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I am as convinced now as I was when I last testified before this Committee twenty-one months ago as Chairman Designate, of the wisdom of the legislation creating, and subsequently authorizing, the National Endowment for the Humanities. It is admirably suited to its purpose. One of its great features is that it makes clear, as one works with both its letter and spirit, that the purpose of the Endowment is the advancement of the humanities for the benefit of all our people. The Endowment's concern is not for any one of the many institutions and constituencies, as such, with which we work; it is for the state of the humanities in the nation and the broadest possible access to them. The Endowment was entrusted with a public mission.

I and my colleagues on the staff of the Endowment are committed to the fulfillment of that mission.

I am particularly sensitive to the hazards along the way to fulfillment of that mission. One of the most dangerous was pointed out fifteen years ago in the Report of the Commission on the Humanities, which contributed so greatly to Congressional consideration of the state of the humanities and the legislation that followed. "We must unquestionably increase the prestige of the humanities and the flow of funds to them," said the Report. But then it cautioned, "At the same time, however grave the need, we must safeguard the independence, the originality, and the freedom of expression of all who are concerned with liberal learning."

I believe that the Endowment has done so.

An important such safeguard lies in our own tradition of a healthy mixture of governmental and private support for cultural institutions and activities. In the proportions in which this has existed so far in our country, this is almost a unique solution. Unfortunately, as my report to you which follows makes clear, private foundation support for the humanities in the United States is now declining markedly.

We have therefore sought, and continue to seek, to encourage the private sector - especially the large foundations and corporations - to retreat no further in exercising their philanthropic responsibilities and to join with the Endowment in a partnership of support for the humanities that will provide a hedge against an unwarranted increase in the Federal share.

Before bespeaking your favorable consideration of the President's recommendation for authorization of the National Endowment for the Humanities, I would like to make several points about the Endowment itself. First, it is established under the Constitution of the United States and therefore cannot be influenced by its federal source of funds.

I am particularly sensitive to the hazards along the way to fulfillment of that mission.
Humanities, I wish to report to you on the operations of the Endowment since your last authorization in 1976 - its programs, its management, and some of the problems we discern for the future.

I. THE ENDOWMENT SINCE 1976

A. Growth of the Endowment

The appropriations provided by the Congress since the last reauthorization have produced a steady expansion in the number and kind of projects supported by the Endowment throughout the nation. With the $76 million appropriated in 1976, 1,614 separate projects were assisted; the requested appropriation of $139.3 million in program funds for FY 1980 should support over 2,300 projects.

This expansion in funded projects has not kept pace with the growth in demand. While appropriations will have increased 75 percent, the support requested by applicants has already increased in only two years by 110 percent: from the $216.6 million requested in 1976 to $455 million in 1978. The funds requested of the Endowment are likely to reach $500 million in FY 1980.

One result of this growth in demand will be a decline in the proportionate number of applications which can be funded. Of the 6,141 applications received in 1976, 26 percent could be awarded at least partial support, but we expect to be able to offer grants to only 23 percent of the 10,000 applications projected for FY 1980.

The growth in applications and grants - expected in 1980 to be 69 percent and 49 percent, respectively, over the 1976 levels - has been accompanied by a marked increase in the productivity of the Endowment staff - the size of the staff having increased since the last reauthorization by only 27 percent. The growth in the number of panelists and panels advising the Endowment corresponded more closely to that in the number of applications: in 1978, 964 panelists participated in 153 separate panel meetings, as against 690 panelists and 111 meetings in 1976.

The increase in applications and in panels are both connected, in part, with the introduction into the Endowment's programs of new or more precise areas of grant support since the 1976 reauthorization - Challenge Grants, youth projects, publications, translations, research conferences, and independent study fellowships for undergraduate faculty - which I shall report on below.

B. The Endowment's Programs

In order to most effectively discharge its responsibilities under the reauthorization legislation of 1976 in what it is now clear must be
an era of limited public funding for the humanities, the Endowment last year established four goals for its work. They are:

-- To promote public understanding of the humanities, and of their value in thinking about the current conditions of national life;

-- To improve the quality of teaching in the humanities and its responsiveness to new intellectual currents and changing social concerns;

-- To strengthen the scholarly foundation for humanistic study, and to support research activity which enriches the life of the mind in America;

-- To nurture the future well-being of those essential institutional and human resources which make possible the study of the humanities.

During the past year all of the Endowment's programs have been carefully examined to determine whether they serve - and serve well - one or another of these goals. This survey suggested the desirability of certain changes in NEH programs, and they have been made. The survey also showed significant progress and a generally high level of accomplishment in each of the four areas since reauthorization of the Endowment by the Congress in 1976, as follows:

1. PROMOTING PUBLIC UNDERSTANDING OF THE HUMANITIES

a. State Programs

The reauthorizing legislation of 1976 formally recognized the State programs in the humanities then operational in all 50 States. In doing so, it established membership and reporting procedures which were designed to assure greater accountability of these programs to the people and to the government of each State, and it expanded the program opportunities for State humanities entities. I would like to report to you on the fulfillment of these provisions of the law.

Section 7 (f) (2) and (3) of the 1976 legislation contained a number of provisions whose effect was to require State committees and their activities to become accountable and accessible to State governments and to the citizens of the States. Governors were authorized to appoint half the members of the State humanities committees, provided that the State appropriates funds to the committee according to a graduated formula. If the State does not wish to allot funds to the committee, the Governor is expected to appoint two members of the governing body. Other provisions called for a membership policy "designed to assure broad public representation;" a "nomination process which assures opportunities for nomination to membership from various groups within the State involved...including individuals who, by reason of their achievement, scholarship or creativity in the humanities, as especially qualified..."
to serve;" a process of regular rotation of members and officers of
the committee; a system for regular reporting to the Governor of the
State committee's activities; and "procedures to assure public access
to information" relating to State committee activities; and finally,
in States not appropriating funds to their committees, or allotting
funds insufficient to meet the graduated formula, the committees are
required to "provide, from any source, an amount equal to the amount
of Federal financial assistance received."

The State committees' compliance with these provisions of the law
was to be embodied in a "plan" accompanying the State committees'
applications to the National Endowment for grants, the Chairman of the
Endowment being charged with determining whether the "plan" effectively
fulfilled the legislation's requirements.

In a paper dated November 16, 1976, and entitled Comments of the
National Council on the Humanities Regarding the "Plan" Required of
State-based Committees by the New Legislation, (Annex 1), the National
Council on the Humanities suggested various procedures which it judged
would constitute full compliance with the legislation. The Council
encouraged close communication with the Governor's office on a formal
and informal basis, advising the States to fulfill the reporting re­
quirement through, at a minimum, a publicly available annual report
and regular mailings to the Governor. State committees were advised
to make their minutes and records of votes publicly available, and to
inform rejected applicants of the reasons for rejection; to solicit
nominations for committee membership in writing from a broad range
of groups, institutions, and organizations in the State; and to estab­
lish a membership policy which provides for rotation of members every
three or four years, and of officers every two years. The Council
expressed the view that the membership should represent both public
members from "business, labor, agriculture, the professions, minorities,
and civic organizations," and "those individuals who by reason of their
achievement, scholarship, or creativity in the humanities, are es­
pecially qualified to serve."

In addition, although not mentioned specifically in the law, the
Council strongly advised the States to establish conflict-of-interest
policies which would ensure that the committees were fully accountable
in their use of public funds.

The provision of a 1:1 cost share from project sponsors and par­
ticipants had always been a policy of the National Endowment for State
Programs, but now continued with the force of the law.

The Chairman of the National Endowment informed the Governors of
the opportunities to appoint members of the State committees, and en­
couraged them to do so. The State committees have also urged the
Governors to exercise at least one of the options available to them
under the law.
The Endowment required each State to submit by May 31, 1977, a plan which met the provisions of the legislation. These "compliance plans" were reviewed by the Endowment and presented to the Committee on State Programs of the National Council on the Humanities at its August 1977 meeting. By autumn 1977, all of the States were in compliance with the legislation. Since then, the Endowment has required an "update" of the compliance plans, and the procedures are monitored annually to assure accountability.

In all but three States (New Hampshire, Texas, and Puerto Rico), the Governors have appointed members to the State humanities committees. There are currently 84 gubernatorial appointees.

Many State committees have gone well beyond the technical requirements of the law, as interpreted by the National Council, in an effort to be fully accountable to the State. Connecticut, for example, gives an annual "Report to the People of Connecticut" in the form of a State-wide meeting to accompany its published annual report. The Nebraska Committee, among many others, conducts public meetings at which grant applicants are permitted to hear the discussion of their applications. All States provide full reasons for decisions on all applications to applicants on request. Although the National Council judged that four year terms and two year terms of office were sufficient to ensure "regular rotation," a number of States allow only one three-year term for members and one-year terms for officers.

The membership of State committees has been broadened significantly since 1976: almost 10 percent of the committee membership is black, 4 percent is Hispanic, 2.5 percent is Native American, and 1.6 percent is Asian-American. A third of the members are women. Of the 1,079 members, business people from large and small enterprises represent over 8 percent of the total, and public officials represent just under 8 percent. Other significant public groups are representatives of civic and other non-profit groups, about 10 percent; farmers and laborers, about 5 percent; lawyers and doctors, about 5 percent; media professionals, about 5 percent. Some 62 college presidents serve on State committees, and a range of humanities interests are represented from anthropology to classics. Representatives of cultural institutions, such as libraries, museums and historical organizations, form about 4 percent of the membership. Traditionally black colleges are represented by 28 of the members and 2 more come from Native American institutions. Gubernatorial appointments to the State humanities committees have strengthened relationships between the States and the committees. Of the 84 such appointments, 20 were either elected or appointed public officials, often from the Governor's office. About 78 percent were from the public sector, with the remainder representing a field of the humanities or a cultural institution. An analysis of State humanities committee membership is attached to this statement as Annex 2.
The State committees have worked diligently to make the humanities accessible and useful to the broad public. About 75 percent of all funded projects in the last year and a half were sponsored by non-academic groups. Community organizations were the largest single group of sponsors: 49.3 percent. State and local governments sponsored almost 8 percent of the projects, with libraries, museums and media accounting for 16 percent of all projects. An analysis of project sponsorship is attached as Annex 3.

State and local governments' cost share of sponsored projects over the past year-and-a-half has been about $1,700,000. Private gifts to State committees above the 1:1 cost share required of all State program grants have added another $1.4 million in the last fiscal year, the amount being matched with Federal funds through the "gifts and matching" provision of the Endowment's funding authority. State appropriations to the State humanities committees have been difficult to obtain. The Alaska legislature has granted the State humanities program about $50,000 to that State's humanities program for a two year period. Conversations are underway in several other States about the possibility of direct appropriations.

Originally, State programs funded by the Endowment were restricted, by NEH policy, to public humanities programs which focused on issues of public policy of particular interest to the citizens of the various States. The 1976 legislation expanded the State program opportunities to embrace a range of options comparable to those of the Endowment itself.

In February 1977 the National Council on the Humanities, after reviewing those provisions of the legislation, approved an advisory document, Comments of the National Council on the Humanities (February 1977): The Endowment's Reauthorizing Legislation and the Programs of the State Committees for the Humanities, (Annex 4). In the paper the Council underscored Congressional concern that the State Programs "...seek imaginative new means of service to the State" through activities which "will be addressed to a multiplicity and variety of worthwhile projects," but encouraged the State committees to make their plans for future programming only after careful consultation throughout the State. The Council advised the State committee members that these new choices for programming would not be accompanied by significantly greater funding, and stressed the consequent need to set clear priorities and "to make informed, perceptive choices" about new program directions. The State committees were urged to avoid the "redundancy, inefficiency, and waste of limited resources" which would be likely to occur if they attempted to duplicate all Endowment programming. They were also encouraged to explore other sources of support for humanities activities within the States. It was made clear that the full responsibility for determining "how best to serve the humanities interests of the citizens of the State" resides in the State committees.

The Endowment offered up to $10,000 in additional administrative support to help the State committees to consult widely with citizens,
organizations, and institutions as they planned new guidelines and programs. State committees also received up to $20,000 for management studies of their structure, grants and fiscal procedures, public outreach, and other relevant policy and planning activities.

The State committees' responses to the reauthorizing legislation has been constructive and thoughtful. They have established program goals and guidelines which serve broader constituencies, and which seek new meanings and larger understanding of the humanities. Most of the committees took advantage of the Endowment's offer to provide additional administrative funds to consult throughout the States and to plan new programs; more than forty State committees conducted management analyses of their operations as well.

A recent editorial in the Fayetteville (N.C.) Times, written in tribute to the late Charles Frankel, declared that the "perceptions that...scholars evoke can be integrated into the stuff of day-to-day knowledge, strengthening society's ability to understand itself and cope with change and with the pressures playing upon it."

The editorial identifies how this idea has been "dramatically brought home in North Carolina through projects financed by the North Carolina Humanities Committee..." and describes some of its impact:

Urban Fayetteville, of course, has provided what many consider THE most striking example of how the humanities can interact with the community to produce benefits for both...

A rough accounting over the past five years shows that a dozen institutions and individuals have received over $93,000 for 35 projects in the Cape Fear Region...The topics have ranged widely, from film series to serious discussions of the impact of technology on values.

Urban growth, women's rights, the cultural contribution of North Carolina Indians, country-wide forums discussing the future of America at her bicentennial, human values in the all-volunteer army, and a series on medieval history. All these have been approached through this unique merging of scholarship with everyday concerns of ordinary people.

This diversity of the current humanities programs in the States is the result of tailoring them to the needs, resources and the humanities interests of particular States rather than to one central national focus. "Mini-grants" have enabled many small communities without the resources or experience to plan their own humanities program to apply to the committees for modest grants to bring an already produced humanities presentation to their towns. In a number of States "humanists-in-residence" have developed programs in isolated and otherwise hard to reach areas; there have also been professional historians, archaeologists, philosophers,
and other humanists "in-residence" in hospitals, historical societies, libraries, and in city and State governments, aiding their staffs to exploit humanities resources and to make them more accessible and useful to the community.

One of the more significant aspects of the broadened program focus has been the State committees' response to the reawakened interest Americans have in their "roots." Expanding this interest beyond narrow genealogical concerns to a new and changed perception of the whole society, and of how various groups shape and contribute to this process, is one of the achievements of this kind of program focus. The examples are myriad, even though the new program lines have only been effect for about a year and a half.

The enlarged opportunities for State programming have not resulted - as some feared might happen - in programs with a traditional academic orientation. No State has developed grant lines which have final products or goals that do not benefit the broad public directly.

The State humanities programs cannot be fully understood or their significance measured in the abstract or through generalities. That is, perhaps, their strength. The diversity of America is fully represented in these programs. They reflect the interaction of the traditional disciplines of the humanities and the specific traditions, history, concerns and resources of each State and the thousands of communities within those States. The example of North Dakota illustrates the vitality and effectiveness of this approach. The report to the people of North Dakota published by the North Dakota Committee for the Humanities and Public Issues (NDCHPI) at the end of 1978 begins with this statement:

"If you live anywhere in North Dakota, except for the sparsely-peopled area of the Badlands, you have been within a half-hour drive of a humanities program funded by NDCHPI..."

"NDCHPI funds humanities programs for the state's out-of-school adults because it believes that citizens will make better decisions about North Dakota's future if they better understand themselves and their heritage with the help of the humanities."

"Currently, the membership of the North Dakota Committee is almost evenly divided geographically between the Northeast, Northwest, Southeast and Southwest areas of the State. The public members include the director of a nursery school, a businesswoman, two public television officials, a superintendent of schools, a member of the Governor's Council on Human Resources, a retired telephone company executive, two ranchers and a State Government official. The academic members include three from two-year community colleges, including one Native American institution, and eight from other campuses."
Gifts raised from private individuals in North Dakota for the program over the past year totalled more than $100,000, with few gifts over $1,000 and the bulk of the gifts under $100. Some of the larger donors to the North Dakota program include the North Dakota AFL-CIO, the Otto Bremer Foundation, the Campbell Foundation and the Northwest Area Foundation. For a TV program of interpretive coverage of the North Dakota legislature last winter, 354 people gave gifts of $100 each.

The North Dakota "mini-grant" program, which this Committee pioneered and which has been used successfully by many other States, has permitted the program to reach into towns with populations well under 500. The Executive Director judges that very soon every town in the State will have participated in the program.

The most striking change in the North Dakota program, in the opinion of that Committee, is the public outreach - a result of the expanded program opportunities presented by the 1976 legislation. Two films, both prize-winning productions, have had particular impact in the State, one becoming a commercial success. The films, "Prairie Fire" and "Northern Lights," present in documentary and in dramatic form, respectively, the history of the Non-Partisan League, an early 20th century populist farm movement in North Dakota which had significance far beyond its borders and long after the League's dissolution. These films responding to North Dakotans' deep interest in their own past, throw new light on the uniqueness of the heritage and outlook of the people of this region and their contribution to American labor history.

Sponsors of North Dakota projects have included the Dickinson Rotary Club, the Dakota Indian Rights Association, the Tioga Chamber of Commerce, the Governor of North Dakota and Staff, the First Presbyterian Church of Jamestown, the Devils Lake Sioux Tribe Otanka Club, the Still Homemakers Club in Wilton, Rugby Sons of Norway, Hazen Jaycees, Velva Senior Citizens, Crosby Kiwanis Club, North Dakota State Penitentiary, the American Legion of Wilton, Grand Forks Public Library, and the Cass County Mental Health Association, among about three hundred other groups. Less than a quarter of the projects funded were grants to an academic institution. The average grant in North Dakota this year is under $2,000.

Helping the State humanities committees to share new ideas, to raise new questions and to present a strong independent voice in discussions with the Endowment, is the Federation of Public Programs in the Humanities, to which 42 State committees belong. Located in Minneapolis, it has an Executive Committee of 15 State chairmen and directors who meet regularly with the Endowment on matters of mutual concern. The Federation was formed in 1976, and is funded through dues from the member committees. It has a contract from the Endowment for a newsletter, Federation Reports, and for the annual meeting of State programs in the humanities, to be held this fall in Philadelphia.
In the past four years, and particularly since the 1976 legislation, the State committees have developed fund-raising plans, working relationships with the Governor's office in most States, and comprehensive plans of accountability responding to the legislation, and they have begun dialogues with State legislatures to develop new funds for rapidly expanding programs. The tightening of the Federal budget promises to accelerate this search for new money within the States, and we are optimistic that with the increasing impact of the State humanities programs, additional dollars will be found from private and State sources.

This year, with Federal funding of $22.1 million, the State humanities committees will be supporting 2,400 projects reaching up to 24 million persons.

b. Dissemination of the humanities through the media

The Endowment's grants to radio and television seek to bring to adult audiences a richer understanding of the humanities, and with it, a lively appreciation of the history and diversity of the American people and of their cultural heritage. The grants themselves require collaboration between humanities scholars and writers, producers, and directors, and they support the production of radio and television programming in the humanities of the highest possible quality for national and regional audiences. By further assisting in the secondary distribution of these productions, the grant also make them continuously available to wider audiences over a number of years.

The grants are made in a milieu in which entertainment looms large. The bulk of the daily flow from the media is light entertainment. Programs focusing on the humanities are available for only a few hours of any given week. In 1977-78 the three commercial networks, combined, presented only 41 hours of humanities-related programs out of more than 1,100 hours of special programs. Leaving aside the contribution of NEH-supported programs, public television did only slightly better with 95 hours of humanities-related programs - about one-half of one percent of the total of original programming.

These figures show what was offered. They do not describe demand. For demand there is. The response to Endowment-supported programs such as "The American Short Story Series," "In Pursuit of Liberty," and "The Best of Families," shows that there is a substantial audience for high quality humanities programming. These series are still drawing some of public television's largest audiences - cumulatively more than 10 million people each week, concurrent with their additional use in public schools, libraries, colleges, and by local civic groups.

Our effort with the Endowment's media grants has been not only to fulfill demand, but to stimulate growth. Of the more than 258 hours of television and 125 hours of radio programming, national and regional,
plus regionally-oriented productions and research and development for new programs which have resulted from the Media Program's grants since its establishment in 1972, some 40 percent came from our 1977-78 grants alone. Internal modifications in the Media Program were aimed at assisting this growth. Prior to the current reauthorization period a program of planning grants to public broadcast organizations to help them review and strengthen their commitment to humanities programming was developed. But during the current period it became clear that independent filmmakers and unaffiliated radio and television producers should also be eligible for such grants, and they were initiated in FY 1977. They are now an intrinsic form of support, and 22 such grants have been made to date.

At the same time, the Media Program sought to broaden the subject matter of its grants to reflect the advances which have been made in humanities research in recent years in the fields broadly embraced by the term social history. As a result, 102 radio and television projects in the areas of social and labor history, women's and ethnic studies, were funded during the current reauthorization period, at a total cost of $15,192,000. This was 50 percent of the total of the Program's grants during the period.

The potential for increased media production in the humanities is great: the institutional constituency includes 250 public television outlets, 200 public and non-commercial radio stations, and more than 3,750 independent film, television, and radio producers; there is also strong interest in the private sector - "The Best of Families," for example, attracted more than $2.3 million in corporate and foundation support, and four new series, not yet launched publicly, have received $4.1 million from sources outside the Endowment.

This potential for growth is evident in other aspects of our media work. A particularly encouraging sign is the proportion of new applicants and grantees. Whereas the previous reauthorization period produced 132 first-time applicants for media grants, the current period will have doubled that by the end of FY 1980. As between the same two periods, the number of new grantees will have quadrupled, from 42 to more than 160.

Another important aspect of the Media Program evidencing growth is the audience. The cumulative identifiable audiences for the products of Endowment grants to radio and television are estimated at 23 million for FY 1977, 27 million for FY 1978, 29 million for FY 1979, and 30 million for FY 1980.

A number of Endowment-funded media projects are of such outstanding quality as to serve as models within the radio and television industry. Among them I would cite "The American Short Story Series," which can properly be characterized as a unique achievement. It is the first series produced by American public television to be purchased by the
BBC; it represented the United States with great distinction and to
general acclaim at the 20th General Conference of UNESCO; and it has
received the Black Filmmakers' Hall of Fame Special Award for Outstanding
Contribution to Black Culture and Black Life. It has been enthusiastically received in this country by both public and critics, and has been
sold thus far to nine countries abroad. It has prompted creation of a
paperback anthology, is being distributed free to thousands of public and
civic groups, and will be used by libraries, schools, and universities
over the next decade.

I may also cite "The Best of Families," a landmark in the presentation of American social history initially viewed by more than 4.5
million people; "In Pursuit of Liberty," regarded by both industry professionals and scholars as a masterful and important contribution
to our understanding of liberty and individual rights; "The Scarlet Letter," a television presentation of a major American novel of striking
quality which has already been seen and - through a companion radio series - heard by the largest audience for a dramatic series in public
broadcasting history; "The World of F. Scott Fitzgerald," the first major presentation by National Public Radio of the work of an American author;
and "Odyssey," which, though still in production, is already being eagerly awaited as the first major effort to present archaeology and anthropology
to the American public.

C. Interpretive programs in museums and historical organizations

Museums and historical organizations, because of their interests, their collections, their intimate connection to history, and their actual and potential audiences, are prime national resources for promoting public understanding of the humanities. It is this characteristic which prompts the Endowment's program of grants to them for interpretive exhibitions. In the case of historical organizations, the connection with the humanities is clear. In the case of museums, there has been some confusion - largely, I suppose, because of the popular association of museums with art. But the study of art, its history, criticism, theory, even the study of its practice, is an integral part of the humanities - as the Congress recognized in its definition of the humanities incorporated in the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities Act of 1965. Art and artifacts are also - when accompanied by scholarly interpretation and elucidation - classic vehicles for illustrating and explaining the various other disciplines of the humanities, from history through archaeology and philosophy to comparative religion and, above all, comparative cultures. The Endowment therefore does not support a museums and historical organizations program; it supports an interpretive humanities program through museums and historical organizations.

In order to avoid confusion in this regard, and to eliminate the possibility of duplication in the various Federal programs dealing with
museums, the Federal Council on the Arts and the Humanities undertook during this past year to arrive at an understanding among the agencies
concerned as to the role of each in relation to museums. This understand­ing was reached in May of this year among the Institute of Museum Services, which was established by separate legislation accompanying the 1976 reauthorization, the National Endowment for the Arts, the National Endowment for the Humanities, the National Science Foundation, and the Smithsonian Institution.

Since the 1976 reauthorization, the Endowment has emphasized four specific areas of support in this field: 1 - permanent interpretive exhibitions; 2 - sharing collection resources; 3 - historic site interpretation; and 4 - general planning grants. While continuing to support temporary interpretive projects, we have recognized the importance of institutions strengthening the interpretation of their permanent collections - of enhancing the humanistic utility of those objects for which, usually, the institution is known to the public. We have also recognized the need of institutions with extensive collections which are underutilized to place such objects on view and the simultaneous need of other institutions with excellent ideas for interpretive exhibitions to gain access to the necessary objects. Our emphasis on sharing collection resources meets these two complementary needs, and has had the added benefit of frequently developing productive relationships between institutions that would not otherwise have taken place. We have found that our emphasis on historic site interpretation happily responds to an increased interest on the part of Americans in their history, in the cultures of pre-Columbian peoples on this continent, in the concepts of ecological balance, the economic history of local communities, and other significant humanities themes. Lastly, our emphasis on general planning grants, which responds to the needs of institutions seeking to assess the potentials for humanities programs using their collections, print materials, and educational services, has turned out to be particularly useful for organizations approaching the Endowment for the first time; the better understanding of the Endowment's mandate in this field which result leads in turn to more competitive applications.

Beyond these emphases, the Endowment has made a concerted effort in the past three years to elicit applications from the nation's small museums and historical organizations (a small museum being defined as one staffed by five persons or less as listed in the American Association of Museums directory). The results have been encouraging. A significant increase in the number of applications from small museums has been accompanied by a noticeable improvement in their quality, with the result that the 158 grants to small institutions in FY 1978 represented 62 percent of the program's total grants that year.

The great exhibitions from abroad - "Pompeii A.D. 79," "Treasures of Tutankhamun," "Splendor of Dresden" - which with Endowment support have toured the nation, giving millions of Americans new and affecting insights into the rich cultures to which we are heir, have excited wide comment. But we feel that our numerous grants to small museums fulfill as effectively, if on a smaller scale, our main purpose of promoting
public understanding of the humanities. Typical are the Endowment's grants
to the Stuhr Museum of the Prairie Pioneer, in Grant Island, Nebraska,
of $6,648 to plan interpretive programs on 19th century Midwestern and
agricultural history; of $4,704 to the Western Heritage Center in Billings,
Montana, for installation of an exhibit on the history of American In­
dians in the Yellowstone Valley from late prehistoric times to the early
19th century; and to Old Salem, in Winston-Salem, North Carolina, of
$82,513, to install three exhibits in the Wachovia Museum portraying
the lives and cultural contributions of Moravian settlers between 1753
and 1848 through an examination of the Moravian Brethren's concepts of
church and community government, of education, and their innovative public
water system.

Although as a practical matter the Endowment's interpretive programs
have so far operated chiefly through museums and historical organizations,
they are in no way limited to those institutions. Accordingly, and since
the 1976 reauthorization legislation, we have sought to encourage appli­
cations for similar kinds of public interpretive programming from other
institutions such as zoos, botanical gardens, planetariums, aquaria, and
science-technology centers. Through sponsorship of workshops and staff
participation in various conferences, our interpretive programs have
witnessed a rise in funded applications from these sources.

So far in the current reauthorization period we have awarded over
600 grants in the field of interpretive programs. This means that annually
we are providing funding to only some 4 percent of the estimated number of
eligible institutions in the field. But it also means that interpretive
programs funded by the Endowment are presently reaching 14-15 million
people each year.

d. Humanities programs in libraries

This nation's 19,000 public, academic, and special libraries are
among our most important community resources in the humanities - and yet,
until recently, they were not really viewed as such. With physical facil­
ities and book collections assembled over the years by the multi-billion
dollar commitment of private, local, and State funds, America's libraries
now have a potential for providing all citizens with the opportunity to
study the humanities at little cost. The challenge is how to organize
the material resources now available, to link them with humanities scholars
and other pertinent talents, and to formulate effective learning programs
suitable for individual or group pursuit. Increasingly, such opportunities
are being sought as a rising public interest in life-long learning has
drawn large numbers of adults into their local public libraries.

The Endowment, which had been making grants to libraries on an ex­
perimental basis for some years, responded to this growing interest with
the establishment on October 1, 1978, of a Library Program, in the Division
of Public Programs, with an allocation of $1.8 million. This program is
intended for all libraries - public, academic, special, historical society -
that serve the adult public, and is the only Federal funding program that acknowledges libraries as the primary humanities resource available to the public at the community level. With Endowment funds libraries are able to develop pamphlets, booklets, slide shows, video shows, films, etc., that draw attention to the rich opportunities for humanistic learning and understanding that these institutions afford. Librarians have begun to report increases in the circulation of their humanities collections as a result of public participation in their humanities programs. Many of these projects generate donations of valuable books, manuscripts, photographs, and memorabilia to permanent collections.

The process is illustrated by the Endowment's grant of $50,000 to the Alpha Regional Library in Spencer, West Virginia, for the support of weekly workshops, lectures, and newspaper articles on West Virginia history, folklore and folkmusic, and technology, and for the production of county histories. Public interest has been high, and has resulted, among other things, in increased financial support for the library from the City Council. In addition, personal papers and mementos have been donated to the library and a gift of 2,500 negatives from the local newspaper will help establish a photographic history of the region.

A particularly effective feature of these programs is their focus on the community's unique history, the people who make up the community, their values and the heritage they bring to the community's problems. This includes ethnic history and relationships: 19 of the Library Program's awards have been for projects dealing with ethnic history or the relationships between ethnic groups.

The 1980 appropriations request sets aside $3.7 million for the support of humanities programs for the public originating in libraries. With that level of activity, we hope to reach some 8 million persons with such programs.

e. Infusing the humanities into the world of work

The Endowment's program of Fellowships and Seminars for the Professions is designed to infuse understanding and use of the humanities into sectors of the public in which professional training generally neglects the humanities, but professional responsibilities affect the quality and direction of our national life. Both professional-school training and the demands of professional practice are concerned primarily with practical or clinical skills and performance, offering little opportunity to examine the values, traditions, and goals of society, and practically none to apply humanistic scholarship to any such examination. The Endowment provides this opportunity to professional-school teachers in the fields of law and medicine, and to leaders in the fields of business, journalism, labor, law, medicine and health care, and public and school administration. The universe they comprise totals 3.7 million Americans.
Since the last reauthorization period, the number and kinds of practitioner seminars have been expanded. Twelve practitioner seminars covering the professions of law, medicine, public administration, and school administration were supported in FY 1976. In FY 1980 the number will increase to 25, with men and women from the fields of business, journalism, and labor being added to the existing four. Inter-professional seminars - seminars open to men and women in various professions - were inaugurated in FY 1977. During the past four years, 72 journalists have held fellowships; and 1,016 men and women from the fields of business, journalism, labor, law, medicine, public and school administration have attended one-month summer seminars. These individuals are typically in positions which give them the potential to have a significant impact on the lives of their communities and of their fellow citizens.

The Endowment has complemented these practitioner seminars with seminars for teachers of the professions. Three such seminars - for law teachers - were funded in 1978, and their success resulted in the inauguration of a parallel program for medical and other health-care teachers in 1979. A total of 8 professional-school teacher seminars (enrolling a total of 100 teachers) in law and medicine are being offered in 1979, and we plan to continue at the same level in 1980.

These seminars exert a multiplier effect through the participants' students - future lawyers, judges, physicians and other health-care professionals who will be more aware of the humanistic implications of their disciplines, and of the relationship between their professional lives and the values and goals of society - and through the participants' professional and community associations.

A significant example of such a seminar is being directed this month and next by Dr. H. Tristram Englehardt, Rosemary Kennedy Professor of the Philosophy of Medicine at Georgetown University. Its purpose is to offer medical and other health-care faculty members an opportunity to explore intensively the philosophical and ethical core of their fields. Classic and modern philosophical theories will also be applied to some of the most important contemporary areas of bioethical controversy: patients' rights, informed consent, the morality of the allocation of scarce medical resources, and the right to health care and treatment. These controversies will be explored against the background of more basic ethical issues such as the sanctity of life, human dignity, the quality of human existence, and the meaning of fairness and justice. Among the 14 participants selected in a national competition are a professor of psychiatry from Galveston, Texas; a professor of nursing from East Lansing, Michigan; a professor of pharmacy from Philadelphia; and a professor of physiology from Greenville, North Carolina.

f. Non-traditional audiences and techniques

At various points the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities Act of 1965, as amended, makes clear the intent of the Congress that the Endowment shall not limit its support of the humanities to the
academic world. Section 7 (c) (5) authorized the Chairman to "foster... education in, and public understanding and appreciation of the humanities;" while Section 7 (c) (7) authorizes the Chairman to ensure that the benefits of its programs will also be available to our citizens where such programs would otherwise be unavailable due to geographic or economic reasons."

While the Endowment's programs in the media, museums and historical organizations, and libraries, and seminars for the professions, noted above, reach important sectors of the public, they by no means fulfill the stated intent of the legislation. In recognition of this fact, the Endowment, beginning in the early years of this decade, instituted from time to time various programs, frequently on an experimental basis, which employed non-traditional techniques for dissemination of the humanities, or were aimed at non-traditional audiences for the humanities, or both.

On October 1, 1979, all such programs were assembled under one organizational roof in the Endowment's new Division of Special Programs. This Division will help focus the Endowment's initiatives and efforts directed toward more effective dissemination of the humanities to audiences with special needs (e.g., the handicapped); reaching of non-traditional audiences; or application of the humanities to important issues of public policy and to the interests of the general citizen; and activities that do not fit into the other operating divisions of the Endowment, or fall between divisions, or are in a totally new area.

There have been some remarkable accomplishments by these various non-traditional programs since the 1976 reauthorization legislation. Of particular note is the continued success of "Courses by Newspaper" (CBN), conducted by the University of California at San Diego with Endowment funding through the Office of Special Projects. CBN has continued to grow, and now runs in over 500 newspapers with a combined circulation of over 20 million. More than 650 colleges and universities have offered one or more of the courses for credit through supplementary reading and instruction, and approximately 50,000 newspaper readers have earned credit during the past five years. This sizable impact is now supplemented, with Endowment support, by special public library programs, "community forums" on CBN topics in local two-year colleges, and production of Spanish-language materials. And this autumn, public television - without Endowment funding - will broadcast a Time-Life/BBC series linked to the CBN Technology course, which promises to be the largest public education program ever mounted in the United States.

Another innovative "delivery system" for involving the public in the humanities is the series of international symposia to which the Endowment has been contributing. The first such symposium was held in 1977 here in the capital; concerned with Canada, the compound of lectures, seminars, exhibitions, films, and performing arts (with the aid of the Arts Endowment), proved itself a viable and popular means for citizen education in the complexities of other cultures. A second symposium, on Mexico, opened in Washington in the fall of 1978, and then travelled
to a number of other cities. A third, "Japan Today," coordinated by the Japan Society, is currently bringing the thought of eminent literary scholars, historians, philosophers, and writers from both Japan and the United States, plus the art, films, drama, music, and dance of Japan to the public in Washington, New York, Chicago, Denver, and Los Angeles.

Since 1972 the Endowment, through its Youthgrants program, has been extending access to the humanities beyond the classroom by awards for humanities projects which young people themselves have initiated, designed, and executed. An example of this kind of grant is that given in FY 1976 to Steven Plattner, of St. Paul, Minnesota, who conceived and assembled "American Images," an exhibition of Farm Security Administration photographs depicting the FSA itself and the America of the Depression. "American Images" was subsequently distributed by the Amarillo Art Center to fifteen museums throughout Texas and the Midwest, and will be travelling to a variety of community organizations, schools, museums, and cultural institutions through 1980.

There have been no significant changes in the Youthgrants program since the 1976 reauthorization, though a major revision of administrative procedures which will be effected by FY 1980 will allow the awarding of some 100 grants per year, compared to FY 1977's 45 grants, without significantly greater staff or administrative expense.

In FY 1977 an important new youth program, NEH Youth Projects, was inaugurated to reach even younger age groups - teenagers and children - which need professional guidance and supervision. For professionals in the humanities and in youth programming, from the staff of Girls' Clubs and 4-H to museum educators and historians, no funds were previously available at the Endowment - or any other agency or organization - to provide young people with substantive humanities experiences outside the classroom. The objective of the Youth Projects program is to provide large numbers of young people with an opportunity for real involvement in the humanities at a low per capita cost. Eligible institutions include the hundreds of thousands of community organizations, youth groups, media, and cultural institutions concerned with the educational development of youth.

It is a rapidly growing area. In FY 1978 the number of applications quadrupled. Between January and June 1978 the Office of Youth Programs, which administers both Youthgrants and Youth Projects, received over 4,000 requests for copies of the booklet containing guidelines and application forms for one grant program alone. Also in FY 1978 the Endowment conducted a special "Planning Award Competition," to assist interested organizations in bringing together the necessary expertise and in designing effective programs. Over 700 applications were received, most from groups which had never before received Endowment funding. Of the resulting 120 awards, 86 percent went to "first-time" grantees. It should also be noted that approximately 35 percent of the applications rated fundable in the Youth Projects program could not be supported.
because available program funds limit grants to only about 20 percent of total applications received.

An outstanding example of a Youth Project is "History Day," a participatory program modelled after Science Fairs. Beginning in Ohio in 1977, this project has spread to 17 States for 1980, and hopes to reach all States by 1983. It has the support of all major national historical groups, and involved 7,500 young people in exhibits, research, and performances on historical themes. For this year the theme was "Migrations in History: People, Ideas, and Culture."

The Endowment's youth programs are now supported at the level of $1.5 million per year, and reach about 25,000 young people directly. Hundreds of thousands more are reached indirectly, and through the continuing use of materials produced under our grants.

We have also been giving attention to the elderly: a grant to the National Council on the Aging produced humanities discussion material and cassettes for use at 500 senior centers throughout the country. The Endowment has also given a similar grant to the National Farmers Union for material addressing rural themes to be used by NFU groups in 18 States. Grants have also gone to labor unions, urban groups, black, Hispanic, and other ethnic organizations for the development of humanities programs for their members and communities.

During the past decade many important ethical and value controversies have been created - or raised in new forms - by scientific and technological developments. We need only note the controversial experiments with human subjects, in vitro fertilization, nuclear energy technology, environmental damage. As a basis for sound policies and public understanding, there is a major need for scientific and humanistic cooperation in research and education. The Endowment is addressing this problem through its Science, Technology, and Human Values Program. A 1978 survey by the American Association for the Advancement of Science found 117 coordinated science-values programs at colleges and universities. Most have been established since 1973. The Endowment has awarded grants to 30 of these programs, or a fraction over 25 percent. They include Lehigh University's "Humanities Perspectives on Technology," and the introduction of humanities components into the curricula of medical schools such as the University of Texas Medical Branch, Galveston, and the University of Delaware.

A major effort of this program has been to increase cooperation with the National Science Foundation (NSF). Joint funding with NSF has increased from an Endowment contribution of $90,000 in FY 1975 to an anticipated $700,000 for FY 1979. In addition, in the current fiscal year the first joint funding with the Department of Energy has taken place, with an Endowment contribution of $50,000 to help develop humanistic issues being examined in four energy education institutes for high school and college teachers. We plan to explore cooperation with other Federal agencies which support science research and education through
joint funding of projects involving collaboration of scientists and humanists.

A particularly notable achievement in the field of science and the humanities was the completion and publication in 1978 of the first Encyclopedia of Bioethics. This valuable four-volume work was the result of a grant to the Kennedy Institute of Ethics at Georgetown University.

We shall be continuing our efforts with non-traditional techniques and audiences. To take the measure of the possible, and to indicate possibilities to organizations which have not hitherto been active in dissemination of the humanities, the Endowment will be offering professional humanities advice and consultant assistance to a broad range of civic, cultural, minority, social service organizations, and other groups serving the public.

2. **IMPROVING THE QUALITY OF TEACHING IN THE HUMANITIES**

By every available measure, American education in the humanities is experiencing severely troubled times. Student performance on the humanities portions of national examinations has declined for at least a decade. Foreign language enrollment and courses have declined, and the collapse of acceptable student writing ability has received national attention. The percentage of undergraduate humanities majors nearly halved in the first six years of the 1970's. Declining enrollments, reflecting the decline in the traditional age cohort for colleges, have helped produce a collapse of the job market for humanities Ph.D.'s in higher education.

We are in danger, as a nation, of losing the ability to sustain a proud standard of cultural literacy, a standard that has always formed the basis of complete citizenship. The democratic vision of an informed citizenry - independent, diverse, and analytical - shows signs of weakening into a reality of marginal skills and narrow vocational and professional training.

The 1980's call for imagination and efficiency, new ways to use existing resources, and means to sustain the energy and enthusiasm of teachers and faculty who may serve the same school or college for 30 years.

Other Federal agencies provide general support for the nation's education system, aid for the education of certain groups - the disadvantaged, handicapped, low-income - and assistance for specialized training. Only the Endowment, however, has the special responsibility, established by law, for promoting and strengthening teaching and learning of the full spectrum of the humanities at all education levels.

a. **Elementary and secondary education**

There are approximately 94,000 elementary and secondary schools in
the nation, and virtually all of them have courses of study in the disciplines of the humanities. Evidence exists, however, of growing public concern about what appears to be the decreasing emphasis on the humanities disciplines. Areas such as foreign languages, history, and expository writing are frequently mentioned as in need of serious attention. Further, all schools, even those with a strong emphasis on the humanities disciplines, need to relate the findings of recent humanities scholarship to their humanities curricula.

The Endowment's Elementary and Secondary Education Program began operation as a discrete program in 1977. (Previously, elementary and secondary grants had been made within the general category of Education Projects.) With relatively few funds the Elementary and Secondary Education Program has made numerous grants and combinations of grants which have had nationally significant impact by helping to revitalize humanities studies in a number of areas.

Most notable is the work being done under Endowment auspices to improve the teaching and learning of expository writing. A grant to the Council for Basic Education sponsored a Commission on the Teaching of Writing. The Commission Report, entitled Empty Pages: A Search for Writing Competency in School and Society is being published by Fearon Pitman this summer and was featured at a national conference on writing in March of 1979. Several writing projects have been aimed primarily at training teachers in the theories and classroom applications of composition and improving them as participants in the writing process. The major effort of this sort is the National Writing Project, which began as the Bay Area Writing Project of the University of California at Berkeley. Originating as a single summer institute for teachers of composition, the National Writing Project has over 40 different national dissemination sites representing all regions of the country. (Work with some of the Defense Department's overseas dependent schools has also taken place.) At least 50% of the funding for each of these sites in the National Writing Project is contributed by local sources and is then matched by the Endowment.

Funding from the Endowment has also played a prominent role in international education and non-Western studies. A wide range of projects is represented, almost all involving a combination of curriculum development and teacher training. Some examples are:

--- Kansas State University's project in South Asian studies for teachers from Kansas, Nebraska, Oklahoma, Colorado, Missouri, and Indiana;

--- the University of Illinois' project in African studies for teachers from Missouri, Arkansas, and Illinois;

--- an East Asian studies project sponsored by the Great Lakes Colleges Association open to teachers from the entire country;
--the University of Texas at Austin's project in Latin American studies for teachers from the southwest United States; and

--the University of Maine at Orono's project in Canadian studies for teachers from New England, New York, and Louisiana.

The Elementary and Secondary Education Program has also received national acclaim through its support of two major projects in the area of law-related education. The American Bar Association is sponsoring a major effort ("Law and the Humanities: Designs for Elementary Education") to stimulate interest in and disseminate information about programs in law-related education at the elementary level. Nearly all of the previous developmental work in this burgeoning field has been at the secondary or post-secondary levels. The ABA project builds upon the work of the Endowment-sponsored "Law in a Free Society" project of the State Bar of California, which has been developing K-12 curriculum materials (case studies, teacher and student guides, and filmstrips) on eight humanities concepts for use in history, civics, and social studies curricula. The materials already produced have been used in over 30 States and in several other countries.

As concrete measures of the impact of the Endowment's Elementary and Secondary Education Program, one might note that during the past four years:

--more than 16,000 schools were assisted.

--39,000 teachers were assisted through in-service experiences and use of new curricular materials developed in Elementary and Secondary Education grants.

--the curricular materials and teachers reached 2,300,000 students in humanities courses or in other courses with humanities units.

b. Higher education

There are more than 3,000 institutions of higher education in our country, and most are facing serious difficulties created by the economy and by demography:

--few State institutions have funds available for improvement of the curriculum; some State systems (e.g. California) are reeling from the impact of budget cuts.

--private education also faces rising costs and a shrinking student pool.

--most institutions have a large portion of faculty tenured in, with little potential for fresh perspectives from new staff.
Carnegie Foundation surveys show a decline in humanities majors from 9% of all undergraduates in FY 1970 to 5% in FY 1976. The social science majors in that period dropped from 18% to 8%. In the wake of the relaxation or elimination of general education requirements in many schools, a great many students receive no significant or coherent exposure to the humanities.

To meet the current problems faced by institutions of higher education, the Endowment now helps colleges and universities to undertake a variety of activities including planning, experimentation, and reorganization of their own curriculum, design and dissemination of exemplary course materials, and refresher training for their faculties. Many institutions need to revise general education so that it gives all students a good exposure to humanistic values and concerns, rounding out the professional courses. Some are concerned with ways to reintroduce the broad study of foreign language and culture. Others are interested in preparing students to cope with the technological world from a perspective of history and values.

1. Consultant grants: At the time of the 1976 reauthorization the Endowment's Consultant Grants Program had just been instituted. Through this program of small grants (usually less than $5,000), outstanding scholars help institutions assess their strengths and weaknesses in the humanities and plan improved instructional programs. Such grants will have gone to 480 different institutions in the period FY 77-80. We are especially pleased that the program has been of particular interest and assistance to two-year colleges, vocational/technical schools, and colleges seeking to meet the needs of older, "non-traditional" students. By the conclusion of a consultancy, many colleges have devised strategies for strengthening the humanities which can be carried out by judicious realignment of the institutional budget; others, who need outside funding to meet their needs, are able to present much stronger cases for support in subsequent applications to the Endowment and other agencies.

2. Pilot and implementation grants: As financial pressures cause institutions to reduce the size of their humanities faculty, course-by-course, piecemeal efforts to strengthen the humanities are far more difficult to undertake than they once were. Moreover, piecemeal efforts cannot meet current needs; only through a concerted, coordinated, planning effort and outside help can institutions effect the sort of substantial changes that appear necessary. The Endowment helps institutions test new approaches in the classroom before making commitments to major restructurings which might draw off already limited institutional funds, and it helps institutions, once the plans have been carefully tested, to implement a reorganized curriculum.

A number of significant changes have been made in the Endowment's curriculum support since the beginning of FY 1977. Two grant categories - Program Grants and Development Grants - have been combined into a single program, Implementation Grants, which is much more streamlined in its
operations. Before FY 1977 an institution could request as much as one million dollars over a five-year period for revision of its humanities curriculum. Applicants are now limited to a maximum of $300,000 in Endowment funds and are asked to provide 50% cost sharing as a demonstration of institutional commitment to the project. The Endowment also places a high priority on programs that are central to the curricular needs of the institution. Expensive tangential or elective programs that would depend upon increased enrollments for post-grant survival cannot be risked in the current economic climate, no matter how "innovative." Institutions are now encouraged to bring innovation and imagination to bear on central needs, such as the retraining of highly specialized or traditionally trained humanities faculty to enable them to teach general education courses for professional students or non-traditional students as enrollment patterns shift.

In the period 1977-80, 211 different institutions in each of the 50 States and Puerto Rico have been, or will be, aided with Pilot Grants to test revised programs. During the same period 20 institutions have, or will have, received Implementation Grants to restructure or create a "general education core curriculum;" fourteen institutions to implement regional studies programs; eight institutions to implement programs in humanities and medicine or health science; and twenty institutions to develop interdisciplinary studies programs.

Literally tens of thousands of students are benefiting from Endowment aid. Some examples:

--the University of Kentucky is developing an Appalachian Studies program, while the Maricopa County Community College District in Arizona is developing a Southwest Studies program, and Southwest Missouri State University has developed a two-semester, team-taught course on its region.

--the University of Tennessee is developing a clinical humanities residency for medical educators, while the University of Kansas is implementing a three-year program designed to enable business students gain a better understanding of social and ethical issues involving the business world.

--Northland College in Wisconsin has developed four courses as additions to a curriculum which has been focused on environmental issues, and a core curriculum for an undergraduate major in Law Studies was developed with a grant to the University of Wisconsin, Milwaukee.

3. Regional and national grants: While aiding individual colleges and universities to meet the needs of their particular student body, the Endowment supports the design and dissemination of exemplary materials which large numbers of institutions can use. Through this type of aid
high quality materials can be economically produced and made available to enrich the education of students in small colleges across the nation. Some examples:

--with Endowment aid, the University of Maryland is developing curriculum materials bringing philosophy to bear on critical issues of public life, such as morality in foreign affairs or in the allocation of scarce resources.

--the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith is producing twelve films and slide presentations which use the family history of individuals to give insights into American ethnic groups. These films will be used in courses on ethnicity, history, and sociology.

--the Center for Middle Eastern Studies, University of Texas at Austin, edited out-takes from BBC material to create a film, "Saints and Spirits," on contemporary practices in Moroccan Islam for use in high schools, community colleges, four-year colleges, and universities; a teachers' manual accompanies the film.

--the University of Wisconsin at Madison produced three 16mm documentary films on South Asian culture.

--the University of Southern California, with an Endowment grant, prepared a script and scenario for a film on the history of medicine and the physician in the West for use in undergraduate courses and schools of nursing and medicine.

An estimated two-thirds of the nation's higher education institutions are benefiting from these and other national/regional education grants.

4. College teachers: Many teachers in two-year and undergraduate colleges have heavy teaching loads and committee assignments and little opportunity to discuss their special areas of research with colleagues with similar interests. Their situation has been aggravated in the past three or four years by the financial limitation accompanying declining enrollments, and by the lack of mobility in the profession, particularly among teachers of humanities courses.

The Endowment's Summer Seminars provide these teachers with opportunities to work for eight weeks with distinguished scholars in their fields at institutions with libraries suitable for advanced study. Through research, reflection and frequent discussions - both formal and informal - with the seminar director and other teachers from across the country, seminar participants can increase their knowledge of the subjects they teach and enhance their ability to impart this knowledge to undergraduate students.
The program, which began in 1973 with 25 seminars in English and History, is offering 123 seminars this year in 21 humanities disciplines. Responding to the demand for more seminars in Composition and Rhetoric, 18 have been offered in this field in the period 1977-1979. Seminars in Afro-American and American studies, film studies, and humanities issues pertaining to science and technology were also introduced in 1978 and again in 1979. In order to encourage more applications from two-year college teachers and to respond to their particular needs, five seminars are open only to this group in 1979 on an experimental basis.

During the period 1977 to the end of FY 1979, 351 Summer Seminars will have served 4,167 teachers from over 1,000 different undergraduate and two-year colleges representing all fifty States, Puerto Rico, Samoa and Guam. Assuming that the 1,460 college teachers in the 1979 Seminars each teach 75 students, 109,500 college students will be secondary beneficiaries of the program this year alone.

3. STRENGTHENING THE SCHOLARLY FOUNDATION FOR HUMANISTIC STUDY/SUPPORTING RESEARCH

Fundamental to all Endowment-supported activities, and to its goals--whether they involve the public or the academy--is scholarly knowledge. The Endowment is now the single most important agency furthering the discovery, analysis, presentation, maintenance, and revision of humanistic knowledge in the nation. This degree of importance has not been sought by the Endowment. It has come about through external developments: the general financial difficulties afflicting our educational/scholarly enterprise; the impact of inflation on fixed institutional endowments; the shift in the interests and the reduced financial resources of private foundations.

We are fully aware of the potential hazards of such prominence. I quote again the Report of the Commission on the Humanities of 1964: "A government which gives no support at all to humane values is careless of its own destiny, but that government which gives too much support--and seeks to acquire influence--may be more dangerous still." We therefore make every effort, in the structuring of our programs, in our review process, in our grants, in our relations with scholarly organizations, with centers of learning, and with individual scholars, and in the interplay between the Endowment and private sources of funding, to maintain that balance, that sense of proportion, that perspective alert to consequences, which spell the difference between public service and governmental interference.

a. Individual study

Opportunities for intellectual growth are vital to the profession of the humanities. Foremost among such opportunities, certainly for
those who profess the humanities in our colleges and universities, is the periodic release from classroom responsibilities which permits the pursuit and free expression of intellectual curiosity. It is this private work of individual scholars which is the building block of the humanities edifice; its sum is a major and indispensable part of any effort to strengthen the scholarly foundations of humanistic study. But the number of such opportunities available has always been disproportionately small. At the time of the Endowment's creation, there were fewer than 500 post-doctoral fellowships available annually for the nearly 200,000 college and university teachers in the humanities. That there are today roughly twice that number of such fellowships available is only due to the Endowment.

The increase in the number of applications to and awards by the Endowment is striking: in place of 1967's 1,200 fellowship applications we are expecting 4,300 in the current fiscal year, exclusive of applications to the various Endowment-supported re-grant programs. In 1967 the Endowment awarded 157 fellowships, in 1978 we awarded 435.

This growth has taken place in a situation in which the prospects for private support of individual study are not encouraging. Only a relatively small number of colleges and universities have ever offered sabbatical leaves to faculty members, and many who did are now being forced to curtail the practice in the economic pinch of recent years. Private foundation support of fellowships threatens to decrease rather than increase. Further, few privately supported fellowships are available for teachers of undergraduates.

The Endowment has responded to this situation with an increase in the number of fellowships it offers for individual study and, this year with a restructuring of its fellowship programs. We are introducing a new category of fellowship which provides study opportunities for teachers in undergraduate colleges and for younger scholars in major universities who are also engaged principally in undergraduate teaching as opposed to research or the teaching of graduate students. This new program is a reaffirmation of the importance of the humanities in our nation of undergraduate teaching and of a more diversified pool of researchers.

We are continuing our established programs of independent study, year-long residential seminars, aid to advanced study centers, and summer stipends. The latter are particularly noteworthy: during the current reauthorization period some 907 persons from 372 different institutions will have been aided.

A remarkable number of books, monographs, and teaching materials have resulted from our fellowships and stipends. Their principal audience is, quite properly, scholars and students. But not infrequently they attract wider audiences. Among the latter it is a pleasure to note Dorothy Rabinowitz's *New Lives: Survivors of the Holocaust Living in*
America; Paul Fussell's *The Great War and Modern Memory*, which won a 1976 National Book Award; and Richard B. Davis's *Intellectual Life in the Colonial South, 1585-1763*, which received a National Book Award this year.

b. Basic research

Our basic research grants, so far as individual scholars are concerned, are largely distinguishable from our fellowships and stipends by the larger scope and longer duration of the former. But our research grants also support collaborative research, most often under the aegis of an institution, and the work of specialized research organizations which re-grant the funds provided by the Endowment to individual scholars or teams of scholars. It is a measure - and a happy one - of the vitality of American humanities research that the demand in this field appears inexhaustible. Less happily, the Endowment's resources do not share this characteristic. A rigorous review and selection process is therefore imperative - and is operative. We are nonetheless pleased that the Endowment was able in FY 1978, for example, to support by its basic research grants the work of 3,139 scholars and support personnel - for this basic research is the heart of the humanities enterprise.

The Endowment's grants for fundamental research projects that are collaborative, interdisciplinary, and open to all fields of the humanities, are unique in the Federal Government. The variety in subject matter is limitless. But several broad fields of endeavor - some, such as "grass roots" historical work, specifically encouraged by the Endowment - can be remarked.

Through our State and Local History program, the cooperation of local professional historians and citizens in developing and using regional and local documents and resources is actively encouraged. A noteworthy achievement in this field has been the Bicentennial State Histories, which were just being launched at the time of the last re-authorization of the Endowment. With a total investment of $1,696,150, the project is making possible a concise, authoritative, and readable history of each of the 50 States and the District of Columbia. The remaining four works of the series will appear this fall. Paperback editions are being prepared, with Tennessee, South Carolina, and Michigan paperback titles already available. As of May of this year 275,000 hard-cover copies have been sold.

This project has inspired a number of urban history projects, and we now are funding such projects in 10 major cities; they include, for example, a "History of Atlanta." This work has developed model projects involving innovative methodologies and team research in several fields - architecture, history, and historic archaeology. We have also made grants for writing the histories of the two largest confederations of American Indian tribes, the Sioux and the Iroquois,
that should develop new methods for studying the internal relations among Indian tribes. Other such grants are producing studies of three Pueblo tribes, the Zuni, Jemez, and Santa Clara.

Our basic research grants have also supported American legal studies, through a pioneering project concerning civil liberties and 19th century American State courts, and a major study of the development of the Constitution. The latter is in preparation for the bicentennial of the Constitutional Convention.

At the very time that opportunities are opening up for American scholars to conduct research in China, the Soviet Union and the East European states, Africa, and Latin America, funding from private foundations to support international scholarly exchanges is being drastically curtailed. This kind of research is both essential for the well-being of American scholarship and clearly in the national interest. In these circumstances, the Endowment is increasingly the major source of support for international exchange programs. Recent grants, of great importance to international studies, have supported international conferences in 1978 and 1979 between American and Soviet historians, the preparation of a book on American historiography which will constitute the agenda for the 1980 International Conference of Historians, re-grants by the Social Science Research Council for foreign area studies, the exchange program with the People's Republic of China, and the exchange program of the International Research Exchange Board (IREX) with the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe. In such exchanges, Endowment funds support only American scholars.

Still another vital area covered by our basic research grants is archaeology. This is a costly kind of scholarship which throughout the world benefits from government support. Without the opportunity to compete for permits for foreign excavations and thus to have direct access to excavation material, American archaeologists would be dependent on secondary analysis, and the selection of sites for excavation and interpretation of the data would be wholly beyond the control, knowledge, or influence of American scholars. The Endowment supports foreign archaeology only on a gifts-and-matching basis, the gifts coming mostly from private citizens in relatively small amounts. Major projects include the preparation of the first archaeological map of the Theban Necropolis in Luxor, Egypt (the first time non-French scholars have been involved in this area); the UNESCO-sponsored project to survey archaeological sites and undertake digs before the construction of the Upper Euphrates Dam in Turkey floods an historically invaluable region; and the excavation of the agora in Athens, generally considered the most important of the sites of antiquity.

American archaeology has also been assisted with grants like that to Virginia's Historical Landmarks Commission for study of the British fleet sunk in the York River during the Revolutionary War battle at Yorktown.
c. Research materials

The Endowment is the sole source of long-term support in either the Federal Government or the private sector for the creation of major reference works, scholarly editions, and translations of national and international significance in the humanities. While the immediate recipients of the Endowment's grants for research materials - whose professional skills are essential to the nation's research potential - are of necessity a small number, there are legions of researchers, scholars, students, and members of the public who make use of the archival materials, the dictionaries, bibliographies, atlases, and encyclopedias which are the end-products of the grants. To illustrate: The Atlas of Early American History, a superb example of the collaboration of modern scholarship, design, and technology, has already sold over 4,000 copies to libraries, schools and individuals since its publication in late 1976. Four of the bibliographies currently receiving Endowment support have a combined total of 6,126 institutional and 34,143 individual subscribers; it is estimated that even the smallest of these is consulted by researchers 1.1 million times in the course of a single year.

Since 1977 Endowment grants have helped make possible bibliographic control in the following fields of the humanities: American and English Literature, Modern Foreign Languages, American History, Philosophy, History of Art, History of Music, Asian Studies, History of Law, History of Science, Classics, Women's Studies, and Black Studies.

Endowment grants are also making possible the preparation of the first dictionaries for the Assyrian, Hittite, and Sumerian languages - reference works which will open to scholars the hitherto inaccessible documents and literature of these significant cultures. By supporting the lexicographical research and compilation of native American language dictionaries - such as the Navajo-English/English-Navajo Dictionary, a Commanche-English/English-Commanche Dictionary, three dictionaries for the Salish Indian tribes of the Pacific Northwest, and ten dictionaries for various Alaskan native languages - not only the preservation of these languages has been ensured, but these peoples have also been aided in their efforts to maintain their cultural identity.

Grants have also been made to create distinguished biographical or historical dictionaries and encyclopedias, e.g.: Notable American Women, an historical Dictionary of Chinese Official Titles, the Encyclopedia of American Folklore, the Harvard Ethnic Encyclopedia, the Encyclopedia of Islam, the Encyclopedia of American Forest and Conservation History, and a planning study for an Encyclopedia of Mexican-American Culture.

Some grants have also established important precedents and support for the application of computer technology to the preparation of reference works for the humanities, for example, the Thesaurus Linguae Graecae,
a data base of all Greek literature written between the time of Homer and 700 A.D.

Over 100 of the Research Materials projects contribute directly to the creation of basic resources essential for the study and writing of American social history, an important Endowment objective. These include preparation of authoritative editions of the works of Frederick Douglass, George Washington, Mark Twain, of the papers of black abolitionists and of the Women's Trade Union League, and the preparation of the Dictionary of American Regional English, which is considered the most important lexicographic project since the Oxford English Dictionary.

A new Endowment initiative, the American Newspaper Project, has been identified as of first priority by the Organization of American Historians and by a large number of State libraries and historical associations. No other Federal agency provides support for this effort. By this means, each of the 50 States will be able to locate and gain bibliographic control over their newspaper archives and to microfilm important and endangered titles, thus preserving for future generations these resources essential to an understanding of the regional and local sources of American history and culture.

d. Translations

In FY 1977 the Endowment inaugurated a program for the translation of significant humanities texts from foreign languages. This step was taken in the knowledge that a good translation with notes and an introduction to establish the cultural context of the work is a research tool of great and lasting value both to scholars and to the public at large (that such work has not been celebrated or rewarded in the academy is both regrettable and well known, and this furnished an additional stimulus to the Endowment). The program has evoked a strong response - 240 applications were received for the first deadline - and competition is keen. Initially, "modern" works were excluded (to guarantee the lasting value of the works translated), but it became clear that many works of the modern era have lasting significance, and this restriction has been dropped.

With $1 million now allocated annually for translations, projects in 41 different languages have received support representing the following geographic areas: Africa, 1; Asia, 27; Russian and Eastern Europe, 19; Meso and South America, 6; Middle East, 24; Northern Europe, 25; and Southern Europe, 22. The program has already had an impact on publication policies for translations: new series are being undertaken in Near Eastern, Chinese, Japanese, Indic, and Slavic languages by university presses, and many more translations are being accepted for publication generally.
Subsidy for scholarly publications, an area of expressed Congressional interest, was instituted by the Endowment in 1977 to assure that important texts resulting from its research support would be made available to the field.

Throughout FY 78, the program continued to be restricted to products of the Endowment's own grants, but this restriction was relaxed this year. This was done to heighten competition and guarantee the quality of what is supported, to broaden the constituency of presses eligible for support, and to avoid the implication that one Federal grant was an entitlement to a second.

Since its inception in the spring of 1977, the Publications program has offered much-needed title support to presses (95% of them non-profit) for the publication of works in the fields ranging from American history and literature to ancient Greek grammar and the Japanese Constitution. Apart from works by individual scholars, the program has helped publish computerized bibliographies and other reference works, visual catalogues of collections of art on microfiche, transcriptions of oral epics, and previously unpublished documents such as Mark Twain's letters and the "Anti-Federalist Papers."

It is fair to say that without such a program, scholarly publishing would be hobbled at all but the largest and most prosperous university presses.

f. Research collections

Perhaps no area of the humanities presents a stronger case for increased support than research libraries, archives, and other collections of research materials. At the same time the growing problems in this field give pause: rising costs, increasing volume of material, and deteriorating stocks combine to indicate that new solutions are essential.

The prices of U.S. periodicals have increased annually by an average of 17.5 percent, and hard-cover books 11.6 percent, the last few years. Coupled with these increases is the sharp decline in the dollar with the resultant effect on the purchase of foreign books and periodicals. Research libraries are forced to divert funds previously used for operations to acquisitions. As a result, they are no longer able to maintain research collections and service levels at the point they were in the last two decades.

The processing of backlogs and special materials has fallen behind at a time when statistics reveal that the volume of records to be processed has accelerated dramatically. For example, the volume of records created in the Ford White House in two years is roughly equivalent to the
volume of holdings from Franklin Roosevelt's twelve years as President. If those records are not collected, weeded, processed, and preserved today, they will not exist to be consulted tomorrow.

The National Enquiry on Scholarly Communication has drawn attention to the need for establishing national bibliographic networks. The development of such a network or networks is still in the formative stage and will require significant additional funding before it is completed.

A most compelling area of need is the conservation and preservation of documentary resources. It is estimated that in the Library of Congress alone, six million volumes are so brittle that they cannot be given to a user without significant risk of damage to the book. The Endowment's Research Collections Program clearly has insufficient funds to tackle problems of this magnitude, but has made grants for model projects.

With the increasing use for research purposes of non-print documentation such as photographs, architectural drawings, oral history tapes, videotapes, and sound recordings, pressure is placed on repositories to collect these materials and make them accessible. Few standards have yet been developed for arranging and describing this material, not to mention the lack of information on how best to store and preserve it.

The range of activities supported by the Endowment during the past three years in an attempt to meet these needs can be divided into several primary areas. The first concerns processing of collections in order to make them more accessible for research, surveys to identify and ensure the deposit in an appropriate repository of materials important for research, and guides both to the holdings of a single institution and to certain classes of material wherever they may be found throughout the country. With Endowment grants, dozens of collections of books have been catalogued and archival materials of all kinds have been organized, have been put in acid-free folders and protective containers to ensure their preservation, and have had finding aids prepared so that scholars and others can use them. As a result, whole fields have been or are being opened up for research, such as women's history, Puerto Rican history, and American coal mining.

Secondly, Endowment grants for oral history and microfilming have helped ensure the survival of key records in a number of important areas such as ethnic history and labor history.

Thirdly, a few grants have been made since 1976 to encourage the development and application of national standards in a number of areas. One example is an award to the Society of American Archivists to develop and promote the adoption of an archival security program by all repositories holding valuable research resources. The Endowment has also made consultant grants to provide institutions with authoritative advice on how to deal with the problems of archival management.
Endowment grants support networking and other less formal modes of inter-institutional cooperation in order to encourage institutions to share both information and scarce resources of manpower and material. During the past three years, most responsible library administrators have come to accept the fact that no single institution can continue to collect comprehensively in all fields and all media. Even the Library of Congress now recognizes that it must rely on other libraries to collect more deeply in certain fields and also to do the original cataloging for such materials. Endowment grants have been instrumental in encouraging the adoption of the concept of "distributed cataloging," resource-sharing, and other cooperative arrangements which will help libraries make their scarce funds and personnel stretch further.

Finally, the gifts-and-matching mechanism used by the Endowment in several of its grants has helped to alert the public to the needs of research collections. Most notable is the $14 million in private support - double the amount of Federal support - which has been raised since 1972 on behalf of the nationally important collections of the New York Public Library. About half of this amount was raised in the last three years in response to the Endowment's 2-for-1 grant offer.

4. NURTURING ESSENTIAL RESOURCES IN THE HUMANITIES

a. Challenge Grants

In 1976 the Congress amended the National Foundation on the Arts and Humanities Act to include under Section 7 (h) a broad new program designed to help the nation's "cultural organizations and institutions" achieve financial stability, improve their economic well-being, and encourage new and increased sources of income. This initiative, of resounding importance to our humanities resources, was rapidly translated into the Endowment's Challenge Grants program.

Early in 1977 the Endowment staff sponsored a three-pronged publicity drive to notify eligible applicant institutions of the Challenge Grant program. First, a series of meetings was held which roughly coincided with the President's first public announcement of the program. Second, each of the Endowment's operating Divisions made special mailings to organizations and institutions regularly engaged in humanities programs. Third, the Public Information Office conducted a mass mailing to more than 30,000 persons affiliated with cultural institutions, professional associations, former grantees, and representatives of institutional interests.

The response to the program has been formidable: against four application deadlines, 850 institutions sought funds totalling more than $287 million. The Endowment, employing a set of review standards and criteria reflecting the legislative intent, has been able to honor
464 of those requests, fully utilizing the $80.5 million appropriations made, or requested, through FY 1980. This four-year Federal appropriation will have generated at least $241 million in non-Federal money on behalf of these 464 institutions. The initial two-year Federal appropriation, for FY 1977-78, of $26.5 million, produced new and/or increased contributions from the private sector to the grantees of $105,547,632. The ratio of these figures is 1:3.98 - well in excess of the three-to-one matching requirement of the Challenge Grant program.

The Endowment has made the Challenge Grants program accessible to more than a small, continuing clientele; the agency recognizes its constituency numbers somewhere around 20,000 institutions eligible to receive its support. The Endowment, therefore, has extended Challenge Grants to help initially not just some important national resources, but as many widely spread community resources as possible. The spread of grant recipients has been broad, embracing a wide range of organizations and institutions concerned with the humanities, including colleges and universities; public and research libraries; centers of advanced study and independent research institutes; museums; genealogy societies; historical societies, villages, and archives; folklore centers; university presses, and local and national organizations.

Because of the high volume of applications and the limited funds available, the Endowment limits Challenge Grants to no more than one to an institution. Large institutions, some of whose constituent parts have a function and purposes quite distinct from the primary business of the parent body - university presses are an example recognized by the Endowment - may claim exceptions on behalf of such components. Recipients of institutional Challenge Grants may also apply for Bicentennial Projects Challenge Grants. The Endowment does not currently entertain second applications from grantees already in receipt of a Challenge Grant.

The Endowment and the National Council on the Humanities do not regard the Challenge Grants program as a vehicle to provide permanent aid, nor as a means of enlarging the scope of the humanities by helping to create new institutions or extraneous and new ventures. Rather, we consider that it is intended to secure more effective, long-term, private and non-Federal support for existing institutions in the humanities; to generate, by such support, relatively stable management and operations; and, in time of economic need, to help prevent an attenuation through financial distress of institutions' capacities and the services they render to the humanities generally.

Challenge Grant applications seeking support of "projects" eligible for funding consideration through the Endowment's regular
grant programs are not accepted. An exception is made for Bicentennial Challenge Grants, which encourage a continuing observance of the Bicentennial period through support of humanities projects which bring the public and private sectors together to assess "where our society and Government stand in relation to the founding principles of the Republic" and to find "new processes for solving problems facing our Nation in its third century." So far, few Bicentennial applications have been received, and only two such grants have been made. Neither grantee has requested a lower matching ratio. One Bicentennial grant, for $375,000, is to the Bicentennial Council of the Thirteen Original States Fund, Inc., to help support its thirteen-year "Great American Achievement" program. The other is for "Project '87," sponsored jointly by the American Historical Association and the American Political Science Association. With Endowment funds of $250,000, these two associations will undertake a three-year program of studies of the American Constitution which, in turn, will provide material for curricular development and public-oriented programs in subsequent years.

Not until Challenge Grants are completed - and they run generally from two to three years - will we have a full sense of the real impact they are making. However, based on annual narrative reports, it is clear that the grants are serving institutions well. The funds generated by the Federal Challenge are contributing to the creation or expansion of endowments; the beginning or strengthening of development and fund-raising offices; the retirement of debts; the ability to meet increasing costs and inflationary pressures; expenditures on capital improvements, conservation efforts and preservation; the purchase of needed equipment and materials; building of cash reserves and streamlining cash flow demands of institutions; and generally modernizing and making more effective administration and management procedures.

The Challenge Grant program at this stage appears to be a timely and major contribution to the well-being of the humanities in America.

To give you a detailed insight into the functioning of this new and very valuable program, I am attaching to this report a list by States of Challenge Grants awarded by the Endowment during the three cycles of FY 1977-78-79 (Annex 5); a summary of these same grants by type of institution (Annex 6); a tabulation of matching gifts by categories of institutional recipient for FY 1977-78 (Annex 7); and a tabulation of matching gifts by category of donor for FY 1977-78 (Annex 8).

C. Management

The large and varied program of grants which I have described is managed by the Endowment this year at a cost of slightly over 7 percent of
our appropriation, and only 5.5 percent of all appropriated and gift funds administered by the Endowment. These are very respectable figures, but they are by no means the whole story. For good management is closely tied to general policy objectives, and to effectiveness of operations as well as economy in their conduct. This is particularly so in government, and we are fully conscious at the Endowment of what I referred to in my statement to this Committee at the time of my nomination to be Chairman of the Endowment as the demands of the public and of Congress "for our public agencies to be models of good management, efficient and thoughtful administration." One of my first steps on taking office was therefore to create the post of Deputy Chairman for Management and to fill it with the most able and experienced talent I could find. With his assistance, and that of the Endowment's managerial and administrative staff, we have proceeded to a number of changes and improvements in Endowment operations, the more important of which I wish to submit to your attention.

1. Improved planning and information

The NFAH Act calls on the Endowment to help develop a national policy of support for the humanities. But effective policy depends on solid information about needs, trends, and opportunities, and little hard data about these areas is presently available. We have therefore moved to give greater priority to the collection, analysis, and dissemination of critical information about the status of the humanities. Because of limited staffing only a few sectors can be selected for study in any year. Currently these are the status of the humanities in two-year colleges and the supply/demand situation regarding Ph.D.'s in the humanities. In the coming year the Endowment will begin to develop a comprehensive analytical picture of the financial, material, and human resources that support the humanities in the U.S.

At the same time, the Endowment's own internal data processes will move from a manual system to a computerized system in order to permit staff to better analyze and evaluate our grant-making, and to place it into the context of national needs.

2. Treasury funds

Among the distinguishing characteristics - and strengths - of this nation's cultural life have been widespread local and private support and, closely linked to that, a sharing - by literally thousands of citizens - in the decision-making about the work in the humanities to be supported. The Federal Government is, and must remain, a junior partner in this enterprise. In establishing the Challenge Grant Program, the Congress has, in effect, challenged private citizens and State and local governments to recognize their responsibilities to sustain cultural institutions.

We are very pleased to report that at the same time that Challenge Grants were successfully generating new monies on behalf of humanities
institutions, the Treasury Fund mechanism was also able to elicit record amounts of gifts. In 1977 nearly $8 million in gifts was received by the Endowment on behalf of specific projects recommended by the National Council on the Humanities for support. During the following year over $11.7 million in gifts was offered for this purpose; and although FY 1979 has only four months left, it is clear that the current year's Treasury appropriation will be fully utilized. To sustain this momentum, the Endowment has requested for 1980 the largest amount ever - $12 million - and hopes to continue to increase the role which gift dollars play in Endowment-funded projects.

Moreover, as part of its planning and assessment work next year, the agency will seek to identify other ways of encouraging non-Federal support for the humanities.

3. Diversification of panels and staff

Because of the central role that they have in the peer review process, the Endowment continues to give priority consideration to the composition of its review panels and seeks to secure as broad a representation therein as possible. Among the reviewers and panelists used by the Endowment there has already been represented a broad segment of people from institutions ranging from community colleges to high schools and universities, from business and other areas of endeavor and from all areas of the country. However, we are particularly concerned to enlarge this pool. As one way of accomplishing this, a large number of organizations - particularly those representing minorities and women - have been solicited for names of possible panelists and reviewers. Specifically, the presidents of 42 minority colleges, universities, and associations were requested to name potential reviewers/panelists. As a result, 520 persons were identified and approached; of these, 200 expressed interest in serving Endowment programs. Their names have been placed into a computer so that the entire staff can have access to them in choosing panels. Some have already begun to serve as reviewers and panelists.

The effort to broaden representation on panels by women and minorities has been successful. Next year, no panel will have less than one-third women, and most panels will have 50 percent.

There has also been significant progress in diversifying our staff. During the past year we have welcomed the Endowment's first woman Deputy Chairman, and women have been appointed to other high-level positions. Of the five Deputy Division Directors, four are women, and 47 percent of the staff at GS-11 and above are women. Blacks, Hispanics, and Asian-Americans make up 25 percent of overall Endowment employment compared to 20.5 percent Government-wide. Since September, 1977, the Endowment has hired eight minority group members at the level of grade GS-11 and above; this has increased minority representation to 12 percent of the overall staff employment at these levels.
his Administration has also moved to increase representation of women, minorities, and persons from organized labor on the National Council for the Humanities.

With these steps, and more to come, we hope to continue opening up the Endowment and its grant process to the broadest possible array of individuals and institutions.

4. More open procedures

As a corollary to diversification of panels and staff, we have been attempting to make all of the Endowment's meetings more open to the public it serves. For the first time applicants can now be given summaries of panel comments along with a list of panelists who review their proposal. In addition, the Endowment's Annual Report is now more descriptive of the grants which have been made.

5. Administrative improvements

We have devoted a major effort, particularly this past year, to achieving increased productivity through more efficient management and procedures, and to attaining the administrative and technical expertise needed to respond to the requirements of the Federal regulatory and oversight agencies. To achieve these ends, we are reviewing all policies, procedures, and techniques used to carry out the Endowment's administrative functions with an eye to maximum utilization of manpower, elimination of duplication, reduction of paperwork, and the introduction of policy measures that will provide the necessary administrative support by the most economical means available. Significant progress toward the accomplishment of these objectives has been made in a number of areas:

a. Administrative structure: At the outset of FY 1978 the National Endowment for the Arts and the Humanities Endowment, which had previously been served by a "Shared Staff," each assumed responsibility for its own administrative and technical support. This arrangement has enabled the Endowment to establish administrative processes specifically responsive to the requirements of the humanities, and to develop and institute cost-saving techniques resulting in greater productivity and increased efficiency.

b. Management information system: The Endowment has undertaken the development of a comprehensive automated management information system. The first functional process to be automated was the Review/Evaluator and Panelist System. This system has replaced the former manual processes involved in maintaining a data bank of information on several thousand reviewers and panelists, and facilitates the information retrieval and selection of reviewers and panelists needed to participate in the application review process. Ultimately, the system will also support the administrative functions of accounting, budgeting, program planning and grants administration.
c. Administrative efficiencies: During the past year several major improvements in the internal operations of the Humanities Endowment were achieved. Two of these - computerization of payroll accounting and the arrangement of consultant and panelist services by letter rather than contract - have saved several positions. (They in turn have been allocated to create an Upward Mobility program.) Because of other improved procedures, grantees are now notified of their awards and reimbursed for their outlays in one-quarter of the time it took in 1977.

6. Improved coordination with other Federal agencies

Pursuant to Presidential directive, and to the intent of Congress as expressed in the basic legislation, the Endowment has increasingly sought to coordinate information and activities with other Federal agencies. These initiatives are aimed at preventing duplication of effort and funding, and at increasing the effectiveness of the Federal dollar spent for educational and cultural purposes. The Federal Council on the Arts and the Humanities, which is headed by the Chairman of the Humanities Endowment, has begun with the assistance of its member agencies and the cooperation of the Congressional committees concerned, to take a more active role in fulfilling its statutory responsibility to promote coordination among the cultural programs of its member agencies. During the past year the Council has focused on three areas in which more than one Federal agency has a significant number of programs: museums, arts education, and international communication. Results to date include:

1. A Memorandum of Understanding relating to international cultural matters has established a new framework for decision-making among three major agencies: the Arts Endowment, the Humanities Endowment, and the International Communication Agency.

2. A Memorandum of Understanding on the Arts in Education outlines the joint appointment by the Office of Education and the National Endowment for the Arts of a senior official to coordinate arts in education activities.

3. An Interagency Agreement concerning Federal museum programs takes the first important steps toward clarification of the responsibilities of Federal museum programs. The Agreement is among the Institute of Museum Services, NEH, NEA, the National Science Foundation, and the Smithsonian Institution.

4. A new edition of the Cultural Directory is nearing completion and will be published by the Smithsonian Press this fall.

5. A thorough review of the Arts and Artifacts Indemnification Program, the Federal Council's only assigned program, is underway and is expected to be completed shortly.

Other activities currently in progress under the aegis of the Council include work on energy issues relating to cultural institutions,
efforts to coordinate the activities of Federal agencies in the area of Folklife, and the drafting of a new Executive Order relating to Federal design.

II. NEEDS IN THE HUMANITIES

National needs in the humanities are even greater today than they were four years ago when the Endowment last came before you for reauthorization. Through this report run the consistent threads of the needs of the men and women and institutions which make up the humanities resources of this nation, and of the demands of our citizens for greater services by those resources. In a sense, these demands by our citizens are encouraging: they show an ever wider acknowledgment of the value of the humanities in the search for a way through the complexities and perplexities of our age. But these demands are made on resources whose capacity to meet them is far from growing proportionately, and in many cases is shrinking absolutely.

Central to the difficulties of our humanities resources are the financial pressures upon them. Many cultural and educational institutions are still suffering from the ill-effects of the recession of the early 1970's, worsened by the constant drain of today's inflation. In a striking indication of this unhappy situation, the Chronicle of Higher Education recently reported that nearly 20 percent of the endowments of the nation's higher education institutions lost money during 1977-78. This was the poorest performance of these funds since the 1974 recession. Moreover, the total return of 2.5 percent for the past year fell far short of the inflation rate of 7.4 percent. It is estimated that when combined with previous years' developments, college endowments have lost roughly a fourth of their purchasing power in the past five years.

Compounding these financial difficulties is the fact, ever more evident, that the funds previously available from private foundations for many humanities institutions and their work have been sharply curtailed.

At the same time, the Endowment's own growth must - given the economic problems facing the nation - be slowed. We are faced with increasingly difficult decisions about where the Endowment's aid should go, and what its grant-making philosophy should be during the next several years.

The number of applications to the Endowment grows steadily - over 10,000 are expected next year. Of these, only about 20 to 25 percent can be funded - though probably twice that number could well be justified for funding in terms of their intrinsic merit and potential contribution to the humanities. The percentage of applications which can be supported has been declining, despite efforts to limit the number of applications received. For example, our Summer Stipend Program permits only 3 applicants per academic institution. Applications and awards in the Publications program are also limited; in many other programs, staff discourage
applicants from requesting large-scale or multi-year funding. Finally, many applications which might come to the Endowment are channeled to re-grant organizations such as the State Committees, summer seminars, and scholarly organizations (American Council of Learned Societies, International Research and Exchange Board, the Social Science Research Council).

In these circumstances, the fact is that large areas of needs in the humanities find no response from the Endowment because of limited available resources. I want to mention some of the more significant of these. In doing so, I am not presenting a specific agenda for new or increased Federal support in the future. But as these are areas of serious concern to all of us who work in the humanities, they should be brought to the Congress's attention.

A. Financial stability of humanities institutions

As recognized by the Congress when it established Challenge Grants, humanities programming requires a network of financially healthy institutions. While the responsibility for their basic health must rest primarily with the non-Federal sector, providing incentives to this sector remains a great task for the Endowment.

Thus far, the Endowment has been able to provide such incentives, either at the full level requested or at a reduced level, to some 55 percent of the Challenge Grant applications submitted during the past four cycles of review. However, given the total "universe" of eligible institutions - approximately 22,250 - the Endowment has in fact reached only a very small percentage of those institutions which might benefit from the fund-raising leverage of a Challenge Grant, and from the additional infusion of funds into humanities programs and activities. For example, only 2.4 percent of the institutions of higher education, 3.2 percent of the media organizations, and 1 percent of the museums eligible for Challenge Grant funding have actually received awards.

In view of the obvious limitations of our resources, the National Council on the Humanities has recommended that during this first authorization period for Challenge Grants the Endowment consider only one grant per institution. How to aid new institutions while sustaining the flow of the new monies which have been raised by Challenge grantees - especially those serving national audiences and clienteles - is one of the most serious issues facing the Endowment as it moves into the 1980's. It is likely that at some point during the next reauthorization period, the present restriction will be modified; the extent of the change and the conditions which might accompany such a change must await future policy discussion and recommendation by the National Council. At this point, however, it seems clear that the Endowment's Challenge Grants must be part of a broader strategy comprising a variety of programmatic and advocacy measures directed at increasing local and private support for humanistic work.
B. Preservation and Conservation

One of the most pressing problems facing the humanities today centers around the conservation and preservation of books, manuscripts, photographs, sound recordings, videotapes, and other archival materials. Until now, because of budgetary limitations, we have had to limit support for preservation to requiring that collections processed with Endowment funds be stored in acid-free folders and protective containers, and, if possible, in a properly controlled environment. Unfortunately, the great majority of repositories have no climate control in their stacks.

Some Challenge Grant recipients are using their grants to raise funds for the physical renovation of library facilities and the construction of conservation laboratories in libraries, but these are few in number and trained personnel are in short supply. For major progress to be made, a broad-scale, national effort will be needed, including research and development into improved and cost-efficient technology, model microfilming programs, staff training, and renovation and climate control.

C. Reference works

At present, because of limited funds, the Endowment cannot fund research tools and reference works whose use will be primarily in the classroom. Thus, a valuable type of project with a broad audience of teachers and students is currently not receiving support.

A particular need and audience exist for reference works of a specifically regional focus. In view of our funding limitations, they receive little encouragement at present. Such works include a biographical dictionary for each State, linguistic atlases for all regions of the country, and descriptive, critical bibliographies which can be easily updated.

D. Scholarly journals

The Endowment has never had a program for the systematic support of scholarly journals; our involvement in this field has been limited to occasional subvention of specific issues devoted to a bibliography or conference proceedings. Nevertheless, such journals play an essential role in the dissemination of scholarship; for some fields (e.g., philosophy) they are the major organs of dissemination. Their economic problems, always severe, have been further aggravated by the reduction of library acquisition budgets over recent years and changes in the postal regulations. Since these journals are designed specifically to serve scholars, public support - e.g., through Challenge Grants - is not a viable prospect. But with small grants not to subsidize, but to aid experimentation with cost-cutting, cooperative, and other practices recommended by the recent National Enquiry into Scholarly Communication, it would be possible to help publications of demonstrated value strengthen themselves and the
whole system of scholarly dissemination.

E. Bibliographic networking

With the technological developments in the field of automation, a national bibliographic data base and networks are a practical possibility, as the National Enquiry into Scholarly Communication has corroborated. The Endowment has made a number of grants to encourage the creation of links between institutions both to serve as models and to collect data on the costs and benefits of such linking. For a national bibliographic network to come into effect, increased effort must be exerted to establish a uniform system that is accessible to all research libraries and archives, and to set up both formal and informal networks and clearinghouses for the exchange of information. If funding were available, the Endowment could expand its efforts to encourage projects to develop new approaches and procedures for access to data.

F. International studies

As noted above, the Endowment's support of international scholarly exchange has been gradually increasing in order to offset declining foundation support. However, that support has concentrated on only three areas - the Peoples' Republic of China, the Soviet Union, and Eastern Europe. One of the private programs supported by the Endowment - the Social Science Research Council's foreign studies program - is global in its coverage, but rarely has much more than $100,000 to distribute annually for graduate and post-doctoral work on a major area, e.g., Latin America. We are already being invited to consider a scholarly exchange program with Mexico, and it would not be surprising if, with the added stimulus of the Presidential Commission on Foreign Language and Area Studies, which is due to make its recommendations public before the end of this year, this trend continued.

Perhaps even more compelling than specialized scholarly studies is the need for greater understanding by the public of other cultures, and particularly of the historical and social background of changes currently taking place in other countries. The traditional reward system in the academic community discourages the creation of substantive work for the general public. However, as shown by the Bicentennial State Histories project, which demonstrated the usefulness and impact of research in State history aimed at the general public, the Endowment can play an important role in encouraging scholars to write for a wider audience. The whole area of international affairs is particularly appropriate for this kind of effort. Recent events in Iran revealed a staggering lack of public knowledge of the history and development of that land and its people. At a recent conference on African writers at Indiana University, the most frequently heard complaint centered around the tendency of Americans to view Africa as a monolith,
and to be ignorant of the traditions and development of the African nations. During the coming years the Endowment will be exploring ways of encouraging scholars, most particularly in international affairs, to produce works - including books, radio and television programs, and community discussion materials - that will promote increased knowledge of the history, traditions, and culture of countries of growing importance in the world today.

G. Humanities education

Changes in the nation's population mix and reduced employer demand for liberal arts graduates have produced serious problems in the humanities programs of our schools and colleges. How to assure effective teaching and a curriculum relevant to changing individual and societal needs during a time of retrenchment is a great challenge facing teachers and administrators.

The Endowment has heretofore concentrated its education aid on development of exemplary curriculum materials serving many schools or on specific projects designed to fit the needs of a specific institution. Of the estimated 30,000 humanities departments in colleges and universities and the 90,000 elementary and secondary schools, only a small proportion can be aided by current Endowment programs each year; thus the hope of effecting for the humanities the kind of national upgrading the sciences have achieved during the past 20 years has not been realized.

To expedite the renewal process and to reinvigorate a declining morale among humanities educators, three areas need particular attention during the coming years.

- infusion of the humanities into vocational/professional education;
- dissemination of information about successful humanities programs through faculty conferences and exchanges; and
- opportunity for teachers at all levels to update their subject knowledge and to relate their subjects to changing social conditions.

H. The next generation of scholars

With the steady or declining enrollments in colleges and universities, their faculties - who also constitute the bulk of the nation's scholarly manpower in the humanities - will see less turnover and an ever older average age. Leaders in humanities scholarship are concerned about the present lack of opportunity for their younger colleagues and fearful of a "lost generation" of scholars. Since different generations have different views of what constitute important subjects for research, and often have different approaches to the study of even traditional subjects, the implications of an aging humanities work force must be carefully
considered by the Endowment and other agencies which are charged with responsibility for safeguarding the nation's research potential.

While the Endowment's recent restructuring of its fellowship support will provide some small relief for younger scholars, broader scale aid - post-doctoral support, targetted fellowships, and research aids - especially for those persons not affiliated with the traditional sector of humanities institutions, may be deemed advisable if the nation is to have its humanistic scholarship continuously renewed and strengthened. In this connection it should be expected that as public-oriented humanities programs expand and employ an increasing proportion of persons trained in the humanities, these individuals are likely to identify different kinds of subjects - and different kinds of audiences - than those to which humanistic scholarship has traditionally been directed. This development may, in turn, produce new kinds of research issues for the Endowment to address.

I. Neglected constituencies

The resources of the humanities - schools, colleges, libraries, museums, research centers and scholarly organizations - are not distributed evenly across our country or readily available to all our citizens regardless of geographic or economic circumstances. Mindful of the authority invested in the Endowment by the Congress to address this problem, we continue to seek new and increased opportunities for the public to gain access to and participate in activities and programs in the humanities.

The humanistic traditions of our country both shape and are shaped by those who pursue work in the humanities. Moreover, our strength as a nation of nations is made manifest in the cultural pluralism that mirrors the diversity of our citizens. The Endowment, therefore, will always have an obligation to ensure - insofar as it has the means - that those who seek to participate in and give form to our cultural patrimony are afforded opportunities to do so.

Of special concern to us is the need to provide assistance to ethnic and other minorities who seek to use the humanities to illuminate their separate cultural traditions, to enrich their personal lives, and to increase their contributions to our common cultural life. While the State humanities committees have been especially thoughtful in their response to this need, the problems to be addressed are national in scope and require increasing attention on the part of the Endowment. It is not simply a matter of responding to the petitions of applicants schooled in the art of "grantsmanship." Rather, equality of access to the humanities requires that the Endowment undertake special initiatives - such as a program of technical assistance - to increase the availability of Federal programs of support to those who by virtue of education, geography or economic conditions have been underserved in the realm of the humanities.

* * * * * * * *
The Administration recommends to you renewal of the authorization of the National Endowment for the Humanities for the five fiscal years ending September 30, 1985. To this end, we have forwarded to the President of the Senate, with a request for its introduction and referral to this Committee, a proposal for legislation amending the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities Act of 1965, as amended. Our suggested amendments are all minor. Apart from the correction of some anomalies, they are directed at reinforcing the Endowment's ability to discharge its mission or, in one case, at improving the administration of funds.

The anomalies involved are the authority of the Endowment to make loans, which has never been used, and which Section 11 of our proposal would repeal; and the due date of the Endowment's annual report, which Section 18 would move forward from January to April, to correspond with the term of the Government's fiscal year now in effect.

The provision which would improve our administration of funds is contained in Section 19 which, besides authorizing appropriations for the Endowment's basic program and for the "Treasury Fund," would also permit the release of those indefinite appropriations to match gifts received by grantees for the purposes of Sections 5 (c) and 7 (c) of the Act. This would replace the present requirement that the Chairman of the Endowment, in order to release matching funds from the Treasury, must accept such gifts as Federal funds. The suggested change would simplify accounting, particularly in the Challenge Grant program; would recognize the impossibility of the Endowment's duplicating Treasury controls over gift funds, which are presently considered to be Federal funds but are exempt from Treasury control; and, in the case of Challenge Grants, would, without any alteration in the ratio now required between Federal funds and funds used by grantees to match them, make much easier the acceptance of private gifts in the form of "deferred giving," which is becoming increasingly important in the efforts of cultural organizations and institutions to build up their endowments.

The provisions which would reinforce the Endowment's ability to discharge its mission concern the State Programs, grants for the support of renovation of facilities, funding for support of interagency agreements, grants the Chairman is authorized to make without a prior recommendation from the National Council on the Humanities, and the Endowment's efforts to introduce into its panel review process people with diverse backgrounds.

Sections 13 and 14 of our proposal amend the provision of the Act covering the Endowment's grants to the State humanities committees by retaining the present $200,000 minimum allotment for all States of the Union, Puerto Rico, and the District of Columbia,
but exempts the four jurisdictions with populations under 200,000 - American Samoa, Guam, the Northern Mariana Islands, and the Virgin Islands - from automatic entitlement to the $200,000 minimum.

The Chairman of the Endowment is also permitted to waive, for the four jurisdictions with populations under 200,000, the requirement that their humanities committees use the first $125,000 of Federal funding to support activities which receive at least half their funding from sources other than the Endowment.

An additional change concerning the State humanities committees would alter the proportions between the block grants and discretionary grants distributed to the State committees by the Endowment. At present 75 percent of the funds appropriated by the Congress are distributed in equal amounts by block grants to each committee, and no more than 25 percent are distributed by discretionary grants. Our proposal would alter this ratio of block to discretionary grants from 75:25 to 50:50 in five percent increments over a five-year period. Further, in distributing the discretionary portion of the grants to each State humanities committee, the Chairman would be authorized to take into account such factors as the quality and focus of programs, levels of State appropriations to the humanities committee, and State population. The intent of these provisions is to give the Chairman more flexibility to encourage State appropriations to the humanities committees.

Through an anomaly in the present wording of the Act, the Chairman of the Humanities Endowment, in making grants for renovation under the Challenge Grant program, should do so on the recommendation of the National Council on the Arts. The General Counsel of the Humanities Endowment has ruled that the Chairman should act on the recommendation of the National Council on the Humanities, and the Endowment's Challenge Grants supporting renovation have been made since the last reauthorization on the basis of this ruling. The effect of Section 2 and 15 of our proposal would be to: 1) statutorily require the Chairman of the Humanities Endowment to make such grants on the recommendation of the National Council on the Humanities; 2) remove the authority to make grants in support of construction; and 3) permit the Humanities Endowment to make grants in support of renovation on the same basis as the Arts Endowment.

Section 16 would provide specific authority for the Endowment to enter into inter-agency agreements and to support such agreements with program funds.

Section 17 would recognize the effects of inflation since the establishment in 1973 of the $17,500 ceiling on grants the Chairman can make without a prior recommendation from the National Council on the Humanities by raising this figure to $30,000, thus giving the Chairman greater flexibility in emergency situations.
As I have noted above, the Endowment makes a conscious and considerable effort to select for membership of the peer review panels persons with a broad range of esthetic and humanistic perceptions. Section 18 of our proposal would give statutory recognition to these factors, in addition to the "broad geographic representation" on those panels already required by the Act, by inserting "and culturally diverse" after "geographic" in Section 10 (a) (4).

The text of the legislation which we propose is attached (Annex 9), as is a sectional analysis of its various provisions.

I hope that these proposals will receive your favorable consideration, and that we may look forward, with your counsel, guidance, and authorization, to further support of the humanities in the service of all the people of this nation.