

THE NATIONAL ENDOWMENT FOR THE HUMANITIES

DURING THE ADMINISTRATION OF

PRESIDENT LYNDON B. JOHNSON

November 1963 - January 1969

VOLUME 111

CONTENTS OF VOLUME III

	<u>Page</u>
V. The Endowment under the Chairmanship of Barnaby C. Keeney	
A. The summer of 1966	
Personnel changes	168
Structural changes	168
Drafting the 1968 budget: the definition of education programs	173
B. Program operation, October 1966 to January 1967	
Division of Fellowships and Stipends	
Division of Research and Publication	
Division of Education and Public Programs	
C. The 1968 appropriation	
D. Planning for fiscal 1969	
E. Program operation, fiscal 1968	

V. THE ENDOWMENT UNDER THE CHAIRMANSHIP
OF BARNABY C. KEENEY

A. The summer of 1966

Personnel changes. In accordance with the understanding at the time of his appointment, Dr. Moe resigned the chairmanship of the Endowment effective June 30, 1966.^{1/} On the same day the Senate confirmed Mr. Keeney's nomination,^{2/} and he assumed office in the first week in July.^{3/} The President at this time appointed Dr. Moe to fill the resulting vacancy on the Council,^{4/} where he continues to serve.

On the staff, Philip Broughton also departed on June 30, as had been agreed, and was replaced as deputy chairman by Wallace B. Edgerton on July 1, 1966. Besides the new deputy, four professional staff positions were filled for the first time between mid-June and mid-July:

Gladys Hardy, as Director of Planning and Analysis, beginning July 11, 1966.

John Barcroft, as her assistant, beginning (at first, as an expert) on June 15.

James Blessing, as program officer and acting director of the Division of Fellowships and Stipends, on June 26.

J. Saunders Redding, as director of the Division of Research and Publication on July 5.^{5/}

Mr. Blessing was shortly appointed director of the fellowship division,^{6/} thus leaving one important vacancy on the staff, the position of director of the Division of Educational and Special Projects.^{7/}

Structural changes. When Mr. Keeney arrived on July 5, there were two broad tasks to be accomplished during the summer. One was to

prepare to process applications in volume for the first time; the other, to draft the fiscal 1963 budget for review by the Council and submission to the Budget Bureau in September.

On the processing of applications, it may be noted that about 175 proposals had been submitted to the Endowment up to the beginning of July 1966.^{8/} During Dr. Moe's tenure, there had been no serious effort to act on all of these, partly because of the lack of staff, partly because programs and policies were still being settled, and, in large part, because it was felt that it would be improper to spend more than a token amount of the available funds on the first comers, to the detriment of those who delayed submission until application procedures had been officially announced.^{9/} When Mr. Keeney arrived, the first formal announcement of programs, application forms, and instructions for submission were at the printer; they were mailed during August 1966. The announcement,^{10/} carrying out the program decisions agreed to by the Council in June, set an application deadlines for all programs in mid-October 1966 and stated that awards would be announced the following February and March. A flood of applications was expected, and it was therefore essential to set up workable means of processing them within the announced period.

The first step toward both the review of applications and the preparation of the 1963 budget was an appropriate division of responsibilities among the newly increased staff. To Mr. Blessing of the Division of Fellowships and Stipends there were assigned, naturally, the three programs of postdoctoral fellowships and summer stipends, both for

younger scholars, and senior fellowships. To the Division of Research and Publication, headed by Mr. Redding, there went the approved programs of support for general scholarly research, special historical studies, research tools, the editing for publication of the works of American authors, and support for American scholars' travel to international conferences. The third division, Educational and Special Projects, was taken to include educational television and talking books, for each of which funds had been earmarked by the Senate Appropriations Committee; the program for museums and historical societies; and the "general educational programs" with whose content John Ehle's committee had been struggling.^{11/}

Planning for the implementation of these programs called not only for delegations to the staff but for attention to the question of how matters both of program policy and of decision on particular applications were to be organized for presentation to the Council. Up through June 1966, the volume of business had been small enough to permit, and most of the decisions to be made had been basic enough to warrant, consideration of each question that arose by the Council as a whole. It was quite clear, however, that once the Endowment became fully operative this would no longer be possible.

Dr. Moe had taken some steps, during his chairmanship, toward setting up means for obtaining preliminary recommendations which could then be presented to the Council for review in as much or as little depth as they might choose and as time would permit. He had invited specialists from outside the Endowment to serve, with Council members,

on advisory panels in six areas where programs were contemplated;^{12/} he had had the Council discuss the means of evaluating fellowship applications at both the May and June meetings, with agreement on the use of outside panels reached;^{13/} he had appointed subject matter committees of Council members to deal with other applications not covered by the first two procedures;^{14/} and he had appointed the committee chaired by Mr. Ehle to deal with all matters concerning general educational programs.^{15/}

By July, it had become clear that some changes in these arrangements were called for. Each of the six advisory panels, for example, had originally corresponded to a contemplated Endowment program; but with the appropriation of \$2 million instead of \$5 million in May 1966 and the resulting redefinition of the areas of activity, four of the six special programs had been eliminated. The two programs remaining were those concerned with museums and historical societies and editing the works of American authors.^{16/} The advisory panels for both these fields met during June, each making recommendations for the use of its allotted sum (\$300,000 and \$350,000, respectively) from the available appropriation.^{17/}

Another difficulty with the early arrangements arose with the assignment of program responsibility to the several divisions of the Endowment. Under the original committee structure, applications to the Division of Fellowships and Stipends were to be reviewed by outside panels and then by a single committee of Council members; applications to the Division of Educational and Special Projects were to be reviewed,

with minor exceptions, either by the outside panel or museums and historical societies or by Mr. Ehle's committee; and most applications to the Division of Research and Publication would have been reviewed by a rather large number of subject-matter committees of the Council. This division of labor would have provided for individualized attention to research applications on the part of Council members out of proportion to the funds assigned to the research program; and the recommendations of the several subject-matter committees, in practice, would have been difficult for a single staff member, the division director, to coordinate into a coherent program with a limited amount of money. There were also questions whether the twenty-six members of the Council, many of whom were not practicing scholars, provided enough manpower and enough depth of knowledge in a wide variety of fields to evaluate all research applications adequately. These considerations called for a larger share of the work to be done within the staff, or under its direction; and such a shifting of responsibility was even more pressing with respect to general educational programs, where the two chairmen and the Council committee had already reached a near-stalemate on program content.

One of Mr. Keeney's first steps was to reorganize the Council.^{18/} The pattern that emerged was similar to the one already set up for the Division of Fellowships and Stipends. Altogether, four Council committees were organized, corresponding to the three operating divisions and the Office of Planning and Analysis. Grant applications, which would usually be handled by the operating divisions, were to be "discussed with the appropriate committee of the Council before bringing them to

the whole Council.^{19/} The Committee on Planning and Analysis, of which Mr. Keeney himself was to be chairman, was to advise on general matters, particularly in the interim between full Council meetings. While it was originally proposed that this committee also be empowered to make recommendations on grants in the interim between meetings, subject to later ratification by the Council,^{20/} this aspect of the committee's functions could not be used to any significant extent because the act required the full Council to recommend on every application. All the committees operate as a matter of convenience, without formal legal standing, and enable the full Council, meeting triannually, to get through a greater body of work than would otherwise be possible on a more than perfunctory basis.

The establishment of these four committees, accomplished in August and September 1966, cleared the way for preliminary evaluation of proposals within the staff and by outside consultants before consideration by members of the Council itself. Most of the actual work of evaluation, however, waited until later in the fall, when the earliest unsolicited proposals to the Endowment could be considered together with others received before the October 1966 deadline.

Drafting the 1968 budget: the definition of education programs.

The 1968 budget was due at the Budget Bureau in September of 1966, before any real experience had been acquired with the programs only recently approved for fiscal 1967. For the programs in the Division of Fellowships and the Division of Research and Publication, preparation of the budget draft consisted mainly of describing to the Bureau what the

Endowment intended to do in 1967 and proposing to extend the same programs, with more money, for another year.^{21/} Drafts supplied by the divisions were to be consolidated by the Office of Planning and Analysis into one document, reviewed by the Council at a meeting scheduled for mid-September, revised as necessary, and finally again consolidated with the budget of the National Endowment for the Arts by the shared Office of Administration.

For the programs in the Division of Educational and Special Projects, the task was not so straightforward. There was still no agreement about the meaning of "general educational programs," which were to be the division's main activity, and there was no division director to help determine the meaning. The process of deciding how the Ehle committee's \$500,000 was to be used, and of finding the language with which to describe these activities to the Budget Bureau, was begun by the Chairman in a memorandum in mid-July. He wrote that one of the main objectives of the Endowment was the development of teaching of the humanities in schools, colleges, and universities, and the education of the public, and that, toward that end,

"The fundamental program will be in the development of education at the level of the college and the school. . . . The Endowment will endeavor to promote such improvement through the establishment of summer institutes, special programs and workshops, and to promote the improvement of teaching materials, particularly books, through a variety of means. Five hundred thousand dollars has been set aside for this purpose from the initial appropriation.^{22/}

The "cultures of the American peoples" program was referred to by the Chairman only in a pencilled notation on his draft, "The American heritage and minority groups got left out."^{23/} The training of critics was

referred to not at all and was reinstated as an area of interest only at a later time.^{24/}

It fell mainly to the Chairman and the Office of Planning and Analysis to work out the details of the program, both for the purpose of using up the allotted \$500,000 in 1967 and of stating the intentions for 1968. So far as the 1967 program was concerned, of course, there was no doubt that the money could be used, and it would have been quite possible simply to wait and see what kinds of applications came in by the October deadline for "general educational programs." But there were several reasons militating against this.

First, one could predict about the kinds of education applications that would be received only that they would be extremely varied in purpose, that many of them would be rather narrow or even trivial in their effect and that others would be far too expensive for present consideration, and that a very basic kind of sorting out would be needed between the kinds of projects that were worthwhile in purpose and justifiable on a \$500,000 budget and those that were not. The over-all quality of applications for education projects in hand by mid-July was not encouraging. In addition, there was a strong feeling that the Endowment's function was at least as much to initiate and help share proposals as to respond to them. It was clear to all concerned that the Endowment should not abdicate its potential for leadership in favor of simply providing financial support for the status quo.

Accordingly, the thinking that went into the first drafts of the education sections of the budget began with ideas about rather concrete

projects, or types of projects, that would be worthwhile, and not with the possible total scope of the program.^{25/} It would have been possible, at a later stage of the drafting, to generalize the language in which these ideas were described, but another complication entered at that point: It was not yet clear to the staff just how specific proper budget language needed to be. All were determined to avoid a recurrence of the previous year's experience before the House Appropriations Committee, where Mr. Denton had objected that he "did not find any specific information on just how you plan to spend the \$5 million you are requesting. . . ." ^{26/} It had not yet been clearly established what kind of specificity was needed, that is, whether specific price tags were more important than completely worked out program content, nor, for that matter, whether Denton's reaction of the previous year was the standard reaction to a lack of specificity. This time, the Endowment was taking no chances, and the working assumption was that, unless the Chairman and staff were entirely clear in their own minds, a year in advance, about the specific kinds of things the education budget should be spent on, the Budget Bureau and the Congress would again find the document unacceptably vague.^{27/}

A near-final draft of the 1968 budget was submitted to the Council in mid-September.^{28/} John Ehle had already agreed graciously to the termination of his committee as such,^{29/} and the budget's description of education programs to be undertaken in fiscal 1967 was accepted by the Council without significant change.^{30/} With revisions more of language than of substance, the document sent to the Budget Bureau on

September 30 distributed the original \$500,000 for "general educational programs" in fiscal 1967 as set out below.^{31/} For clarity, the 1967 allocations for the three additional programs in the Division of Educational and Special Projects also are shown.^{32/}

	<u>Allocation for "general educa- tional programs"</u>	<u>Other 1967 allocations</u>
<u>Improvement of teaching and creation of public understanding (Division of Educational and Special Projects)</u>		
A. Structured education		
1. Curriculum dissemination (elementary and secondary level)	\$100,000	
2. Teaching internships (higher education)	64,000	
3. Institutional cooperation (higher education)	60,000	
B. Extramural education		
1. Training of critics	8,000	
2. Talking books		\$100,000
3. Television		100,000
4. Museums and historical societies		300,000
C. The Center	<u>50,000</u>	
Subtotal	\$282,000	
<u>Development and planning funds (assigned for administration to none of the three operating divisions, but corresponding in general purpose to the functions of the Office of Planning and Analysis)</u>		
	<u>218,000</u>	
Total	<u>\$500,000</u>	

On the objectives of the division's programs, the budget submission stated:

"The objectives of the Endowment are 1) to improve teaching of the humanities within the framework of education in its broadest sense; 2) to improve the public presentation of the materials and results of the humanities; and 3) to inter-relate the subjects of the humanities to each other and to bring them to bear upon the problems of public and private life."^{33/}

The budget added,

"The accomplishment of these objectives is more difficult than those of the first two programs because there is a better basis of experience on which to base programs of fellowships and research support, because of the uncertainty of what to do and how to do it, and, paradoxically, because of the many other programs directed at the improvement of teaching, as well as the efforts of the various agencies which seek to improve the quality of life in general."^{34/}

The content of the several programs in 1967, as stated in the September budget, was to be as follows:

A. Structured education

1. Curriculum dissemination (elementary and secondary level) \$100,000

"The significant curricular developments in the humanities at the elementary and secondary levels of education have only partially been disseminated into the nation's school systems. Good basic curricula exist in many fields, but the gap between development and application remains large. This reflects lack of strong rapport between the universities, which have developed the curricula, and the schools, which must decide whether to accept and apply them. The Endowment proposes to examine the problem of university-school cooperation by assembling a conference of experts from both levels who have participated in joint university-school programs in the recent past, as well as curriculum experts from both levels who are interested in establishing joint programs. Out of such a conference should come a clearer idea of the guidelines which make joint efforts at curriculum dissemination successful, and new directions may be indicated for use of new teaching methods and materials, and means of relating studies to each other and to humane life. Universities and

school systems will then be invited to submit joint proposals for a continuing program. The Endowment will select one or more of these and fund it with 1967 funds"35/

2. Teaching internships (higher education) \$ 64,000

"Although no sharp distinctions can be made, it is generally true that colleges excel in teaching, and universities in research. We propose to establish internships to permit young Ph.D.'s to work for a year with notable teachers in colleges, and then either remain in college teaching or return to university teaching. It is hoped that those who return to the universities will bring with them a greater understanding and appreciation of teaching, and that those who remain in colleges will conduct more active research programs which will, in turn, influence their colleagues. They will be in the approximate age range of the junior postdoctoral research fellows. They will be selected on the basis of their scholarly and teaching promise, and they will be assigned as far as possible to the college of their first choice but preferably not their own undergraduate college. During their year at the college they will teach a light load and serve an apprenticeship under a senior professor who is a master-teacher in one of the humanistic fields.

"During the present fiscal year we plan to make twelve experimental awards, assigning no more than one fellow to a college. . . ."36/

3. Institutional cooperation (higher education) \$ 60,000

"The thrust of our program to give young university scholars contact with liberal arts colleges is strengthened by our program to establish cooperative arrangements between clusters of colleges and junior colleges in the vicinity of a strong university. The purpose would be to increase contact between the colleges and the university with a view to strengthening the teaching of the humanities in both places--by making the facilities of the university available to the faculty of the colleges, and by making the attitude of the colleges relevant to the faculty of the university. We plan to make a few small grants in fiscal 1967 to groups of colleges and universities who have conducted joint planning for reciprocal strengthening of the teaching of the humanities. The Endowment intends to invite proposals and to select two or three of the best to try out. Each group will be expected to construct its own program, but some examples of what might be done would be exchanges of faculty

and students, opening of each institution's library to the faculty of the others, joint colloquia and departmental seminars, joint planning, research, teaching and similar activities. This program resembles but does not duplicate the program for cooperative relationships between developing institutions and well-established colleges or universities contained in Title III of the Higher Education Act of 1965. The Endowment program aims at all colleges and junior colleges regardless of their stage of development as institutions, and will support arrangements specifically for the humanities. . . . "37/

Subtotal, structured education \$224,000

B. Extramural education

1. Television \$100,000

"An obvious attack on the problem of creating greater public understanding of the humanities is through radio, television, and films. Congress appropriated to the Endowment \$100,000 for 'the study of educational television and radio' in 1967. A massive study of educational television is nearing completion by the Carnegie Commission on Educational Television; therefore the Endowment proposes to take the term 'study' in its broad sense and initiate a program to improve instructional television. Such television originates primarily from decisions of schools and universities to offer a course or set of courses via classroom television; however, many of these courses are broadcast by educational television stations to the broad public. The problem is that, in a period when the number and variety of such instructional courses are ballooning, competent television teachers and producers are scarce. Some American producers and teachers, and some foreign teachers and producers, have succeeded in creating genuinely distinguished television instruction. Our pilot program proposes to bring to this country selected groups of these foreign educational broadcasters to meet in seminar with their American counterparts, discuss and compare methods, and eventually produce on film the best of their joint ideas in a series of demonstration movies. This series of films or video tapes would show how to conceive, script, direct, produce, and teach through the medium of television various humanistic subjects. A handbook would be printed as a companion to each finished film. The series of pilot films would become a basic primer in the use of television for instruction. . . . "38/

2. Talking books \$100,000

"A more specialized example of the sort of program which the Endowment hopes to develop is the talking books program planned in 1966 and funded for fiscal 1967. The new legislation enabling the Library of Congress to provide talking books to other than blind persons will make it unnecessary to continue the program past fiscal 1967. Anticipating the five-fold increase in audience which the new legislation will bring to the Library of Congress talking books program, the Endowment plans to fund pilot projects in hospitals to demonstrate a) that there is an audience for excellent works in the humanities among the users of talking books; and b) that there is a need for such a facility among the temporarily handicapped, primarily the hospitalized. In addition, our program will produce a wider range of titles in the humanities which can then be distributed by the Library of Congress. The ultimate result will be to strengthen the program of the Library of Congress, and inspire imitation of the Endowment's program by private groups across the country through the demonstration of need and feasibility. Grants will be made to three hospitals for pilot programs on the use of talking books in fiscal 1967; this will expend the \$100,000 appropriation for this purpose, and the program will be discontinued."^{39/}

3. Training of critics \$ 8,000

"The Endowment's objective of stimulating public understanding of the humanities may be partially achieved by providing opportunities for journalists to improve their ability to write effectively about literature, the performing arts, the results of scholarship, education, and other subjects relevant to the humanities. In fiscal 1967 the Endowment envisages a small pilot program in training of critics. . . ."^{40/}

4. Museums and historical societies \$300,000

"Museums and historical societies together represent institutions which interest vast segments of the American public. There are some 5,000 museums in the country, and annual attendance is over 200 million. There are over 3,000 historical societies, containing some of the most ardent professional and non-professional historians in the country. The major problem which both groups face is improving the competence of their professional staff, both in the curatorial and the educational aspects of their work. These museums and historical societies probably represent the major untapped resource of humanistic education at both

the school level and the general level. Without well-trained staff, the resources will remain untapped; therefore, the Endowment will initiate in fiscal 1967 and continue thereafter a series of programs aimed at the up-grading of professional staff. In the present fiscal year, a small program of fellowships and internships will be established, aimed at producing well-trained personnel for the field, and providing in-service training for those already in the field. In addition, the Endowment will support regional seminars and institutes of shorter duration than the fellowships and internships, with the aim of providing training which is feasible for the staffs of small museums and historical societies, many of which cannot afford to free a staff member for more than two or three weeks. . . .

<u>"FY 1967 estimate</u>	\$300,000
Internships	\$173,000
Fellowships	60,000
Seminars and institutes	67,000
". . . ."41/	
Subtotal, extramural education	\$508,000
C. <u>The Center</u>	\$ 50,000

"All of the programs in the previous portion of our presentation have had as their impetus the desire to apply a stimulus to various segments of the population who by the nature of their work can affect a broad spectrum of the public--critics, television producers and teachers, museum and historical society staffs, and the producers of talking books. This program deals with the need to establish a focus for the humanities in relation to one another, and in relation to the national life. The Endowment proposes to conduct an investigation of the feasibility and desirability of stimulating the development of a major and general center for the study of the humanities and arts which would have a national rather than a local impact. In fiscal 1967 and fiscal 1968 we will fund a study of possible structures and programs for such a center, of the desirability of establishing one, of whether or not Washington or some other place is the most desirable location, and of possible sources of operating and capital funds. Such a center, if feasible, would symbolize the national commitment to humanistic scholarship, to the relevance of the humanities for our life, and to the improvement of the humanities in their most general sense. One need only reflect upon what other centers in the sciences and

social sciences have stimulated in the various fields to
perceive that such a center could have profoundly practical
benefits. . . . 12/

Total, 1967 funding for programs
in the Division of Educational
and Special Projects \$782,000

Personnel changes, page 1

- 1) Letter from Dr. Moe to President Johnson, June 16, 1966; letter from President Johnson to Dr. Moe, June 28, 1966.
- 2) 112 Cong. Rec. _____ (1966).
- 3) Information from personnel records, not microfilmed. See also White House Press Releases, June 28 and July 14, 1966.
- 4) White House Press Release, June 28, 1966.
- 5) Information from personnel records, not microfilmed.
- 6) Memorandum from Mr. Keeney to Robert Cox, October 6, 1966.

Structural changes, pages 2-6

- 7) See application log, not microfilmed.
- 8) See, e.g., transcript of notes, second Council meeting, May 1966, pp. 29-34 (first series of page numbers); agenda, third Council meeting, June 1966, pp. 2-3.
- 9) "Program Information 1967" and "Post-Doctoral Fellowships and 1967 Summer Stipends," included in volume II, appendix, pp. 157-164.

insert page 1

- 7) The deputy chairman, Wallace Edgerton, was appointed acting division ^{director}~~chairman~~ in addition to his other duties. Memorandum to the file, "Staff Meeting of July 5, 1966," by Mr. Edgerton.

mendation, however, was that no program of publication subvention be funded for the time being. Ibid.

- 17) Memorandum from Mr. Keeney to members of the Council,
18 July 13, 1966; memorandum from Gustave O. Arlt, G. William Miller, and John Courtney Murray, to members of the Council, August 26, 1966; minutes, fourth Council meeting, September 1966, pp. 3-5.
- 19 18) Minutes, fourth Council meeting, September 1966, p. 4.
- 20 19) Ibid.
- 21 20) See National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities, Estimates of Appropriations for the Fiscal Year 1968, submitted to the Bureau of the Budget, September 1966 (hereafter 1968 Budget, September 1966)
- 22) "Draft for Use in Planning the Budget for Fiscal 1967," unsigned memorandum by Mr. Keeney, July 19, 1966.
- 23) Ibid.
- ~~24) Memorandum to the~~
- 24) "Possible Future Program Areas," memorandum from Mr. Keeney to staff members, August 5, 1966, p. 4; "Proposed Budget," unsigned paper from the Office of Planning and Analysis, August 8, 1966.

- 25) See, e.g., "Program to Improve Instruction in the Humanities in the Schools," unsigned draft memorandum by Mr. Keeney, July 13, 1966; ~~memorandum from Gladys Hardy to Mr. Keeney~~ "Development of Teaching," memroandum from Gladys Hardy to Mr. Keeney, August 12, 1966.
- 26) See page 100 above.
- 27) See, e.g., transcript of notes, fourth Council meeting, September 1966, p. 25, when Mr. Keeney said, "Mr. Redford urged that we not do the budget in a way that would let it be approved or . . . [disapproved] by line items. I am not sure what we can get away with."
- 28) National Endowment for the Humanities, Budget Estimates and Program Plans, Fiscal Year 1968 (September 1, 1966).
- 29) Letter ffrom John Ehle to Mr. Keeney, July 19, 1966 (not micro-filmed).
- 30) See Minutes, fourth Council meeting, September 1966, pp. 6-8.
- 31) 1968 Budget, Setpember 1966, note 21 about, pp. H-20, H-33.
- 32) Id. at H-20.

33) Id. at H-21

34) Ibid.

35) Id. at H-22.

36) Id. at H-23.

37) Id. at H-24.

38) Id. at H-27.

39) Id. at H-28.

40) Id. at H-29.

41) Id. at H=29-30. The content of this section generally followed the recommendations of an advisory group on museums and historical societies which had been set up by Dr. Moe and whose conclusions had been approved by the Council at its June 1966 meeting.

42) Id. at H-31.

Program operation, October 1966 to January 1967

Division of Fellowships and Stipends.

During the summer of 1966, the administration of the three programs by then approved by the Council was assigned to the Division of Fellowships and Stipends. These were (1) senior fellowships, (2) fellowships for younger scholars, and (3) summer stipends, also for younger scholars. By the October 1966 deadlines, over 450 senior fellowship applications had been received and more than 400 applications for the younger scholar awards. Since the division's staff still consisted only of Mr. Blessing and his secretary, the chairman's special assistant, John Gardner, was assigned to assist the division. Because of the acute shortages of administrative funds for consultants, of staff, and of time, almost the entire screening of senior fellowship applications was performed by a panel of eight men meeting for two days, who produced a list of 50 recommended awards and 52 alternates. In the case of the younger scholar programs, a good many fewer applications were received than had been expected (217 applications for summer stipends, and the intention had been to make 200 awards; 195 applications for younger scholar fellowships, against an announced intention to make 100 awards). It had already been established, however, that the programs would provide a wide geographical and institutional spread and that regional review committees ought to be used to help obtain such a spread. For the younger scholar

programs, therefore, a larger number of consultants was used, and those who served on the panels had a much more reasonable workload. The review panels produced a list of 130 summer stipend applications recommended for approval and of 100 recommended younger scholar fellowships plus 6 alternates. [A fuller description of the review procedures followed in these programs follows:

REVIEW PROCEDURES

Probably
delete ->

A. Summer stipends and fellowships for younger scholars

In fiscal year 1967, the Endowment received a total of 412 applications under these two programs. The applications were first screened by the staff for eligibility. Because the programs are aimed at providing a wide geographical and institutional distribution of awards, applications were then reviewed by six regional panels of scholars generally of 5 members each. The panels were asked to consider particularly the applicant's promise as a teacher and a scholar and the contribution which his proposed work might make to his development in both those respects. The applications recommended by the regional panels were then reviewed by a further selection committee composed of the six regional panel chairmen, whose recommendations were presented to the National Council on the Humanities.

The same general procedure will be followed in fiscal year 1968.

B. Senior fellowships

In FY 1967, the Endowment received 455 senior fellowship applications. A preliminary staff screening eliminated those from ineligible applicants and separated out those applications which clearly appeared to be of inadequate quality to compete successfully for one of the 50 to 60 awards available.

All eligible applications were then reviewed by an interdisciplinary panel of eight distinguished scholars. These panelists first selected the strongest applications within broad fields of the humanities and then proceeded to the necessary step of attempting to select the best 50 without regard to field. An alternate list of over 50 more extremely strong applications was also prepared and ranked by the panel for submission to the National Council on the Humanities.

Because of the extremely heavy workload this procedure places on a single panel, and because the number of applications for senior fellowships in FY 1968 is about 600—considerably larger than last year—the national selection committee's meeting in 1968 will be preceded by 5 preliminary panel meetings. Panels will include both broad-gauge scholars from the various fields of the humanities and men with humanistic understanding from outside the academic world. Although the preliminary panels will meet in locations convenient to their members around the country, their judgments will be strictly on the basis of quality.

(from Amendments to the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities Act of 1965, Hearings before the Special Subcommittee on Labor of the House Committee on Education and Labor, 90th Cong., 1st sess., p. 43 (1967).)

The National Council on the Humanities met in January 1967 to make its recommendations on these applications. At that meeting, a major issue promptly arose about the functions of the Council and, in particular, the functions of the Committee on Fellowships and Stipends. Dr. Moe, as chairman of the committee, had come to Washington before the meeting to look over the panel's recommendations. For the rest of the Council, however, it had been impossible, again because of lack of staff and time, ^{for the staff} to consider providing any more than lists of the applications, and impossible to mail even the lists--which ran to 70 pages for senior fellowships alone--for study by Council members before the meeting. Indeed, some of the material was still being typed and duplicated on the evening before the meeting began.

When the meeting opened, the panel's fellowship recommendations were first taken up, in accordance with the memorandum on reorganization of the Council, by the Committee on Fellowships and Stipends. The committee reported back to the full Council that it was satisfied with the list of proposed younger scholar awards. On the senior fellowship list, however, Dr. Moe had found one application, ranked too low on the alternate list to have any chance of being awarded, from a scholar "without peer in the United States" in his field. He also said, probably accurately, "In many cases I know more about these applicants than the screening committee knew." (Transcript, p. 15.) The question

was whether the committee and the Council were simply to rubber stamp the panel's recommendations. (Add about one sentence on the debate and its conclusion.)

Since this controversy, the fellowship committee has reviewed fellowship recommendations only with respect to questions that could be generalized into 'policy questions,' and it has considered the appropriateness of guidelines for judging the applications and the selection of panelists; but it has not reviewed the quality of the individual applications in determining which should be granted. (Add a sentence on the change agreed on at the August planning committee meeting, so that panelists will choose more people than there are places.)

Division of Research and Publication.

The programs for fiscal 1967 that had been approved by the Council and assigned to the Division of Research and Publication to administer were these:

Scholarly research	\$ 600,000
Research tools and other aids to scholarship	300,000
Special studies in history, particularly American history (later called special studies in the history and culture of the Americas)	200,000
Travel to international scholarly meetings	50,000
Editions of American authors (including the Constellation Library)	<u>350,000</u>
Total fiscal 1967 allocation	\$1,500,000

By October of 1966, the Council had approved grants of about \$600,000 from these funds, including grants to the Modern Language Association and the Association of American University Presses that consumed the entire allocation for editions of American authors. (~~See pages 103-5 and 135 above.~~) This left some \$900,000 with which to respond to applications received under the other research programs before the October 1966 deadline.

Altogether, just under 400 applications came in before the deadline. As in the fellowship division, the division director, Mr. Redding, and his secretary, comprised the entire division staff. The chairman assigned the secretary to the Council, Anne von der Lieth,

to act as Mr. Redding's assistant during this time.

In working out a procedure for review of these applications, no serious consideration was given to having separate panels for the separate programs. The dividing lines between the programs were too hazy, the programs taken separately were too small, and the number of specialized fields encompassed in each program were too many to have justified such a procedure. It was clear, on the other hand, that the panelists must have competence in a wide range of disciplines, and there was some feeling that they should be drawn from all over the country, not just the eastern seaboard. The result was the establishment of three interdisciplinary panels, of which one met in Washington, one in Wisconsin, and one in California. Proposals were sorted out for the three panels on the basis of their members' competence. A fourth panel was later added to advise on applications in the fields of art and music, which had been insufficiently represented at the main panel meetings. When the panel meetings had been concluded, with the result that far more applications had been recommended for approval than funds permitted, an intensive series of staff meetings was held to discuss the merits of each proposal and the probable usefulness of a grant amounting to only part of the request. By this means the recommendations were narrowed to within about \$50,000 of the money available, and these recommendations, with a summary of

each application, were taken to the Council at its January 1966 meeting. As had been the case with fellowships, the process had taken too long to mail more than a small fraction of the papers to the Council in advance. The frustration of the Council was matched only by the exhaustion of the staff. Mr. Redford, chairman of the Committee on Research and Publication, reported:

"We had before us . . . recommendations which amount to \$922,000 in grants for this year and might assume future support of something close to between \$1.5 and \$2 million in future years. As we looked at the materials handed to us, we were immediately confronted with the fact that between then and 12:30 didn't offer us much time for the consideration of grants as such. A large amount of money. Also, we didn't have the kind of documentation and kind of knowledge of procedural steps and recommendations which would enable us to have confidence in the recommendations for grants that were made.

"I may say in the beginning that the discussion which followed is in no measure any criticism of the staff. Staff for this purpose is inadequate and has had to operate under the difficulties of the first go-round and has had a tremendous load of work for a short time. We would have felt like congratulating the staff on what it had done, but we had the feeling that enough had not been done, but more ought to be done in the future.

"We spent a big part of our time discussing the question of procedure and documentation. We felt, in order to be able to go through in any short period of time, or at all, the materials handed to us, we would need fuller documentation. Some of these dispositions have been made largely upon staff consideration and staff finding that they were unworthy applications. Others have been made solely by the panels with staff participation.

"It is our feeling that prior to the next go-round a great deal of consideration ought to be given to procedure and documentation, so that the committee asked to work at these things

would have before it such things as (a) full list of applications, with action taken upon each; (b) the action taken by the staff and, if staff recommendation practically disposed of it, the staff reasons should be listed; (c) that the separate action steps that were taken should be shown; (d) the action of the panel, including whether the panel's conclusion was unanimous or there were dissents, including any possible statements of panel priorities, and pinpointing marginal cases, cases in which there was division, cases which raise special policy points.

"We felt the documentation in front of us didn't give us a good basis for passing on these things. What we were thinking about is how a committee acting upon these things would feel that it had adequate information concerning the nature of the projects and what had happened at successive action stages with respect to it, with reasons for disapproval or approval. . . .

" . . .

"It was the feeling of the committee . . . that at this time we were under the necessity of taking it all on faith and conveying to you our approval with the qualification that the notification to all these people of grants should have a clear statement that grants this year do not imply prior rights over anybody else in future years." (Transcript, 1/67, pp. 27-28.)

The most basic change made, to permit[↑] the committee's objections to be met, was the dropping of application deadlines from the research program for fiscal year 1968. This permitted the work to be spread throughout the year, and dealt with by the committee at three Council meetings instead of one. It has also meant that one panel, with about fifteen members and broken up into subcommittees, has been able to consider all the applications to be taken up at a particular Council meeting. Another change is that full staff meetings

presided over by the Chairman, to review panel recommendations, have been discontinued, and that function has been carried on by committees of staff members outside the division. Finally, the division staff now includes two full-time assistants to the director.

Division of Education and Public Programs. The programs of the Division of Educational and Special Projects (later renamed the Division of Education and Public Programs) for fiscal 1967 have been described at length at pages 11-17 above. As was there noted, the decisions on what was to be done in the first year of operation were made before the division had senior staff of its own; they were concrete and specific; and, although most of the programs were not described specifically in the public announcement of 1967 programs, they were given some standing by submission to the Council and the Budget Bureau in September 1966. Internally, the budget document was taken as controlling from its completion in September until mid-March of 1967, when the Congressional presentation was submitted on the hill.

The division's first senior staff member was appointed just as the program decisions were being completed. A program officer, Stanley Ghosh, came to the Endowment in the last week of September; and the division

director, Robert Walker, was appointed on October 19. Walker's initial appointment was on a per diem basis, and he did not officially become full time until the beginning of January 1967. Between October and January, these staff members (with the program analyst, Joan Rafter) had both to prepare to implement the plans set out in the budget and to process the applications received in response to the October 1966 deadline.

Because the public program announcement had been very general, and the budget document was very specific, the two tasks of implementing budgeted programs and processing applications received did not entirely coincide. This was unlike the situation in the other two divisions, where it was possible to treat the two tasks as one. In the education division, on the contrary, the budget placed a heavy burden on the staff to generate proposals consistent with its statements of intent for the 1967 fiscal year. Two of the budgeted programs--teaching internships and museum

internships--required a separate supplemental announcement directed toward prospective individual interns, and also the special solicitation of grant applications from possible host institutions. Two more programs, television and talking books, required substantial staff work with possible grantees in order to develop proposals that would be in line with the stated intentions and that would use the \$100,000 earmarked for each by

the Congress. The allocation for a feasibility study of a national humanities center similarly called for special staff efforts to generate an appropriate proposal; this, unlike the others, had not been accomplished by the January Council meeting at which all 1967 grants were to be recommended. The program of seminars and institutes for historical

society personnel was further along by the time work began in October: the Council had agreed in September to farm the program out to the only well qualified organization, the American Association for State and Local History, and that group had shown itself willing. Finally, the allocation of \$8,000 for training of critics involved special problems. Its presence in the budget was due to the Council's hasty recommendation for a grant to be used by Miss Genauer, and a way around the conflict of interest had to be found. This was accomplished by the solicitation of some competing applications on the subject--none having been received by the October deadline--and the convening of a panel that found one of the later applications more promising.

The foregoing paragraph accounts for the implementation in 1967 of all the division's programs except three: curriculum dissemination (for the schools), institutional cooperation (among colleges and universities), and fellowships for training of museum personnel. Only

in these programs was there opportunity for the division to respond to the approximately 200 applications submitted by the October deadline under the 1967 program announcement. As a result, many applications outside the three categories were recommended for rejection in January without having been evaluated on their merits, including a sizable number identified by the staff as potentially meritorious.

At the same time, however, two projects were recommended which were outside the defined program areas. In each case the staff

recommendation, which the Council accepted, was for a grant "at the discretion of the Chairman," from any "available funds." The bases for these recommendations, as explained to the Council, were these:

a) In support of a grant to a university, not for institutional cooperation, but for a program of creative writing and translation:

"This project . . . can be considered a prototype experiment in institutional development and in the selective elevation of general education."

b) In support of a grant to a private organization concerned with the schools, not for curriculum dissemination but for a program to encourage a liking for books in underprivileged children:

"The Division . . . wants to bring this proposal up at this time because it is seriously concerned with the question of providing culturally disadvantaged children with an exposure to the humanities they have no present means of achieving. This is a direction in which the Division is most anxious to expand in the future. We feel that the aims of this proposal are so closely aligned with our own that it should be funded now, if at all possible, as a demonstration of the directions we wish to take and to attract other proposals of a similar nature for the time when we have a funded program in this area."

As the Council's recommendations were carried out after the meeting, "available funds" for these two projects were found, in the first case (\$10,000), in the planning and development budget, and in the second case (\$39,000) by the reallocation of \$50,000 from the fellowship division, whose awards had proved somewhat less expensive than anticipated. (See FY 1967 budget estimates contained in 1968 budget submission to Congress.)

Of the three programs in which it was possible to support applications responding to the public program announcement, only museum fellowships presented no problem. An adequate number of applications were received, a panel on museum and historical society grants was convened, and enough of the proposals were found strongly deserving of support to use half again as much as the budget estimate of \$60,000.

In the case of projects for the schools, the budget proposal had been to begin with a conference of experts, and then to invite proposals submitted by universities and school systems jointly. This was abandoned, presumably because of the amount of time such a procedure would have consumed and because about thirty applications dealing with elementary and secondary education were already on hand in mid-October and would have to be acted on in January. A panel meeting on these applications was also held, but with less satisfactory results than the museum panel meeting.

The concept of curriculum dissemination, as the gist of the program for the schools, had been arrived at in an effort to find a place for the Endowment in elementary and secondary education that would not duplicate on a small scale what the Office of Education was already doing on a larger one. As applied to the proposals in hand, the concept proved quite unsatisfactory. A definition drawn from the appli-

cations approved for grants in January 1967 would be that a curriculum dissemination project was either a teacher training institute which in some way differed from the institutes supported by the Office of Education under section 13 of Public Law 89-209, or a curriculum revision project involving the cooperation of university faculty as well as school personnel. After the January experience, a staff paper submitted to the Council remarked, "The present program in elementary and secondary education, which focuses on curriculum dissemination, has two difficulties: 1) it narrows activity too much; and 2) even with a narrow focus, it does not permit valid distinctions between what the U.S. Office of Education can and will do and the National Education Association can and will do."

The final program budgeted for 1967 was support for cooperation among institutions of higher education. The program had doubtless been selected not only as inherently useful but also as a way of multiplying the effectiveness of the small funds available for support of education. Together with the experimental internships for the improvement of university teaching, the institutional cooperation program constituted the entire scope of support budgeted in 1967 for higher education as such in the humanities. By the time of the January meeting, however, only a handful of proposals for cooperative programs had been received, and most of these were insufficiently developed to promise the "reciprocal strengthening" that the budget had laid out as the object of the program. To use the allocated sum of \$60,000, a two-year grant to one group of colleges was approved; two other proposals were approved conditionally, as to only one of which was the condition eventually met and the grant made. At the January meeting, roughly seventy applications for other kinds of support to higher education were rejected, many of them for want of a funded program.

The Council, when it met in January to pass upon all the applications received, accepted the staff's grant recommendations, which are summarized in the table below.

	<u>Number approved</u>	<u>Amount recommended</u>
A. Applications identified to the Council as falling within funded programs:		
1. Curriculum dissemination	5	\$ 77,160
2. Teaching residency	12	64,000
3. Institutional cooperation	3	80,500
4. Television	1	100,000
5. Talking books	1	100,000
6. Training of critics	1	8,000
7. Museums & historical socs.		
a. Internships & fellowships	16	213,000
b. Seminars and institutes	3	67,750
8. Centers	<u>1</u>	<u>50,000</u>
Subtotal	43	\$760,410
B. Applications not classified into program areas in papers submitted to the Council:		
1. Elementary & secondary ed.	1	\$ 39,000
2. Higher education	1	15,000
Subtotal	2	\$ 54,000
TOTAL	45	\$814,410

The Council was not happy about these recommendations, however.

The Committee on Education and Special Projects, reporting on its

meeting, had two contradictory complaints about the pattern of grants that was emerging: first, that the budgeted categories were too rigid, leaving insufficient room to experiment with other kinds of projects; and second, that the grants were too diffuse to make an impact. The committee report did not identify the proponents of either view; but in the language of the second objection, that the Endowment was trying to do too many different things at once, one could hear Mr. Ehle's voice protesting the disappearance from the program of the "cultures of the American peoples."

In fact, there was something to be said for both objections. On the one hand, the Council had been unable to decide to concentrate on any one program area to the exclusion of all others, and, given the size of the budget, attempts to affect several areas at once could not possibly yield immediately impressive results. At the same time, to define a limited number of areas in which applications would be entertained was to call for the rejection of other sorts of proposals--with the possibility of exceptions only to the extent that the planning and development budget could serve as the contingency fund which the Chairman had proposed at the Council's first meeting. In the two years since this first group of grants was approved, a good deal had been learned about how program emphases may be made complementary to rather than at odds with program flexibility.

The 1968 appropriation.

The recommendations made at the January 1967 meeting of the Council, consuming substantially all the Endowment's funds for the remainder of fiscal 1967, were announced in a series of press releases issued during the first two weeks of February. The awards announced amounted to almost \$3.5 million; roughly a quarter of the funds were covered by a release of February 8, which was headed, "Humanities Endowment Announces \$936,000 in Research Grants." The release included brief summaries of twenty-three research projects approved and a list of forty-six more. Among the summaries there appeared the following:

"The History of the Comic Strip

"A grant of approximately \$8,789 was approved to the University of California at Santa Barbara for completion of a study of the history of the comic strip in the 19th century. The project to be undertaken by David Kunzle will center on the work of the Swiss artist-writer Rodolphe Toepffer and the German Wilhelm Busch, precursors of satirical portraiture, whose work strongly influenced comic strip art. This study should make a great contribution to the understanding of the comic strip on a historical and sociological basis, as well as an artistic one."

Mr. Kunzle's grant was promptly attacked on the floor of the House, during a debate on increasing the ceiling on the national debt, by Congressman Durward Hall of Missouri:

"Federal grants of this nature are one more reason why the Johnson administration suffers from a credibility gap, and why the Congress should not approve another increase in the debt ceiling until this administration learns to distinguish between what is essential, and what is utter nonsense priorities [sic] when it comes to spending the taxpayer's dollars in time of war and severe strains on the Federal Treasury.

". . .

". . . If perchance, the Ford Foundation or the Carnegie Foundation wants to finance a study of the comic strips, more power to them; but why the taxpayer and why the Federal Government at a time when we are going deeper into the red, at the rate of \$56,000 a minute? . . .

". . . I am against further increases in the legal debt limit of the United States."

The Associated Press picked up one sentence from Hall's statement--

"the biggest belly laugh will not be found in the comic books, but rather in the sheer stupidity of throwing tax dollars away on projects like this"-- and the Endowment's activity began to get national publicity for the first time. Mr. Keency replied, pointing out that the artists to be studied had strongly influenced the development of political cartooning, and Dr. Hall, joined by one other member of Congress, inserted further statements in the Record.

At this point, on March 9, the Endowment testified in support of its 1968 budget request before the House Subcommittee on Interior

and Related Agencies Appropriations. For the most part, the request called for continuation of the activities begun in 1967, in most cases under program descriptions much more general than those which had been written earlier.

Julia Butler Hansen, who had succeeded to the subcommittee chairmanship on Mr. Denton's defeat,

questioned Mr. Keeney at some length both on the value of the comic strip study and on other research grants, which Hall had also attacked as a whole. Hall himself appeared before the subcommittee on March 15 and injected a new issue: he had found that Kunzle was not an American citizen and furthermore that he was outspokenly opposed to the American involvement in Vietnam. "The questions raised," Hall said, had "to do with what oversight and what control is in effect concerning the individuals to whom such grants are made." Frank Thompson, chairman of the authorizing subcommittee, also testified more generally in support of the Endowment's appropriation.

For another six weeks after the hearings the debate in the Record continued, Hall's insertions being answered by Congressmen Thompson, Moorhead, Brademas, and Morse of Massachusetts, among others.* The House committee meanwhile reported a bill including \$3,000,000 in general program funds for the Humanities Endowment--\$2 million less than the request and \$1.5 million less than the sum actually available in fiscal 1967, but still \$500,000 more than the appropriation for fiscal 1967, if the funds carried over from fiscal 1966 were disregarded.

* For footnote: Hall's insertions, after Endowment testimony, were on March 13, 20, 21, 22, April 3, 4, 10, 11, 12, 24. Supporting statements were put in the Record by Thompson on March 21 ("My colleague's language harks back to the rantings of the early 1950's when McCarthy frequently put intellectuals under fire"); by Moorhead on April 4 (inserting two editorials, one on Thompson's "Scholar Power" speech; by Brademas on April 5 (same insertions); by Morse on April 19 (inserting BCK's George Washington speech); also favorable insertions by Button of N. Y. on April 25 and by Senator McGee on April 4 and 26.

The committee report stated:

"In its consideration of the funding for this program, the Committee has made an earnest effort to achieve a practical medium between the extremes of those who have no regard whatsoever for the program and those who enthusiastically endorse it. There were many ramifications for consideration.

"With proper and careful administration, this program offers distinct cultural benefits to our people that must be available if we as a nation are to participate in a full life spiritually and intellectually.

"This requires, prudent, sensitive, intelligent administrative supervision in the highest degree. One of the best ways to achieve this is by continual appointment of panelists of the very highest caliber who are responsible for recommending awards of grants and loans. This not only materially assists in grant awards for the most meritorious projects, but also develops the highest quality of criteria available in this nation whose cultural heritage is magnificent.

The committee's ^{report} ~~recommendation~~ raised one immediate difficulty: while recommending the "continual appointment of panelists of the very highest caliber," an objective tully in accord with the Endowment's position, the committee had reduced the administrative budget to a point likely to make it extremely difficult to comply with the recommendation. The amounts recommended by the committee were as follows:

	<u>Recommendation</u>	<u>Reduction</u>
Humanities, general program funds	\$ 3,000,000	\$2,000,000
Humanities, matching funds	500,000	500,000
Arts, general program funds	4,500,000	500,000
Arts, state program funds	2,000,000	750,000
Arts, matching funds	500,000	500,000
Administration	<u>1,200,000</u>	<u>420,000</u>
Total	\$11,700,000	\$4,670,000

The 1968 Interior appropriations bill came to the floor on April 26, 1967. Attention to the Foundation's appropriation was quite out of proportion to its share of the funds involved in the \$1.4 billion bill. During the general debate, supporting statements were made by ten members, while Dr. Hall announced he would propose a further cut below the committee's recommendation, this time on the grounds not only of the fiscal situation and the supposed triviality of studying the history of cartoons and comic strips, but also because five books on political cartooning had already been written. Charles Joelson of New Jersey replied,

" . . . I feel very strongly that we will be on a very dangerous course if we try to tell the artists what they should create or the scholars what they should study. We should keep our legislative noses out of the direction of art and humanities, because, if we do not, we will be traveling on the very dangerous and deadly road to thought control by the Government.

"Although I am in favor of this program of aid to the arts and humanities, if it should ever mean that the Government will tell artists and scholars what they should create, and how they should think, I would rather withdraw my support than be party to such a perilous course." (page H4644.)

Frank Thompson observed, "I think the fact that the criticism is so terribly narrow is a tribute to the grants made by the Foundation on the Arts and Humanities." (Ibid.)

When the bill was read for amendment, Hall proposed to reduce the Foundation's funding from \$10,700,000 to the level of the

previous year, or \$9,000,000. Ten more members besides those who had spoken earlier made statements defending the committee recommendation, including the majority leader and the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, George Mahon, who spoke strongly of the importance of the program. Hall's amendment gained express support only from H. R. Gross, and it was defeated on a division vote, 29 to 99.

In the Senate, where hearings had been held on March 14, the chairmen of the two Endowments appealed for restoration of the President's full request of \$16,370,000. The result was a \$1 million increase in general program funds for the humanities, bringing that appropriation to \$4 million and the total to \$12,700,000. Since the House allowance in general program funds for the Arts Endowment had been \$4.5 million, the Senate recommendation came closer to, but still fell short of carrying out the equal funding requirement of the act. With respect to the humanities increase, however, the Senate committee report said:

"The committee values highly the programs of the State councils approved under the National Arts and Humanities Act and urges that within the \$1 million increase approved for the National Endowment for the Humanities particular effort be made to encourage those programs which otherwise would be assisted by matching funds."

Since this sentence appeared to mean that the Humanities Endowment

should grant a quarter of its funds to state councils on the arts, for programs which under the law were to be administered exclusively by the Arts Endowment, the Humanities Endowment did not follow the committee's recommendation.

The Senate, without controversy, approved the \$12,700,000 appropriation recommended by the committee on May 17, 1967. The \$1 million difference was split in conference, yielding the following as the final appropriation figures for fiscal 1968:

Humanities, general program funds	\$ 3,500,000
Humanities, matching funds	500,000
Arts, general program funds	4,500,000
Arts, state program funds	2,000,000
Arts, matching funds	500,000
Administration	<u>1,200,000</u>
Total	\$12,200,000

The appropriations act was signed on June 24, 1967, and became Public Law 90-28.

Planning for fiscal 1969

The arts and humanities act of 1965 authorized appropriations for general program of the Foundation for only three years, ending with fiscal 1968. Beginning with 1969, ~~the Endowment's plans would not be limited by a \$5 million ceiling on general program funds, but~~ new authorizing legislation as well as new appropriations requests would be required.

A draft bill to extend the Foundation's authorization was sent to Congress in June 1967, shortly before the 1968 appropriations act was signed. This bill, providing a permanent authorization for "such sums as may be necessary," was introduced by Senator Pell on June 29, 1967 (S. 2061, 90th Congress, 1st session), and by Congressman Thompson on July 10 (H. R. 11308, 90th Congress, 1st session).

It had been made clear before the bill was sent up that the authorizing committees would set a ceiling on appropriations. The reauthorization hearings involved the question, therefore, of how great an expansion in funding would be sought as well as of the directions in which the Endowment wished to expand. In anticipation of the hearings the Endowment prepared, for a May 1967 meeting of the Council, a description of proposed future programs along with cost estimates at four different levels of funding, the highest reaching an Endowment

total of \$50 million by fiscal 1971 and the lowest, \$10 million by that year. By the time the hearings began in July, a ~~still more ambitious~~ set of figures had been prepared, estimating a ^{new} budget reaching \$98.4 million for the Humanities Endowment by 1971. These last were the figures published in the hearing record.

The programs proposed called for massive increases in the fellowship and research programs, with the bulk of the funds to be used for expansion of much the same kind of activity that the Endowment had already begun in 1967 and was planning to continue in 1968. In the fellowship division two new, relatively small programs also were proposed, one to help college administrators and others prepare themselves to return to college teaching, and the other to give active people in various professions an opportunity to examine and deepen their understanding of the historical and philosophical roots of their professions. In the research division, several kinds of activity previously eligible for support within the general research program--notably humanistic types of social science research--were singled out for special attention through the earmarking of funds; the only entirely new area of activity was to be support for nonprofit university presses and journals, both scholarly and general. For fellowship and research programs together, both of which represented the primarily scholarly aspects of the humanities, the 1968 allocations were to be multiplied sevenfold by 1969 and

twenty times by 1971.

Much greater still were the increases proposed in the education and public programs of the Endowment. For these areas, roughly \$1 million had been allocated for fiscal 1968; in 1969, the proposed increase was to \$22.8 million and in 1971 to \$48.5 million. In contrast to the fellowship and research programs, the two largest items in the education and public program budget represented entirely new kinds of activity for the Endowment. Both are important to understanding of the agency's later operations.

The first of the two programs was one of institutional grants to colleges and universities "to strengthen the quality of teaching in the humanities at all levels of higher education." Such grants, in the range of \$1 million to over \$3.5 million for a several-year period,

were to be "limited to a number of carefully selected institutions just below the top which have the potential to develop into outstanding centers of teaching and research in the humanities." It was estimated that forty to fifty universities and thirty to sixty colleges might qualify as potential grantees. Related to the institutional grants program, funds were also budgeted for planning grants to enable colleges and universities to prepare for institutional development in the humanities, and for development grants aimed not at the institution as a whole but at developing, where more appropriate, selected departments, divisions, or schools within the institution. The estimates for these activities began at \$13.8 million in fiscal 1969 and rose to \$24 million in 1971.

The second program of particular significance, and the largest item in the public program estimates, was called the regional popular program. Describing this program, which was to begin with \$1 million in 1969 and to increase to \$4.5 million by 1971, the paper describing the Endowment's plans stated:

"In particular, the Endowment would seek to develop regional popular programs aimed at these objectives:

"1) to discover or create a mechanism whereby civic groups at the regional, state and local levels can participate effectively in the programs of the Endowment;

"2) to discover or create a mechanism whereby regional, state and local groups can themselves provide support for public programs in the humanities in their area; and

"3) to discover or create a mechanism whereby regional, state and local groups can share the Endowment's responsibility to create public understanding and use of the humanities.

"If these groups can be found already to exist with most communities, they will have effect more quickly and prove more permanently useful than if they must be artificially created. The present Endowment view is that the humanities can best be disseminated at a local level by various groups or combinations of groups--for example, the historical societies. The Endowment wishes to proceed as quickly as possible with its regional popular program."

The key words in this ~~program~~ description were "civic groups"; state and local historical societies, which exist in many more communities than do colleges, were the prime example. In the concept of the regional popular program there were joined the wish to promote public understanding of the humanities and the wish to promote public support for the Humanities Endowment.

The need for public understanding of the humanities had been stressed by both chairmen and by the Council from the beginning. On one occasion, in September 1966, the Council had considered squarely the question of what proportion of the Endowment's resources should be directed to a public program, as opposed to support for scholarship and even as opposed to support for formal educational programs. The document being considered at that time had projected, for development of teaching and education of the public together, the allocation of less than a quarter of the Endowment's funds in the years 1969-1972, with

about three-quarters going to fellowships and research. It was pointed out that the proportions did not reflect the relative importance of public understanding and of scholarship, but rather than there was not yet a good basis from which to project a larger public program for the future. The Council strongly urged, with the Chairman's full agreement, that the tentative plans for future public programs be greatly enlarged. (9/66, pp. 13-14, 16, 83.)

During the Endowment's first year of operation, however, almost none of its grants had been aimed at the general public immediately and directly. This was in part because the shortage of funds had dictated their use in a way that would eventually have a multiplier effect, as through the training of critics who write for the general public and, in the largest program, through training of museum and historical society personnel who would in turn improve institutions visited by far more people than the Endowment could have hoped to reach directly. In part, also, appropriate groups known to be able to conduct successful museum training programs could be found; and no readily available such/base existed for programs involving the public directly.

But direct involvement of members of the public also was needed, especially if one wished for demonstrable as well as inferred benefits from the public program. A member of the Council, Gerald Else, put the need in this way:

would be willing, whenever necessary, to let the members of Congress know of their continuing interest in the arts and humanities. I would think that the selection of such groups might vary from region to region. Certainly alumni associations, some labor groups, and some church groups ought to be interested. At this point I am only suggesting it as an idea to be explored, because I think the need for such a mechanism will be with us for quite a while."

Not long afterward Congressman Reifel also wrote that he had urged a group in South Dakota "to establish a State Council for the Humanities similar to the State Council on the Arts . . . /because he felt/ that such an organization, if spread across the nation, could give you a base of support that Members of Congress would be willing to listen to."

With respect to state councils, the Endowment had already established a position, although in a slightly different context. In September 1966 the question had been raised with the Council as follows:

"The Arts Endowment is required, under the National Foundation for the Arts and the Humanities Act, to support State art agency programs at a cost of \$2,750,000 annually. Because of the inclusion of both of the Endowments under the Act, several states, most notably Colorado, have established Councils on the Arts and the Humanities, thereby raising the question of encouraging the development of such joint councils."

At that time, the possibility was noted that "including the humanities in more state agencies could help to spread publicity about our programs," but the staff had doubts on several scores: questions were raised as

to "(1) the general relevance of such agencies to the goals which the Endowment has established, (2) whether involvement with such agencies might lead to a formalization of State programs in the humanities and the requirement that they be funded through the Endowment, and (3) the capability of agencies of State government to make significant contributions to the advancement of the humanities." The conclusion

had been "that the Endowment should be friendly toward such agencies but should not become closely involved with them." This attitude was unchanged in the description of regional popular programs as published in July 1967: "If . . . groups can be found already to exist with(in) most communities, they will have effect more quickly and prove more permanently useful than if they must be artificially created."

Nevertheless, when Mr. Reifel's letter suggesting the establishment of state humanities councils arrived, the staff had already been thinking in not entirely dissimilar terms. The regional popular program was first described to the Council in May of 1967 in a paper that assigned it one more purpose besides those stated in the later published version: "to discover or create a mechanism whereby the American public can be made aware of the activities and importance of the Endowment." On historical societies as the mechanism, the paper said:

"Their variety and membership makes them a desirable exponent of the humanities. There are nearly 3,500 historical societies, whose membership includes all spectrums of a community--businessmen, doctors, lawyers, housewives, local officials, teachers, professors. Such a membership could represent NEH persuasively to the local community and to the Congress."

Or, as an unedited draft of the paper had put it, "Imagine NEH, in short, as having between 1-2 million local agents, spread all over the country."

* * * * *

Hearings on the Administration bill to extend the Foundation's authorization began, as in 1965, with a joint meeting of the House Special Subcommittee on Labor and the Senate Special Subcommittee on Arts and Humanities. There were two days of joint hearings on July 12 and 13, 1967, followed by further House hearings on July 18 and 26 and further Senate hearings on August 15 and 16. Both subcommittees were generally friendly. Mr. Keeney testified that the actual needs in the humanities were on the order of \$150 million a year and would rise in three years to \$200 or \$300 million annually. Reconciling those figures with the \$98.4 million estimate for 1971, he explained that a partial contribution by the government would generate much larger private expenditures. For the Arts Endowment, Roger Stevens placed the needs at \$130 million to \$150 million a year. And, in a statement

On September 27, 1967, the Senate subcommittee reported to the full Committee on Labor and Public Welfare an amended version of S. 2061. The authorization provided was for two years. In the course of amending the act to provide this extension of section 11(a), the authorizing subsection for general program funds and the only subsection that was to expire, the bill also placed a two-year limit on all other program fund authorizations. That is, matching funds and funds for state arts programs, originally authorized permanently in sections 11(b) and 11(c) of Public Law 89-209, were changed to two-year authorizations as well. The amounts approved by the subcommittee for the two years were as follows:

	<u>Fiscal 1969</u>	<u>Fiscal 1970</u>
Humanities, general program funds	\$27,500,000	\$40,000,000
Humanities, matching	2,500,000	5,000,000
Arts, general program funds	22,000,000	32,000,000
Arts, state program funds	5,500,000	8,000,000
Arts, matching	2,500,000	5,000,000
Administration	as necessary	as necessary
	-----	-----
Total	\$60,000,000	\$90,000,000
	+	+
	administration	administration

(Note:

This may be the place to point out the change in the principle of equal funding. The formula in the original authorization was--

Humanities general programs = Arts ^{general} state programs

and

Humanities matching = Arts matching + Arts state programs

Appropriations acts in 1967 and 1968 had not carried out the first part of this formula, but had given Arts more than half of the general program funds.

In the new authorization, the formula became--

Humanities general programs = Arts general programs + Arts state

and

Humanities matching = Arts matching

My question is, how far was the decisive thing the Humanities promise to start regional programs more or less equivalent to Arts state programs? I'm aware of the published Senate language encouraging regional programs, but that can't tell the whole story.)

Response to [unclear]

*(The Senate funds go beyond
Senate language on
establishment of regional
programs)*

The subcommittee bill also included several other amendments in Public Law 89-209. The major ones affecting the humanities were as follows:

- (1) Matching of unrestricted gifts. (Explain.)
- (2) Authority for Chairman to approve or disapprove any application involving \$5,000 or less, without prior Council recommendation, if pursuant to delegation by the Council and later reviewed by them. (Explain very briefly.)
- (3) Amendment of the definition of the humanities to include "the study and application of the humanities to the human environment." (Explain very briefly.)

No further action was taken on the 1969 authorization before the 1969 appropriations request was submitted to the Bureau of the Budget at the end of September, 1967. The cost estimates for 1969 submitted at the authorization hearings had called for humanities program funds of \$41.4 million, rising to \$98.4 million by 1971. The estimates for 1969 submitted to the Budget Bureau, based on the expected subcommittee action, amounted to \$27.5 million, a reduction by one-third. Essentially the same programs were retained in the ^{appropriation request;} planning; the share of the fellowship and research programs at the lower level remained constant at about 45 per cent. Between education and public

programs, however, the proportions shifted somewhat: institutional planning and development grants, by far the largest item in the July reauthorization estimates, had to be reduced disproportionately to keep other programs viable at the \$27.5 million level; and the estimate for regional popular programs was actually increased between July and September, from \$1 million to \$1.2 million for fiscal 1969.

At this stage, in November 1967, the Council met for the first time in six months, the administrative budget having been too small to finance more than three meetings a year. The Council had been informed the previous May of the 1969 program plans, in a preliminary form, but almost no discussion had taken place except with respect to fellowship programs. The November agenda called for consideration of the new programs proposed for 1969, but it did not make clear what kinds of recommendations, if any, the Council could effectively make, since the document had already been submitted to the Budget Bureau. The meeting was also heavily weighted with discussion of problems of immediate program operation on the one hand and, on the other, of matters too general to affect program planning directly. In part for these reasons, the November discussion of 1969 programs was not, from the staff's viewpoint, altogether constructive.

The Committee on Education and Public Programs reported no reactions whatever to the \$7 million program of institutional planning and development grants, and on the regional popular program it was remarked only that a good deal of study would be required. More interest was aroused on the part of the committee members present by two smaller programs--elementary and secondary education, and films, radio and television--about which their guidance on program particulars had specifically been asked.

The Committee on Research and Publication took issue with the earmarking of special funds for cataloguing of research libraries and for translation, and with a new program beginning subsidies for scholarly publishing. On the reasonable assumption that the final 1969 appropriation would be something under \$27.5 million, it recommended that these programs be the first to be eliminated. The committee did, however, approve setting up special programs, if funds permitted, for support of social science research and for support of American research institutes.

The main issue on 1969 programs, raised by the Committee on Fellowships and Stipends, concerned "lateral entry fellowships," the experimental program to enable highly qualified former college teachers, after having spent a number of years in academic administration or elsewhere, to become current again in their fields and prepare to return to teaching. The committee had not liked the program in May, did not

like it in November, and did not consider itself bound by the fact that a motion in May to drop the proposal had been defeated. A renewed motion, after much discussion, was carried. At the same time, the committee objected that too little money was projected for expansion of the senior fellowship program, and none at all for fellowships for the large class of scholars of less than the very distinguished standing needed to win a senior fellowship award, but still more than five years beyond the doctorate (the limit on eligibility for younger scholar fellowships and summer stipends). Finally, the committee expressed in November, as it had in May, a strong interest in providing fellowships for high school teachers, notwithstanding the immense cost of reaching significant numbers through such a program. They agreed reluctantly to hold the matter in abeyance while the staff tried to devise a program not overlapping the Office of Education's activities or to work out coordinated arrangements.

After the November meeting, the Budget Bureau took action on the 1969 request that made it easy indeed to drop the new program proposals to which the Council had objected. The \$27.5 million request was cut by two-thirds, to \$9,050,000. The staff rewrote the budget once more for submission to Congress, incorporating the changes asked by the Council and several others as well. Again, fellowship and

research programs together were maintained at about 45% of the total request, with fellowships for professions the only new program now budgeted. In the education program, the institutional grants originally projected at as much as \$3.5 million apiece were now budgeted at \$2 million altogether, and became "planning and small scale development grants to improve the quality of humanities instruction" at "a wide variety of institutions." thus "providing a solid base for a major institutional grants program in fiscal 1970 or thereafter." The share allotted to public programs again increased, from 14% to 19% of the total, or \$1.75 million.

Program operation, fiscal 1968

During this preliminary period of work on the 1969 authorization and appropriation, the Endowment was also starting on its second year of actual program operation. The announcement of programs for fiscal 1968 had been issued in April 1967, with the notation that all programs described were subject to the availability of funds. As has been mentioned earlier, the 1968 budget request proposed continuation of substantially the same programs begun in 1967. Since in 1967 there had been available two years' appropriations together, totalling \$4.5 million, the appropriation of \$3.5 million for 1968, although technically an increase, actually called for more than a twenty per cent cutback in programs below the level ^{of the previous year.} ~~contemplated by the published announcement.~~

In the Division of Fellowships and Stipends, the 1968 programs were as follows:

	<u>1967 actual obligations</u>	<u>Allocation from 1968 appropriation</u>	<u>Total available 1968*</u>
Younger scholar fellowships	\$ 814,170 (100)	\$ 536,000	\$ 575,636 (68)
Summer stipends	256,194 (128)	176,000	176,000 (117)
Senior fellowships	756,450 (57)	528,000	566,995 (36)
Total	<u>\$1,826,814</u> (285)	<u>\$1,240,000</u>	<u>\$1,318,631</u> (221)

* Includes carryover from 1967 and refunds received during 1968.

Apart from the substantial decreases in funding for fellowship programs--taken up, in the case of summer stipends, mainly in a reduction of the grant amount rather than in the number of awards--one other main change ~~was~~ was made in ~~the operation of~~ the fellowship programs for 1968.

The program of younger scholar fellowships and summer stipends, as described in the original 1966 budget submission, ^{had been} was intended in part "to recapture the importance of teaching." At the first meeting of the Council, when fellowship programs were discussed, and some members were expressing doubts about whether the Endowment should undertake them, the program was defended on the ground that its emphasis on teaching, in addition to scholarship, was nearly unique. In the announcement of the program, however, the only way that was found to carry out this intention was to state that institutional nomination of candidates (which the program required) was to be based on the individual's "teaching and productivity in scholarship"; and to request, in letters of reference, "some particular comment about the individual's promise as a teacher."

As early as November 1966, a month after the first deadline for applications, there was staff criticism of the program as over-emphasizing the research function, ~~and a narrow kind of research at that,~~ and ignoring other ways in which individual development--the

purpose of the program--might be brought about. The criticism was confirmed in discussions with the panelists who were then reviewing the applications, and the chairman of the panel (~~Nell Eulich, memo to JHB, 2/13/67~~) later wrote a detailed memorandum on ways in which the program might be improved. She suggested, among other things, "(I)t should be stated in the instructions that the Endowment is willing to reward further study and learning for the purpose of teaching as well as research. . . . on the line of . . . the better parts of the former Ford Fellowship program in which breadth of training was emphasized rather than narrowness of specialty.

In an effort to meet this problem, the scope of the younger scholar fellowship program was enlarged in 1968. The new announcement made it clear that proposals need not include the production of a manuscript, and it was stated:

"The primary purpose of these awards is to support scholarly and intellectual growth.

"The Endowment has established two categories of these fellowships for 1968-69:

- (a) Fellowships for further study and research in an applicant's central area of interest, and
- (b) Fellowships designed to support general study in a field tangential to an applicant's primary area of interest.

" . . . The aim of . . . (fellowships under category b) is to enable the individual to develop scholarly competence in a secondary field by wide reading and familiarization with its primary documents and bibliographic tools as a means of understanding better his primary area of interest. The tangential field may be in the natural or social sciences as well as in the humanities. "

For senior fellowships, the announcement said:

"While the Endowment will generally look for proposals bringing work into synthesis or developing new insights of major consequence to the applicant's field, for 1968-69 the Endowment will award fellowships not only (a) for study, research, and writing in an applicant's central area of interest, but also (b) to support systematic study in a field tangential to an applicant's central interests, in the natural or social sciences as well as in the humanities, or (c) to enable scholars who have worked primarily as specialists to prepare works of broad public relevance and appeal. "

The changes in the younger scholar fellowship program had only a moderate effect during the second year of the program: 41 out of 299 applicants for younger scholar fellowships labelled themselves as in category B, and 7 out of 68 successful applications were in this category of broadening rather than specialized study. [Closer evaluation of the accomplishments of this program has, for the past four months, been delayed to permit the completion of this history.]

With respect to senior fellowships, the concern of the Committee on Fellowships and Stipends was at first expressed in terms of encouraging applications from nonacademic applicants, who might be more likely

than others to write "works of broad public relevance and appeal." The second year's senior fellowship awards, however, included only one free-lance writer out of 36, while Columbia and Yale received nine awards between them and nearly all the rest went to other major universities. The Council, acting on the second year's fellowship competition in November 1967, was concerned on several scores: the concentration of awards in a few places; the general character of the successful applications, which were called "excellent and distinguished but enormously safe," "gilt-edged securities"; the financial situation permitting only 30-odd awards as against 600 applications received, of which 250 had been judged very good and 99 outstanding; and the corollary lack of opportunity for younger, less well established men to win fellowships and the inability of their universities to give good advice on whether they should even bother applying. As a result, Council members strongly

urged the future enlargement of the senior fellowship program beyond the sums then projected, or the establishment of a new intermediate level fellowship program, or both; and it was resolved that choices between senior fellowship applications of equal quality, in the future, should take into account the desirability of a geographical spread and a spread among different types of institutions.

The programs of the Division of Research and Publication, with the appropriation of \$3.5 million for fiscal 1968, were cut back slightly less than those of the Division of Fellowships and Stipends, but the problems created by the reduction were scarcely less severe.

The comparative figures for 1967 and 1968 were as follows:

	<u>1967 actual obligations</u>	<u>Allocation from 1968 appropriation</u>	<u>Total available 1968</u>
Research	\$1,128,498 (81 grants)	\$ 885,000	\$ 927,280 (78 grants)
Editing and publication	350,000 <u>(2 grants)</u>	300,000	300,000 <u>(1 grant)</u>
Total	\$1,478,498 (83)	\$1,185,000	\$1,227,280 (79)

The two line items "research" and "editing and publication" require a word of explanation. The division had begun to operate in 1967, it will be recalled, with five separate program categories, each with funds specifically budgeted. In the process of review of applications in the first year of the program, distinctions among the categories had not been maintained. Reviewing panels were instructed only as to the total amount of money available, and the staff, for lack of time as much as for any other reason, made no attempt to measure their recommendations against the funds earmarked for each of the five categories. The 1968 announcement of programs still contained vestiges of these categories, but it has continued to be the case that distinctions among them are not made a factor in review of applications.

For budgetary purposes, on the other hand, the two categories listed above were recognized beginning with the fiscal 1968 appropriations submission to the Congress. "Research" is given an extremely broad definition; "editing and publication" was limited to support for two projects in 1967 and one in 1968. The continuing project, the Endowment's largest to date, is the Modern Language Association's Center for the Editions of American Authors, which is producing authoritative editions of the writings of Emerson, Hawthorne, Mark Twain, and other nineteenth century authors, including some previously unpub-

lished materials. The second project in 1967, ~~completed only recently,~~
as yet incomplete
 was a study by the Association of the American University Presses of
 several questions related to scholarly publishing, including the question
 of making popular, inexpensive reprints of the CEAA volumes widely
 available. The study dealt also with the need for subsidies to scholarly,
 nonprofit publishers, for the production of books and articles written
 as a result of Endowment grants and otherwise; and no program for
 support of publication as such was instituted pending the results of that
 study. For practical purposes, therefore, during fiscal 1968, the term
 "editing and publication" meant a grant of \$300,000 to the MLA and
 that only. Other kinds of editing projects were handled within the frame-
 work of the general research program.

(To cover here:

1. Renewal problem.
2. Inability, with limited funds, to give affirmative encouragement in fields etc. that need encouraging.
3. Corollary complaint about too many bibliographies etc.

Then:

- a short parallel section on education and public
- a section finishing up the action on the authorization and 1969 appropriation
- a section covering the May Council meeting: new directions as determined by lack of money and the need for relevance.