11-13-1975

National Endowment for the Humanities: Summary Programs (1976): Speech 01

Ronald Berman

Statement of

Ronald S. Berman

Chairman, National Endowment for the Humanities
Chairman, National Council on the Humanities

Joint Hearings

before the

Special Subcommittee on Arts and Humanities
of the
Committee on Labor and Public Welfare
of the
United States Senate

and the

Select Subcommittee on Education
of the
Committee on Education and Labor
of the
United States House of Representatives

on

Reauthorization of the National Foundation
on the Arts and the Humanities

November 13, 1975

Statement of Dr. Berman

To come before this joint meeting of your two Committees is an honor and an opportunity. It is an honor to speak on behalf of the President's recommendations for re-authorization of the National Endowment for the Humanities and to address the particular needs of Congress for information pertinent to the extension of the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities Act. And it is an opportunity for a dialogue on the contribution of the humanities to the enrichment of life in America.

Ten years ago, as an act of national leadership, the Congress chartered the Endowment in recognition of a need for Federal "support of national progress and scholarship in the humanities." Far-sighted members of these two Committees were troubled by the implications of a national policy that subsidized the development of scientific - but not humanistic - knowledge. In the words of the Act's Declaration of Purposes, "a high civilization must not limit its efforts to science and technology alone but must give full value and support to the other great branches of man's scholarly and cultural activity in order to achieve a better understanding of the past, a better analysis of the present, and a better view of the future."

The Humanities Endowment quickly struck a responsive chord, first among scholars and the teachers of our young. But then, more remarkably, it rapidly gained a constituency of adult citizens who proved anxious to serve the country's well-being when humanistic resources and programs were thrown open to them. Beginning with a few professionals, Endowment programs have come to involve hundreds of thousands directly, with a reach to millions.

Through earlier re-authorization hearings, Congress has taken stock of these developments, re-defining and enlarging the Endowment's mission. At the same time it has established funding levels within which the agency might consolidate and build on early progress. The record is one of steady growth, although in the past few years appropriations have fallen below the Administration's request.

The integrity of this Federal venture in support of the humanities is attested in the bipartisan support it has received in the Congress and from successive Administrations. A high standard is imposed through periodic Congressional

oversight and through the safeguarding mechanisms which Congress wrote into the Act. Chief among these is the National Council on the Humanities, whose 26 distinguished members conduct a continuing oversight of program divisions and the whole grant-making process, to which over 1,000 independent expert reviewers contribute. Besides offering policy advice to the Chairman, the Council meets quarterly to perform the taxing labor of reviewing applications, and making recommendations thereon, before awards are made. This insures that the work supported is of high quality, weighed against national criteria. It also insures that the Endowment stays within its proper limits - that is, to function through and in response to humanists and their institutions rather than encroaching on their fields or dictating their activities.

The American Perspective

Our time perspective here today has some interesting extensions. Monday, September 29, was the tenth anniversary of President Johnson's signing of the Act creating this Endowment. More dramatically, the 200th anniversary of the Declaration of Independence is at hand. The American Revolution was,

of course, already a culmination of historic forces - European wars and religious persecutions, imperial rivalries, exploration and settlement under colonial tutelage extending over three centuries. And its full intellectual heritage embraced Magna Charta, Roman law, and Greek philosophy going back to Plato and Socrates.

Within the 200-year life of the United States, the Endowment's brief span engenders a necessary modesty. Still, we may have come in time to help win a wider public appreciation of a little-understood fact: that this nation owes its being to thinkers and leaders who were truly great humanists. To cite a modern appraisal, "there was no period in our history when the public interests of the people were so intimately linked to philosophical issues. It is amazing to see how far into the past and future American men of affairs looked in order to understand their present. Never was history made more conscientiously, and seldom since the days of classic Greece has philosophy enjoyed a greater opportunity to exercise public responsibility."*

---

*"A History of American Philosophy," by Herbert W. Schneider; Columbia University Press, 1946.

In the founding of the United States, the principles of English liberty achieved a new democratic expression that has survived - and helped others to survive - in a world of aggressive tyrannies. It has also survived internal transformation, from a diffuse agrarian society to one in which 70 percent of our 215 million citizens live in cities. And it has done so because the national character has been further shaped by great minds - I think of Emerson, Whitman, Melville - and because in times of ugly crisis new leaders arose to uphold the "unalienable rights" asserted in 1776.

The constitutional process, and the struggles that go with it, continue to unfold. Meanwhile we have entered an era of extraordinary scientific, technological and economic complexity. A French philosopher, Raymond Aron,has aptly remarked on the burdens which today are thrown - at least in a democracy - on voters and political leaders who are, necessarily, amateurs in understanding even the terminology of these technical matters. What enables such a system to work? Only, one supposes, the intention of law-makers to employ their powers in what they see as the public good. It is precisely that "good" which is the concern of the humanities - of history,

literature, philosophy, ethics and jurisprudence, to name the more pertinent disciplines. Almost by definition, good government is the result of judgments which flow, consciously or not, from the pool of humanistic learning which is the nation's ultimate treasure and strength.

Thomas Jefferson understood this, and exemplified it. He was among other things President of the American Philosophical Society, keenly interested in new knowledge discoveries. But he saw, too, that judgments made in government must show a decent respect for the opinions of ordinary citizens. "I think the most important bill in our whole code," he wrote, "is that for the diffusion of knowledge among the people. No other sure foundation can be devised for the preservation of freedom and happiness."

It is these twin purposes - the production of humanistic knowledge and source materials, and their dissemination and use for the public good - that the Endowment serves, under your mandate.

Major Programs and Emphases

We organize our work around four main activities -- research, fellowships, education, and public programs. Their purview

may seem self-evident, but experience has led to certain emphases which govern our present thinking and future planning.

Research

Research epitomizes our concern with the production of knowledge - that is, the discovery, refinement and interpretation of humanistic knowledge, old and new. It is a world of serious scholars - of books, archives, artifacts and other documentation of man's history and thought. One primary focus is the support of America's major research collections, upon whose needs your Committees heard witnesses in 1973. The demands on many of these centers - from scholars but also local government agencies, business and the general public - have outstripped private financial support. Thus, three years ago, the New York Public Library was forced to reduce access to its research collections, which are, in fact, a resource of national importance. Through challenge grants of $2.25 million, the Endowment helped generate a $4 million public response which has restored these vital services. Country-wide, there are some 150 important centers of research in the humanities. While most are of lesser magnitude than the New York Public Library,

each is indispensable in its region as an arsenal of American culture and intellectual power. Among them - to name just three - NEH has made grants to the Newberry Library in Chicago, the Appalachian Oral History collection at Alice Lloyd College in Kentucky, and to the Huntington Library in California.

We are, of course, committed to support basic, or "new", research which is essential to maintain the world eminence of American scholarship. Grants are made to individual scholars, in the traditional pattern. At the same time, with increased funding in the 1974-76 period, the Endowment has supported collaborative projects of broader scope, requiring several professionals. Much of this work is directed to the development of research tools - of dictionaries, historical atlases, bibliographies, etc. - of wide and lasting value to scholars and students. Sixty-one such projects are on-going at present.

An allied interest is in the editing of historical documents and literary texts. In fact, the first big grant made by NEH was to the Center for the Editions of American Authors. Now, 10 years later, the Center's monumental task of preparing authentic editions of American literary classics is nearing completion, and our

last grant has been made. The project is a model of scholarly procedure which already is influencing similar work in the Soviet Union and elsewhere. One hundred ten volumes have so far been produced - including the works of Hawthorne, Emerson, Thoreau and Twain. Published in hard covers by university presses, these books have an almost biblical authority in textual accuracy and the author's intentions, which have too often been distorted by editing abuses. Moreover, they will have a further life, running into millions of copies, in paperback editions. No NEH funds, I should add, are used to meet these publishing costs.

There is one other research project that deserves your special attention, as it was only an idea when I came before these Committees in 1973. This is the preparation of a Bicentennial history series of 52 books, under an Endowment grant to the American Association for State and Local History. The nation's best historians are engaged in writing individual histories of each of the states, for publication in 1975-76 both in hard-cover and paperback editions. Every American will thus have at hand an up-to-date, popular, but academically sound account of his state's origins and development, and its place in the larger scope of American history.

Fellowships

The Endowment's Fellowship program has from the beginning enabled outstanding academic humanists to deepen their knowledge and increase their teaching excellence. It has responded to these needs in every state, at the most advanced levels and also in community and junior colleges. And it has reached out, beginning three years ago, with fellowships to leaders in the professions of journalism, law, medicine, and school administration. In these latter innovations, successful applicants take part in special study programs based in leading universities, enabling them to better perceive, sharpen, and apply humanistic perspectives in their key sectors of American society.

Fellowships are vitally important for intellectual growth in the humanistic professions, but the number of such opportunities has always been disproportionately small. There are approximately 140,000 college and university teachers in the humanities. At the time the Endowment was established, there were fewer than 500 postdoctoral fellowships annually available to humanists, and this number has not increased since then, aside from those offered by this agency. NEH granted 157 fellowships and 128 summer stipends

for 1967-68, the first year of such support. As of FY 1976, an estimated 385 fellowship grants and 1,160 awards for summer study are being made. This growth has been justified by a parallel growth in both the quantity and quality of individual applicants, whose number has jumped from about 1,200 in FY 1967 to an expected 5,200 in FY 1976, in addition to 5,000 others who will apply to Endowment-sponsored programs conducted by universities and learned societies.

Education

In the category of Education programs, the Endowment supports the upgrading of the teaching-learning process in the humanistic disciplines. One aim is to design curriculum projects - for example in American studies - that may be widely replicated in colleges and universities. Another aim is to assist study programs of distinctive excellence based in the particular needs of individual institutions. Altogether, 146 colleges and universities (including two-year schools) have in the past three years received such planning, program, or development grants.

In a relatively new departure, we have begun an experiment to help leading libraries, museums, and other cultural institutions become centers for formal education in the

humanities. And another new program - the National Board of Consultants - has won a strong response from a large number of colleges. The Board enables any higher-education institution to engage the services of outstanding teachers, scholars, and administrators to help develop or strengthen humanities curricula. The consultancies are of ten to 20 days, low in cost, and are of special interest to smaller colleges whose resources require special planning to keep abreast of progress in the larger institutions.

A third initiative dates to about the time of the 1973 re-authorization, and has led to collaboration with the National Science Foundation in encouraging proposals under the heading of Science, Technology and Human Values. Through this program, NEH has made a number of important grants to increase the humanities component in the curricula of leading medical and engineering schools.

Promoting Public Use of the Humanities

This brings me to Public Programs. We have seen that Research is focused on knowledge production, Fellowships on both production and dissemination, and Education on traditional forms of dissemination in school and college classrooms.

Public Programs is at the end of this spectrum, concerned with humanities dissemination per se, by non-traditional means, and addressed to the adult public. The result is an inter-action between thousands of professional humanists and millions of ordinary citizens. There are two principal approaches in this effort. One is through improving and increasing the humanities programs of public service institutions such as museums, historical societies, public libraries, and television and radio production centers. The other is through state-based committees of private citizens which act as re-grant agencies for Endowment funds, which must be locally matched, in support of state-wide programs in which the humanities are brought to bear on public policy issues.

Before going on, let me note that dissemination programs this year command, over-all, about 80 percent of Endowment funds, as against 20 percent for production. And that public programs alone account for 47 percent of total funding. This provides a yardstick of NEH response to the urgings of Congress toward assuring the widest possible access to the humanities by all Americans. I refer here to the amendments to our Act in 1968 and 1970, and to the strong interest expressed during the 1970 reauthorization in having the Endowment experiment

with state-based programs. The experiment has proved itself. Public activities in the humanities, previously uncharted, are now a dynamic fact of life in every state in the nation.

At the last reauthorization hearings I mentioned several new or proposed innovations in programming; a number have since been translated into realities. At that time I reported on a program, then one year old, of Youthgrants in the Humanities. This is open to young people in or out of school who come up with projects of humanistic merit, and in four years has resulted in 152 NEH grants. The sums awarded are generally quite small, but the results are often gratifyingly large. I also spoke last time of a pending venture, Courses by Newspaper. This has gone from strength to strength, and the new "term" has just begun with a further series of lectures prepared by outstanding scholars and appearing in over 350 newspapers all across the country. The present course is synchronized with the Calendar of the American Issues Forum, which I shall describe in a moment. Nine thousand Americans have taken all or some of the Courses by Newspaper for credit in 250 colleges associated with the program, while several million newspaper readers have been reached in their own homes by this innovative form of continuing education.

This brings me to a new, major enterprise of dissemination. I refer to the American Issues Forum, supported by the Endowment (with the co-sponsorship of the American Revolution Bicentennial Administration), which has just gotten underway all across the country and became, in effect, the national Bicentennial program. Members of this Congress helped with the launching, at a reception sponsored by Congresswoman Lindy Boggs last July. The idea, suggested by Walter Cronkite in 1973, is to generate a national dialogue on fundamental issues in American history as part of a serious observance of the Bicentennial. A National Planning Group of distinguished private citizens from the media, business, labor, education, and the humanities last year designed the Forum Calendar which has been widely disseminated as a framework for discussions to be carried out by or through schools, colleges, cultural institutions, unions, service clubs and the national organizations, and the media. In essence, the Calendar is an invitation -- extended to every American individual, organization, and community -- to participate in orderly public discourse focused on nine historical themes, one each month from this past September through next May.

The Endowment's role has been concerned with the start-up of the Forum, with preparation and distribution of the Calendar and modest grants to a spectrum of supporting organizations with their own national clienteles, and with support to a related program of Bicentennial Youth Debates. Major national membership organizations -- like AFL-CIO, the NAACP, the National Grange -- are providing materials on Forum topics, and over 1,500 communities, and more than 7,000 schools and colleges are participating. The private sector is supporting this unique national Bicentennial program at both the national and local levels. Literally thousands of events and scores of radio and television programs are clustering around the Forum Calendar, and it is already clear that a very high proportion of the population will take part in them as students, discussants, or audiences.

The American Issues Forum is a framework, not a curriculum, and has only the force of its appeal to a widespread interest in American history and the quality of life. Appended to this statement is a listing of the major AIF projects now underway. Here I might note simply that the Forum will succeed according to what its millions of participants make of it. I am optimistic that a year hence we shall look back

on it as a distinctively American exercise of our democratic heritage. And it is an example not of what Federal funding may achieve, but of what Federal leadership may effect.

Museum and Media Programs

I think we can agree that museums and the media both have a public role as educators, which is or can be significant for the spread of humanistic knowledge.

There are 1,821 museums in the United States, over 1,200 of them devoted to history, art, or a combination of the two. There are also some 3,500 historical organizations. It is a fair estimate that 50 percent of the adult public vists a history museum or historical site at least once a year, and that almost as many visit an art museum. As this patronage has increased, museum directors and scholars have seen both a need and opportunity to use their invaluable collections in a more active, instructional manner - for example, to arrange exhibits on themes of regional or local, as well as national, interest, and to interpret them more effectively through films, lectures and printed materials. Members of these Committees will perhaps remember having enjoyed the National Gallery's exhibition of Impressionist paintings from

the Soviet Union. I mention this because - characteristic of its help to museums - an Endowment grant went to help the Gallery explain and interpret the paintings and their historical importance for the 316,000 visitors who came to see them here in Washington. This was done through an illustrated guide, lectures, and a half-hour color film which was shown nationally on public television. With Endowment aid, the exhibition was also seen in New York, Chicago, Los Angeles and Fort Worth. If time allowed I would hold forth on the splendors of two other national museum events we have assisted; as it is, let me simply mention that all attendance records were broken at the Tapestry Masterpieces exhibition at New York's Metropolitan Museum of Art, and at the showing of Chinese archeological treasures in San Francisco and Kansas City. In San Francisco I am told, for example, more people, on several successive days, attended that carefully interpreted exhibition than have been recorded at any other museum, anywhere in the world.

I must add that NEH responds also to the needs of museums and historical societies in smaller cities and towns where growing audiences are anxious to learn about their local and

regional history. We have, for example, supported the Milwaukee Public Museum's exhibit on "The Urban Habitat." And we have lately made a $380,000 three-year grant to the Museum of Texas Tech University at Lubbock for development of its Ranching Heritage Center. The Center has attracted over $1 million in private support, and thanks to archeologists and historians its 22 historic ranch structures will authentically interpret the growth and character of the ranching way of life. If it all sounds somehow like a Hollywood stage set, it is not; its affinities lie more with Colonial Williamsburg and Old Sturbridge Village. It is one example of the more than 185 grants the Endowment has made in the past two years to assist local museums and sites more effectively to harness their resources for public education and enjoyment.

The powerful influence of television and radio is with us to stay. Commercial channels continue to be largely impervious to cultural enticement, although the great corporate advertisers have made gifts of $3 million for matching in NEH-sponsored programs on national public television. It is through that network, comprising 246 stations, able to reach 76 percent of the population, that the Endowment has been able to present a growing number

of highly successful programs of humanistic content. Some of these -- "The Wright Brothers" and "To Be Young, Gifted and Black" -- have been widely acclaimed original productions. Others have presented galleries of film classics, for example, "Humanities Film Forum" and, more recently, "The Japanese Film: Insights to a Culture." And most striking of all, perhaps, was the nine-episode "War and Peace," which was seen by more than 15 million people.

And now the most ambitious public television series ever attempted in the United States - "The Adams Chronicles" - is nearing completion, for showing over 13 weeks beginning in January. Sponsored by the Endowment, with assistance from the Mellon Foundation and Atlantic Richfield, it is being produced by WNET in New York. Its historical accuracy will stem from the cooperation of the Massachusetts Historical Society, the Harvard University Press, and the Adams Papers, a family archive (organized with the help of an NEH research grant). The lives of four generations of Adamses -- two of them Presidents -- will be traced through family vicissitudes, public triumphs,and private tragedies. The series should be a superior contribution to the Bicentennial year, and set a new pattern for the production, in this country, of programs

which are at once educational, serious, informed and entertaining. Other grants in both TV and radio will support local and regional productions. To name just two, a television documentary on William Faulkner's Mississippi is in preparation; and a 52-week radio series is in production in northeastern Pennsylvania on the history of immigration to the area and the problems and accomplishments of existing ethnic communities.

The State-Based Programs

This brings me to the Endowment's state-based programs. An outgrowth of the prompting of your Committees, they are something new under the sun, and quite certainly a great asset for our national life. Through them, ordinary citizens in every state are able to draw upon the humanistic resources I have described above— the riches of our great libraries, museums, universities, and most of all, the intellect and knowledge of America's 140,000 humanities scholars and teachers — to enlighten their own discussion of public issues ("the current conditions of national life," as the legislation phrases it) in a state-wide context.

The state-based programs are unique in concept and function. They had to be. Unlike the situation in the arts, where official state arts councils were well-established in a

number of states prior to creation of the Foundation, there were (and are) no state agencies concerned quite clearly and specifically with support of public humanities programs. Why should there have been? -- local individual and community arts activities were traditional, but the very concept of public humanities programs was itself brand-new.

The Endowment thus began by bringing academic humanists together with civic leaders to consider ways and means of creating suitable mechanisms for receiving and re-granting federal funds for programs in the humanities developed at the grass-roots level within the states. Participants in these discussions included university and museum administrators, librarians, lawyers, judges, editors, doctors, ministers, business people, farmers and trade unionists - sometimes as representatives of their professional organizations, often as individuals.

This across-the-board representation of community interests was quickly seen as the indispensable key to the whole experiment of bringing the humanities out of the academy and into public circulation and use. Accordingly, NEH encouraged the formation of volunteer committees whose membership generally had three elements: individual humanist

scholars, university and other institutional administrators, and general public members. I am pleased to report there has never been a shortage of volunteers of the very highest caliber.

In the planning phase, these committees, consulting with institutions, civic organizations and state governments, developed central themes of special importance in their states, on which a variety of humanities resources could be focused for public discussion. "Private Rights and the Public Interest" is an example of such a theme, chosen (in varying forms) by several states. As these proposals have won approval from the Endowment and its National Council, the committees - still made up of volunteers - have become operational and engaged in re-granting NEH funds to non-profit organizations and groups which provide lectures, exhibitions, media events, and "town-meeting" debates on the chosen theme. The committees have been alert to involve all interested organizations; to reach all sectors of the population including minorities and the handicapped; and to insure that programming extends to the inner cities as well as the rural grass-roots.

Such programs have been brought into full operation in all 50 states (although six are still in their first year) - a task involving tremendous creative energies. About one-

fifth of NEH funding is allocated to these programs. Every dollar of these funds must be matched from non-federal sources in the states, and here we see another proof of effectiveness: NEH contributions (totaling $28 million) have been more than matched. And this really adds up. Non-federal funds so generated by state-based committees for their use in grant programs totals over $30 million to date.

The state-based committees, I should make clear, have themselves played a full part in developing the criteria upon which the Endowment relies in this area of its activities. The chairmen of nine of these volunteer bodies act as a Program Advisory Committee; when they meet, any state chairman may sit with them and vote; and their determinations on national grant-making standards are considered annually by the committee heads from all the states. The requirements set by NEH - apart from fiscal and accounting procedures - are minimal: programs must avoid advocacy, involve academic humanists, draw on humanistic disciplines, and be addressed to adults. The committees themselves determine what grants to make within the state, although their overall plans year by year are regularly scrutinized - as are all applications to NEH - by the advisory National Council on the Humanities.

A brief description of one of these state programs seems in order here.

When the South Dakota program completed its third year last June, 160 humanists - approximately two-thirds of the total number in the state - had taken part in open-forum discussions with adults in 112 communities on issues of land use and education. For example, in Manderson, a village located on the Pine Ridge Reservation, scholars in literature, languages, philosophy, and religion examined with local citizens questions regarding the curriculum of the school system as it relates to Indian culture. Of the 109 participants in the two-day meeting, 81 were members of the Oglala Sioux tribe. On other occasions, historians and scholars in literature joined in popular discussion of the implications of technology, taxation policy, and land use planning on rural life in programs held in Yankton, Rapid City, Watertown, Huron, and ten smaller communities. The series attracted overflow audiences, including farmers, ranchers, business leaders, and public officials.

When this kind of activity is projected nationally, the figures make clear that "the opinions of mankind" are being expressed with a new force and rationality, on a scale

unprecedented in the United States and - very likely - the world. In four years NEH state-based programs have generated some 3,500 projects in 9,000 localities, with an estimated 20 million Americans as participants or audiences. A great deal of credit is owing, I think, to the 10,000 scholars, and the hundreds of volunteer committee members, who gave these proofs that humanistic knowledge, too often seen as preoccupied with the past, can speak to the issues of today and tomorrow.

I hope this is a sufficient summary of the growth, unique character, and public usefulness of the Endowment's state-based programs and their volunteer-committee mechanisms.

A Proposed Amendment

A proposal for a change to programming through official state humanities agencies is now before your two Committees, contained in S.1800 as introduced, and in H.R. 7216. Although I do not support the proposed amendment, I welcome the call to discussion: it typifies, to my mind, the even-handed and thoughtful way in which this Committee, over ten years, has guided our shared, national enterprise in the humanities.

What I have said above makes plain my thorough, professional satisfaction with the integrity and achievements of the present

state programs, and their conformance with national standards which enables me to feel secure in these judgments. In nearly four years as Chairman, and as a scholar by profession and a populist by inclination, I have been constantly surprised and reassured by the creative evolution of the Endowment's state-based programs. I cannot keep abreast of all their activities, but I have come to know many volunteer committee members and have devoted a due portion of my days to their policy questions and the main lines of program development. I think I know shoddy work when I see it; I have seen little of it in this many-sided, widely dispersed, and idealistically ambitious enterprise. It is a good show altogether.

This is my personal sense of the question. You have also a quite detailed examination and analysis of the questions posed by the amendment in a briefing paper prepared by the National Council on the Humanities and which I will also append as a part of this statement. I commend this to you (I had no hand in it) as the only professional study that has been made of the considerations entering into state programs in the humanities - the actualities of what has been built up by NEH and the Council itself at the behest of your two Committees, and the implications of the proposed amendment.

The Council's report impresses me in its attention to the distinctions between the arts and the humanities, which have always been a source of some confusion. In defining the humanities, the language of our Act includes the study of "the history, criticism, theory, and practice of the arts," which usefully suggests the cultural affinities of the arts and the humanities. But the distinctions between the two fields must be understood. The arts are concerned with completed works, statements, compositions, portrayals of fact and fiction, and performance, with the end of aesthetic reward, solace, or inspiration. (Man does not live by bread - or even the humanities - alone.) The humanities, as the above statutory definition indicates, may validly undertake to interpret these works, but are more directly concerned with a context of research and knowledge addressed to philosophical questions (including those raised by science), communication, rational discourse, and value judgments. The humanities are different in nature from the arts -- sometimes just beginning when the act of creation or performance leaves off -- and they work through different mechanisms. Your committees recognized the difference ten years ago, when they did <u>not</u> establish state humanities councils; and they did so again in 1970, when they encouraged the experimental approach which produced the state-based programs. By 1973 these were already an established success, winning your endorsement during that year's reauthorization.

The Council's briefing paper is astute also in pointing to the parallel between the Humanities Endowment and the National Science Foundation in their pursuit of national objectives in the increase and dissemination of essential knowledge resources. In both fields, the validity of research and related activities arises from disciplines, from empirical and philosophical inquiry, discovery, and the refinement of knowledge and understanding that is documented for continuing study and development. To support serious work in either field, as the Council suggests, requires evaluation and judgment by the best minds available according to national - even international - standards of merit. The Council fears a falling-away from such criteria, and my feeling is they are right.

This said, I may summarize briefly my view.

Like its counterpart in the sciences, the business of the Endowment is with the development and dissemination of knowledge. This end is reached sometimes through institutions whose product -- a television program or a major traveling exhibition, for example -- serves the whole of the nation directly; sometimes it is reached through an individual scholar -- perhaps in a state which boasts only one institution of higher education and few scholars, perhaps

in a state blessed with many; sometimes it is reached through a curriculum -- developed perhaps at a relatively obscure community college, perhaps at a major university -- which will be exemplary throughout the nation; sometimes it is reached through a single institution -- a research library, for example -- which despite its geographic location is a national resource; and sometimes it is reached through the cooperation of a large number of individuals and a large number of institutions.

These purposes are defined under Section 7(c) of our authorization legislation. Like the nation's defense, health and foreign policies, they serve national priorities, are measurable by national standards, and maintain our national eminence. There is just no way, in my opinion, in which they may be effectively served by fragmenting the responsibility and the funds of the National Endowment among 50 separate jurisdictions.

But the Congress also gave the Endowment another responsibility: that of bringing the humanities to bear upon "the current conditions of national life." And in consultation with this Committee of the Congress and others, my predecessor (Mr. Wallace B. Edgerton, during his Acting Chairmanship) and I

were persuaded that this could most effectively be done in state-wide contexts. After a number of experiments with state arts and humanities councils and university extension units, we all came to recognize that the goal could most surely be achieved by relying in each state upon a mix of citizens who had direct access both to the various strata of the state's citizenry (who recognize what are the current issues of public policy within the state) and to the human and institutional repositories of knowledge which can be brought to bear upon important issues.

I do not know that this is the only way in which humanists can join with the whole range of state citizens to address "current conditions of national life"; but I do know that it has worked.

Wisely, your committee leaders have sought discussion of possible alternatives; I (like you, I suspect) have been on the listening end of such discussion over the past few months. To the best of my knowledge, however,

none of those engaged in the humanities (whom this Endowment was created to serve), no state governors, and none of the existing state-based committees (who almost alone have working experience of this kind of public programming in the humanities) believe that the amendment would improve upon the current structure. In all that I have heard, no case has been made for replacement of the existing volunteer-committee system in conducting state humanities programs. Indeed, the overwhelming evidence is that the volunteer committees are politically non-partisan, fiscally responsible, a credit to the citizenry of their states, and a force for good in promoting the national commonweal.

The Impact of Federal Support

I should like, here, to illustrate the cumulative impact Federal assistance can have in the humanities, based on actual grants.

The range of direct, immediate beneficiaries covers (for example) the junior college teacher who receives a summer

stipend for individual study of American Indian culture; the several scholars who are preparing an historical atlas of the United States; a group of college faculty who are integrating ethical studies into their engineering and pre-med curricula; a team of scholars and editors designing "Courses By Newspaper" on critical public issues; and a museum exhibition or a television film program.

In all these cases, however, the immediate grantees have received NEH funds because their work will serve ultimately hundreds, even millions, of Americans: the junior college teacher's knowledge of American Indian culture will benefit hundreds of students during his or her teaching career; the historical atlas will be used by hundreds of other scholars and in thousands of classrooms and libraries, enriching education and the future acquisition of knowledge; the revised college curriculum will be emulated by other institutions and help train thousands of young people for

professional work of broad effect among the general population; Courses By Newspaper will appear in hundreds of city newspapers and be read by millions; and the museum and television projects will be viewed by other millions in small towns as well as major urban areas.

In addition, the effects of one small grant can be spread out over different time periods and felt by ever larger numbers of people at each stage. Thus, for example, a Youthgrant of $2,910 to an 18-year-old youth in Southern Nevada helped her organize a local history project which directly involved 35 4-H club members, resulting in four television presentations and an historical exhibit, at the Nevada State Fair, which helped thousands of people gain a greater understanding of the development of their state.

Given this mix of program purposes and immediate and long-term audiences, it is not possible to quantify for any year what a particular budget authority level produces in "number of individuals served." But facts and conservative estimates yield this picture of the reach of NEH programs in the present fiscal year. They will support the work of 1800 individual

humanist scholars, for research, fellowships, and youth-grants. They will fund educational development in 200 schools, colleges, and universities. They will assist 250 research collections, museums, libraries and other humanities-related institutions. They will support 2,250 projects developed in all 50 states through re-grants of the state-based programs, involving 12,400 humanists and reaching an adult audience of 21 million . And they will reach 23 million people through national and regional television and radio programs; 18 millions through Courses By Newspaper; and a further multi-million audience -- surely the largest audience ever engaged in a nation-wide program -- through the American Issues Forum and Bicentennial Youth Debate.

These are not just statistics. Some are grant recipients pushing back the frontiers of scholarship, learning to become better teachers, or organizing and presenting humanistic knowledge for academic or general use. Many are active participants in community discourse addressed to life's difficult decisions; many more are seeking out those few hours or pages in which the media have begun to explore the ideas and works of history's great minds.

Another measure of the Endowment's stimulus is in gifts received from the private sector in support of grant activities. Last year such donations totalled nearly $6 million. Since NEH began, over $26 million in private gifts has been received - releasing an equal amount in Federal matching funds - in aid of humanities programs. (This is apart from the $30 million in non-Federal funds generated by State-based projects, and from private contributions made directly to NEH grantee organizations.)

Funding Levels and National Needs

The foregoing account of NEH work is a record of that "support of national progress and scholarship in the humanities" which the founding Act called for ten years ago. Essentially, it is a record of Federal response to verifiable needs and interests - the needs of the scholarly community and its institutions, and the awakened interest among an adult public hitherto lacking access to these knowledge resources. Without the stimulus provided by the Endowment, we might not have witnessed this efflorescence.

The Administration's bill now before you proposes an authorization of $113.5 million (plus $12.5 million in matching funds) for the Endowment in fiscal years 1977, 1978, and 1979. I can assure you that current and developing needs in the humanities will fully justify those levels.

At the half-way point in the Endowment's life, as testimony for the 1970 reauthorization showed, the agency received 2,135 applications. It made in that year 503 awards to a total of $10.5 million. By contrast, during the year ending June 30, 1975, the Endowment received 6,824 applications and was able to fund 1,330 (or one out of five) of them, totaling $73.1 million. (In addition thousands of applications were made to organizations conducting NEH State-based programs, and under several fellowship programs aided by NEH.)

What this balance sheet records is a continued commitment on the part of the Administration and the Congress to support this important work. The agencies and individuals presently receiving NEH funds represent a broad spectrum of the constituency to which we respond. But of the 3,000

institutions of higher education, 1,800 museums, 2,200 public library systems, 246 public television stations, and 140,000 scholars in the humanities, none is ineligible for support from the National Endowment for the Humanities. We are, inevitably and properly, highly selective in funding only the best proposals. In this way, we assure that the appropriations requested by the President and provided by the Congress are used to achieve the greatest possible "progress and scholarship in the humanities." I therefore urge you to support the requested authorization.

A generation ago George Santayana wrote that "to be an American is a moral condition, an education, and a career." He saw and admired us as optimists. But he warned of "unpleasant surprises and moral impoverishment" if we disregarded the lessons of the past and a rational approach to the present. His warning was apt. It is echoed in the Arts and Humanities Act where it declares that United States world leadership "cannot rest solely upon superior power, wealth, and technology," but must be founded on "respect and admiration for the Nation's high qualities as a leader in the realm of ideas and of the spirit."

Facing America's Third Century

The Bicentennial is very much with us. Inevitably there's an air of celebration, of bands tuning up for parade. We can expect uncommon outbursts of rhetoric and oratory, and whole industries of slogans and fads, to the outrage of certain intellectuals and others of a sensitive and irritable temper. But if a good time cannot be had by all, it likely will be enjoyed by most.

Initially, the Federal Government itself became involved in promotion of the Bicentennial, but the mechanism chosen proved vulnerable to commercial and political pressures and was discarded. As a result, as you will perhaps recall from the 1973 reauthorization, the Arts and Humanities Endowments were assigned a substantial role - not of promotion, but of responding to proposals from individuals and institutions equipped to contribute to a serious observance of the Bicentennial, through projects of lasting value. The Endowments were already supporting the nation's cultural development - including numerous projects with Bicentennial aspects - on program lines requiring no new departures and no change in their strict application and review procedures.

This turn of events, I think, has proved fortuitous. Good proposals have come from all sectors of our constituency - the scholars, the institutions, the media, from young people and national organizations, and (in the state-based programs) from civic bodies, minority groups, and plain citizens in every corner of America. The Endowment staff has been kept more than busy; so has the National Council on the Humanities, whose oversight has insured against any lowering of the Endowment's non-partisan standards. We have also enjoyed excellent relations with the American Revolution Bicentennial Administration and the President's Domestic Council Bicentennial Committee, which endorsed a large number of NEH projects as special Federal efforts undertaken for 1975-76.

I have already highlighted a variety of outstanding or typical Bicentennial-related grants we have made. Allow me here to add mention of Endowment support for scholarly work on the state papers and private journals of great Americans. The papers of Washington, John Jay and Daniel Webster, for example, are already being collected and prepared for publication, and we shall be supporting similar studies on Franklin, Hamilton and the Adams family. Of more recent

eras, the papers of Frederick Douglass, Jane Addams, and Louis Brandeis are being prepared with NEH grant assistance. I should also note, in relation to the Bicentennial, that the Endowment is helping meet the cost of several international conferences that will bring many of the world's most distinguished intellectuals and cultural leaders to the United States in 1975-76. These forms of international exchange help insure an access to foreign scholars and scholarship which is essential to American leadership and progress in the humanities.

I believe these activities, and those cited earlier, make up an important contribution to the nation's 200th anniversary. Their effects will be felt as incentives by all humanist scholars, and in all cultural institutions, invigorating their future work. And I think they will arouse the interest of countless ordinary citizens to the larger meanings of what was so proudly hailed and fought for in the American Revolution.

In the euphoria of the moment, it is as well to guard against adulation and piety. To speak of a serious re-examination of our past is to look at human fallibility as well as genius, to observe our heroes in the full regalia of their selfish interests, passions, and weaknesses as well as their strengths (and in the case of the villains, their strengths as well as weaknesses). It is to look at where, among our triumphs, we have failed. In the long perspective of time, this land but yesterday was terra incognita; and in the round perspective of the great globe itself, we have never been - nor can we be - "independent" in any final sense. Our power in the world is great, but the rise and fall of civilizations makes a cautionary study.

The public-spirited concern aroused by the Bicentennial will reach a peak on July 4, 1976 - and it will be a great deal more than a mere rhetorical self-indulgence. It will produce a momentum of heightened expectations as to the nation's

well-being, and a readiness to serve that well-being. Inevitably, the Congress and the Administration will face the challenge of consolidating and building on these gains; certainly, the Humanities Endowment will be an instrument for meeting that responsibility. Indeed, the Endowment's legislative charter is addressed to the long-haul buttressing of human values in American society, not to transient occasions.

Ten years of Federal support to the humanities is, I think, a bright page in the recent history of this country. What we have still to write is the continuation and crossing over into America's Third Century. I hope that Congressional reauthorization will also be a reaffirmation of the high purposes which the Humanities Endowment has so far been privileged to serve.

Attachments

1. Briefing paper of the National Council on the Humanities ("The Establishing of State Humanities Agencies")
2. List of State-based committee members
3. Bicentennial-related activities, 1974-76 ("The Endowment and the Bicentennial")