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Mr. Chairman:

I am pleased indeed to join with you in
welcoming to this hearing Dr. Joseph Duffey, President
Carter's nominee for the Chairmanship of the National
Endowment for the Humanities.

As Dr. Duffey and my colleagues on this
Committee know, I have had a long, abiding and intense
interest in humanistic studies, in the efforts of our
government to support and encourage both the pursuit and
the appreciation of the humanities and to also ensure that
there be increased state and local participation in, and
direction of, government support of the humanities.

As a Senate author of the legislation which,
12 years ago, created the federal programs to support
both the arts and the humanities, and as one who has
been responsible since that time for Senate oversight and re-authorization of those programs as Chairman of the Senate Subcommittee, I welcome this opportunity to hear Dr. Duffey's views.

I think it might be appropriate at the outset to review the circumstances that led to the Congressional decision in 1965 to establish a national program for the humanities. To know where the program is today and to focus on its future, it is extremely helpful, I think, to go back to its roots.

The idea for a national humanities program grew from widespread concern during the decade of the 1950's and early 1960's that the humanities were in serious danger of being not only neglected, but swamped in a rising tide of federal funds for science and technology. The United States, in the years after World
War II, had made a tremendous commitment, in terms of public attention and public funds, to the physical and biological sciences and to engineering, and to technology.

In this atmosphere, humanistic studies—the studies of history, of philosophy, of language—were in danger of languishing in our universities, our schools, and in public discourse and discussion.

It was to correct this imbalance and to give recognition to the essential and necessary contribution of humanistic studies, that Congress established the National Endowment for the Humanities.

Time, I believe, has proven the wisdom of the Congress in establishing the Endowment, and in increasing the scope and size of the program through the years.
Today, while our government still invests far more heavily in science and technology than in the arts and humanities, the Humanities Endowment provides an essential counterbalance in our society. Its potentials are enormous to benefit our country, and there are great challenges ahead. They will require enterprising and imaginative leadership, not just in Washington, but throughout what may be called the humanities community, and as it applies to our country as a whole.

Let me mention just a few of the challenges that I see:

--I believe we can and should seek to broaden financial support for the humanities, by enlisting active financial support by state and local governments, business and other private sources.

--I believe we can and should make stronger efforts to involve a broader spectrum of Americans in
the humanities. We have a very strong base of humanistic studies in our colleges and universities, but we need enterprising leadership to bring the enrichment of the humanities to the grass roots of America.

--And, finally, I believe we can and should continue to insist on the highest standards of quality in our humanities programs. I think there is no necessary conflict between broadened participation and quality; indeed, knowledge and wisdom are not diluted by diffusion, but instead are distilled, refined and improved.

I look forward to helping in any way that I can to meeting these challenges in the days ahead.

And I look forward, Dr. Duffey, to hearing your ideas and thoughts on how the Humanities Endowment can best contribute to the enrichment of American life in the coming years.