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sincere hope that this Committee and the White House will seek
further before selecting a new leader for this extraordinarily
important program.

Thank you, sir.

The Chairman. Thank you.

Senator Pell, do you have any questions?

Senator Pell. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. And I would add, as I am sure you would, that is not reflection on Mr. Curran. It is a reflection on the White House and the person they have tapped for this particular job.

In that regard, I was struck with Professor Ziolkowski's analysis of who should be the chairman. Could you even more refine your definition of the qualities that a chairman of the National Endowment for the Humanities should have?

Mr. Ziolkowski. Well, I have thought about this very carefully and mentioned five characteristics, and I am sure that I could probably on reflection think of others. But really the ones that I mentioned, representation through one's own work, sense of quality gained through experience in the field, a belief in the procedures—that is, in the peer review process as well as absolute equanimity and fair-mindedness vis-a-vis developments, because the humanities are fascinating.

Let me pause at this point for one remark. The question has come up several times today, are the humanities in the state of crisis? On the one hand, yes, they are; on the other
hand, they have been in the state of crisis at least since Socrates complained about the production of books and how it was going to destroy memory. There is always a crisis in the humanities, and for that reason the humanities represent the fascinating subject that they represent. If there were not a crisis, many of us, I think my more interesting colleagues would not be there. It is a constant crisis, and the problem is not to satisfy a tidy section of western literature or western culture and say this is what we are going to nurture and care for, but rather to be able constantly to adjust to the continuing crisis that represents the humanities. So that is an expansion of that point.

Then the other two points that I mentioned simply were the necessity to have a spokesperson with vision. And, finally, the commitment—and I believe in this because this is why we have the NEH—the commitment to the Federal role in the support of the humanities, not so much simply because the NEH is a channel to get needed funds to scholars. That is very, very important. But even more important, the fact that the NEH represents the visible symbol of this nation's commitment to the values represented by the humanities. We have symbols like NSF and NIH and NASA and others that represent our commitment to the sciences and engineering and technology. We need a powerful shining symbol of our commitment to the humanities.
Senator Pell. That was four points. You said there were five.

Mr. Ziolkowski. Well, five, the fifth was this commitment to the Federal role represented by the NEH.

Senator Pell. Forgive me. You had the past work, peer review--

Mr. Ziolkowski. Well, past work, but also a sense—that is, one's own past work, but also a sense of quality that you get through the work. In other words, it is important for the director not always to have to rely on the peer review panels themselves, but on the basis of his or her own sense of quality.

Senator Pell. All I am driving at is what are the five points, briefly? One is past work; two, belief in peer review; three is to have a spokesperson with vision; four is to have a commitment to the Federal role. What was the fifth?

Mr. Ziolkowski. The fifth was actually in your list after the first one; that is, I make a distinction between past work, which is a demonstration of one's achievements, but then, secondly, a sense of quality that you achieve through the past work. So I make those as separate points.

Senator Pell. Okay. And I guess that means that essentially being well-known. In this regard, Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask unanimous consent to insert in the record the Who's Who Biographies of the four previous chairmen of the Endowment for the Humanities. I would like to be able to
submit Mr. Curran's, but he's not, of course, in Who's Who, which is one of the points we are discussing.

The Chairman. Without objection, so ordered.

Senator Pell. I would also like to have accepted two articles, one by Professor Walter Capps on "Why Humanities Community is Uneasy Over Proposed Chairman", which appeared in the Los Angeles Times; and the other, an article in The Chronicle of Higher Education, concerning the departure of Mr. Curran from NIE.

The Chairman. Without objection.

Senator Pell. Thank you very much.

[Documents follow:].

[Documents follow:].
Senator Pell. Dr. Schaeffer, what would be your thoughts with regard to the qualities that a Chairman should have; would they be the same, or are there any variations?

Dr. Schaeffer. I think that Ted's list is a very, very good one. I think that perhaps I would like to add to it an ability to be able to work effectively with what is now a fairly large staff, as well as a council.

It is an administrative position, in addition to the leadership that Professor Ziolkowski has described, and I think one of the things that both Ron and Joe did—I did not have an opportunity to work with Bill Bennett—was to bring together not only a staff, but a sense of coherence to the councils, as they would come together, and there was a confidence that evolved there.

I am not saying that the nominees under consideration lack those abilities, but I think I would add those as being extremely important, because if you have internal conflicts in the Foundation, they come out visibly, and they can be indeed counterproductive very rapidly. The profession is a small one in that regard.

Senator Pell. Thank you.

What, Dr. Schaeffer, do you think would be the
main priorities of NEH over the next four-year cycle?

Dr. Schaeffer. I think we have all read Bill Bennett's report with interest. It is really not so much a report as paper of all of the many documents that we have been reading lately about the problems in undergraduate education. I think this is one of the few to whom clear authorship has been ascribed.

It is my feeling, however, that this report, as well as all of the others that we have been looking at, are far more in the way of mirrors than lamps; they are reflective of a situation that the various institutions in this country have been aware of for at least the last five, if not the last ten, years. They are reflecting changes that are already occurring, even as the reports come out to call for change.

I believe that we are at a point in American higher education where we are entering a major revitalization of the quality of undergraduate education and the role of the humanities within the general education of such students, and I am confident that somewhere in the early to mid-years of the next decade, 1992 to 1995, there is going to be an immense need for highly-trained and highly-skilled humanists to take over teaching roles that will be filled by the mass hirings that went on in the 1960s. I think it is extremely important for
the National Endowment and the Chairman of the National
Endowment to be sensitive to these changes that are going
on in the last years of the current decade in preparation
for the 1990s. There are juniors and seniors in college
today who are going to be the professors of the humanities
disciplines by the end of the Nineties, and we have
got to be extremely careful that we are identifying
and nurturing and furthering the interests of those
students. I give it a very, very high priority from
an educational perspective.

Senator Pell. And Mr. Ziolkowski, what would be
your thoughts as to the priorities of the next four
years?

Mr. Ziolkowski. I would like to refine just a
little bit further one of the points that
Professor Schaeffer mentioned. There has been an
outpouring recently of documents about the humanities,
about the decline in the humanities, the needs of humanities,
this and this, by Ernie Boyer, by Mr. Bennett, and by
a number of others.

I think it is extremely necessary to have an agency
that can assess those, because a lot of the information---
some of the facts, for instance, that Senator Hatch
mentioned earlier this morning---really need to be put
in context. The fact that one loses majors in a given
subject, for instance, is not the only fact. The fact that enrollments are growing in some of those same subjects that are losing majors is, from the teachers' point of view, equally important, because there are a lot of courses to be filled.

There needs to be an assessment of this information, an objective assessment, that can take the reports that have come out, put them into a useful context, and develop some sort of a national policy, because it is a great national policy that transcends anything any individual university can do to predict what is going to be the needs in the coming decades.

There are going to be needs, we know, from retirement facts, that a number of teachers will be retiring in the Nineties, and we are going to need people in those jobs. The NEH could do a research role and fulfill a research commitment there.

However, I think above all, to turn away from the practical needs, the most important job that the NEH itself can do is to represent the central, continuing importance of the humanities steadily, as for instance, the interest in technology, computer science, and molecular biology fields--subjects with a great deal of appeal--come and distract students and the public attention from year to year or from decade to decade,
even. The humanities need to be constantly supported, morally supported, intellectually and ideologically supported, and it is that kind of support, that continuing support, that is much more important, I think, than new directions or the practical goals. The NEH is the agency, and the Director of the NEH is the person who really ought to represent that continued, steady belief in the humanities, the old as well as the developing humanities.

Senator Pell. I appreciate what you say very much indeed, and I appreciate also the tenderness of your position, and the fact that it would be much more agreeable to be testifying for the confirmation of somebody to a job, rather than opposing it.

I appreciate very much the stature of your positions and your role in the academic community, and I appreciate the tremendous time change and personal inconvenience that Professor Schaeffer went through to get here from California. I really commend you both on your testimony which is, I think, of the highest order and of the kind that should be part of the Endowment for the Humanities.

I would also commend you both on your gumption and guts, your courage, in taking a position, because as I said a little bit earlier, my own experience has
been that institutions of higher learning do not have much courage when it comes to taking a position that opposes their source of funds—somewhat like the clergymen at the time of the Vietnam War, who were very hesitant about telling their congregation their personal views on the war.

And I commend and congratulate both of you on your courage in coming, and I assure you I will do my best to see that there is no retribution, and we trust in the fairness of Mr. Curran, if he is confirmed. I think he is basically, personally, a fair man—that there will be no retribution. I think he is basically, personally fair.

I appreciate very much your coming, and the quality of your testimony, and the quality of your personal being.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

The Chairman. Thank you, Senator Pell.

I also appreciate you coming and giving the Committee the benefit of your thinking in these very important areas.

I take it, however, that you are expressing your deep-felt concerns about this nominee. I do not think either of you will say that you absolutely know that he cannot do a good job at the NEH; is that right? You are not saying that he absolutely cannot do a good job at the NEH; you are just expressing your concerns about that.
Mr. Ziolkowski. I think mine goes a bit further than concern, and I think I heard more than concern from my colleague, Bill Schaeffer.

I can give you an unequivocal answer. I met Mr. Curran this morning for the first time personally. We chatted outside and discovered that we have a great deal in common in our backgrounds. He went to Yale and then went to graduate school at Duke. I went to Duke and went to graduate school at Yale. So, we have a lot in common.

I listened to his testimony and came to appreciate why he may be here today, because I think that he must be a marvelous headmaster, and I think I would not have hesitated—and it would have been a privilege—to send one of my three children—all three of whom, by the way, have their Ph.D.s—to his school.

However, if you are asking me about this man and this job, I have listened to him very carefully this morning. The MLA in the letter that it sent out, did not take a position; we simply said, "These are the qualifications, and we need to know more about Mr. Curran."

Well, I know a little bit more. I am a scholar. I am very hesitant. I would prefer to read books and articles by him before I make up my mind. The position that I have is based on four hours of listening this
morning.

However, I must say, on the basis of what I have heard, to give you an unequivocal answer, no, I do not think that this is the right man for the job.

The Chairman. Well, we appreciate your opinions on it. I am not sure that you have to be in "Who's Who in America" to serve in this position. I am absolutely positive you do not have to be a Ph.D. I have met more knucklehead Ph.D.s in my day than many people, perhaps, and you have met some who do not deserve that title--.

Mr. Ziolkowski. Absolutely.

The Chairman. ---and you know that it is commonly given today where, when you and I went to school, it was a very difficult thing to get. So I admire you having one.

But let me just say something to you. There are a number of people who hold Ph.D.s that I am sure neither you nor I would like to see in this position.

So I do not think that is the criterion. I think it is important, but I do not think it is determinative.

I think you have outlined some fairly good qualifications, and I commend you for that--and you likewise, Dr. Schaeffer. I think both of you come here sincerely, with vast experience, I think, with a great deal of personal commitment to the field.