

## **Mega Awards, Challenge Prizes, and Calculating the Prestige of the World's Greatest Awards--the Stakes Are Getting Higher**

The World of Awards in 2014: Analysis and Commentary

by Larry E. Tise, Ph.D., Historian

### **The Stakes are Getting Higher**

When I became seriously interested in trying to learn something about the world of awards, I had just become the first Executive Director of the Benjamin Franklin National Memorial at The Franklin Institute in Philadelphia, PA. The year was 1989 and The Franklin Institute had just received a bequest from the late chemical manufacturer Henry Bower of Philadelphia to establish the world's foremost award in science. The bequest was generous and the new award, to be known as the "Bower Award for Achievement in Science," was to start out with a prize of \$250,000 USD to be given each year in perpetuity. The bequest included an endowment whose funds were to be invested so that the award could grow over time to insure that the Bower Award would continue to be either the largest or among the largest science prizes in the world.

The Bower bequest, of course, asked several questions that needed to be known before the new award could be launched. What are the largest science prizes in the world? And how are those prizes administered? And, after all, what is science? Both the attorney for Mr. Bower's estate and the trustees of The Franklin Institute wanted assurances that the goals of the bequest could be achieved and that the Bower Award could be positioned as the world's leading award and prize in science. As I began searching for answers to these questions, I quickly learned that there was literally nowhere to turn for authoritative information. When I began calling other

institutions sponsoring awards in the US and abroad, I quickly learned that each award across the world seemed to be operated in isolation from all others. I found a thirst for knowledge, but no one who could help me understand where the new Bower Award would fit into the panoply of awards around the world.

Being an intellectually curious and peripatetic historian, I launched into a quest that would take me across the US and Europe where it seemed most of the world's greatest awards were located. Chicago, Dallas, DC, New York, Los Angeles, and many points between in the US; London, Amsterdam, Brussels, Oslo, Stockholm, Dusseldorf, Geneva, Paris, and Rome in Europe. Everywhere there was an appetite for knowledge, but nowhere could I find anyone who could give me an overview of the world of awards. To fill the void, I began collecting data on what were believed by some to be the world's greatest awards. With the help of generous hosts, I organized a meeting of award directors at the MacArthur Foundation in Chicago and another one at the Institut du France in Paris. Those who met wanted an organization, which led to the birth in 1994 of the International Congress of Distinguished Awards.

While these activities were going forward, I, of course, also had to present the Bower Award for Achievement in Science for the first time in 1990--as per the terms of the bequest. When it was presented for the first time that year to Paul C. Lauterbur for his construction of the scientific methodology for doing Magnetic Resonance Imaging (MRI), we could say with some confidence that the new Bower Award had the largest cash prize for scientific discovery in the United States. But it was nowhere near the monetary value and had little hope of achieving the international prestige of the generous Nobel Prizes in Chemistry, Physics, or Medicine. Nor did it equal the newly established Draper Prize of \$500,000 in engineering launched by the National

Academy of Engineering in 1989. But, all in all, we could still argue that it was the largest prize for scientific discovery in the US. And it was probably the 4th or 5th largest cash prize for any award given anywhere in the world when it was inaugurated in 1990.

But that was 1990. Now--a quarter of a century later--the trustees of The Franklin Institute have kept the Bower Award at the \$250,000 level. And, as we have completed the most recent survey of the world of awards in 2014, the Bower Award is tied with the important Heinz Awards of the Heinz Family Foundation of Pittsburgh for 51st in the world in terms of cash value. When the Bower Award was founded in 1990 and the Heinz Awards in 1993, they were the standard bearers both in quality and cash value. While these two fine award programs have perhaps maintained high standards in terms of choosing outstanding recipients of their awards, they have been trumped over and again by the rapid cash increases of some older awards and the emergence of new awards with cash values exceeding \$1 million. Indeed, whereas in 1990 a cash award of \$100,000 was viewed as attractive and \$250,000 very enviable, by 2014 it became necessary for new awards to offer cash prizes of \$1 million or more if they wanted to be noticed for the largesse of their monetary value.

### **Welcoming Mega Awards**

The creation of new awards and the expansion of older awards go through cycles over time. Until the 1950s the world of awards was a relatively small realm. But as the world economy has spiraled in booms and declines since the 1960s, we have seen increases in the emergence of new awards as the economy has grown--especially in certain nations. As the economy of the United States expanded rapidly in the 1960s and 1970s, so did the number of new awards. The decade of the 1980s saw an outpouring of new awards in the booming

economy of Japan. The rise of the tech industry worldwide brought a new raft of awards in the 1990s. Since the onset of the new millennium in 2000, a new cadre of awards creators has come on the scene--a worldwide club of multi-billionaires.

The spate of new awards--all with cash prizes intended to be around the threshold of \$1 million USD are as follows:

**Table 1. "Mega" Awards (ca. \$1 million+) Created since 2000**

<u>Award</u>	<u>Field</u>	<u>Year Est.</u>	<u>Award Amt.</u>
African Leadership Prize	Leadership	2007	\$5,000,000
Queen Elizabeth Prize	Engineering	2013	\$1,616,000
Global Energy International Prize	Science	2002	\$1,014,000
Dan David Prizes	Multidisciplinary	2002	\$1,000,000
Gates Award for Global Health	Science	2000	\$1,000,000
Gotham Prize for Cancer Research	Medicine	2007	\$1,000,000
Hidayo Noguchi Africa Prize	Medicine	2006	\$1,000,000
John W. Kluge Prize	Humanities	2003	\$1,000,000
Kavli Prize	Science	2005	\$1,000,000
Opus Prize	Humanitarian	2004	\$1,000,000
Shaw Prize	Science	2002	\$1,000,000
Abel Prize	Science	2002	\$ 982,000
Astrid Lindgren Memorial Prize	Literature	2002	\$ 765,550
Holberg International Memorial Prize	Humanitarian	2003	\$ 736,000

Through these generous benefices by donors who were aware that to make a statement in the world of awards one needed to establish large cash dividends, a total of fourteen new major international awards came on the scene after the year 2000.

The new Mega Prizes literally took over the world of major awards (Table 2).

**Table 2. Mega Prizes (in bold lettering) among Existing Historic Prizes**

<u>Award</u>	<u>Field</u>	<u>Year Est.</u>	<u>Award Amt.</u>
<b>African Leadership Prize</b>	<b>Leadership</b>	<b>2007</b>	<b>\$5,000,000</b>
Templeton Prize	Religion	1972	\$1,776,000
<b>Queen Elizabeth Prize</b>	<b>Engineering</b>	<b>2013</b>	<b>\$1,616,000</b>
Conrad Hilton Humanitarian Prize	Humanitarian	1996	\$1,500,000
Nobel Prizes	Multidisciplinary	1901	\$1,249,000
<b>Global Energy International Prize</b>	<b>Science</b>	<b>2002</b>	<b>\$1,014,000</b>
Balzan Prizes	Multidisciplinary	1961	\$1,108,000
Alan T. Waterman Award	Science	1975	\$1,000,000
<b>Dan David Prizes</b>	<b>Multidisciplinary</b>	<b>2002</b>	<b>\$1,000,000</b>
<b>Gates Award for Global Health</b>	<b>Science</b>	<b>2000</b>	<b>\$1,000,000</b>
<b>Gotham Prize for Cancer Research</b>	<b>Medicine</b>	<b>2007</b>	<b>\$1,000,000</b>
<b>Hidayo Noguchi Africa Prize</b>	<b>Medicine</b>	<b>2006</b>	<b>\$1,000,000</b>
<b>John W. Kluge Prize</b>	<b>Humanities</b>	<b>2003</b>	<b>\$1,000,000</b>
<b>Kavli Prize</b>	<b>Science</b>	<b>2005</b>	<b>\$1,000,000</b>
<b>Opus Prize</b>	<b>Humanitarian</b>	<b>2004</b>	<b>\$1,000,000</b>
<b>Shaw Prize</b>	<b>Science</b>	<b>2002</b>	<b>\$1,000,000</b>
Zayed International Prizes	Environment	1999	\$1,000,000
<b>Abel Prize</b>	<b>Science</b>	<b>2002</b>	<b>\$ 982,000</b>
Packard Fellowships	Science	1998	\$ 875,000
<b>Astrid Lindgren Memorial Prize</b>	<b>Literature</b>	<b>2002</b>	<b>\$ 765,550</b>
<b>Holberg International Memorial Prize</b>	<b>Humanitarian</b>	<b>2003</b>	<b>\$ 736,000</b>
Crafoord Prizes	Science	1980	\$ 625,000
MacArthur Fellowships	Multidisciplinary	1981	\$ 625,000

Among the world's twenty-three major awards with cash prizes above \$500,000 in 2014, more than half (14) had been created since the year 2000. And if one includes in this list those that had been created in the 1990s as well, all except six of the major awards had been created in the past twenty years.

The lavishness of the investment of some of the newly arriving donors in the realm of awards becomes even more apparent if one focuses, not only on the size of each prize awarded, but also on the number of prizes given and the total amount of money devoted to the resulting bundle of prizes. The annual investments of the new award programs actually begin to rival the yearly outlays of some of the oldest and best endowed award programs on the planet.

**Table 3. Mega Awards (bold lettering) with Largest Pre-existing Award Programs**

<u>Award Program</u>	<u>Year Est.</u>	<u># Awards</u>	<u>Principal Amt</u>	<u>Total Awarded</u>
MacArthur Fellows	1981	24	\$ 625,000	\$15,000,000
Packard Fellowships	1998	16	\$ 875,000	\$14,000,000
Guggenheim Fellowships	1925	200	\$ 61,600	\$13,317,950
Nobel Foundation Prizes	1901	5	\$1,249,000	\$ 6,245,000
Balzan Prizes	1961	5	\$1,108,000	\$ 5,451,600
<b>Dan David Prizes</b>	<b>2002</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>\$1,000,000</b>	<b>\$ 3,000,000</b>
<b>Kavli Prizes</b>	<b>2005</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>\$1,000,000</b>	<b>\$ 3,000,000</b>
<b>Shaw Prizes</b>	<b>2002</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>\$1,000,000</b>	<b>\$ 3,000,000</b>
<b>Gruber Awards</b>	<b>2000</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>\$ 500,000</b>	<b>\$ 2,500,000</b>
Milken Educator Awards	1987	75	\$ 25,000	\$ 1,875,000

As seen in this table, four of the newly created award programs--Dan David, Kavli, Shaw, and the Gruber Foundation Awards--quickly made a place among the ten top historic and well-

established programs such as the Nobel Foundation Prizes (1901) and the venerated Guggenheim Fellowship Awards (1925).

It is useful to note that in a period of time from the millennial year of 2000 until the present--a period of modest economic inflation around the world--there has been a considerable inflation in the number of awards that we have recognized in past reports as distinguished and in the typical cash amount of awards being presented on an annual basis.

**Table 4. Number of Awards per Monetary Value, 1999 to 2014**

<u>\$USD Value Range</u>	<u>1999</u>	<u>2003</u>	<u>2007</u>	<u>2014</u>
\$0	6	9	13	13
\$1 to \$9,999	1	2	4	3
\$10,000 to \$24,999	2	6	11	9
\$25,000 to \$49,999	6	11	12	18
\$50,000 to \$99,999	22	24	24	24
\$100,000 to \$249,999	31	43	47	56
\$250,000 to \$499,999	13	13	16	22
\$500,000 to \$999,999	4	11	18	17
\$1,000,000 +	4	7	15	22
Total number of Awards	89	126	160	184
-----				
Percent below \$100,000	41.6	41.3	40.0	36.4
Percent over \$100,000	58.4	58.7	60.0	63.6
Percent over \$250,000	23.6	24.6	30.6	33.2
Percent over \$500,000	9.0	14.2	20.6	21.2
Percent over \$1 million	5.6	5.5	9.3	12.0

As indicated in Table 4, by 1999 (after the inflation of award amounts was well underway), 58.4 percent of all distinguished awards given were at the \$100,000 level and above. Fifteen years later in 2014, 63.6 percent of all distinguished awards were at the \$100,000 level and higher. The greatest increase in number of awards was at the higher and not the lower end of the scale. Whereas the number of awards below \$100,000 remained essentially flat, the numbers of awards at the \$100,000 and \$250,000 levels increased considerably. At the \$500,000 level, the number of awards quadrupled from four to seventeen. At the \$1 million level, the number quintupled from four to twenty-two. The percentages of prizes at those levels grew steadily as well.

One can also track the inflation in the size of cash prizes by looking at how classic award programs have responded to the emergence of larger awards and the new Mega Awards. Such

**Table 5. Increase in Prize Amounts for Selected Existing Prizes, 1999 to 2014**

<u>Award/Prize in \$USD</u>	<u>1999</u>	<u>2003</u>	<u>2007</u>	<u>2014</u>
Templeton Prize	\$1,240,000	\$1,115,000	\$1,600,000	\$1,776,000
Nobel Prizes	1,120,000	1,210,000	1,290,000	1,249,000
Balzan Prizes	350,000	734,000	869,000	1,108,000
Hilton Award	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,500,000	1,500,000
Goldman Prizes	75,000	125,000	150,000	150,000
Lasker Medical Prizes	25,000	25,000	300,000	300,000
Tyler Environmental Prize	200,000	200,000	200,000	200,000
Rolex Awards	50,000	100,000	100,000	100,000
Pritzker Prize	100,000	100,000	100,000	100,000
Man Booker Prize	35,000	79,650	100,000	80,520
Erasmus Prize	160,000	165,000	196,000	202,000

older, renowned awards as Templeton, Nobel, Balzan, and Hilton have sought to increase the amounts of their prizes so as to keep pace with new large awards. Others--most of them with limited endowments-- have increased but slowly or maintained the older level of their prizes. Some of these older awards--Erasmus, Goldman, Lasker, Pritzker, Rolex, and Tyler have generated such an aura of renown in their own rights that their reputations are likely worth more than the amount of any prize they might offer.

Another way of tracking changes in the world of awards is to look at the fields of endeavor or research that are chosen to highlight with the creation of new awards. Identifying fields is one of the challenges of understanding the evolution of award giving. Although donors may select a specific topic for an award--e.g., crime, women's rights, DNA research, clean water, cosmology--these are subtopics in much larger realms of endeavor--e.g., science, medicine, environment, literature, art. From the earliest days of attempting to construct criteria for the world's most distinguished awards and of selecting those awards from among thousands that fit the criteria, we have also sought to understand the broader categories of human endeavor being honored. This has been a rewarding pursuit, since we are thus able to track the relationship between award giving and the evolving broader concerns of human society.

Table 6 reflects the changing numbers of awards in each of the principal fields we have constructed to trace this phenomenon. Some of the seemingly incongruous fluctuations in certain fields results from the fact that we have had to construct a special field denominated as "Multidisciplinary" to account for some award programs that give awards concurrently in several fields (e.g., King Faisal Awards, Heinz Awards, Wolf Prizes) and some of the newer mega

awards actually define on an annual basis the particular realms that they will be honoring in a given award cycle (e.g., Dan David, Zayed). Despite these anomalies, Table 6 shows

**Table 6. Principal Award Fields of Distinguished Awards, 1999 to 2014**

<u>Award Field</u>	<u>1999</u>	<u>2003</u>	<u>2007</u>	<u>2014</u>
Multidisciplinary	10	13	6	18
Arts	12	19	35	25
Culture	0	3	3	3
Economics	1	1	2	3
Engineering	0	2	3	5
Environment	4	12	20	20
Humanitarian	7	13	12	18
Humanities	3	3	5	5
Innovation	0	1	2	4
Leadership	0	1	4	4
Literature	9	11	12	17
Mathematics	1	1	2	2
Medicine	5	5	9	12
Peace	5	7	8	7
Religion	2	2	4	1
Science	17	22	32	34
Technology	4	8	5	6

that the ancient and traditional realms for giving awards--Arts, Literature, and Science--continue to be the fields that are most heavily represented in 2014 as distinguished awards. In fact, all three of these fields are still growing more rapidly than most other areas.

Table 6 also reveals that the most popular realms for the creation of new awards since 1999 have been the Environment and Humanitarian concerns. Reflecting worldwide worries about global warming and the need for a healthy planet, major new awards have been created to encourage the environmental sciences and efforts to clean polluted cities and housing terrains. A parallel effort to recognize new developments in dealing with poverty, hunger, refugees, and health dangers have brought forth new humanitarian awards as well. At the same time, several new fields have emerged as donors have sought to gain recognition for realms of human achievement that have been overlooked in previous awards. Culture (material studies), Engineering, Innovation, Leadership, and Technology are among these emerging topics.

Meanwhile, some of the older popular topics that absorbed attention during the post World War II world have remained pretty flat when it comes to the creation of new awards. Principal among these are the Humanities, Medicine, Peace, and Religion. Although the world of medicine and health care has been one of the world's largest arenas of economic growth and research endeavor, innovations in medicine have come to be dominated by pharmaceutical and medical device corporations and teams of researchers, making the identification of individual discovery much more difficult to determine.

A further tool for monitoring what is happening in the world of awards relates to the nationality of awards and prizes. Historically speaking, the United States has been the proverbial home for awards and award giving. More than half of all the distinguished awards given in the world today have been created, funded, and operated in the United States. That is, in part, because there have been more philanthropies created in the United States than all of the rest of the world combined. And also that America--recognized almost from the birth of the United States--has been viewed as a nation of voluntary associations, non-profit corporations, and self-

help improvement organizations devoted to the "betterment" of society. There has been no significant change in this aspect of awards from our first report in 1999 to the present. The United States is home to 58% of the world's distinguished awards. The US is trailed distantly by the United Kingdom (7%), Japan (6%), and Sweden (5%).

If one takes into account the emergence and impact of the large Mega Prizes created since the year 2000, there are signs that there may be a sea change in the offing--at least at the top end of the world's awards. As shown in Table 7, there is a tremendous diversity in the national identities or locations of these fourteen of the world's largest and most generous

**Table 7. Nationality of "Mega" Awards (ca. \$1 million+) Created since 2000**

<u>Award</u>	<u>Nationality</u>	<u>Year Est.</u>	<u>Award Amt.</u>
African Leadership Prize	United Kingdom	2007	\$5,000,000
Queen Elizabeth Prize	United Kingdom	2013	\$1,616,000
Global Energy International Prize	Russia	2002	\$1,014,000
Dan David Prizes	Israel	2002	\$1,000,000
Gates Award for Global Health	United States	2000	\$1,000,000
Gotham Prize for Cancer Research	United States	2007	\$1,000,000
Hidayo Noguchi Africa Prize	Japan	2006	\$1,000,000
John W. Kluge Prize	United States	2003	\$1,000,000
Kavli Prize	United States	2005	\$1,000,000
Opus Prize	United States	2004	\$1,000,000
Shaw Prize	Hong Kong	2002	\$1,000,000
Abel Prize	Norway	2002	\$ 982,000
Astrid Lindgren Memorial Prize	Sweden	2002	\$ 765,550
Holberg International Memorial Prize	Norway	2003	\$ 736,000

awards. While six of the fourteen are located in the United States and others are located in the United Kingdom (2), Japan (1), and Sweden (1)--nations long identified as leaders in the world of sponsoring awards--the others are from nations that have hosted few if any awards in the past. These are Norway (2), Hong Kong (1), Israel (1), and Russia (1). Based on these trends in the creation of new awards, one can safely predict that over the next decade there will most likely be a new wave of awards arising from the world's burgeoning new economies--China, India, Malaysia, and Brazil.

### **The Challenge of Challenge Prizes**

In addition to the appearance of a host of new awards that we are denominating "Mega Awards," the world of awards has also seen since the year 2000 a new surge of compelling awards that offer gigantic cash premiums for certain types of extreme or superhuman accomplishments. Although the issuance of challenges for a coveted prize or cash is one of the oldest forms of giving awards in recorded history, this type of award was brought into the popular imagination again in 1996 when the X Prize Foundation in the United States issued a challenge for someone to build a reusable manned flying craft that could attain suborbital flight twice in the space of two weeks. The reward for the successful developer was a cash prize of \$10 million with promises as well to transform the winning craft into a commercial flying machine. Bearing the name Ansari X Prize, the challenge was met on 4 October 2004 by group that produced a flying machine designed by aeronautical pioneer Bert Rutan and financed by former Microsoft co-founder Paul Allen.

The success of the X Prize Foundation in this instance sent a wave of enthusiasm across the world--among corporations, government agencies, and foundations--that this special type of

inducement could work miracles in solving problems large and small. Enthusiasts began planning ways of issuing challenges to build other spacecraft, to develop miracle machines for purifying water, for eradicating poverty, and for finding solutions to many of the problems that have plagued human society for centuries. Many institutions--such as NASA and private entrepreneurs--caught the fever and began setting up challenge prizes sometimes without understanding precisely that challenge stimuli can only work in certain restricted situations. Challenges will only work where all of the variables can be controlled and where the prize giver can define precisely what is the challenge and how entrants will be evaluated.

In an effort to explain more fully the special "challenge" of challenge prizes, we have developed some guidance and a set of principles to be considered by individuals thinking about establishing such a prize. This guidance may be found on the ICDA.org website under the rubric of Awards Research Reports.

Given the fact that Challenge Prizes have become one of the integral segments of the World of Awards, we have included in our 2014 Directory of Awards several challenge prizes that meet our criteria for distinguished awards. The ones we have included are those that are offered for human achievement in one of the fields tracked by ICDA. But since they are finite awards that will be suspended when the prizes are won, they will appear on our roster only so long as the challenges are still being offered.

### **Calculating the Prestige of the World's Greatest Awards**

We have saved for last in this report the most revolutionary feature of the ICDA 2014 Roster of Distinguished Awards. This is the implementation of a strategy and methodology for

calculating the relative prestige of all of world's great awards. It seems most logical to introduce this new feature at this point, because some of the most important reasons for developing a rating system are an outgrowth of massive changes we have witnessed in the world of awards over the past two decades. The number and variety of distinguished awards has increased dramatically during the past twenty years (we are tracking twice the number of awards now compared to our first roster in 1999). The amounts of cash prizes have inflated until the threshold for establishing an important new award has gone from \$100,000 in 1999 to \$1 million or more today.

But this very expansion of the number of distinguished awards and the inflation of cash prizes has made it increasingly difficult to navigate the world of awards. We originally established a set of criteria for "distinguished" awards in 1999 as a means of identifying from among the 30,000 awards in the world those that were truly distinctive and the most worthy of envy and notice. To keep track of things between and among these "distinguished" awards, we have tracked various measurable data--the age of an award, the specific field in which it is given, and the size of the cash prize given with the award. But these are relative data when it comes to the crucial matter of just how important is one prize or another in the galaxy of awards. Even though a particular award may have a modest cash prize or none at all, it is possible that it may be revered in its field as the most important award of all. By the same token, a cash prize of \$1 million does not mean that a particular award is among the first rank of the world's awards.

Affixing a prestige rating to awards can only be accomplished by watching and listening to what is happening in the world of awards over an extended period of time. It can only be done intelligently by sifting and comparing relative methodologies of securing nominations and choosing recipients for awards. It is informed as well by observing who is chosen to receive

particular awards and when they are chosen. For, in the world of awards, there are those who seek out awards as part of a conscious campaign to win credibility for their discoveries or innovations. And some of the same folk knock on the door of multiple awards to get broader recognition, to expand their resumes, and, of course, to secure a cash windfall. Many potential laureates for distinguished awards are also located at institutions--mainly universities--with robust and well-established offices that assist faculty in submitting nominations. It is a subtle business--giving and receiving awards--done by human beings at both ends. But all of these factors are calculable and measurable with years of observation and constant vigilance.

We've defined essentially five levels of defining the prestige of the world's awards (explained in deeper detail on the ICDA.org website):

**Most Notable Awards (5)**--those awards that are accorded the highest level of respect across the world of awards.

**Gold Standard Awards (4)**--those that adhere to the highest level of good practices in an exemplary and consistent manner.

**Highly Esteemed Awards (3)**--clearly leading awards in their field. But also in this category, between levels 3 and 4, we have established several additional measures of prestige for certain awards with further defining characteristics: **Mega Prizes (3.6)**; **Challenge Prizes (3.4)**; and **Prototype Awards (3.2)**

**Esteemed Awards (2)**--distinguished awards of longstanding demonstrated distinction

**Recognized (1)**--important awards previously recognized as distinguished awards

While it is likely that casual readers may find these categories of ranking to be so subtle as to be without meaning, veteran observers of awards and award programs will recognize that these ratings yield meaningful groupings of the many and varied participants in the world of awards. And further, that these categories also take into consideration those awards that have inspired others over many years as well as the many newcomers who have not yet demonstrated their

longevity and permanency. Nevertheless, it should be understood that this initial ranking of awards by their prestige is most definitely a work in progress. It will need to be revisited on a regular basis as the fortunes of individual awards wax and wane and as relatively new awards prove their mettle on a long term basis.

**Table 8. The World's *Most Notable* Awards (5) (listed alphabetically)**

<u>Award</u>	<u>Principal \$USD</u>	<u>Field</u>	<u>Year Est.</u>	<u>Nationality</u>
Balzan Prizes	\$1,108,000	Multidisciplinary	1961	Italy
Bank of Sweden Prize	\$1,249,000	Economics	1958	Sweden
Conrad Hilton Prize	\$1,500,000	Humanitarian	1996	United States
Erasmus Prize	\$ 202,020	Humanities	1958	The Netherlands
Gruber Found. Awards	\$ 500,000	Multidisciplinary	2000	United States
Guggenheim Fellows	\$ 61,600	Multidisciplinary	1925	United States
Japan Prize	\$ 500,000	Science	1985	Japan
MacArthur Fellows	\$ 625,000	Multidisciplinary	1981	United States
Nobel Peace Prize	\$1,249,000	Peace	1901	Norway
Nobel Prizes	\$1,249,000	Multidisciplinary	1901	Sweden
Rolex Awards	\$ 100,000	Multidisciplinary	1976	Switzerland
Templeton Prize	\$1,776,000	Religion	1972	United States

Whether one looks at the world of awards for those that achieve the highest level of recognition; for those awards valued by their recipients as the finest accolade one can receive; for those awards with the most enviable level of professionalism in presenting their awards and promoting the achievements of their recipients, these twelve awards or award programs are, we believe, the most notable the world has to offer.

The second category of awards in terms of prestige include those that are ranked as Gold Standard Awards. These awards differ little from the category of the Most Notable Awards-- except that some of these are somewhat narrower in focus and, while they may be recognized as the award of record for their field, they have not achieved the general international recognition of the most notable group. Their standards are, nonetheless, impeccable and of the highest quality.

**Table 9. The World's *Gold Standard* Awards (4) (listed alphabetically)**

<u>Award</u>	<u>Principal \$USD</u>	<u>Field</u>	<u>Year Est.</u>	<u>Nationality</u>
Crafoord Prize	\$ 625,000	Science	1980	Sweden
Goldman Prizes	\$ 150,000	Environment	1990	United States
Heineken Prizes	\$ 150,000	Multidisciplinary	1963	The Netherlands
Heinz Awards	\$ 250,000	Multidisciplinary	1993	United States
King Baudouin Prize	\$ 202,020	Humanitarian	1978	Belgium
King Faisal Prizes	\$ 200,000	Multidisciplinary	1977	Saudi Arabia
Kyoto Prizes	\$ 500,000	Multidisciplinary	1985	Japan
Lasker Awards	\$ 300,000	Medicine	1946	United States
Lemelson-MIT Prize	\$ 500,000	Innovation	1994	United States
Pew Fellows (Marine)	\$ 150,000	Environment	1989	United States
Pulitzer Prizes	\$ 10,000	Literature	1917	United States
Rome Prize Fellows	\$ 28,000	Arts	1894	United States
Wolf Prizes	\$ 100,000	Multidisciplinary	1978	Israel

Whether someone is the recipient of one of these great prizes or finds one of these awards listed next to the name of an individual, it is certain that the laureates chosen by these programs have attained the highest level of recognition the world has to offer in their realm of work.

The next level of awards in our ranking of awards by prestige are those that we have denominated as "Highly Esteemed." This category includes those new large cash prizes that we have already described as "Mega Awards" (3.6) and "Challenge Prizes" (3.4). It also includes a further group of historically important awards that we have denominated as "Prototype Awards" (see Table 10). These are unique awards that helped establish precedents in award giving

**Table 10. The World's Most Important *Prototype Awards* (3.2) (alphabetically)**

<u>Award</u>	<u>Principal \$USD</u>	<u>Field</u>	<u>Year Est.</u>	<u>Nationality</u>
Aga Khan Award	\$ 500,000	Culture	1977	Switzerland
Blue Planet Prize	\$ 500,000	Environment	1992	Japan
Carnegie Hero Medal	\$ 3,500	Humanitarian	1904	United States
Cervantes Prize	\$ 168,250	Literature	1976	Spain
Copley Medal	\$ 8,050	Science	1731	United Kingdom
Draper Prize	\$ 500,000	Engineering	1988	United States
Gish Prize	\$ 300,000	Arts	1994	United States
Fields Medals	\$ 15,000	Mathematics	1936	United States
John Scott Awards	\$ 10,000	Technology	1816	United States
Man Booker Prizes	\$ 80,500	Literature	1995	United Kingdom
Priestley Medal	\$ 0	Science	1922	United States
Pritzker Prize	\$ 100,000	Arts	1979	United States
Ruth Lilly Poetry Prize	\$ 100,000	Literature	1986	United States
Tchaikovsky Awards	\$ 27,000	Arts	1958	Russia
Tyler Prize	\$ 200,000	Environment	1973	United States
Van Cliburn Awards	\$ 20,000	Arts	1961	United States
Welch Award	\$ 300,000	Science	1972	United States
World Food Prize	\$ 250,000	Science	1986	United States

that have been replicated over and over--often without any conscious awareness of the inspiration--across the world of awards (e.g. Carnegie, Copley, and Tchaikovsky). Other of these awards are seen in their special realms as the most coveted recognition one can achieve in that field (Gish, Man Booker, Pritzker). Some of these awards remain the sentimental favorites in a field--even though they may have been eclipsed by much richer prizes (Fields, John Scott, Priestley). Others are viewed as the absolute authority in the realm they represent (Aga Khan, Cervantes, Ruth Lilly, Van Cliburn, Welch). Others were responsible for bringing to the fore major fields that had previously been overlooked (Draper, Tyler, World Food Prize). Because these awards have played such a large role in helping to define and shape the world of awards, whenever they speak or choose a recipient, the rest of the awards world is sure to listen. They are part of a well-established tradition of speaking authoritatively in their realm of award giving.

In addition to Mega Awards, Challenge Prizes, and Prototype Awards, the "Highly Esteemed" category of prestige ranking includes an additional thirty-five awards that constitute the quality core of the world of distinguished awards. Taken together, the sixty-eight awards that appear in the "Highly Esteemed" category are the bell weather awards and prizes in the world of awards. It is from this group that have come the most important innovations in award giving. These are the awards that almost always bring forth for the first time those laureates who have not yet been recognized. It is from these laureates that the awards we have denominated as "Most Notable" and "Gold Standard" will choose their recipients. For, as the number of awards have grown and multiplied over the past twenty-five years, we have witnessed the proliferation among the most established awards a practice of picking recipients who have essentially already been vetted by other awards programs.

As a consequence, it is very rare any longer for someone to receive a Balzan Prize, an Erasmus Prize, a Japan Prize, a King Faisal Prize, a MacArthur Fellowship, a Nobel Prize, a Pulitzer Prize, or a Wolf Prize unless that individual has already been the recipient of another "Highly Esteemed" award. Indeed, one of the most commonly heard claims in the world of awards is that of priority in being the first to recognize the merits of a particular individual to be worthy of receiving one of the world's most prestigious awards. And then, after the fact, to have the brilliance of one's judgment certified or confirmed when that person is chosen for one of the "Most Notable" or "Gold Standard" awards. I recall very fondly the moment when the Norwegian Nobel Committee announced in 1993 that Nelson Mandela and F. W. de Klerk would share the Nobel Peace Prize that year. I heard joyously from three different awards organizations how proud they were that *they* had been the first to present the unusual pair South African leaders joint prizes!

This example and many others that have occurred before and since go to prove that world of awards--as strange as it may seem--is really an interconnected world. Although those who present awards and the laureates who receive them do so with great fanfare, much pomp, and celebratory speeches, the practice of giving awards--despite all the money now involved--is not so very different from honoring a hunter in a primordial culture for bringing home an abundance of game; of recognizing a warrior who shot his arrow straightest or threw his spear farthest; of calling out a female agriculturalist for growing the most flavorful corn or peas; or of praising a wise chief who negotiated peace rather than war. The world of awards, no matter how complicated it may seem, continues to reaffirm that when human beings are not at war, they can do very civilized things. And it is right and proper to recognize them for doing it.

\*\*\*\*\*

Addendum: Allocating levels of prestige in the world of awards, when all is said and done, is not an absolute process. It is part of an ongoing discussion. And it is an important discussion. When we first brought forth the idea of creating a worldwide "Official Roster of Distinguished Awards" in the 1990s, there were no tools for evaluating awards or for determining what awards were worthy of being recognized as distinguished around the globe. The appearance of a self-proclaimed "Official Roster" launched an ongoing discussion about the role of awards in human society. By moving to the next stage of putting forth a method of factoring prestige, we are hoping to advance that discussion a little further. It is part of an ongoing process of understanding how awards can play a fundamental role in many realms of human society and our shared history. We thus invite comment and suggestions on how we can improve our systems of choosing distinguished awards and of factoring levels of prestige between and among them.