness and medical care. She has completed a major revision of the Center's landmark ethics guidance on decision-making and care near the end of life, cited above. Her book, *After Harm: Medical Error and the Ethics of Forgiveness* (Johns Hopkins, 2005), examined the influence of historical and cultural sources on how physicians and patients think about medical mistakes and their aftermath.

Josephine Johnston, LLB, MBHL, is a legal scholar who also holds a Master's degree in bioethics and health law and completed a postdoctoral fellowship in bioethics. Her research focuses on controversial uses of medicine and biomedical technologies, including stem cell research and assisted reproduction.

In addition to conducting research, The Hastings Center publishes the *Hastings Center Report*, a highly competitive, peer-reviewed journal founded in 1970 and the leading forum for humanities scholarship in bioethics. The *Report* also features special supplements reporting on research projects. The March-April 2011 issue, for example, included a special report, "Troubled Children: Diagnosing, Treating, and Attending to Context," which was written by Erik Parens and Josephine Johnston. This report was a major product of a research project funded by the National Institutes of Health that explored controversies in the use of psychiatric drugs in the treatment of behavioral disturbances in children. The three-year project involved five multidisciplinary workshops that included pediatricians, sociologists, philosophers, psychologists, psychiatrists, and legal scholars. They explored the human values at work when we make decisions about who is sick enough to warrant treatment, what diagnosis they should receive, and what sort of treatment they should receive.

This report, like many other Hastings Center publications, was disseminated through collaboration between research scholars and the Center's public affairs and communications department, which includes staff with expertise in new media and in communications with journalists. This department was created through a recent capacity-building initiative at the Center, **Bioethics in the Public Interest** (2007-2010), whose goal was to expand the Center's dissemination capacities and its ability to communicate about complex bioethics issues with journalists, policymakers, and the public. The new media director works closely with scholars at all stages of project development, with the goal of creating multimedia Web sites for projects, including HTML and/or downloadable versions of project publications, commentaries commissioned for the project, links, and other resources. **Bioethics and the Public Interest**, funded by a \$2.1 million grant from the Ford Foundation, has subsequently attracted public and private support for its projects. It demonstrated The Hastings Center's ability to plan, execute, and sustain a major capacity-building effort.

The results of that effort – Center's exceptional new media and communications capacities – will directly support the Hastings Center Humanities Research Initiative. Specifically, the public affairs and communications department will collaborate with the Senior Humanities Research Scholar and with each Scholar-in-Residence to develop a dissemination plan for research projects undertaken through the initiative, including project Web sites and media outreach to build audiences for the research. Project Web sites are designed to be enduring, searchable, and updatable, and will therefore be of considerable value to this research initiative.

Other capacities and partnerships of The Hastings Center will also support this initiative. The Center's Bioethics Forum blog, a weekly commentary on topical bioethics issues, receives 50,000 unique visitors and 200,000 page views each year. Contributors to the Forum include Hastings Center scholars and prominent humanities scholars from other institutions, such as Susan Reverby, the Marion Butler McLean Professor in the History of Ideas and Professor of Women's and Gender Studies at Wellesley College and author of *Examining Tuskegee: The Infamous Syphilis Study and its Legacy*; Carl Elliott, a professor at the Center of Bioethics at the University of Minnesota; Alice Dreger, a professor of clinical medical humanities and bioethics at Northwestern University Feinberg School of Medicine; and Hilde Lindemann, a professor of philosophy at Michigan State University.

As mentioned earlier, The Hastings Center created a partnership with Yale's Interdisciplinary Center for Bioethics called the Yale-Hastings Program in Ethics and Health Policy. This partnership offers The Hastings Center's researchers and visiting scholars – including the humanities scholar-in-residence – the opportunity to spend time at Yale. In addition, The Hastings Center has partnered with the Centre for Biomedical Ethics at the National University of Singapore to launch *Asian Bioethics Review*, a journal modeled on the *Hastings Center Report*, and establish a visiting scholars program for researchers from Singapore. As a result of renovations to establish the Singapore visitors program, the Center can now accommodate up to four visiting scholars at one time.

Looking to the future, The Hastings Center seeks to augment a role it has assumed throughout its history: carrying out bioethics scholarship of unparalleled quality; focusing

on large foundational issues grounded in the humanities; educating young scholars; and being a trusted source of unbiased information on bioethics issues for scholars, clinicians, lawyers, journalists and the public.

Previous NEH Grants

The Hastings Center has received several NEH grants. Beginning in 2005, an NEH collaborative grant supported a project lead by Gregory Kaebnick called “The Ideal of Nature: Appeals to Nature in Debates about Biotechnology and the Environment,” a comparative study of how ideas about nature are invoked in contemporary moral and policy debates about medical biotechnology, agricultural biotechnology, and the environment. Three kinds of questions were central to the investigation: how “nature” is understood, whether and how moral claims about nature can be justified, and whether and how moral claims about nature may legitimately affect public policy. A book of commentaries from researchers on this project is in press.

Two other NEH collaborative grants funded major Hastings Center projects lead by Erik Parens. In 2001, a project called “Surgically Shaping Children” explored the ethical issues raised by surgeries aimed at making children with atypical bodies look more normal. Three cases grounded the exploration: surgery for children with ambiguous genitalia; limb-lengthening surgery for children with achondroplasia (dwarfism); and surgery for children with atypical faces. A major outcome of the project was a well-reviewed volume of essays edited by Parens, *Surgically Shaping Children: Technology, Ethics, and the Pursuit of Normality* (Johns Hopkins University Press, 2006). In an earlier NEH-funded project, launched in 1995, Parens examined the prospect of using emerging technologies (including surgery and medication) to “enhance” human traits and

capacities. The project culminated in a volume of essays edited by Parens, *Enhancing Human Traits: Ethical and Social Implications* (Georgetown University Press, 1999). A review in *Nature* praised the book as “something of a landmark” with respect to discussion of issues that too often were reduced to a shorthand of utopian versus Orwellian futures.

A decade earlier, the NEH supported a two-and-a-half year research project on applied humanities and public policy. The project focused on issues growing out of the lively debate within the humanities at that time about whether or not attempts to relate the humanities directly to issues of daily life and public policy were appropriate and beneficial. Since most of the work at The Hastings Center had represented an attempt to do just that, this question had been an important concern for the organization.

Philosophers, historians, literary scholars, and other humanists had become increasingly active in governmental and clinical settings. The project asked basic, broad-ranging questions about the applied humanities. What is the cultural mission of the humanities? How directly can humanistic knowledge and perspectives be brought to bear on public policy issues? What civil purposes can – and should – the humanities serve? To what extent, in what ways, and with what voice, ought the humanities to address our social, political, and economic life? Answers to these questions are suggested in a book that grew out of the project, *Applying the Humanities* (Plenum, 1985), edited by Daniel Callahan, cofounder of The Hastings Center; Arthur L. Caplan, a former Hastings researcher and now director of the bioethics center at the University of Pennsylvania; and Bruce Jennings, director of bioethics at the Center for Humans and Nature. Contributors included Martha Nussbaum, PhD, the Ernest Freund Distinguished Service Professor of

Law and Ethics at the University of Chicago Law School, and Ruth Macklin, PhD, a professor of bioethics at Albert Einstein College of Medicine.

As mentioned earlier, Hastings also participated in an NEH fellowship program as one of the Centers for Advanced Study from 1974 to 1984. Hastings hosted 39 NEH Fellows, many of whom went on to become leaders in their fields. They included John Arras, the Porterfield Professor of Biomedical Ethics and Professor of Philosophy at the University of Virginia and a member of the Presidential Commission for the Study of Bioethical Issues; Susan Wolf, the McKnight Presidential Professor of Law, Medicine and Public Policy and the Faegre and Benson Professor of Law at the University of Minnesota; and Thomas Murray, president of The Hastings Center.

Fundraising Plans

The Hastings Center is well-positioned to fulfill the fundraising requirement of a \$500,000 NEH challenge grant. In December 2010, the Center publicly launched **Facing Life: The Campaign for Bioethics**, and as of April 2011 it had raised \$9.3 million toward the comprehensive campaign goal of \$20 million. Since December 2010, the campaign has raised over \$1 million. The Hastings Center Humanities Research Initiative fits within the goals of this campaign. The goal includes \$15 million in campaign support for endowment for research aims and Board-designated capital reserves and \$5 million in cumulative annual giving, with significant growth factored in. (We will not use the NEH challenge grant for fundraising costs.)

The Center set its goals after hiring a consulting firm in New York to evaluate the feasibility of a major fundraising effort. The firm assessed capacity from Board members

and other individuals to complement the Center's existing foundation and grant programs and to build on the \$2.1 million leadership gift from the Ford Foundation by embarking on a capital campaign. The study also looked at the prospects for the Center to increase its donor base and annual giving. The conclusions of this analysis were very promising. They showed that the Board's commitment and potential to make lead gifts to this initiative put the Center in a strong position to raise the needed campaign gifts.

Moving forward on the consulting firm's recommendations, the Center 1) hired a professional development director with major campaign experience, 2) developed a strong case statement and collateral campaign materials, and 3) recruited an exceptional cadre of campaign volunteers which includes four Nobel laureates; past presidents of Yale, Princeton, Columbia, and Stanford; and many leaders from business, government, and other areas of influence. The Center's leadership developed a five-year plan to project what would be needed to underwrite the current needs of The Center and create a new model of philanthropy that would move the Center toward a more independent research path. Financial goals for the campaign were determined by a thorough review by members of the Executive, Finance, and Development Committees of the Board. In addition to the \$2.1 million capacity-building grant from the Ford Foundation, highlights of successes to date include three individual gifts at the \$1 million level; doubling of support from the Hastings Center Fellows; a 10 percent increase in annual giving over last year; and 96 percent participation in the annual fund from Center staff.

In support of the campaign, the Center's development team created a gift pyramid of needed and identified prospects, based on meaningful assessment of both capacity and inclination to support the Center's needs. A major measure of the success of the Center's

fundraising effort for the NEH challenge grant will be an increase in the Center's donor base. Over the period of the grant, our development team will monitor financial projections to assure that financial goals are met. The NEH challenge grant would provide a significant incentive to donors. Not only would it help leverage those already identified for possible campaign gifts, but we believe that it would also help open doors for consideration from others with a passion for and belief in the importance of the humanities in informing the bioethics dialogue.

The NEH challenge grant, then, would enable The Hastings Center to fortify and expand two bridges. One of those bridges reaches out to donors – those acquainted with the Center's work and potential new donors for whom the Center's mission strikes a deep chord. The second bridge is the one cited earlier, and it *is* the Center's mission: to be a bridge between the humanities and the sciences by exploring ethical issues raised by advances in medicine, science, and technology as they affect individuals and the wider world. An NEH challenge grant would make a tremendous difference in The Hastings Center's capacity to strengthen and expand its enduring commitment to the ancient questions of the humanities. By grappling with those questions as they are filtered through the prism of contemporary developments The Hastings Center's Humanities Research initiative would make a significant contribution to humanities scholarship.