

Remarks by
Lynne V. Cheney, Chairman
National Endowment for the Humanities

at the
76th Annual Meeting of the
Association of American Colleges
San Francisco, California

January 13, 1990

It is indeed a pleasure to be here today at this gathering sponsored by the Association of American Colleges. With an organization that has so long been an advocate of the humanities making this event possible, I know that I do not have to begin in the way I often do: that is, by explaining what the humanities are. There is confusion on this point, as my mail frequently makes clear. I received a letter not long ago addressed to the Natural Endowment for the Humanities--a mistake that has a certain woodsy charm about it. My favorite misaddressed piece of mail, though, was a card sent to me recently at the National Endowment for the Amenities.

Being here gives me opportunity to thank the American Association of Colleges for its support of the humanities and also to congratulate this organization for the excellence of its research on higher education generally. Reports like Integrity in the College Curriculum, which has become something of a classic, and the more recent Those Who Can are remarkable for their frank assessments of our colleges and universities, as well as for specific recommendations for change. In the world of higher education, making frank assessments and specific recommendations isn't always easy. As those of you at this conference know well, the academy can be a contentious place, with rules of engagement far tougher than those that

prevail in the political world at large. In Congress, for example, even the hardest battles are usually fought by opponents who shake hands at the end of the day. This is not out of selflessness or nobility, understand, but out of the pragmatic recognition that the foe in this fight may be the friend you need in the next one. A certain civility is found to be useful.

But this pragmatism seldom has an equivalent in the academic world, where the approach to battle tends to be scorched earth, everytime. Thus, it is small wonder that much commentary about what is taught and learned in our colleges and universities occurs at a level of abstraction so high that it cannot possibly cause offense. And it is all the more noteworthy that the American Association of Colleges has avoided this course, choosing instead to engage the issues in direct, concrete, and provocative ways. I am deeply grateful--and I think we should all be--for the work of this organization.

For those of us at the National Endowment for the Humanities, taking up general education and core learning in colleges and universities, as we did in 1989, has been a logical development from earlier efforts. In 1986, we funded a survey by the National Assessment of Educational Progress to assess what seventeen-year-olds in the United States know. The

results were dismaying, as we reported in 1987 in American Memory, our congressionally-mandated study of elementary and secondary education. More than two-thirds of the nation's seventeen-year-olds were unable to locate the Civil War within the correct half-century. More than two-thirds could not identify the Reformation or Magna Carta. By vast majorities, students demonstrated unfamiliarity with the works of such writers as Dante, Chaucer, Dostoevsky, Austen, Whitman, Hawthorne, Melville, and Cather.

Subsequently, in connection with our 1988 congressionally-mandated report on the state of the humanities, we funded a survey of college and university requirements that showed it was possible to graduate from almost 80 percent of the nation's four-year colleges and universities without taking a course in the history of Western civilization and from more than 80 percent without taking a course in American history. In 1988-89, it was possible to earn a bachelor's degree from:

- o 37 percent of the nation's colleges and universities without taking any course in history;
- o 45 percent without taking a course in American or English literature;
- o 62 percent without taking a course in philosophy;
- o 77 percent without studying a foreign language.

When we put these figures together with the earlier NAEP study showing how extensive were the gaps in knowledge of seventeen-year-olds, we began to be concerned about what college graduates know. The picture that the survey research seemed to paint was of many students graduating from high school without knowing as much as they should about the humanities and subsequently going to college where they aren't required to learn much more.

To test this hypothesis, the NEH asked the Gallup organization to conduct a survey of college seniors' knowledge of history and literature. Twenty-five percent of the college seniors that Gallup tested were unable to locate Columbus's voyage within the correct half-century. About the same percentage could not distinguish Churchill's words from Stalin's, or Karl Marx's thoughts from the ideas of the United States Constitution. More than 40 percent could not identify when the Civil War occurred. Most could not identify Magna Carta, the Missouri Compromise, or Reconstruction. Most could not link major works by Plato, Dante, Shakespeare, and Milton with their authors. To the majority of college seniors, Jane Austen's Pride and Prejudice, Dostoevsky's Crime and Punishment, and Martin Luther King, Jr.'s "Letter from the Birmingham Jail" were clearly unfamiliar.

It should be stressed that it is not only in the humanities that college seniors are found wanting. The National Science Foundation sent a film crew to a recent graduation at Harvard. The filmmakers asked bright, fresh-faced graduates in their caps and gowns to explain why it is that we have seasons. The graduates in the film answered the question with impressive authority--and complete inaccuracy. Most of them explained, quite self-confidently, that we have winter because the earth is farther from the sun then. Now, even if you don't know the right answer to this question, you can quickly figure out that this explanation doesn't make sense. If the earth's being farther from the sun is the crucial matter, then why isn't it winter everywhere at once, in Canberra, Australia, as well as in Cambridge, Massachusetts?

50 Hours, the report issued by the National Endowment for the Humanities at the same time as the Gallup survey, recommended a required course of studies--a core of learning--that would ensure that undergraduates have opportunities to explore in broad-ranging, ordered, and coherent ways, the major fields of human inquiry: science, mathematics, and the social sciences, as well as the humanities. Copies of this report are available, so I won't go into many details now, though I would be happy to do so during the discussion period. Suffice it for now to say that 50 Hours

reports on many colleges and universities that have established cores of learning. These institutions can be found in every part of the country; and although their numbers are still relatively few, they are growing. Still, the pace of change is slow, no doubt in part because the task is hard. To design a rigorous and coherent program for general education is to answer the question: what should an educated person know? And that is a challenging question, indeed.

Moreover, we have found what seems an intellectually respectable way of avoiding the matter. We say that what is important is not what a person knows in various fields, but whether he or she understands the methods of inquiry used. Knowledge is not the issue we say, but "approaches to knowledge"--a phrase that happens to come from Harvard's catalog but that is used, in one form or another, as the rationale for the programs of many institutions. When "approaches to knowledge" is invoked--when a college or university argues that becoming acquainted with methods is more important than acquiring knowledge of subject matter--what one typically finds in place in general education is a miscellaneous assemblage of offerings rather than what John Henry Newman called "a connected view of the old and the new, past and present, far and near." History requirements can be satisfied by studying tuberculosis in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries or by a course titled "Inequality in

America." Humanities requirements can be fulfilled by studying "Beast Literature" or "The Sport Experience"; social science requirements with a course in "Lifetime Fitness" or in "Status, Friendship, and Social Pressure," or in "The Analysis of Daytime Serials"--that's soap operas, to the uninitiated.

Now some of these courses I have cited from colleges and universities across the country may well be rigorous and well-taught, and some may well not be. The key point I mean to make with these examples has to do with limited scope. When such courses are an undergraduate's sole experience with the humanities or social sciences--as they often are, when they can be used to fulfill general education requirements--we shouldn't be surprised to find students earning bachelor's degrees and lacking knowledge of basic landmarks of human thought. Similarly, when courses such as one I came across recently called "The Two Crazies: The Mad Scientist and the Mad Artist" or another called "Drugs and Plant Hallucinogens" can be used in fulfillment of science requirements, we shouldn't be surprised when students have limited knowledge of the natural world. I had a chance not long ago to discuss the National Science Foundation film I mentioned previously with a group of recent college graduates. In the group of young people I was talking with, there was a bright young woman who was quite sure she could arrive at the explanation of the seasons that had eluded the Harvard graduates. But, please, she said, before she started figuring it out, would I remind her of whether the earth went around the sun or the sun around the earth?

This young woman, an honors graduate from a highly regarded school, had taken a science course in college, a course in relativity. She knew a great deal about that, but was missing one of science's most basic stories, the one with Ptolemy and Copernicus as its protagonists.

Now let me be clear: It is not only in colleges and universities that general education should occur. When bachelor's degree recipients do not know about the Copernican universe or Magna Carta, we are seeing the result of sixteen years of education; and it is not only in the last four that fealty is paid to processes of knowing, often at the expense of attention to knowledge itself. In fact this emphasis is much more relentless at the elementary and secondary levels.

In elementary schools, basal readers for students in early grades focus on teaching "how to identify the sequential order of events" or "how to follow directions involving substeps." Writers for the textbook industry produce prose--"plastic prose," I call it--that has the cultivation of these mental skills as its chief aim. Driven by the idea that processes of knowing are of chief importance, we give our children manufactured prose to read rather than a rich and well-considered array of literature. One mental skill particularly stressed in basal readers is "how to find the main idea," a proficiency we would all, of course, want our children

to have. In looking through basal readers, however, I have many times come across pages on which children are instructed to find the main idea and discovered that in the flat, uninspired prose on that page there was absolutely no main idea worth finding. This does seem to exemplify the difficulty of trying to teach skills without paying sufficient attention to content.

Another extreme manifestation of the elevation of process over content can be found at education conventions where publishers fill their display racks with row after row of books that promise to teach youngsters "how to think." These books are not quite content-free, but they come as close as possible. Their mainstays are exercises in seeing analogies. Is a triangle more like a human being or a wheelbarrow?

Meanwhile, looming over our education landscape is the Scholastic Aptitude Test, an examination that, in its verbal component, studiously avoids assessing substantive knowledge. Whether test-takers have studied the Civil War, learned about Magna Carta, or read Macbeth are matters to which the SAT is studiously indifferent. The emphasis that the SAT puts on what is called "developed ability," as opposed to knowledge, makes this test unique among those used by industrialized nations. When the British or French or Germans or Japanese set out to assess students at the end of secondary education, they test,

rather sensibly it seems to me, for what their students have learned.

One more instance of the elevation of process over content--this one from higher education--can be found in what have come to be known as "discourse studies," as approach to knowledge that has become enormously influential in literature and other disciplines as well. What counts most in such teaching and research is not the what. The subject can be anything: poem, play, or bumper sticker. What counts is the how: How is this text, seemingly innocent, implicated in ideology? How can it be unmasked? At a large midwestern university, the Humanities Department is currently proposing to abolish its chronologically organized Western civilization sequences and substitute three new courses: "Discourse and Society," "Text and Context," and "Knowledge, Persuasion, and Power." In the old courses, the focus was on the works of Plato, Dante, Descartes, and Rousseau. In the new ones, the emphasis is on "the ways that certain bodies of discourse come to cohere, to exercise persuasive power, and to be regarded as authoritative, while others are marginalized, ignored, or denigrated." Instead of focusing on the writings of Wordsworth and Eliot, the new courses emphasize--and again, I quote--"hegemony and counterhegemony."

Given the pervasiveness--"hegemony," perhaps I should say--of the view that ways of knowing should have preeminence over knowledge, the time has come, let me suggest, for a thorough and thoughtful examination of this idea. Many questions might be asked; let me begin the discussion by posing just two.

First: Even if we posit that the various fields of human inquiry are at the highest levels of scholarship distinguished by differing approaches, is this a matter of interest or use to most undergraduates? I come at this question from literature, and I have to say that most undergraduates I have known--most people I have known--who love plays and novels and poetry are not interested in them as methods of discourse but as sources of insight into their lives and into the human predicament. "Why are we reading," Annie Dillard asked recently, "if not in hope of beauty laid bare, life heightened and its deepest mystery probed?" There is satisfaction, of course, in seeing how language achieves beauty, heightening, and revelation--but it is the achievement itself that draws most people back time and again.

A student of Harvard Professor Robert Coles recently described the value of literature this way:

When I have some big moral issue, some question to tackle, I . . . try to remember what my folks have said, or I imagine them in my situation--or even more these days, I think of [characters from novels, like] Jude Fawley [in Jude the Obscure] or Jack Burden [in All the King's Men]. . . . There's a lot of me in them, or vice-versa. I don't know how to put it, but they're voices and they help me make choices. . . . Why don't college professors teach that way?

Many professors do, of course, including Robert Coles. But to the extent that we allow "approaches to knowledge" to distance us from knowledge itself--in this case, from the novels themselves--shouldn't we ask whether we are serving our students well? Shouldn't we ask whether we are teaching them in ways likely to encourage them to find in the humanities the wisdom and solace that generations have found?

My second question is this: When, throughout our system of education, we emphasize "approaches to knowledge," what kind of young people are we likely to produce? If we assume that it is possible to teach processes of knowing without emphasizing knowledge itself, then we can hypothesize quick-witted, nimble-brained generations that, not knowing as much as they should, nevertheless have the ability to learn quickly.

But it may also be the case that not knowing as much as one should severely hinders ability to learn at all, much less to learn quickly. Bernard Lewis, Princeton's distinguished professor of Islamic studies, told recently of teaching a graduate seminar and finding that the students in it did not know what the Crusades were. They had the modern meaning--a crusade as a cause--but no idea of the word's historical significance. This would, one would think, be a rather great hindrance to students engaging in advanced study of Middle Eastern history.

Lack of knowledge can be an obstacle to understanding the present as well as the past. A story in last Saturday's Washington Post was headlined, "East European Events Leave Busy American Teenagers Unmoved." It told of teachers across the United States trying to engage their students with the dynamic and moving events of these past few months in Poland and Hungary, Germany and Czechoslovakia--and of those teachers finding their students confused and indifferent. The students didn't have sufficient historical context to understand the significance of changes in Eastern Europe. As one teacher put it, "They don't understand what communism is in the first place. So when you say it's the death of communism they don't know what you're talking about." During a discussion in which East bloc countries were referred to as "satellites" of the Soviet Union, one student raised her hand to ask, "I'm sorry,

but what is this talk of satellites? . . . Are we talking about satellite dishes or what?"

The emphasis in our educational system on approaches to knowledge as opposed to knowledge itself is not the only culprit here. All of us in this room can think of many reasons why young people in this country do not know as much as they should. But surely the emphasis on process and the neglect of content that we can see at all levels of education is an important factor. If we do not emphasize that there are some figures and books and events that are important to know, then we shouldn't be surprised when young people don't know them. If we don't undertake the hard work of setting out a framework for learning, then we shouldn't be surprised when students don't have one and when they have difficulty making sense of new events.

Concentrating on knowledge, concentrating on what should be taught and learned, as well as on ways of teaching and learning and knowing, is not easy work. But it may be among the most worthwhile efforts that those of us concerned about education can undertake.

The generations, Bernard of Chartres once observed, are like small figures "seated on the shoulders of giants." His point was not to diminish the present and glorify the past, but

to stress the enormous benefit to the present that knowledge of the past offers. By focusing on what is important to know and helping the next generation to learn it, we lift them up so that they can in Bernard's words, "see more things than the ancients and [see] things more distant."

I would like to thank the Association of American Colleges for continuing to encourage a broad range of discussions on issues affecting our national life.

TESTIMONY OF

Robert H. Dyson Jr., Ph.D., Director

The University Museum
University of Pennsylvania
Philadelphia, PA

Before the
Subcommittee on
Education, Arts and Humanities
of the
Labor and Human Resources Committee
of the
Senate
of the
United States of America

April 5, 1990

Mr. Chairman, I would like to discuss the National Heritage Preservation Program established by Congress last year and administered by the National Endowment for the Humanities. Attached to my testimony is an overview of support for conservation during the last five years, which highlights the role played by the National Endowments for the Arts and the Humanities and the Institute of Museum Services. This was prepared by the National Institute for the Conservation of Cultural Property.

The National Heritage Preservation Program (NHPP) responds to what has long been identified as one of the highest priorities of the conservation field: helping institutions stabilize collections of material culture. In 1984, the National Institute for Conservation published two seminal reports, *Ethnographic and Archaeological Conservation in the United States* and *A Suggested Curriculum for Training in Ethnographic and Archaeological Conservation*. These reports established two critical priorities, which were to:

- stabilize collections from active decomposition; and,
- provide specialized training for preventive care training for staff members of museums as well as professional conservators.

"Material culture" can be defined as the tangible objects of a given society that reflect the ideas and activities of a people, from prehistoric times to the present. Collections of material culture may include all objects used by, made by or resulting from the use of a people and can be composed of both the cultural and natural materials of the human environment. These objects are an integral part of the record of civilization. Together with written documents contained in our libraries and archives, they provide the basis for continued learning and enjoyment by scholars, curators and the public.

Out of the more than 133 million objects reported by the sample of 364 museums in the Institute of Museum Services' 1985 study *Collections Management, Maintenance and Conservation: A Study of America's Collections*, a report funded by the Congress, more than 25% were objects of material culture. Books, documents, negatives and photographs amounted to almost 20% of the objects housed in these institutions. These are comprised principally of material that provides documentation of collections. [Note: Preserved animal specimens (29.3%), philatelic material (11.3%), furniture (6.6%) and works of art on paper (1.9%) accounted for the bulk of other kinds of objects. Previous studies estimate the number of museums at more than 5,000.]

The deteriorating conditions of many collections of material culture have been caused by inadequate or non-existing environmental and security controls, improper storage facilities and insufficient or no conservation treatment. We currently lack the human and financial resources to care for what we have. There is a severe shortage of professionally trained conservators and collections care technicians to cope with the situation.

These are not glamorous subjects. By their very nature, they are unlikely to attract private contributions or support from state and local governments without an incentive such as the NHPP. Those who support museums would

much rather be identified with the construction of a new gallery or the acquisition of an important artifact. However, such conservation needs must be met if our collections are to be preserved for present and future generations. Collections care is the essential underpinning that makes public programs possible.

The National Heritage Preservation Program was recommended to Congress to respond to the needs of collections through providing matching support grants for:

- security, fire prevention, climate control and lighting systems;
- renovation of storage space and acquisition of storage equipment and supplies;
- hardware and software computer costs and photography of objects for cataloging and documentation;
- pest control equipment;
- installation or renovation of conservation laboratories; and,
- personnel to implement and oversee these improvements.

Support is also needed for training programs for conservators and collections care technicians.

Mr. Chairman, if I may, I would like to take a minute to discuss several of these areas in detail.

SECURITY, FIRE-PREVENTION, CLIMATE CONTROL AND LIGHTING SYSTEMS

It takes a tragedy as has just happened at the Isabella Stewart Gardner Museum in Boston to bring to the public's attention the importance of museum security. Eleven paintings and a Shang dynasty bronze beaker worth more than \$200 million, according to the museum's curator, were stolen.

While we normally assume such thefts occur only in art museums, no category of objects remains immune. Items that were once mere ethnographic curiosities are now sought by art collectors, and collections currently insured for thousands of dollars are now worth millions. (A single Mayan pot, for example, may now be valued at more than \$10,000). Most importantly though, the value of these objects to our continuing education and growth as a society is priceless.

Proper documentation should be among the first steps taken to safeguard a collection. It is essential that objects be well described and photographed. If a theft occurs, a detailed description can then be circulated to law enforcement agencies as well as collectors and galleries who might unwittingly acquire a stolen object. While the world-renowned pieces taken from the Gardner Museum cannot be sold on the open market, the same protection of notoriety cannot be applied to that Mayan pot of which I just spoke. Should such an object be discovered and become a case for litigation, proper documentation is essential to its recovery. In addition, physical security (alarms, lighting, independent key systems) and proper training of security guards are essential to protecting our nation's treasures.

The same urgency applies to protection against fire. Imagine the destruction a single spark could bring to a collection of fragile textiles. Or the damage smoke poses to wooden objects. The destruction of a fire is even greater should it occur in storage areas where objects are frequently piled on top of each other, wrapped in newspapers or stored in cardboard or wooden boxes.

Many collections of material culture are kept in old buildings or historic structures that were not originally designed as museums. While they may be of historic value in and of themselves, they often require renovation and modernization to protect the collections. Even museums in newer buildings need constant maintenance or renovation to keep pace with newer technological advances.

Natural light sources such as windows and skylights are one of the chief culprits of destruction to collections in older buildings. Replacing the glass with glazed panes or screens that filter the damaging ultra-violet rays of the sun is effective protection for delicate objects and specimens. Even too much artificial light (incandescent or florescent) damages works of art on paper by promoting "mat burn," fading oil paintings and weakening the canvas support, fading textiles and hastening the destruction of ethnographic items made of natural materials. Light damage is obvious to many museum professionals but the public is frequently not aware of the damage that can occur from too much light in a gallery or storage area. Some institutions are now telling their visitors that light levels in exhibit areas have been purposely reduced for protection and preservation, particularly for textiles and paper materials. This is an example of how museums can teach the consumer about conservation.

Collections of material culture call for modern and often complex systems of climate control. Take, for instance, a collection of Native American artifacts, which might include costumes made of delicate feathers, durable pottery, woven blankets, painted wooden vessels and fur clothing. Other objects in the collection probably include perishable items such as skin, hides or bone. Each of these materials has its own needs in terms of climate control although they may all be housed in a few rooms or in the same museum gallery. An adequate system must protect each of these objects while compensating for their very different, and often conflicting, climate control requirements.

All too often, climate control does not extend beyond the exhibition space into storage areas. As I noted earlier, storage is often the most neglected part of a museum's operation. An object that has survived for millions of years in the desert sands can be destroyed within the space of just a few years in a damp basement.

RENOVATION OF STORAGE SPACE AND ACOUSITION OF STORAGE EQUIPMENT AND SUPPLIES

As you know, Mr Chairman, almost all museums own many objects which cannot all be exhibited at the same time. Indeed, museums in America often display only a small fraction of their collections while most remains in storage.

For example, at the University Museum of which I am the director, we have 1.5 million objects in the collection and only one percent is on exhibit, while 99% of the collections is in storage. The artifacts in storage are valued for their research contributions and many are never meant for public display. Storage in museums can be likened to the "stacks" of a research library. Delicate objects such as textiles must be rotated in and out of exhibitions as they are too fragile to stay on exhibition for extended periods of time, even under the most ideal lighting conditions.

Proper storage is imperative to maintaining our nation's collections. In most museums, these facilities are in appalling condition. Frequently, they are simply extra rooms or hallways that have been turned into storage areas because no other space is available. Objects are often directly exposed to the deteriorating effects of unfiltered sunlight, insects and larvae, mildew, dust or other air pollutants and fluctuating temperature and humidity. Unexposed objects are often wrapped in paper or stored in cardboard boxes whose acidic qualities hasten decomposition. Even wooden shelves and boxes can release harmful chemicals that accelerate deterioration.

Another major storage problem is the common practice of compacting: baskets are nested, pots are stacked, textiles are folded on top of another. In the process, fibers warp, weaving stretches or breaks and pottery chips or fractures. Further damage occurs when human hands must plow through piles of objects or reach between stacks of artifacts to find a given object. When shelves, boxes or stacks are improperly labeled, even more objects are subject to damage from handling.

Collections should be completely inventoried, cross-referenced, and the location of each object in storage accurately noted. Storage areas should be efficiently designed for quick retrieval with minimal disturbance to neighboring objects. Adjacent research space should exist to minimize the inefficient and potentially dangerous process of transferring objects to areas where they may be more closely studied.

TRAINING FOR CONSERVATORS AND COLLECTIONS TECHNICIANS

The National Heritage Preservation Program should also provide support for the training of conservators of material culture, another long-neglected area of need. The philosophy and practice of conserving such collections must reflect the fundamental value of the specimens as cultural documents and their potential use for scientific research. The methods of treatment often differ from the traditional approach to conservation that has been applied to paintings and other works of artistic or historical significance. Collections of art are often restored to their original appearance to display their aesthetic value and the artist's intent. Restoration treatments may also be appropriate for some historical objects which call for returning them to the appearance of a certain time. In some cases, articles from collections of material culture may require similar restorative treatment for exhibition purposes.

However, in most cases, the conservation needs of collections of material culture should take into account the fact that they are valuable scholarly reference materials. During conservation treatment, all evidence that may aid in reconstructing the original context and history of the artifact must be preserved, or at least recorded, since alteration of this documentary evidence through over-cleaning or inappropriate restoration interferes with future interpretation and research. As you can see, Mr. Chairman, this calls for highly specialized training which must foster an approach to the artifact's original function, its subsequent cultural modification and its value for future study.

Treating individual objects has traditionally been the focus in museum conservation; training programs have responded by providing specialized "medical school" instruction, educating surgeons. Highly-trained conservators spend much of their time dealing with collections care needs in their museums that others could accomplish with less training. In museums without conservators, these needs are not addressed. While much still remains to be done in this field, it is critical that training be provided in the constant monitoring of collections and their environment by training museum staff members who would serve as "paramedics" or "nurses" and would know when to call in a professional conservator.

Caring for Collections: Strategies for Conservation, Maintenance and Documentation noted that "the first step in caring for collections is the proper maintenance of their environments in storage and on exhibition." This report recommended training paraprofessional collections technicians as a primary goal. It also stated that these technicians could "handle the lowest levels of conservation—routine collections maintenance activities normally either completely neglected or done by conservators—freeing the conservator to carry out activities that require special expertise and training. Tasks such as routine environmental control monitoring, daily surveying of exhibition areas, matting, framing and preparing preliminary condition reports can be handled by a paraprofessional trained in conservation awareness"

In response to these recommendations, in 1985 the Bay Foundation committed more than \$500,000 to the Pilot Collections Care Training Program, administered by NIC, to address this need. The curriculum focused on anthropology, art, history and natural history collections and was designed to provide comprehensive training in collections care and maintenance. With the results of these pilot programs in hand and matching grants, the field is in a position to initiate ongoing training programs. The ultimate goal is to have *in every museum on a permanent basis a staff member(s) who would have as part of his or her job description essential elements identified by the four pilot programs.*

SUMMARY OF THE NEEDS

Last year, the Congress initiated the National Heritage Preservation Program with an appropriation of more than \$4.1 million. The following is an outline of what is needed in incentive matching grants to fully implement it.

Based upon a review of several studies, some of them cited above, it is estimated that in the next fifteen years there will be a need to renovate and upgrade more than 12 million square feet of storage, laboratories, preparation areas and exhibition space. The cost will average \$20 per square foot for a total cost of at least \$250 million.

Increased funding for the National Heritage Preservation Program is needed to provide the necessary impetus to raise matching funds of an equal amount to insure the preservation of our cultural heritage. Even more important, NHPP will help participating organizations convince trustees, individual contributors, businesses and foundations as well as state and local governments that collections care is an important priority. \$8.5 million in federal matching support for 15 years would meet the capital improvement needs for these collections.

Grants should be available for a maximum of one million dollars to be used and matched over a five-year period. It must be emphasized that this effort should be administered on the basis of the importance of the collections and their need. It is anticipated that those qualifying will receive support for documented needs, which will mean that fewer grants may be made each year.

We anticipate that over 15 years, a National Heritage Preservation Program funded at \$8.5 million a year would serve at least 440 institutions. The distribution pattern might resemble the following:

15 Institutions @ \$2 million to \$1.5 million	\$ 25,000,000
35 Institutions @ \$1.5 million to \$750,000	37,500,000
125 Institutions @ \$750,000 to \$250,000	40,000,000
250 Institutions @ below \$250,000	<u>25,000,000</u>
	\$127,500,000
Minimum Capital Improvements Matching	<u>\$127,500,000</u>
TOTAL	\$255,000,000

The program should require that applicants plan comprehensively for collections care. Applicants should present proposals for grant matching, raising increased operating costs that result from improvements implemented and generally increasing the public awareness of the importance of collections care. It is expected that the experience gained from the NHPP will generate new ideas and build on existing ones. For example, the Bishop Museum in Honolulu is planning to put a glass wall between an exhibition area and storage space to provide visitors with a better understanding of why storage space is needed and important. Many other innovative strategies can be used and others will be developed as a result of the NHPP.

\$1.5 million a year is needed over the proposed 15-year term of the National Heritage Preservation Program to provide matching support for collections care training courses and degree-granting programs for professional conservators.

The National Heritage Preservation Program would train more than 400 participants in collections care and 20 professional conservators each year.

Seven collections care programs, training 60 participants (a total of 420 additional staff members) each year also are required. After initial capital expenditures, annual operating costs will average \$200,000. (Three-quarters federal and one-quarter matching.) This estimate does not include space for housing the training programs, which would be provided by the museum or other institution offering them.

Three professional conservation training programs concentrating on collections of material culture, including natural history, are needed. Each program would train up to 10 graduates each year. After start-up costs, the operating budget for these programs will be \$500,000 - 600,000 each year. (One-half federal and one-half matching.) This does not include costs for basic facilities, which would be provided by the university and cooperating museum.

The following summarizes the costs for these programs.

7 Collections Care Training Programs (multi-discipline) @ between \$140,000 and 150,000 each	\$ 15,000,000
2 Degree Granting Programs for Professional Conservators @ \$250,000 each (Note: It is anticipated that the Getty Conservation Institute will support an additional program.)	<u>\$ 7,500,000</u> \$ 22,500,000
Minimum Training Program Matching	<u>\$ 13,000,000</u>
Total	\$ 35,500,000

CONCLUSION

I hope my testimony has helped illustrate how full funding for the National Heritage Preservation Program will provide the necessary support for the stabilization of collections of material culture. One area not in the current guidelines that I would like to see included in the future, if funding permits, is matching support for the installation or renovation of conservation laboratories across the country. The number of laboratories nationwide should be expanded; most of the facilities at existing laboratories need to be upgraded. Attention should also be paid to laboratories at regional centers so that smaller institutions do not have to send objects from their collections thousands of miles for conservation treatment.

Over a fifteen-year period, federal funding of \$10 million (\$8.5 million for stabilization of collections grants and \$1.5 million for training) will be required annually to address the needs of these irreplaceable resources.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to conclude by thanking this committee for its past support of conservation efforts within the federal government and to encourage you to support this vital program. In closing, I would like to quote from the President's Fiscal 1991 Budget Request to Congress, a document rarely appreciated for its memorable prose. The section summarizing support for all endowments, institute and other federal cultural agencies is entitled "Preserving America's Heritage." It eloquently sums up the reasons why our collections must be protected:

America is a nation of immigrants, whose common heritage includes the thinking, art and science of the homelands of those who have come here and are still coming here. It includes the multiple encounters of these immigrants with the continent, with each other, and with Native Americans It includes the communities, customs and folkways . . . the roots of our many pasts. The preservation, understanding and passing on of the best of this heritage is essential if Americans are to know what it is to be "American."

— *Caring for America's Heritage* —
Investing in Our Common Wealth

Our nation's heritage is embodied in its:

- artistic works;
- documents, books, film and information on magnetic media;
- historic structures;
- historical objects;
- material evidence of past and present cultures; and,
- natural history specimens.

These are the irreplaceable treasures that tell us where we have been and where we plan on going in the future. Viewed another way, these are the capital resources we must now care for so they will be available to present and future generations.

In order to assure that this heritage is available it is essential:

- to increase public awareness of the need for preserving our nation's heritage;
- to make ongoing care and conservation a fundamental priority of historic preservation organizations, libraries and archives and museums and historical societies; and,
- to coordinate conservation and preservation activities.

These are also the goals of the National Institute for the Conservation of Cultural Property, Inc. (NIC). NIC is the national forum where conservation and preservation leaders, directors of the institutions responsible for the care of our nation's heritage and decision makers work to address these challenges. NIC's programs and projects further advance these goals.

Reauthorization of the National Endowments for the Humanities and the Arts and the Institute of Museum Services is essential to continuing the progress that has been made toward developing and implementing a national conservation strategy. Such a strategy will comprehensively address collections care needs and enhance the partnership of support from individuals, businesses, foundations and state and local governments.

Through federal incentive grants, the endowments and the institute, along with the state historic preservation offices, provide leadership to thousands of private and state and local government institutions which hold these treasures in trust for all citizens. Because programs for historic preservation are not being considered by the committee, they will not be addressed in detail at this time.

The Role of the Arts and Humanities Endowments and the Institute of Museum Services

Since the previous reauthorization, the endowments and the institute have strengthened their policies and program administration. In some cases, sorely needed additional resources have been allocated to these efforts. Peer panels have

provided recommendations for improving guidelines based on their professional experience and a review of applications. For example, IMS recently launched the Conservation Assessment Program (CAP), administered by NIC. It is designed to provide museums with smaller budgets the opportunity on a first come, first serve basis to obtain an assessment of their entire museum so the collections care needs can be addressed. The CAP report will assist participating institutions in long-range planning; provide recommendations for implementing improvements; and serve as a tool for fundraising, especially at the local level. CAP is modeled after the very successful IMS Museum Assessment Program (MAP), which has proven effective in providing assistance to museums, especially those with smaller budgets.

In response to the last reauthorization, the Institute of Museum Services provided the Congress with a report, *The Nature and Level of Federal Support for Museums in Fiscal Years 1985 and 1986*. This report contains an analysis of support for conservation. While there has been no similar effort in the library and archive field, principal support for these institutions comes from the NEH Preservation and Challenge Grants Programs.

The following chart shows how the endowments and the institute support conservation and preservation activities. Grants are provided to libraries, archives, museums, historical societies and organizations that preserve film.

Program	FY '85	FY '86	FY '87	FY '88	FY '89	FY '90*
In Thousands of Dollars						
Institute of Museum Services:						
Conservation Support	\$3,219	\$3,243	\$3,200	\$2,903	\$3,200	\$3,200
National Endowment for the Arts: Museum Program	2,370	2,011	2,238	2,165	2,250	2,322
Media Arts Program	800	800	800	800	525	1,165
National Endowment for the Humanities:						
Office of Preservation	0	4,059	4,129	4,700	12,330	17,453

* Appropriation

The principle budget increase has been allocated to the NEH's Office of Preservation. In response to a NEH capability statement, the Congress provided almost \$8 million in fiscal 1989 for a comprehensive preservation program of which the most significant component is for microfilming of brittle books and serials. In fiscal year 1989, just over \$4 million was added to fund the first year of the National Heritage Preservation Program. In his 1991 budget, the President requested \$19 million for the Office of Preservation of which \$4.2 million is for the second year of the NHPP.

Grants from additional endowment programs and other federal agencies also make a valuable and important contribution to preserving our nation's heritage.

Examples include:

- The NEA Expansion Arts Program, in collaboration with the President's Committee on the Arts and the Humanities, awarded a grant to the African American Museum Association to identify works in need of conservation.
- Since 1977, the NEH Challenge Grant Program has continued to respond to applications for conservation and preservation assistance. For example, in

fiscal years 1985 and 1986, it awarded \$2,131,824 and \$588,000, respectively, to museums to address conservation needs.

- The NEH Museum Program supports conservation surveys and treatments for artifacts of significance to the humanities when these works are included in interpretive exhibitions or installations. In fiscal 1985 and 1986, this support totaled \$199,127 and \$211,199, respectively.

The Role of Other Federal Agencies

The following highlights other federal agency programs that provide some support for conservation and preservation:

- The National Historical Publications and Records Commission supports the preservation of documents and records as part of its grant program.
- The Department of Education's Strengthening Research Library Resources Program incorporates preservation of books and manuscripts into its awards. In fiscal 1988 and 1989, this amounted to \$851,000 and \$592,000, respectively.
- The National Science Foundation's Systematic Anthropological Collections and Biological Research Resources Programs offer grants to preserve collections as scientific resources. In fiscal 1989, these programs awarded grants of just over \$5 million.
- The President's budget calls for \$28.865 million appropriation for the state grants through the Historic Preservation Fund. If approved, this will support a core program of identification, evaluation, protection and assistance to local governments. It does not offer assistance to permit the states to award subgrants to restore and protect threatened National Register Properties.

Agencies such as the Library of Congress, National Archives, National Gallery of Art, National Park Service and Smithsonian Institution, have principal responsibility for caring for our federal patrimony. In addition, these institutions provide leadership and technical assistance to organizations throughout our country. For example, the Park Service publishes the *CRM Bulletin* quarterly to promote and maintain high standards for preserving and managing cultural resources. Timely information is made available to state and local governments, the private sector and other federal agencies. The Park Service plans to publish the *NPS Museum Handbook* later this year. The handbook will contain guidelines for storage, environmental controls, fire protection and other collection care issues.

Save Outdoor Sculpture!, (SOS!), a joint project of the Smithsonian Institution's National Museum of American Art and NIC will inventory and assess the condition of all outdoor sculpture in the United States. The three-year project will dramatize the perilous condition of outdoor sculpture and will provide opportunities for public and private groups and individuals to remedy this situation. A nationwide corps of volunteers will be recruited to fan out within their local communities to conduct the inventory. The goals of SOS! are to:

- Complete an inventory of all outdoor sculpture in the U.S.
- Report on the condition of outdoor sculpture in every community.
- Secure television, press and radio coverage to highlight the importance of preserving outdoor sculpture.
- Implement strategies to encourage the care of outdoor sculpture.
- Develop programs to inform the general public of the artistic and historical significance of outdoor sculpture.

Testimony
of
DELMONT R. OSWALD
Executive Director
Utah Endowment for the Humanities
on behalf of
THE FEDERATION OF STATE HUMANITIES COUNCILS
regarding
reauthorization of the
NATIONAL ENDOWMENT FOR THE HUMANITIES
before the
SENATE SUBCOMMITTEE ON EDUCATION, ARTS AND HUMANITIES
April 5, 1990

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee:

I am Delmont R. Oswald, Executive Director of the Utah Endowment for the Humanities, one of the fifty-three state and territorial humanities councils in the United States which are members of the Federation of State Humanities Councils. I also serve as a member of the Board of Directors of this Federation.

First I wish to thank you for your consistent support of Thomas Jefferson's democratic ideal of an active and informed citizenry, and for your support of agencies established for the purpose of making this ideal a reality--such as the state humanities councils and the National Endowment for the Humanities. Millions of the nation's citizens benefit each year from programs funded by these organizations which bridge the gap between the best minds and ideas at America's colleges and universities and the people living everyday lives who make up the backbone of our country. It is the enlightened citizen, the one who understands issues and options, who directly involves himself or herself in our democratic process that will fight to maintain it. The support you have shown, both financially and morally, verifies and announces to the world that a major goal of the United States Congress is to elevate its entire citizenry into that enlightenment. The agencies I represent, with your continued support, are providing the lifelong education programs essential to the welfare and growth of this democratic process. NEH Chairman Lynne Cheney, in her recent report entitled Humanities in America, has referred to this contribution as the "Parallel School," an appropriate appellation for the services we provide.

All productive people are continuing students, whether they actively study texts and ideas or simply learn from experiences and observation. What many do not recognize, however, is that learning through experience and observation must involve a personal context for the processing of information. This context is made up of one's personal history, value structure, and various environments--all of which are rooted in the humanities. It is the humanities that teach us who we are, what we are, and help to define our purposes for being. By understanding this context we are better able to design the direction our lives should take and the contributions we wish to make to our families, our nation, and the world. It is the humanities also that teach us how to learn, how to reason, how to evaluate, and how to be adaptable in a constantly changing world. No one can say that these are luxuries or elitist benefits for a select few. They are the necessary tools for survival. They are also the reasons we want to survive.

In 1952, Albert Einstein wrote, "It is essential that the student acquire an understanding of and a lively feeling for values..., a vivid sense of the beautiful and the morally good. He must learn to understand the motives of human beings, their illusions, and their sufferings in order to acquire a proper

relationship to individual fellowmen and to the community.... This is what I have in mind when I recommend the humanities as important." NEH and state humanities council projects are for all people who in some way see themselves as students, who believe that learning is a lifelong process, and who value the enlarged perspective and deepened understanding that come from stretching their minds.

A 1987 report on the humanities entitled The Humanities and the American Promise stated, "The action of the humanities always starts with the sovereign individual who reads, writes, and reflects and makes moral judgments. To this extent, education in the humanities is a do-it-yourself activity." This pronouncement reveals one reason why the Utah Endowment for the Humanities and all state councils are so successful--we provide the resources for do-it-yourself projects. The major part of our budgets go to support good ideas that spring from many places: a filmmaker with a vision, a homemaker who yearns to discuss recent literature with other readers, a citizen who needs to know more about other countries to feel informed about foreign policy issues, a history teacher whose students are fascinated by archaeology and ancient people, or a professor excited by research findings who wishes to share them with the public. One person's inspiration becomes a grant proposal, which in turn becomes a program that encourages many others to read, write, reflect, and discuss in order to broaden their own visions and improve their judgement. Thousands of people--scholars, project directors, audience members--who value the humanities are involved each year, epitomizing the volunteer spirit that is so vital to America's success. Every one of them can feel pride in their participation in these ventures that enrich the community as well as the individual spirit.

In Utah we are celebrating fifteen years of operation. Since we awarded our first grant in 1975, we have supported nearly 1300 humanities projects serving audiences in every county of the state. Our Humanities Resource Center distributes smaller programs, including media discussions, a Speaker's Bureau, and exhibits. In addition, UEH awards annually several \$500 Teacher Incentive Program Grants, two research fellowships to Utah scholars, and a Governor's Award in the Humanities. The nearly \$6,000,000 received over this period from the National Endowment for the Humanities has generated well over \$12,000,000 in local in-kind and cash contributions, all of which is administered very responsibly and with great deliberation by volunteers from the academic and public communities.

Utah's achievements include projects that have dramatically affected the cultural life of our state. UEH funds helped underwrite the first United States Film and Video Festival which now enjoys international prestige and brings thousands of visitors to our state. Through two grants to the Ute Indian Tribe, a written language of its people was produced, along with materials

to ensure its being taught and passed on to future generations. The Utah History Fair engenders interest in history among thousands of student participants and their families each year. The Utah Council for Humanities Education, a teacher support network, was founded with our aid, as were the Utah Humanities Forum, an organization for humanities administrators in higher education who rarely had occasion to collaborate, and the Utah Alliance for Arts and Humanities, a cooperative advocacy organization to promote the role of the arts and humanities in the schools.

This past year UEH funded some very diverse and exciting projects. Teachers workshops focused on South Africa, Ireland, Palestine, Israel, Afghanistan, China, the USSR, and the French Revolution. Excellent curriculum units were prepared and distributed, comparing the United States Constitution with constitutions of other nations, and teaching critical thinking skills. Several outstanding films and video tapes were underwritten, among which were a Cambridge debate format program entitled "The Issues of Privacy" and a cross-cultural documentary entitled "Native and American." Production has just been completed on "The Geography of Hope," a film biography of Wallace Stegner, a Pulitzer Prize winning author who lived and taught in Utah, and "A History of the Strawberry Valley Project," a video examining the history of Utah's oldest federal reclamation project. Other projects include a series of lectures in conjunction with the Utah Shakespearean Festival and the Greek Classic Festival, a tour of a one-man dramatic presentation on Patrick Henry, programs on Hispanic oral history, polygamy, English as an official language and the ethics of cheating. This variety and the far-reaching benefits are typical of the programs of every one of the fifty-three state councils.

Without question, I can say that the programs UEH has funded have contributed greatly to a better understanding of the lessons to be learned from the study of the humanities. In the coming years I foresee an even greater need for our programs. It has been predicted that by the year 2085 the Anglo population in most of the nation, including Utah, will become a minority. Already in our society we can see growing racial tensions, and old roots of discrimination which we hoped had perished are starting to revive. More than ever before our states and nation will have to rely on education to create a tolerance for diversity and a strong sense of community. The state humanities councils and their programs are in an ideal position to address this and other problems that will come with the changing political and economic structure of our world. As Linda Ellerbee, a prominent newspaper columnist, has written, "If we believe in absurdities we shall commit atrocities." We must do all we can to create a rational civilization that prides itself on its understanding and ethical dealings with one another. The humanities do this.

To accomplish these objectives, the Federation of State Humanities Councils strongly urges that the National Endowment for the Humanities be reauthorized for a period of three years. The programs which the Endowment supports are extremely important to our nation and the Federation believes it is valuable for the Congress, the Administration, and the public to more regularly review the development of the humanities and to focus on the inner workings of the Endowment more often. The Federation feels that a five year reauthorization period is too long and that a three year extension will keep Congressional and Administration leaders abreast of the record of achievements of NEH and the state councils.

Further, Mr. Chairman, the Federation recommends that for Fiscal Year 1991 the NEH be authorized at a minimum level of \$223 million, the amount that would be needed to meet the cost of inflation which has occurred since Fiscal Year 1981 when the NEH received \$151.299 million. For the remaining two years, the Federation would recommend that the authorization levels be set at such sums as may be necessary.

The Federation strongly supports the freedom that is provided to the state councils in developing public humanities programs as intended by the legislation and would encourage that that environment continue in the future.

Lastly, the Federation strongly supports legislation that will strengthen humanities education across the country. The humanities need to be at the foundation of any effort to improve our educational system in the future. The state humanities councils have played a vital role in the development of humanities education and any expansion should include this vital link.

In closing my testimony, I would like to share some wisdom from one of the great thinkers of our century, T.H. White. In his wonderful book THE ONCE AND FUTURE KING, he has Merlyn the magician pass on the following advice to the young King Arthur: "The best thing for being sad, replied Merlyn,...is to learn something. That is the only thing that never fails. You may grow old and trembling in your anatomies you may be awake at night listening to the disorder of your veins, you may miss your only love, you may see the world around you devastated by evil lunatics, or know your honor trampled in the sewers of baser minds. There is only one thing for it then-to learn. Learn why the world wags and what wags it. That is the only thing which the mind can never exhaust, never alienate, never be tortured by, never fear or distrust, and never dream of regretting. Learning is the thing for you." Learning is the thing for all of us, and governmental support of the National Endowment for the Humanities and the State Humanities Councils is perhaps the best way to bring this vision to the people--one of the greatest services for democracy.

Testimony
of
THOMAS H. ROBERTS
Executive Director
Rhode Island Committee for the Humanities
regarding
reauthorization of the
NATIONAL ENDOWMENT FOR THE HUMANITIES
before the
SENATE SUBCOMMITTEE ON EDUCATION, ARTS AND HUMANITIES
chaired by Senator Claiborne Pell
April 5, 1990

- good examples

Mr. Chairman, honorable members of the Subcommittee, thank you for the opportunity to appear before you today to comment on the work of the state humanities councils. I am Thomas H. Roberts, Executive Director of the Rhode Island Committee for the Humanities. It is a privilege to speak to you and a heavy burden to represent to you accurately the intensely vital and immensely varied work being carried out by the fifty-three state humanities councils. While I am familiar with some of the accomplishments of most of the councils, I can speak more authoritatively about the work of the Rhode Island Committee for the Humanities (RICH). I have been the Executive Director of RICH since 1973.

While Rhode Island is undeniably small, we share many of the properties of the other states (except the wide open spaces), and we have a population that is easily as diverse ethnically, racially and generationally as those anywhere in the country. The challenge to build a cultural education program that embraced all those interests and still drew substantively on the traditions of the humanities was one taken very seriously by the founding members of RICH. Quite frankly, it took a great deal of effort and imagination to fashion a program that could successfully match the fine scholarship available in southern New England with the determination to build an accessible, popular, representative public program for our state. But that effort has

been rewarded in Rhode Island and in every state by the rich intellectual experience afforded to millions of Americans through the programs of their state humanities councils. We have felt that it can work, that it does work in Rhode Island and elsewhere, and that the state humanities program as a whole is one that Congress and President can look at with pride.

Certainly, there is little I can tell this Subcommittee about the purpose of the Endowment or the intent of the state councils. You are all keenly aware of the philosophical underpinnings of federal support for cultural programming. What I can tell you is that it is working. If numbers alone can gauge our success, then the state humanities councils have achieved stunning levels of success. Hundreds of volunteer board members encourage thousands of humanities scholars to participate in tens of thousands of activities that reach millions of Americans. From tiny libraries in southwestern Kansas or northern Mississippi to major museums in Chicago and New York, scholars from rural community colleges and major urban universities exchange ideas with audiences ranging from children in school to elderly in senior centers. And, while we have inevitably supported projects that have misfired, the quality of state humanities council programming has been astonishingly good. It has to be. Americans are too perceptive to accept pretense or nonsense. When the talk is empty, the rooms are too. We know rather quickly whether a program is working or not. And they do

work. People stay at our programs, they participate, and they keep coming back.

There is an unfortunate tendency in some quarters to underestimate the intellectual curiosity of the American people. State humanities councils regularly provide opportunities to exercise that curiosity--to probe, to question, to debate--for people long finished with their formal educations. State humanities councils are bringing them stimulating, challenging programs--informative, well-designed exhibits and publications; lively lectures; provocative discussions; entertaining and enlightening films.

Let me report to you from the front lines: the minds of America are alive and well. They are being exercise regularly and more durably than their corporal counterparts. All this intellectual exercising is taking place in libraries, senior centers, shopping malls, hospitals, parks, granges, reservations, museums, buses, almost everywhere. It is hard work and it is rewarding and Americans by the millions are devoted to this experience that Lynne Cheney has dubbed "the parallel school."

In recent years, state humanities councils have reached beyond their traditional audience of adult Americans. Councils have made a strong commitment to enhancing the quality of secondary education and to ensuring the place of the humanities

in secondary school curricula through institutes for high school teachers and through programming designed for the students themselves. In Rhode Island, the state council has for seven years conducted its own secondary school local history program, The Rhode Island Legacy. Acclaimed by scholars, teachers, students, and even the press, The Rhode Island Legacy series has had a significant and lasting impact on the 275 teachers and 38,000 students who have participated in it in the past seven years. Through this program, students directly engage in debate on moral and political issues that animated past generations and that, in many cases, continue to spark debate today. Teachers are exuberant about the Legacy's effect on their students' understanding of history.

This is just one project among the dozens funded in Rhode Island every year. And that can be multiplied by the thousands of activities supported by humanities councils in every state. In order to continue this remarkable work, I urge you on behalf of the Federation of State Humanities Councils to reauthorize the National Endowment for the Humanities for a period of three years. The Federation feels that a more regular review of the Endowment--and the state councils--is a healthy and responsible exercise. It is the method of the humanities disciplines themselves to explore continually, to continue questioning, to corroborate our principles.

As more and more RICH projects reach more and more people, the demand for state council support increases accordingly. But as demand has increased, the councils' financial ability to meet that demand has been restrained. Councils respond to reductions in Federal funding by enlisting support from state governments and from the very citizens who have benefitted from their active participation in council programs. The resulting generosity has aided immensely but never compensated for Federal reductions. But the good news is that the quality of the programming has remained constant. State humanities councils give taxpayers their money's worth.

If funding for the National Endowment for the Humanities had remained parallel with inflation during the 1980's, the appropriation for fiscal year 1991 would be \$223 million. The Federation urges that NEH be authorized for 1991 at a level that acknowledges the delay in keeping pace with inflation, and that authorization levels for the following two years be set at such sums as may be necessary.

As the nineties dawn, Americans are ever more attentive to the absolute importance of education. But education is not a process that begins in first grade and ends twelve, sixteen or twenty years later. For most Americans, it never ends. That is why libraries, museums, repertory theatres, public broadcasting, adult education programs and state humanities councils have so

many subscribers, members, friends, supporters, users. And the reality of the 1980's is that these valued and valuable institutions require financial support beyond what their users can provide. They--we--must turn to governments, local state and federal, for subsistence. The support we ask is not for ourselves, but for the millions of citizens who exercise their minds in our programs. We must keep the spirit of intellectual curiosity alive in this country, the spirit that animated Thomas Jefferson and George Washington Carver, Jonas Salk and Willa Cather. We must continue to be aware of the ideas of past civilizations and other cultures. We must go on asking not just who or what, but why. This is the charge of the humanities and I ask your help in bringing that charge to people throughout this great land.

TESTIMONY
TO THE EDUCATION, ARTS AND HUMANITIES SUBCOMMITTEE
OF THE SENATE COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND HUMAN RESOURCES
ON THE REAUTHORIZATION OF THE
National FOUNDATION ON THE ARTS AND THE HUMANITIES ACT OF 1965

PRESENTED ON BEHALF OF THE NATIONAL HUMANITIES ALLIANCE

Theodore Ziolkowski
Dean of the Graduate School, Princeton University

5 April 1990

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Subcommittee,

I am Theodore Ziolkowski, Dean of the Graduate School and Class of 1900 Professor of German and Comparative Literature at Princeton University. It is a pleasure to testify before you today and to represent the National Humanities Alliance and its membership of more than sixty scholarly and professional associations, organizations of museums, libraries, historical societies, higher education, and state humanities councils, and others concerned with national humanities policies. (A list of NHA member organizations is attached.) I am pleased to have this opportunity to express support for the reauthorization of the National Endowment of the Humanities for five years and without restrictions on content of the grants it awards. My colleagues and I strongly support the view expressed by President Bush when he said that he doesn't "know of anyone in government that should be set up to censor what you write or what you paint or how you express yourself." And we heartily support John Frohnmayer's remarks before your counterpart in the other chamber in which he said "After much careful thought and discussion, it is our conclusion that the legislation proposed here, which contains no content restriction, will best serve the American public."

Today, my testimony is focused upon the federal interest in the national organizations that make up a significant part of the infrastructure supporting scholarship in this country and more

specifically the importance of the Endowment's regrants programs in sustaining scholarship.

On the national institutions supporting scholarship

Independent voluntary associations, many of them configured in loosely connected networks, make up a significant part of the infrastructure that supports scholarly work in the United States and that enhances the general quality of national life. The U.S. situation is unlike that of other countries in that we have different kinds of voluntary associations that developed over the years in response to the needs and interests of both individuals and groups (e.g., independent research libraries, museums, learned society, historic societies, and national associations of these organizations). For leadership, voluntary associations depend on boards that have their own governance arrangements and their own rules and qualifications for membership; for funding, they depend on various sources, which, whether from the public or private sector, are likely to be irregular. Indeed, institutions largely or wholly dependent on income from modest or even substantial endowments, on grant funds for special projects, and on philanthropy are easily affected by inflation; they often experience periods when funds are insufficient to sustain their normal activities. Given the importance of these institutions to the nation's intellectual and cultural life and their financial vulnerability, we believe that the federal government may wish to consider ways to assist those institutions that serve national constituencies.

The 1988 decision to cut back support for the New York Public Library after 17 years of special NEH grants gave renewed focus to long-standing debate on whether there are circumstances in which federal support should be made readily available, on a competitive basis, for the operation of non-profit cultural institutions that are critical to the scholarly enterprise in America -- Institutions that through their collections and special programs nurture scholarship both by preserving and providing access to our national cultural heritage and by encouraging the creation of new knowledge to achieve "a better understanding of the past, a better analysis of the present, and a better view of the future." (National Foundation on the Arts and Humanities Act of 1965)

These national institutions include: Independent research libraries and historical societies with national collections such as the American Antiquarian Society, American Philosophical Society, John Carter Brown Library, Massachusetts Historical Society, and The Newberry Library; centers for advanced study such as the American Schools of Oriental Research and the National Humanities Center; and a few other institutions that facilitate scholarly work such as the American Council of Learned Societies and the Social Science Research Council. (A handful of federal institutions such as the Library of Congress, the Smithsonian Institution, and the Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars support scholarship in parallel ways but they receive federal support through regular appropriations.)

At the present time, many of the institutions that form this infrastructure of scholarship do not have adequate income from endowments to sustain regular operations. The number of institutions that compose the infrastructural group are not numerous nor are they broadly distributed geographically. But, they constitute a critically important and irreplaceable base upon which American scholarship has become the most productive in the world.

These institutions (many of which participate in the regranting programs of the NEH) are increasingly dependent on raising funds from foundations and other institutions that for the most part grant funds tied to particular projects and often prohibited from providing long-term or sustaining support. What they most need, however, are not funds to innovate but simply funds to continue doing what they have been doing very well for years. (Over the years, NEH has very properly encouraged innovation. While this approach is correct overall, it has negative implications for addressing the problem discussed here. NEH's challenge grants may be used to support operations but eligibility is limited to two grants.)

We suggest that the federal interest in the health of these critically important institutions is so great that Congress should begin considering how to make available to institutions that serve national constituencies some kind of support for on-going operations. For museums and historical organizations,

Congress concluded more than a decade ago that federal support for operating expenses was needed and made funds available through the Institute of Museum Services. One way to address the problem for the institutions discussed here would be to establish a new line item at NEH to provide support for on-going functions that are important for the scholarly enterprise. Such a program would be competitive and peer reviewed. Perhaps, while located within NEH, the program could be modeled on that of the Institute of Museum Services. The independence and diversity of our cultural organizations, so highly valued by the American ethos would be preserved with proper design of the federal support. Since long before the establishment of the NEH, there have been those who argue that there is a national interest at stake in the health of these organizations. That view is nicely summarized in a 7/6/88 letter to the New York Times in which then-President of the Rockefeller Foundation Richard W. Lyman wrote, "Surely, its [NEH's] mandate as a Federal agency, is different from that of the big foundations. It has a responsibility for the overall health of the humanities in the United States that no private foundation has."

On NEH's regranting programs

A second major issue that I want to discuss today is the use of the regrants or subgrants mechanism by the Endowment and to urge the Committee to adjust the legislation so that the use of this important instrument by the Endowment's Chairman is clearly authorized.

Virtually from the inception of the Endowment, the agency has used the regrant mechanism as one avenue for the distribution of funds to encourage and support national progress and scholarship in the humanities. The process by which NEH has awarded funds to independent institutions for regranting to individual scholars has been based upon rigorous review within a grants competition. In reviewing regranting proposals, NEH has consistently demanded clear evidence that the proposed regranting institution have in place grant application and review processes that are scrupulously fair and that will ensure the selection of work in the humanities that is of the highest quality.

While rather small in the overall NEH program -- typically no more than 5% of an annual program budget at NEH -- regrant programs have come to play a key role in America's scholarly enterprise, the characteristics of which are as follows:

- o Although typically less than \$100,000 annually for participating institutions, in private research libraries regrants are a cornerstone for planning the sustained involvement of outside scholars in the development and use of collections;

- o NEH's regrants are with major institutions, the institutions at the core of the infrastructure supporting scholarship in this country whose grant application and review processes are similar to and no less rigorous than the procedures employed by NEH;

- o There is no evidence that abuses have occurred in the

grant awarding processes of any of the regrant institutions;

- o The regranting institutions in many instances are providing services that could not be carried out directly by NEH: They can respond rapidly to scholarly opportunities, for example, and the regranting institutions may have in-depth knowledge of particular scholarly areas and of scholarly situations in other countries;

- o Grants help to sustain institutions that are critical to scholarship. NEH funds make possible several small fellowship programs that facilitate scholarly access to private library collections and frequently enable the recipient to obtain matching funds from private sources;

- o Grants are a major guarantor of the pluralism and variety of sources of support for scholarship. Typically, in the centers for advanced study grants program, the NEH grant funds provide 30 to 40% of the fellowship funds directly but in addition are the catalyst for an additional 30 to 40% secured from other private sources to fulfill NEH matching requirements;

- o Several of the regranting programs provide services that the NEH is not equipped to carry out (e.g., scholarly exchange programs. In addition, for the grants activities that NEH could take on directly, almost without exception, the cost to the government would be higher.

One outcome of the major controversy that arose last year over two grants connected to NEH's sister agency, the National Endowment for the Arts, was a finding by the House Appropriations

Committee, endorsed by the Senate Committee, that subgranting or regranting by NEH and NEA was not authorized. The report language went on to specify that "if subgranting is permitted it should be undertaken with procedures that will make the chairmen and councils of NEA and NEH as thoroughly informed and responsible for the subgrants as they are for direct grants."

Coincidentally, the actions by the Appropriations Committees came as Mrs. Cheney and the National Council on the Humanities were just concluding a thorough examination of the rationale for NEH's regrants programs. The outcome of that study, which extended over more than six months in 1988 and 1989, reinforced the importance of the regrant programs in meeting NEH's overall goals and underscored the effectiveness of the safeguards then built into the NEH's regrants process.

NEH promptly complied with the report language produced in connection with the FY-1990 appropriation. Within a few weeks of the passage of the money bill, NEH advised all independent institutions regranting NEH funds (except state arts and humanities councils which were specifically exempted) of several changes in procedures that dramatically increased its oversight, including:

- o Regrant institutions were no longer empowered to decide on regrants but only to recommend them to NEH for approval;
- o For each individual proposed as a regrant recipient or as

an alternate (i.e., intended fellowship awardees), institutions must forward to NEH brief descriptive information on the individual and project and full copies of applications;

- o NEH staff will review materials and forward the lists together with copies of full applications for any requiring further review to the appropriate committee of the National Council on the Humanities. (The committees used to review regrants already were in existence -- committees of the Council organized by grant making divisions to review NEH applications);

- o Council committee members will make recommendations to Mrs. Cheney within one week; the NEH Chair makes the final decisions and will convey them promptly to the regrant institutions.

- o Periodic site visits to observe selection committee work and procedures will be scheduled -- approximately once every three years.

Are the extra steps and cost worthwhile? In the first six months, four separate oversight cycles have been completed (i.e., proposals from one or more of the regrant institutions have been reviewed by NEH staff, Council, and Chairman). The result has been that all recommendations have been accepted, i.e., not a single recommendation has been declined or even formally questioned.

We believe that the substantial investment of time and expense by NEH, its Council members, and of course the regranting

institutions is not in the government's interest. While NEH has gone to some lengths to avoid intrusion, the added procedures are nonetheless seen as bureaucratic intrusion by many of the regrant institutions' staff and trustees. Although the intensified oversight process has been uneventful up to now -- and we have full confidence in the integrity of the present administration - the procedures have the potential for serious mischief in the longer run. The increased oversight has been a test in advance of awards of the quality of the regranting institutions' selection procedures. The test indicates that the regranting institutions do their work very well and that it would be appropriate to return to the less intrusive oversight that has worked so well over the years -- the system in which a rigorous system of review is used to select (and renew) regranting institutions but also a system where the decisions on individual fellowship are made by the regranting institutions and reviewed only later by NEH in connection with reports of the use of regrant funds. (It should be noted that NEH has ample authority to deal with abuse of regranting authority should a problem arise.)

To conclude this overview of the regranting situation as it applied to NEH, my colleagues and I recommend:

- o That the Endowment Chairs be explicitly granted authority to make awards to private organizations that will in turn be empowered to regrant the funds according to a plan that has been approved through NEH's regular review process;

o That regrant applications (and reapplications) receive thorough review in terms of 1) the appropriateness of the applicant institution to administer such a program; 2) the rigor of the applicant's review process for regrants; and 3) the coherence of the objectives; and

o That in making regrant awards, NEH make clear that the regranteeing institution is authorized to make final awards based upon the approved plan.

o Ideally, in addition, Congress will act to establish a separate budget line in order to provide access to sustaining operating funds to the national institutions forming the infrastructure supporting scholarship. This final point is offered both to place the issue on the agenda and with the hope that Congress will act on it now. We recognize that need to clarify and resolve the questions surrounding the use of the regranteeing mechanism are urgent and do not require additional budget for resolution, while a new program, involving additional funds, may require more time to develop.

Active Members of the Alliance

American Academy of Religion
American Anthropological Association
American Association of Museums
American Association for State and Local History
American Council of Learned Societies
American Folklore Society
American Historical Association
American Musicological Society
American Numismatic Society
American Philological Association
American Philosophical Association
American Political Science Association
American Society for Eighteenth-Century Studies
American Sociological Association
American Studies Association
Association for Asian Studies
Association for Jewish Studies
Association of American Colleges
Association of American Geographers
Association of Research Libraries
College Art Association
Commonwealth Center for Literary and Cultural Change
(University of Virginia)
Shelby Cullom Davis Center for Historical Studies
(Princeton University)
Federation of State Humanities Councils
The George Washington University
History of Science Society
Independent Research Libraries Association
Linguistic Society of America
Medieval Academy of America
Modern Language Association
National Council of Teachers of English
Renaissance Society of America
Social Science Research Council
Society for Ethnomusicology
Society of Biblical Literature
South Atlantic Modern Language Association
Speech Communication Association
Virginia Center for the Humanities

Associate Members of the National Humanities Alliance

American Conference of Academic Deans
American Dialect Society
American Library Association
American Society for Aesthetics

(continued)

Associate Members of the NHA (continued)

American Society for Legal History
American Society for Theatre Research
Association of American Law Schools
Center for the Humanities (Wesleyan University, Connecticut)
College English Association
Community College Humanities Association
The Council of the Humanities (Princeton University)
The Hastings Center
Institute for the Humanities (University of Michigan)
Institute for the Medical Humanities
(University of Texas Medical Branch, Galveston)
Institute of Early American History and Culture
(College of William and Mary)
Midwest Modern Language Association
Philological Association of the Pacific Coast
Popular Culture Association
Shakespeare Association of America
Society for the History of Technology
Society of Architectural Historians
Society of Christian Ethics
South Central Modern Language Association
Doreen B. Townsend Center for the Humanities
(University of California/Berkeley)
University of California Humanities Research Institute
(University of California/Irvine)

(March 1990)

TESTIMONY
TO THE EDUCATION, ARTS AND HUMANITIES SUBCOMMITTEE
OF THE SENATE COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND HUMAN RESOURCES
ON THE REAUTHORIZATION OF THE
NATIONAL FOUNDATION ON THE ARTS AND THE HUMANITIES ACT OF 1965

PRESENTED ON BEHALF OF THE NATIONAL HUMANITIES ALLIANCE

Andrew P. Debicki

University Distinguished Professor of Spanish
Director, Hall Center for the Humanities
University of Kansas

5 April 1990

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Subcommittee,

I am Andrew P. Debicki, Professor of Spanish at the University of Kansas, where I also serve as Director of the Hall Center for the Humanities. It is a pleasure to testify before you today and to represent the National Humanities Alliance and its membership of more than sixty scholarly and professional associations; organizations of museums, libraries, historical societies, and higher education; state humanities councils; and others concerned with national humanities policies. I am pleased to have this opportunity to express support for the reauthorization of the National Endowment for the Humanities (NEH) without restrictions on content and to comment on the proposed NEH initiative in foreign languages.

My work as a language and literature teacher at a large midwestern university has benefited substantially from NEH-sponsored activities. I have conducted three endowment-supported summer seminars, which brought college teachers from many states to the University of Kansas, where they--and I--gained new ideas and a renewed enthusiasm for teaching Spanish. I have served on panels that recommended fine research and teaching proposals for support. And I have attended programs in Kansas libraries and towns that communicated the value of great books and great historical figures to the citizens of my state.

For 22 years I have worked at the University of Kansas, which enrolls about 28,000 students and admits 8,000 freshmen a year. While also doing scholarly writing, I have taught Spanish at all levels from beginning language courses to graduate literature seminars, and I chaired the

university's Spanish department. In addition, I serve on the governing board of the Modern Language Association of America, a learned society whose 30,000 members are committed to promote study, teaching, and research in modern languages and literatures.

I have seen first-hand two major problems regarding the learning of foreign languages: the late start most Americans get in learning a second language and the absence of incentives for undertaking such study. Though we have been aware for a long time of the lack of knowledge of foreign languages and cultures among our citizens, this inadequacy becomes more critical as our world shrinks and the need for communication across our borders increases. Again and again, I have talked with students who have returned from abroad, business executives with dealings in Mexico or Western Europe, and Kansas citizens who have traveled for pleasure. They describe the frustration of being unable to read the language or to understand what is said around them, of being unable to ask for what they need, of receiving puzzled reactions when they try to communicate.

As you know, foreign languages were included as a humanities field in the 1965 legislation that established the Endowment, and the NEH has contributed significantly to foreign languages over its 25-year history. The NEH is in an ideal position to effect the kind of improvement in foreign language teaching and learning that our country needs because of the Endowment's focus on language study in cultural and literary contexts and its tradition of using peer review, which allows the best thinking in the field to inform its activities. My colleagues and I are pleased that

the Endowment plans to expand the range of its programs in foreign languages through the initiative included in its budget proposal for Fiscal Year 1991.

There is general agreement that our educational system should provide language study for larger numbers of students and do so earlier than we have in the past. But availability is not enough. Students must be encouraged to enroll in language courses, teachers must have opportunities to improve and maintain their own command of the languages they teach, and institutional arrangements must be modified so that language teachers can use approaches and materials that research on second language acquisition tells us are effective.

These goals have been widely discussed in the field, and I present for the record a statement about the teaching of foreign languages in this country which, I believe, provides background for understanding the importance of the NEH foreign language initiative. The statement was written by a committee of distinguished scholars in linguistics and foreign languages and literature.

The history of language study, like change in language itself, reflects trends and movements in society and culture. Shortly after World War I a committee of the Modern Language Association examined the place of languages in our country and, noting that primary contacts with other countries would be through publications, recommended concentration on a reading knowledge of foreign languages. This approach was widely adopted. Our scientists, scholars, and educated public learned to read French, German, and other languages and spent little time acquiring a speaking knowledge. By the early 1940s few Americans were equipped to communicate directly with the peoples of other nations.

World War II brought sudden and immediate needs for communication with peoples throughout the world and for functional control of other languages. At that time only linguists who had investigated unwritten languages, like those of American Indians, concentrated on a speaking command of language. They achieved that command by memorizing

sentences and mimicking the pronunciation of the speakers. In response to the need to introduce, rapidly, a whole generation of Americans not only to a new set of previously little studied languages but also to real-life practical use of those languages, the field linguists' skills were employed to impart to our soldiers, diplomats, and administrators an everyday command of languages as varied as Arabic, Chinese, Hindi, Italian, Japanese, and Turkish. The technique was taken over by our universities and supplemented with tape recordings, which were also mimicked and memorized. This approach met the needs of the time, as had the concentration on reading after World War I.

As our interrelations with other countries have deepened, we no longer find the World War II concept of "everyday language" adequate. Our students today need wider control of languages and better knowledge of cultures. Language teaching, having evolved steadily in response not only to students' needs but also to developments in linguistics and language-acquisition theory, has been able to incorporate these aims. Teachers now present each language as it is used in communication and in accordance with the cultural conventions of its native speakers. Philosophically and in practice, this view of language is fundamentally different from the concepts that governed the reading approach of the distant past and the mimicry-memorization orientation of the 1940s and 1950s.

The first major change in approach, the presentation of language as it is used in communication, was inspired by recent developments in linguistic and text theory. It is based on a redefinition of both spoken and written language as text that functions in a context rather than as a set of abstract paradigms or vocabulary lists of the kind that filled the "grammar" textbooks of the past. Occasionally a structural paradigm may still be useful as a learning device, but what the language really consists of, and what the student must really learn, is a set of ideal or standard contexts for the forms and structures of the language.

Viewed from this perspective, grammatical competence is based on mastery of sequences and connections within spoken or written discourse, not on memorization of lists of discrete forms. Learning a language--either one's native tongue in childhood or a foreign language at any age--means acquiring the capacity to construct texts and to use them appropriately. In both cases this process, which belongs uniquely to language learning, results in significant cognitive and intellectual growth on the part of the learner. . . .

The second major change in our approach to teaching language and literature gives greater importance to cultural context. This change has been facilitated by our increasingly sophisticated ability to describe cultural factors. Every utterance or exchange of utterances occurs in a cultural context. Thus, even simple terms for agreement and disagreement express meaning not only through specific words but through the contexts in which they operate. In teaching such

material, language instructors necessarily present language with an awareness of the cultural values it embodies; and in studying the material, students undergo a major cognitive development as they begin to absorb the essential quality of another language and culture.

While much more attention is paid now to competence in the spoken language, the view of language as text also redefines relations between spoken and written language. Written texts represent a fundamental manifestation of language. Literature has a place in language study because it is a selected and sanctioned set of the verbal realizations of a culture, and to study literature is to study a culture as it is presented and transmitted by the speakers of the language. (MLA Newsletter [Fall 1989] 16-17)

I turn now to the NEH's special opportunity in foreign language education. I believe that the activities the NEH seeks to support will strengthen the field and therefore the study of languages in the United States. First, the proposed summer institutes will enable elementary-and secondary-school teachers to apply the results of current research on language teaching and immerse themselves in the target language and culture, which will add to their own language proficiency. Second, strengthening undergraduate language programs will help colleges and universities develop courses and faculty study opportunities that will link language instruction with other disciplines and thereby enhance the usefulness of language study and the integration of foreign languages in the overall undergraduate program. Equally important, institutions with teacher-education programs, which hold the key to the current teacher shortage in foreign languages, will be able to improve what they do. Third, the proposed funding for special projects will encourage creative responses to needs the field has identified: for example, language magnet schools, the development of teaching materials and programs in the less commonly taught languages, and the design of articulation agreements

between schools and colleges in specific communities.

The NEH's foreign language initiative underscores the role of the NEH in the development of the humanities and the agency's capacity to respond to the concerns of the field. Many foreign language scholars had come to think that the NEH guidelines for the eligibility of foreign language projects were drawn in such a way as to exclude proposals that reflected the broader understanding of language learning that has evolved in recent years. When advised of the problem, Mrs. Cheney and her colleagues studied it and worked with the language scholars in shaping the initiative. In this case, the NEH provided both the national focus and leadership but followed the field in terms of content.

I particularly welcome the Endowment's encouragement of the use of a range of authentic materials in teaching foreign languages (newspapers, television, films, literature, and other significant texts) and the Endowment's emphasis on continuous and cumulative language study that provides students with appropriately sequenced and connected instruction. I also welcome the NEH's wish to earmark special funds for this important proposal, and I urge you and your colleagues in Congress to respond favorably to the President's request for new funding in support of the initiative. Throughout its 25-year history, the Endowment has taken the lead in carrying out important initiatives in scholarship, preservation, public programs, and education in the humanities. In my view the special opportunity in foreign languages falls well within the Endowment's distinguished tradition and will make a major contribution toward the education of our citizens for the rapidly changing world of the 21st century.

TESTIMONY

TO THE

**SUBCOMMITTEE ON EDUCATION, ARTS AND HUMANITIES
SENATE COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND HUMAN RESOURCES**

ON THE

**REAUTHORIZATION OF THE NATIONAL FOUNDATION ON THE ARTS AND
THE HUMANITIES ACT OF 1965**

PRESENTED ON BEHALF OF THE

**ASSOCIATION OF AMERICAN UNIVERSITIES
AND THE
NATIONAL HUMANITIES ALLIANCE**

BY

**John H. D'Arms
Dean, Horace H. Rackham School of Graduate Studies
University of Michigan**

April 5, 1990

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Subcommittee,

I am John D'Arms, professor of classical studies and history and Dean of the Horace H. Rackham School of Graduate Studies at the University of Michigan. It is a pleasure to testify before you today on behalf of the Association of American Universities (AAU), an organization of 58 research universities with preeminent programs of research and graduate and professional education, and the National Humanities Alliance (NHA) and its membership of more than sixty scholarly and professional associations, organizations of museums, libraries, historical societies, higher education, and state humanities councils, and others concerned with national humanities policies. (A list of AAU and NHA memberships is attached.) I am pleased to have this opportunity to discuss the reauthorization of the National Endowment for the Humanities (NEH). I will discuss three specific issues that we believe need to be addressed during the reauthorization process: research, graduate education, and data collection.

I. RESEARCH

Throughout the history of organized human culture and thought, those intellectual activities subsumed under the humanities have been the critical means by which man has sought to understand the human condition—by studying and connecting our past with our present; by interpreting our creations; and by seeking to understand our place in the expanding universe. As our world becomes increasingly international and complex, the need for humanistic understanding of cultures, attitudes, and sensibilities other than our own has never been greater. As the boundaries of our world stretch beyond our planet, at a rate of change that is accelerating exponentially, the role of the humanities becomes all the more crucial in fostering an understanding of that charge, and in forging a civilizing accommodation with it.

Because the subject matter of the humanities expands and changes so rapidly, the interpretations and approaches of humanistic scholars must also change. Research and

scholarship are the engines that drive this dynamic humanities enterprise: by incorporating fresh perspectives and developing new methods, scholars, through their books and articles in journals, contribute fresh investigation to the humanities. The NEH is the largest and most important funder of research and programming in the humanities in this country. William G. Bowen, an economist who is currently President of the Andrew W. Mellon Foundation and was previously President of Princeton University, undertook a study in 1988 in which he contrasted the support of humanities provided by NEH with support for these activities provided by the largest private foundations. He concluded that NEH is by far the most important single source of funding for the humanities in the U.S. today. "It is not exaggeration to say that the decision made concerning the budget for NEH (overall size and composition), and subsequent administration of the funds, have an absolutely decisive impact on the health and character of the humanities in America." Bowen's analysis showed that the 30 largest private foundations in the United States, taken together, make grants to the humanities in a given year that total less than half the funding provided by NEH.

Although a decade of nearly flat funding has left the Endowment in need of additional resources and faced with extraordinarily difficult decisions as to the best uses for its available funds, the NEH has nonetheless achieved a remarkable record of selecting and supporting work of the highest quality. The scholarly peer review process employed by the Endowment is at the heart of that success. We urge the Committee to recognize and underscore that success in a reauthorization of the Endowment by preserving and, where possible, strengthening the Endowment's capacity to support, through peer review, the highest levels of research and scholarship.

II. DISSERTATION FELLOWSHIPS FOR GRADUATE STUDENTS

The education of future scholars in the humanities must be carried out simultaneously with the support of current research and scholarship. The intimate relationship between research and graduate education is a defining characteristic of American universities; graduate education is the reproductive system of scholarship.

But we have recently witnessed disturbing trends in graduate education that will affect humanistic research and scholarship. Over the past fifteen years fewer talented young persons have been enrolling in humanities graduate programs, and, while there are present signs that this pattern may be changing, those who have enrolled are taking substantially longer to complete their doctorates. The average registered time-to-degree—the time actually spent in a graduate program—is now 8.5 years, three years more than the average time of 5.5. years in 1968. The percentage of Ph.D.s earned in the humanities has declined substantially: in 1973, humanities doctorates constituted 16% of total Ph.D.s; by 1988, that percentage had dropped to 10.6%.

A major part of the explanation for both increased time-to-degree and decreased number of humanities Ph.D.s is the lack of financial support for humanities graduate study. Since the demise of National Defense Education Act in 1973, federal support for graduate study in the humanities has hovered near zero: 1988 humanities doctorate recipients received an average of two and a half percent of their support from the federal government, compared with 20.8% of support in the life sciences, 16.8% of support in the physical sciences, and 14.3 % in engineering.

Inadequacy of financial support for graduate students in the humanities need to be understood in a broader context: the reduced support for doctoral study in the humanities is only a more extreme case of a national overall decline in doctoral support. Across all fields, federally funded fellowships and traineeship have dropped precipitously, from approximately 60,000 in 1969 to less than 13,000 now. Of these remaining fellowships, roughly 900—less than a tenth—support graduate study in the humanities.

Unlike the situation in the humanities, the overall number of science and engineering Ph.D.s has remained fairly constant over the last 15 years. However, the number of U.S. citizens earning doctorates has declined steadily. The deficit has been made up by steadily increasing numbers of foreign students, a source of needed

doctorate recipients that is becoming less reliable as greater numbers of them choose to return to their home countries.

At the same time, the unstable supply of Ph.D.s is on a collision course with increased demand. The combination of faculty retirements with other reasons of departure from the professoriate will produce strong, sustained replacement demands over the next 25 years. Beginning in the mid-90s, increased student enrollments will be superimposed on replacement demand to increase sharply the need for new faculty. If current trends continue to hold, there will be only eight candidates for every ten faculty vacancies across all arts and sciences disciplines by the 1997-2002 time period.

According to the most reliable recent projections, shortages will be particularly severe in the humanities and social sciences, in which only seven candidates will be available for every ten faculty vacancies. And the nation cannot wait to act until these market forces begin to exert their pressures: since it takes over eight years to earn a Ph.D. in the humanities, the faculty who will be needed by the late '90s should be entering graduate school now.

Although the precise magnitude of the projected divergence of supply and demand may be open to question, few analysts dispute that current trends will certainly lead to a shortage of Ph.D.s that will be substantial and will have its impact on all disciplines and all markets: universities, industry, and government. Indeed, the President's Science Advisor, Allan Bromley, has expressed his concern about shortages in the sciences and engineering. Eric Bloch, the Director of the National Science Foundation, has called for a doubling of the National Science Foundation graduate fellowship program and an exploration of additional initiatives NSF might undertake to address this problem.

As is well known, graduate fellowships and traineeships are extremely effective in attracting talented students into doctoral programs, increasing retention rates, and shortening time-to-degree. For the humanities and related disciplines, the Jacob K. Javits Fellows Program in the Department of Education is the sole federal program that

has as its express purpose attracting exceptionally talented students into graduate study in the arts, humanities, and social sciences. In its first six years of funding, the Javits program has amply demonstrated its capacity to accomplish that purpose; but even in its strongest year of funding (1988), the Javits program was able to support only 211 new students, about half of whom were enrolling in humanities graduate programs. Thus, the Javits program at its peak was supporting no more than 3% of those who earned Ph.D.s in the humanities. Those of us concerned about the future of humanities teaching and scholarship hope to work with the Congress to expand that program to meet the urgent need for humanities faculty. (I should like to be able to say we hope to work with the Administration as well, but regrettably the Administration in its FY 1991 budget proposes to phase out the Javits program.).

Although we may have to rely solely on the Department of Education for the only available federal assistance in attracting new graduate students into doctoral programs, there is a special need for humanities graduate students that can and should be addressed by the NEH. For humanities graduate students, the most difficult point in securing financial support occurs at the point at which they are engaged in making their own first significant contributions to research—the dissertation stage.

The special difficulty faced by humanities doctoral students at this stage becomes clear when we consider funding patterns in other areas of graduate education. Federal support for graduate education is overwhelmingly concentrated in the science and engineering fields, primarily in the form of research assistantships as a component of federally funded research project grants. The chances of science and engineering graduate students being supported as research assistants improve during their graduate program, so that they have a comparatively high probability of being supported in such a manner while they conduct their dissertation research. In contrast, humanities graduate students support their doctoral study primarily through personal finances and loans, teaching assistantships, university fellowships, and work outside their academic program. None of these forms of support reliably carries them through the dissertation to degree completion. Increasing numbers of graduate students have already

accumulated substantial loan indebtedness as undergraduates; a further reliance on loans at the graduate level is particularly difficult in humanistic fields where a longer period of time is required to complete the degree. Teaching assistantships and university fellowships are typically available for no more than three or four years. Nonacademic employment takes students out of their programs, resulting in lost time for carrying out dissertation research and completing the doctoral program. Some students are compelled to drop out of school altogether; although these students intend to save sufficient funds to return and complete their dissertations, a substantial percentage of them become locked into circumstances of employment and family that preclude returning to complete their degrees. That is a regrettable—and preventable—loss to the students and to society.

We believe strongly that the National Endowment for the Humanities should establish a dissertation fellowship program. The doctoral dissertation represents the first significant research effort of young humanists; as such, it is wholly worthy of support by the single federal agency charged with promoting humanistic research. A program in which support is awarded to exceptional students through annual national competitions could be managed by NEH with little or no alternation in its current administrative structure. NEH now funds research proposals submitted by faculty through merit-reviewed, national competitions. By administering a dissertation program principally as a research grant program and awarding fellowships through judgments of the quality of the proposed research, fellowship awards could be allocated through existing NEH mechanisms.

Even a modestly funded dissertation fellowship program would produce both direct and indirect benefits to the nation. First, it would provide critical support to a portion of the nation's most promising humanities graduate students, enabling them to complete their graduate work without delay. Second, it would send an important message to all humanities students and scholars: that the federal government acknowledges some responsibility for supporting the first research efforts of the next generations of humanities teachers and scholars, just as it acknowledges its role in

encouraging the research of the current generation. Third, to provide additional resources for dissertation research will contribute to reducing the time required to complete the Ph.D. and to increasing the number of students who will in fact complete their programs. This will place more scholars into the system more rapidly and to that extent will blunt the impact of the impending Ph.D. shortage.

Two additional points should be made with respect to this recommendation for a dissertation fellowship program. First, additional resources must be provided to support this new activity; to fund such a program at the expense of research funding would defeat the purpose of providing NEH with the programmatic capacity to support both current scholars' research and the first research efforts of the next generation of scholars.

Second, responding to the impending faculty shortages is not the responsibility of the federal government alone. Indeed, the Association of American Universities has argued, as have I (see attached article from The Chronicle of Higher Education), that the principal share of responsibility lies with the universities. To be sure, universities have steadily increased their own contributions to graduate student support in recent years, as the federal government and private foundations have reduced their commitments. But educational policies within universities also need to improve. Accordingly, the AAU has formally charged the graduate deans of its member universities, through the Association of Graduate Schools, to examine institutional policies governing doctoral programs and identify changes that can increase retention rates, shorten time-to-degree, and so move graduate students more expeditiously into faculty ranks.

In 1988, just under 3,000 humanities Ph.D.s were granted to U.S. citizens. It would cost the federal government approximately \$15M per year to provide one-fifth of those students one year of dissertation support. That is a cost that would simultaneously assist committed students at the most difficult point in their graduate programs and enrich the entire enterprise in future years. It would bring NEH policy into accord with reality by recognizing and supporting the intimate interrelationship

between research and the final phases of graduate education.

What we are urging, in short, is collaboration and partnership. If both the government and universities respond in ways within their control and appropriate to their missions, we can together substantially improve the climate for humanities teaching, research, and scholarship and reduce the impact of the Ph.D. shortage that is fast approaching.

III. DATA COLLECTION

The remaining years of this century will bring rapid change to both research and graduate education. For public policy to anticipate and to respond as effectively as possible to those changes requires a comprehensive system of information collection, analysis, and dissemination. In the humanities NEH is the single federal agency charged to carry out such information activities. For most of the last decade, continuous debate on the meaning and meaningfulness of statistics on college and university enrollments in the humanities has highlighted the problem of the inadequacy of our data. To address this problem, Congress utilized the 1985 reauthorization to direct that NEH shall:

in consideration with State and local agencies, other relevant organizations, and relevant Federal agencies, develop a practical system of national information and data collection on the humanities, scholars, educational, and cultural groups, and their audiences. Such system shall include cultural and financial trends in the various humanities fields, trends in audience participation, and trends in humanities education on national, regional, and state levels.

Congress went on to specify one mode of use for disseminating data and analysis produced by the practical system:

Such system shall be used . . . to prepare a report on the state of the humanities in the Nation. The state of the humanities report shall include a description of the availability of the Endowment's programs to emerging and culturally diverse scholars, cultural and educational organizations, and communities and of the participation of such scholars, organizations, and communities in such programs.

We endorse Congress's formulation of the scope and nature of the federal interest in data in these areas, all of which are of great value not only to policymakers but also to scholarly, educational, and other public communities. Moreover, we applaud the important steps that the Endowment has taken in fulfillment of this change. Yet we believe that there remains much work to be done to develop a "practical system of national information and data collection" and to remedy the gaps in our knowledge that motivated this Congressional mandate.

In its formal response to this requirement, in December 1986, NEH stated, "The information we plan on using to conduct our assessment of the state of the humanities today is largely in place, and so we have proposed no new data collection projects as part of this system. . . . No additional funds will be sought for implementation of the system." To be sure, NEH has both collected data on the humanities and assisted others in doing so, but it has done so chiefly with particular occasions and purposes in mind. It has not undertaken to establish a system with consistent standards of collection, analysis, and dissemination from year to year, nor has it taken steps to provide ready and inexpensive access to the data it collects. For example, the Department of Education has developed data services that could serve as a model for NEH. The Department charges \$150 for a data tape containing institutional enrollment figures; the company that currently collects and analyzes data for NEH estimated that purchase of a tape would cost more than \$5,000.

The Endowment's judgment that the need for data that Congress recognized five years ago is now filled, therefore, seems to us premature. We urge that Congress reiterate the need for a comprehensive system of data collection and dissemination and allocate funds as they may be needed to enable NEH to carry out this mandate. The Endowment is ideally situated to carry out this task, and we have no doubt that federal funds allocated for this purpose will richly repay society's investment.

The bulk of the funding NEH currently provides for data collection and analysis, through the Humanities Studies Program, appears to go to two agencies: the Department of Education and the National Research Council. But most of the information gathered by the Department of Education and by the NRC is aggregate data, applicable to the humanities collectively. Consequently, it provides little insight into trends in individual humanities departments and disciplines. Although the NEH has periodically funded specialized studies of individual humanities fields by nongovernmental agencies, it no longer appears to do so on a regular basis. Certainly, no advertised competitive grant program exists for this purpose (the Overview of Endowment Programs for January 1990 does not list the Humanities Studies Program as a grant-making program to which individuals or organizations may apply for funding). Yet, unless funding is available for such specialized studies, our empirical understanding of trends within the humanities will remain both sketchy and unhelpful. Three examples reinforce this point:

- We currently have longitudinal information on major fields of study planned by entering freshmen (from data collected by the Higher Education Research Institute at UCLA) and know the numbers of degrees granted in various fields, but know virtually nothing about curricular choices between the onset and the end of the college career. Among other things, there are no easily accessible, longitudinal data on enrollments in specific humanities classes, the number of majors in specific fields, or retention and attrition rates in different fields. Such information provides a fundamental basis for designing strategies to attract and retain majors; without it, one cannot identify whether, and when, students drop into or out of humanities disciplines.

- At the graduate level, we have information on the numbers of master's and doctorate degrees granted in specific humanities fields. But longitudinal information on the number, quality, and other characteristics of graduate students entering various humanities fields will be essential if we are to devise effective strategies to confront in a coherent fashion the projected faculty shortages of the late 1990s.

- The NEH currently uses information from its Challenge Grant program and on contributions to state humanities councils to assess private contributions to the humanities. These data are not being published and, even at their best, provide a very partial picture of private sector giving. They cannot be said to yield the kind of systematic data on public and private funding of the humanities that is a vital underpinning for sound public policy decisions.

The few studies focusing exclusively on the humanities that NEH has contracted for directly during the past few years would have been strengthened and improved through regular on-going consultation with humanities educators, and particularly with representatives of federal and nongovernmental organizations most centrally concerned with data collection, analysis, and dissemination in the humanities. For example, a 1989 study on Undergraduate General Education and Humanities Requirements states that among four-year institutions, "one in four requires foreign languages and literature (23%)" (p. 3). This finding is puzzling in light of the fact that other studies indicate that well over half of all four-year institutions require foreign language study of their undergraduates (see attached table). The unusually low NEH figure appears to be the result of two features of the questionnaire used to solicit information; it asked only about general education requirements and failed to ask about additional graduation or degree requirements (foreign language study is often a graduation requirement, but not a general education requirement); and it asked about requirements for all students rather than requirements for some students or all BA students. Inquiring about requirements that apply to all undergraduates tends to yield figures applicable to a minority of students only (e.g., engineering or health sciences majors). If representatives of the humanities disciplines had participated in the development of the survey

instrument, both of the flaws in the questionnaire could have been avoided and data with more general applicability gathered.

In summary, we offer three recommendation on humanities data collection and analysis:

1. That the provision of the 1985 legislation calling for development of "a practical system of national information and data collection on the humanities . . ." be retained and strengthened. While recognizing the progress NEH has achieved, we urge that the language call explicitly for the continued development of the system; increased attention to inexpensive access to NEH-compiled data by individual scholars as well as to reports and publications developed for dissemination; and for broader, more systematic consultation with relevant association and other nongovernmental organizations.
2. That NEH be instructed to reestablish, within the Humanities Studies Program, a small grants program for nongovernment organizations to encourage the collection and analysis of specialized data on the humanities disaggregated by fields of study and the secondary analysis of data relevant to understanding trends within the humanities.
3. That a standing advisory committee to the NEH on humanities statistics be established. Members of such a committee should be appointed in such a way as to ensure both broad representation of diverse humanities disciplines and institutional expertise in higher education and statistical methods. Both federal and non-federal groups concerned with the collection, analysis, and dissemination of data in the humanities should be represented on the committee. The responsibilities of the committee would include advising NEH on data needs, approaches to analysis, and dissemination.

In the fields of science and engineering, the National Science Foundation is the federal agency responsible for assessing our national capacity. Its chief instrument of for this purpose is Science and Engineering Indicators, a biennial report that provides a thorough description and assessment of the condition of science and engineering research and education in the United States. The breadth and quality of its analyses are extremely informative to policymakers responsible for developing national and institutional policies. The NEH, we believe, should be playing a role comparable to that of the NSF. The importance of the of the humanities to the nation and its quality of life was the fundamental justification and motivating force behind the formation of the National Endowment for the Humanities. A strengthened system of information collection and analysis can help sharpen the policies of NEH and the other federal and non-federal organizations and institutions responsible for the sustaining the quality and vigor of the humanities in the service of the nation.

Thank you for allowing me the opportunity to present this testimony to the Committee.

AAU MEMBER INSTITUTIONS

University of Arizona
Brandeis University
Brown University
California Institute of Technology
University of California, Berkeley
University of California, Los Angeles
University of California, San Diego
Carnegie Mellon University
Case Western Reserve University
The Catholic University of America
University of Chicago
Clark University
University of Colorado
Columbia University
Cornell University
Duke University
University of Florida
Harvard University
University of Illinois
Indiana University
University of Iowa
Iowa State University
The Johns Hopkins University
University of Kansas
University of Maryland
Massachusetts Institute of Technology
McGill University
University of Michigan
Michigan State University
University of Minnesota

University of Missouri
University of Nebraska
The State University of New York at
Buffalo
New York University
University of North Carolina
Northwestern University
The Ohio State University
University of Oregon
Pennsylvania State University
University of Pennsylvania
University of Pittsburgh
Princeton University
Purdue University
Rice University
Rutgers, The State University of New
Jersey
University of Rochester
University of Southern California
Stanford University
Syracuse University
University of Texas
University of Toronto
Tulane University
Vanderbilt University
University of Virginia
University of Washington
Washington University
The University of Wisconsin
Yale University

Active Members of the Alliance

American Academy of Religion
American Anthropological Association
American Association of Museums
American Association for State and Local History
American Council of Learned Societies
American Folklore Society
American Historical Association
American Musicological Society
American Numismatic Society
American Philological Association
American Philosophical Association
American Political Science Association
American Society for Eighteenth-Century Studies
American Sociological Association
American Studies Association
Association for Asian Studies
Association for Jewish Studies
Association of American Colleges
Association of American Geographers
Association of Research Libraries
College Art Association
Commonwealth Center for Literary and Cultural Change
(University of Virginia)
Shelby Cullom Davis Center for Historical Studies
(Princeton University)
Federation of State Humanities Councils
The George Washington University
History of Science Society
Independent Research Libraries Association
Linguistic Society of America
Medieval Academy of America
Modern Language Association
National Council of Teachers of English
Renaissance Society of America
Social Science Research Council
Society for Ethnomusicology
Society of Biblical Literature
South Atlantic Modern Language Association
Speech Communication Association
Virginia Center for the Humanities

Associate Members of the National Humanities Alliance

American Conference of Academic Deans
American Dialect Society
American Library Association
American Society for Aesthetics

(continued)

Associate Members of the NHA (continued)

American Society for Legal History
American Society for Theatre Research
Association of American Law Schools
Center for the Humanities (Wesleyan University, Connecticut)
College English Association
Community College Humanities Association
The Council of the Humanities (Princeton University)
The Hastings Center
Institute for the Humanities (University of Michigan)
Institute for the Medical Humanities
(University of Texas Medical Branch, Galveston)
Institute of Early American History and Culture
(College of William and Mary)
Midwest Modern Language Association
Philological Association of the Pacific Coast
Popular Culture Association
Shakespeare Association of America
Society for the History of Technology
Society of Architectural Historians
Society of Christian Ethics
South Central Modern Language Association
Doreen B. Townsend Center for the Humanities
(University of California/Berkeley)
University of California Humanities Research Institute
(University of California/Irvine)

(March 1990)

GENERAL EDUCATION REQUIREMENTS IN FOREIGN LANGUAGES
AT FOUR-YEAR INSTITUTIONS

Study and Year	Type of Data Base	Nature of Requirement	Percentage
NEH: 1983-84 ^a	Sample	General Ed Requirement (all undergraduates)	19.7
NEH: 1988-89 ^a	Sample	General Ed Requirement (all undergraduates)	23.0

Percentage Change: 16.8

MLA: 1982-83	Census	Degree Requirement (all BA students)	47.4
MLA: 1987-88	Census	Degree Requirement (all BA students)	58.1

Percentage Change: 22.6

ACE: 1983-84 ^b	Sample	Graduation Requirement All students	20.2
		Some students	48.1
ACE: 1986-87 ^a	Sample	Degree Requirement All students	16.0
		Some students	69.0

Percentage Change: all students: -26.3
some students: 43.5

Sources:

a. Tabela A-2 and A-3 in Laurie L. Lewis & Elizabeth Parrie, Undergraduate General Education and Humanities Requirements. Higher Education Surveys Report No. 9, January, 1989.

b. Table 5 in Elaine El-Khawas, Campus Trends, 1984. HEP Report #63 (February, 1985). Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education.

c. Table 3 in Charles J. Andersen, International Studies for Undergraduates, 1987: Operations and Opinions. HEP Report #76 (September, 1988). Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education.

OPINION

Universities Must Lead the Effort to Avert Impending National Shortages of Ph.D.'s

By John H. D'Arms

PRESIDENT BUSH, at his education summit with the nation's governors last September, missed an unusual opportunity to connect the present crisis in the nation's schools with a potential future crisis in the nation's colleges and universities. The parents of today's school children, already worrying about how they will be able to afford the college tuitions of the 21st century, should be worrying still more about whether there will be enough college professors to teach them. Yet neither Mr. Bush nor the governors so much as mentioned this issue.

The evidence pointing to impending national shortages of Ph.D.'s, both for faculty positions and for non-academic jobs, is considerable and convergent. Equally important, the evidence embraces virtually all intellectual fields and territories. A study commissioned by the National Science Board projects a decline of more than 1,500 Ph.D.'s in the natural sciences and engineering by 2000, owing to a shrinking pool of 18- to 24-year-olds, retirements, deaths, and movement out of the country; it projects a national shortage of 8,000 such Ph.D.'s by then. Business schools are projecting thousands of vacant faculty jobs.

And William G. Bowen and Julie Ann Sosa, in *Prospects for Faculty in the Arts and Sciences* and in subsequent studies, argue that even with the most conservative assumptions, the number of available positions projected for humanities and social scientists will considerably exceed the expected number of candidates, beginning around 1997. In short, there are already imbalances in all academic fields, and supply is not increasing fast enough to keep pace with demand.

We still have time to make the adjustments needed to correct these anticipated shortages, but only if the people and institutions responsible for shaping national policy in higher education now step forward together and act thoughtfully and with resolve. I cannot emphasize this too strongly. Unlike the period of enormous expansion of numbers of Ph.D.'s in the 1960's, when (despite projections by Allan M. Carter) we failed to foresee the impending glut of Ph.D.'s, we have the solid data and careful analyses that policy makers need. If only they will heed the message. The real danger is that we again will mis-time our response and wait to act until shortages become acute. That would be tragic. The Ph.D.'s needed by the late 90's should be entering graduate schools now, so as to be ready when market forces begin to exert their pressures.

Many actors are named in this drama. Universities, business and industry, private donors, foundations, state legislatures, and the federal government all have



a stake in securing a strong future for graduate education because of its conspicuous benefits for the larger society. Today's talented and highly motivated graduate students will become the faculty members of

"The real danger is that we will mis-time our response and wait to act until shortages become acute. That would be tragic."

tomorrow, generating the new ideas that have always fostered growth within our society and provided the basis for college and university teaching. Outside the academic sector as well as within it, strong doctoral training is powerfully linked to the quality of the nation's research effort in nearly every field.

Universities should be leading the effort

to avert the impending faculty shortages. But our own houses need to be set in far better order than they are at present. The steps that academics should take are both small and great. At the easier end of the scale, faculty advisers should be familiarizing themselves with the projections of shortages and should be encouraging more of their able undergraduates to seek Ph.D.'s.

A FAR MORE DIFFICULT imperative is the redoubling of our efforts to diversify the membership of the academic profession. By building upon good ideas and pilot projects that really work, we must recruit more of the talented young Americans from minority groups who are currently not even participating in higher education, let alone planning for faculty careers.

The humanities and social sciences, where Bowen and Sosa project surprisingly large shortages, require special attention.

Continued on Page B3

Universities Must Lead the Effort to Avoid Shortages of Ph.D.'s

Continued from Page B1

tion: It is true for some plain speaking here. In graduate education in these fields, deans, other administrators, and especially members of the professoriate must step up to three challenges of major proportions.

FIRST, we need to reduce the number of years our graduate students take to achieve the Ph.D.: The median time in all fields of the arts and sciences increased from 7.2 years in 1970 to an alarming 9.5 years in 1987; for the humanities, the figure is still higher.

Second, we must try to bring down the high rates of attrition in many programs: Precise data are lacking, but the national figure is something close to 50 per cent.

Third, especially in the large public universities, we must reduce the time that graduate students now typically spend away from their research teaching undergraduates: All available indicators suggest that graduate students are teaching more students for more hours for more years than was the case even as few as five years ago.

THIS SET of interconnected challenges is especially vexing because the primary instigators of real change will have to be our faculty colleagues in the humanities and social sciences who construct the graduate curricula and set the degree requirements. They must be persuaded that their behavior needs to change. Faculty members make three main arguments:

• That significant increases in financial support, especially for fellowships, will be required if we really care about speeding up the time it takes to earn a degree and about improving completion rates.

• That the specialized character of graduate education, and the sheer quantity of new theory and method that young doctoral students must master, will, and even should, work against rapid progress towards the degree.

• That short cuts always threaten to undermine quality; as one of my highly respected colleagues puts it, "The historic excellence of [our] graduate programs is

the result of high standards, not high speed."

Now, of course more fellowship support is needed; of course new quantities and configurations of knowledge and methodological advances must be exploited; and of course programs must make appropriate allowances for interdisciplinary work, field experience, and mastering difficult languages—all of which have an impact upon the time it takes to earn the Ph.D. But I confess that I wonder why a talented B.A. in 1990 who couldn't reasonably expect to earn a Ph.D. in philosophy or anthropology or the history of art within seven years would not wish to pursue other career options instead.

Surely better balance and equilibrium, as well as a brisker and more efficient pace, could be achieved by bringing some countervailing mechanisms into play in graduate education.

As a beginning, I believe that faculty members in the social sciences and the

research seminars, and examinations being thought through coherently and freshly, with the best interests of our students constantly in view?

• After students pass preliminary examinations, are we in departments providing enough direction as they search for dissertation topics? In the life sciences, physical sciences, and engineering, where the time required to earn a doctorate is far shorter, graduate students are typically engaged in research alongside faculty members from the outset of their graduate careers. To what extent is this more collaborative research environment a model that can be adapted to faculty/student interactions in the humanities and social sciences?

• The steadily lengthening time needed to earn a degree, while imposing psychological and financial burdens on students, is also costing taxpayers more; further, it reduces (as the economist Howard P. Tuckman and others have pointed out) the

"I wonder why a talented B.A. in 1990 who couldn't reasonably expect to earn a Ph.D. in philosophy or anthropology or the history of art within seven years would not wish to pursue other career options instead."

humanities (among whom I include myself) could probably ask ourselves the following questions:

• Given the resurgence of national interest in broader undergraduate education, with emphasis upon differing approaches to knowledge and critical thinking, are not many of the Ph.D.'s emerging from our programs so specialized in their academic focus that they are really too narrowly trained to be effective in teaching undergraduates?

• When we incorporate new material into our graduate curricula, is it appropriately integrated or simply added on to already existing requirements? In our graduate seminars, do we balance our attachment to our own research topics against the academic needs of our students? Is our battery of course sequences, specialized

number of potential years of productive effort that highly educated individuals will have in the work force. Have we not, as university faculty members and administrators, but also as citizens, some broader responsibility to society to reduce the time required to earn the doctoral degree?

I believe that progress within academic institutions, on all of these fronts, will be critical in generating greater support for graduate education from outside them. Progress could help persuade some of the leading educational foundations to resume the financial support of graduate education from which they have largely retreated in recent years. Progress could help members of Congress and state legislatures to understand better the role of graduate education in future economic and technological progress. Improved performance by universities could also be instrumental in persuading federal agencies, such as the National Endowments for the Arts and for the Humanities and the Departments of Education, Energy, and Defense, to follow the examples of the National Science Foundation and the National Institutes of Health, which in all of their activities have begun giving higher priority to graduate education.

IN SHORT, educational policy makers—starting with those of us in universities—have an unusual opportunity to put aside parochial interests, defensiveness, and panic, and to collaborate in a positive and organized fashion to confront the coming shortages by renewing our national investment in human capital. President Bush could exert real educational leadership by encouraging these efforts. But those of us in higher education must not wait to be prodded: we should step up to our own responsibilities now.

John H. D'Arms, dean of the graduate school at the University of Michigan, is also professor of classical studies and history and president of the Association of Graduate Schools of the Association of

**TESTIMONY OF VARTAN GREGORIAN
PRESIDENT OF BROWN UNIVERSITY
ON
THE NATIONAL ENDOWMENT FOR THE HUMANITIES**

Senate Subcommittee on Education, Arts, and Humanities
The Honorable Claiborne Pell, Chairman
April 5, 1990

Chairman Pell, distinguished members of the Committee, I am Vartan Gregorian, President of Brown University, and I am grateful for this opportunity to speak today about the National Endowment for the Humanities. I am speaking not only in my capacity as President of Brown University, but also on behalf of the Association of American Universities (AAU), an organization of 58 research universities with preeminent programs of research and graduate and professional education.

In 1965, the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities Act established two sister federal agencies, the National Endowment for the Arts and the National Endowment for the Humanities (NEH), each of which is authorized to make grants within areas defined by statute. The law defines the humanities as including, but not limited to, the study of:

language, both modern and classical; linguistics; literature, history; jurisprudence; philosophy; archeology; comparative religion; ethics; the history, criticism, and theory of the arts; those aspects of the social sciences which have humanistic content and employ humanistic methods; and the study and application of the humanities to the human environment with particular attention to the relevance of the humanities to the current conditions of national life. (20 U.S.C. 952, Sec. 3 (a))

The act was amended to reauthorize its component Endowments in 1967, 1970, 1973, 1980, 1984 and 1985. This year it must be considered again for a five-year authorization cycle to continue programs of grants-in-aid for the arts and the humanities.

The National Endowment for the Humanities is the only federal agency dedicated to supporting the many aspects of the humanities-- elementary and secondary education, colleges and universities, the media,

museums, historical societies, libraries, individual scholarship, and community groups.

During the past fifteen years I have come to know intimately the NEH, its mission, its programs, its impact and its historical record. I may venture to say that I have had more involvement with all of its programs than almost anyone in this country. My varied experiences include first hand knowledge of:

- State Programs
I served on two state humanities councils (Pennsylvania and New York).
- Division of Fellowships
Leading faculty and scholars receiving fellowships for advanced research.
- Preservation Program
As President of the New York Public Library, and now Vice Chairman of its Board of Trustees and as a member of the Governing Board of the Commission on Preservation and Access, I have been very active in this program indeed.
- Challenge Grants
Building endowment to strengthen institutional infrastructure and raising private matching funds in Pennsylvania and New York. Both as Dean of the Faculty of Arts and Sciences and Provost of the University of Pennsylvania and as President of the New York Public Library, I can attest to the major significance of these grants.
- Division of Research
Leading institutions conducting major collaborative research and cataloging projects.
- General Programs
As sponsor of such major exhibitions at the New York Public Library as Censorship, Liberty, the Bicentennial of the U.S. Constitution and many others, I can vouch for the crucial role of the NEH not only for making these exhibitions possible at the New York Public Library but throughout the nation as well.

• Division of Education Programs

Leading institutions in revamping curricula so as to better teach the humanities

In addition I have come to know the Endowment in my capacity as a professor of history at universities in California, Texas, Pennsylvania and New York. I have come to know the Endowment also as an administrator, as Dean of the Faculty of Arts and Sciences at the University of Pennsylvania and subsequently as Provost and for eight years as President of the New York Public Library. I have come to know the Endowment also as a Board Member of the J. Paul Getty Trust, the Institute for Advanced Study, International Research and Exchanges, the Institute for International Education, as an institutional member of the American Council of Learned Societies, the New York Center for Visual History, the John Carter Brown Library, and as a Fellow of the New York Institute for the Humanities, etc. In addition during the past 15 years I have come to know and appreciate the leadership and major contributions of four National Chairmen of the NEH.

I cite all of the above credentials and connections for the sole purpose of underscoring the fact that the variety of these experiences has enabled me to know first hand and to appreciate the many different ways in which the NEH has enriched our national life.

During these past twenty five years the real and potential contributions of the humanities to our national life are increasingly recognized in the press and in government but more importantly among the American public. The need to improve the teaching of literature, history and language to our young people has been highlighted in numerous and widely publicized reports. There is growing recognition that needs in the humanities are not just the needs of universities, but also our entire high school system, and the general public as well. The teaching, research and public programs that NEH makes possible have become central to shaping the quality of our national discourse, as well as preserving our national heritage.

That is why, Mr. Chairman and distinguished members of the subcommittee, I have come today to hail the mission, the programs and the record of the NEH and to urge you to reauthorize its continuation and needed budgetary support. I do this with conviction and enthusiasm. It is a conviction broadly shared not only by the academic world but by the general public as well. During the past twenty five years the Endowment

has done justice to its mission and accomplished a superb record.

The Endowment throughout its history has been scrutinized and won both federal bipartisan support as well as widespread non-partisan public support for its mission and programs. From its inception on, Presidents Johnson, Nixon, Ford and Carter, gave strong support for the Endowment as did the U.S. Congress.

In the 1980's the federal government's role in support of the humanities was once again examined thoroughly and endorsed effectively. For example a 1981 Heritage Foundation Report concluded that any future administration, whether it be Democratic, Republican or Independent, ought to have no difficulty in accepting the mandates of the NEH "to encourage scholarship and art of the highest quality" and the fact that the promotion of cultural and intellectual achievement is a proper object of national policy, essential to the maintenance of a healthy democracy and that "the legislative mandate for the National Endowment for the Humanities -- rests on noble ideals which . . . (it) should uphold". The 1981 Presidential Task Force to examine the role and future of the arts and humanities established by President Ronald Reagan also concluded

"our Federal government bears a responsibility for encouraging and protecting the arts and the humanities . . . There is a clear public purpose in supporting the arts and the humanities: the preservation and advancement of America's pluralistic cultural and intellectual heritage, the encouragement of creativity, the stimulation of quality in American education, and the enhancement of our general being".

Indeed President Reagan himself was on record for recognizing that "the humanities are crucial to the vitality of our nation's educational and cultural life and to the maintenance of our civilization."

In 1984 when I attended these hearings I was most impressed by a report provided by the National Humanities Alliance entitled Priorities for the Humanities. Among other things it quoted R.J. Tawney, one of my favorite authors, on Humanism:

"Humanism has many meanings, for human nature has many sides There is the humanism of the age which the word is most commonly used to describe, the humanism of the Renaissance, with its rediscovery of human achievement in art and letters. And there is the humanism of the eighteenth century, with its confidence in the new era to be opened to mankind by the triumphs of science,

and its hatred of the leaden obscurantism which impeded its progress. There is the humanism which contrasts man with the brutes, and affirms that he is a little lower than the angels. These different senses of the word have often been at war: history is scarred, indeed, with the contentions between them. It ought not to be difficult, nevertheless, for the apostles of the one to understand the other; for indignant though some of them would be at the suggestion, they are using different dialects of a common language."

The report concluded that:

"The common language of humanistic disciplines is that of humankind: our history, philosophy, and literature. This common language has survived shifting fashions of higher education, the disrepair of our artifacts and textual resources, the surge of interest in technological and business training, and practical problems of demography and economics. Through the vicissitudes of modern life, our humanistic language remains vibrant, vital and relevant, speaking to us of values and ethics, where we have come from, who we are, and the human scale of our world."

I concur with that assessment.

Humanities are not a peripheral adornment to our technological culture. For beyond the curricular techniques and modes of thought and analysis -- lie the larger philosophic problems -- which pose insistent pragmatic questions:

The Humanities do not solve all the mysteries for us, but they do and ought to help us organize our world.

If I were to define the humanities in a single sentence, I should say that they are the studies which find meaning in experience.

Humanities--leads us to growing awareness of our social consciousness, as well as aesthetic sense, to reason as well as compassion--human dignity as well as human predicament--to outlets not only to individualism but to humanism as well.

The study of humanities should give one a quickened awareness of ~~the~~ own times and the nature of the human predicament today.

Humanities must give us a sense of being part of history-- to make us aware of the complexity of human life, diversity of humanity, to allow us to see ourselves in historical perspective.

Humanities are in their very nature moral agents--in the large sense of Matthew Arnold's definition of morality. For they stand for the application of ideas to life. Their implicit aim is to make us more human.

I would like to remind us that while we welcome the government's role in supporting the Humanities, Arts and Sciences, nevertheless, Academic Freedom is and must remain the central policy of the American universities. Thomas Jefferson was an early proponent of intellectual freedom as the foundation of the modern university. "The University of Virginia," he said, "would be based on the illimitable freedom of the human mind. For here, we are not afraid to follow truth, wherever it may lead, nor to tolerate error so long as reason is left free to combat it." Even though Jefferson was unable to implement that freedom fully at the University of Virginia, throughout the last two centuries American universities, with various degrees of success, have attempted to uphold the principles of free inquiry and the tenets of academic freedom. We must struggle to maintain these principles: we must maintain the integrity of scholarship, the independence and objectivity of scientific research, and the freedom of artistic creativity. The public must understand that the universities of our nation must be the guarantors of the First Amendment. The courts alone cannot guarantee the First Amendment and the right of free speech. The university must remain a sanctuary for ideas -- even unpopular ones. We cannot and we will not compromise on this principle. Freedom of speech cannot be rationed; it cannot be dispensed piecemeal. Rather it is a single entity that belongs to all. The hallmark of a university must not be a little bit of intellectual freedom, not freedom behind closed doors, not freedom just for liberals or just for conservatives or just for radicals or for organized groups, but as Bertrand Russell put it for "a minority of one."

The free discourse and debate fostered at our universities and scholarly and scientific research is our best hope for nurturing in each succeeding generation a respect for the right of each individual to form, espouse, and defend his or her beliefs and thoughts. The university must encourage the examination and challenges of all ideologies, theories, these,

and assumptions. To resolve such debates is not the point; simply to have them is exactly the point. Charles W. Eliot, one of the foremost American educators of his time, observed with great eloquence:

The very word education is a standing protest against dogmatic teaching . . . The worthy fruit of academic culture, is an open mind, trained to careful thinking, instructed in the methods of philosophic investigation, acquainted in a general way with the accumulated thought of past generations and penetrated with humility.

Freedom of thought, freedom of speech, and freedom to publish and disseminate are fundamental features of a true and open democratic society. Justice Hugo Black pointed out so forcefully that: "Freedom of speech, press, petition and assembly guaranteed by the First Amendment must be accorded to the ideas we hate or sooner or later they will be denied to the ideas we cherish."

In two landmark cases in 1957 and in 1967 the Supreme Court reaffirmed these principles as they relate to the university:

"To impose any straightjacket upon the intellectual leaders in our colleges and universities would imperil the future of our nation. . . Teachers and students must always remain free to inquire, to study and to evaluate, to gain new maturity, and understanding; our civilization will stagnate or die." [Keyishian v. Board of Regents, 385 U.S. 589]

The alternatives are Orwellian, and therefore unacceptable. As Nien Cheng wrote about the "cultural revolution" in China [in her book Life and Death in Shanghai], "When the penalty for speaking one's mind is so great, nobody knows what anybody else thinks."

At our universities, we want to know, we need to know what everyone thinks. To think without prejudice and to teach without fear are central to the mission of our university. In the words of President Dodds of Princeton: "Ideas should not be made safe for students but students should be made safe for ideas."

I therefore welcome and strongly support the view expressed by President Bush when he said that he does not "know anyone in government that should be set up to censor what you write or what you paint or how you express yourself."

Recommendation

As a university President and as an historian, I commend the NEH, its Chairman, Council and staff for their commitment to strengthen the curriculum of our secondary schools and universities in the realm of the Humanities. To strengthen the infrastructure of our educational system is of the utmost importance.

- The NEH must continue to support the research of both university-based and independent scholars. We must do this on the basis of time-tested and time-honored peer group reviews, with a view of guaranteeing the independence, the integrity and the quality of proposals.
- The existence of the NEH's Challenge Grants Program is a result of Congressional recognition that the humanities would be well served not just by support for projects, but by strengthening the financial underpinnings of the institutions where the humanities thrive. The Challenge grants program has been enormously successful, and remains in great demand. The annual success rate of applicants is only 20% and even successful applicants do not always receive the full amount requested. I firmly believe that the kind of basic, substantial support that Challenge Grants provide does as much to contribute to the health of the humanities in this country as do some specialized projects. I recommend the expansion of Challenge Grants funding so that the opportunities for other institutions to receive these grants will be more numerous and more substantial.
- The NEH has played a crucial and commendable national role in the realm of preservation. In saving our nation's and humanity's heritage from the ravages of acid paper and time, the NEH is not only rescuing that heritage but also is democratizing that heritage and making it accessible to scholars and the general public throughout the nation and the rest of the world. The national leadership role of the NEH should continue.
- My distinguished colleague, Professor Theodore Ziolkowsky, the Dean of the Graduate School at Princeton University, in his testimony will draw your attention to an issue which is dear to me. My views on this subject are well known to you through prior testimonies of mine. It deals with the NEH's support of the infrastructure of major national institutions, such as the New York Public Library, the Newberry Library, the John Carter Brown Library and many other independent research libraries as well as societies that hold major national collections, such as the American Antiquarian

Society, the American Philosophical Society, or centers for advanced study such as the Institute for Advanced Study, the American Schools of Oriental Research and the National Humanities Center or organizations that facilitate scholarly work such as the American Council of Learned Societies and the Social Science Research Council.

The number of institutions that compose this important national infrastructure are not numerous nor unfortunately are they broadly distributed geographically. They are essential however to the strength of America's scholarship in general and that of humanities in particular. •

These institutions don't want and do not have to have funds for "innovation." They do need crucial ongoing support for doing what they are good at, to collect, to preserve, and to make accessible vast resources to our scholars, our students, and the American public.

Congress should give serious consideration to the continued health and ongoing support of these institutions. Such a support in the long run will be both rational, economic and non-duplicative.

- The NEH's Regrant Program was and still is one of the most innovative as well as non-costly mechanisms through which NEH provided national support for scholarships in the realm of humanities. This was done and still is being done on the basis of thorough and rigorous review of grants and competition. Peer review, scrutiny, accountability have been the hallmark of such regrants. These regrants are done through reputable national institutions.

They have been the means through which the NEH has provided services that it is often not properly equipped to carry out (e.g. scholarly exchange programs). The removal of authority from regrant institutions to give direct grants and instead allowing them merely to recommend to NEH for its approval--is both costly, duplicative, and unnecessary. The NEH Chairman should be given back the authority to make awards to private institutions as well as organizations who on the basis of NEH regular review process and previously agreed upon criteria and procedures should have the responsibility to regrant funds and fellowships. I recommend this even though the procedures, so far, have not been intrusive, thanks to Lynn Cheney, the Chairman of the NEH, and the NEH Council.

- My distinguished colleague Dean John D'Arms of the University of Michigan, who will be testifying on behalf of the Association of American Universities and the National Humanities Alliance will speak among other

subjects on behalf of graduate education. His cogent thesis is that "the education of future scholars must be carried out simultaneously with the support of current research and scholarship." He points out that there are disturbing trends in the Humanities education, particularly at the graduate level, where due to lack of resources more and more individuals are taking a longer time to complete their doctorates. Currently, humanities doctorate recipients receive an average of two and a half percent of their support from the federal government, compared with 20.8% of support in the life sciences, 16.8% of support in the physical sciences, and 14.3 % in Engineers.

Within the next decade or two our nation's institutions of higher learning will be needing to replenish the ranks of our professoriate in the many disciplines of humanities.

There is a national call on the part of educational leaders, foundation leaders, as well as such leaders as the President's Science Advisor and the Director of the National Science Foundation that we must assist in the education and training of our next generation of leaders in the academy as well as industry and government.

I concur with Dean D'Arms and my other colleagues in the American Academy, that a moderately funded dissertation fellowship program would be beneficial to the promotion of the cause of scholarship and teaching in the humanities. A national alliance is needed between governmental agencies and private foundations to see that such a plan is national in scope and meets the long-range needs of the American higher education and the public.

- Finally, events in Eastern Europe and the U.S.S.R, the developments in western Europe and the impending economic and political integration of western Europe by 1992, the economic resurgence of the Pacific Basin--all of these highlight the importance of ideas, our knowledge of foreign cultures, foreign languages and institutions and traditions. The research and teaching in the humanities within the global context has assured added urgency and importance. NEH and our institutions of higher learning have no choice but to internationalize our focus and our scope.

In conclusion

- During the past twenty five years the National Endowment for the Humanities has performed well. Its record is good and its accomplishments are great on behalf of education, scholarship, and knowledge, and preservation of our nation's and humanity's heritage and

democratizing access to information and knowledge.

- The National Endowment for the Humanities has emerged as the most important single U.S. source of funding and often leadership in the realm of the humanities.
- The structural importance of the Humanities in American life is a fact, both from within and outside of our academic groves.
- We should not trivialize and marginalize the work and accomplishments of our scholars and teachers. In an open and democratic society ideological conflict, scholarly controversy, discussion of fundamental political and esthetic issues, differences in educational and pedagogical philosophies should be welcomed and not to be avoided for the sake of "orthodoxy." If humanistic learning and teaching are not lively, the essential public debate will not be lively. If so, then the substance of democracy itself will suffer.

As a colleague of mine wrote recently-- We, the humanists, are doing well, our house has innumerable rooms and we have nothing to apologize for. Humanistic knowledge with all of its ambiguities, contradictions, inconsistencies, and as diverse as it may be, is necessary for the health of our democracy and the free exchange of ideas.

The National Endowment for Humanities deserves your continued support, your appreciation and reauthorization. Its task and mission have not been finished. The nation needs it.

NATIONAL ENDOWMENT FOR THE HUMANITIES

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20506



STATEMENT
OF
LYNNE V. CHENEY
CHAIRPERSON, NATIONAL ENDOWMENT FOR THE HUMANITIES
AND
CHAIRPERSON, NATIONAL COUNCIL ON THE HUMANITIES
before the
SUBCOMMITTEE ON EDUCATION, ARTS AND HUMANITIES
of the
UNITED STATES SENATE.

April 5, 1990

NATIONAL ENDOWMENT FOR THE HUMANITIES

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Subcommittee:

I am honored to appear here today to speak on behalf of the reauthorization of the National Endowment for the Humanities. The Administration is proposing that our legislative authority be extended for another five years, and I urge this Subcommittee, which has been a strong supporter of the Endowment over the years, to endorse this proposed continuation. It is an easy task for me to sing the praises of NEH: As Chairman of the agency for the last four years, I've come to know first hand the important contribution that the Endowment makes to the life of our nation. I've come to know first hand the crucial work it does in advancing education, scholarship, and public understanding of the humanities. The late Charles Frankel once observed that it is through the humanities that a civilized society talks to itself about the things that matter most. As Chairman of NEH, I take great pride in acknowledging the small but significant role the Endowment has played for almost 25 years in helping the people of our nation deepen and broaden their understanding of ideas that are truly important.

The Humanities Endowment that the 89th Congress and the Johnson Administration created in 1965, and that every Congress and every Administration since have endorsed, has proved to be an effective way for the federal government to promote the study of history, literature, philosophy, and the other disciplines of the humanities throughout the nation. President Bush, in his FY 1991 budget request to Congress, commended the Endowment for its efforts in serving as a catalyst to help preserve and pass on the knowledge of our own and other cultures to future generations of Americans. This small agency has, through the thousands of grants it has made, complemented and fortified the vital work being done by public and private humanities institutions and individual teachers and scholars.

As you know, the Administration's bill that we submitted to Congress last month recommends that only minor changes be made in the existing language of the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities Act. Before turning to a discussion of our legislative proposals, I would like to make a few points about our efforts over the last four years.

We have, first of all, stressed repeatedly that the humanities are not being taught or learned as well as they should be. An NEH-funded survey of seventeen-year-olds showed two-thirds could not identify, within a fifty-year period, when the American Civil War occurred. An Endowment-funded survey of college seniors showed that one out of four had Churchill's words confused with Stalin's. One out of four also thought that one of Karl Marx's favorite phrases--"from each according to his ability, to each according to his need"--was in the United States Constitution.

We have, secondly, endeavored through our programs to improve humanities education. While the projects we have funded have ranged widely, many of them have focused on rewarding and encouraging good teaching.

- At Brown University, for example, an NEH grant of \$136,000 is currently supporting a humanities institute in which 30 college faculty members are studying indigenous and Spanish writing in the New World from the colonial period to the present. This grant is part of our ongoing agency-wide special initiative to support projects concerned with the 500th anniversary of Columbus's first voyage to the New World.
- At the University of Vermont, an NEH grant of \$62,776 will make possible a seminar in which fifteen school teachers from around the country will study Dante's Commedia. The knowledge gained by an in-depth study of this classic work of literature will help to inform these teachers' future classroom teaching.
- At Kansas State University, an Endowment award of \$265,000 is supporting a humanities institute, which will be held during the 1990-91 academic year, for 60 high school teachers from rural schools in Iowa, Kansas, Missouri, Nebraska, and Oklahoma on French, German, and Spanish languages and cultures.
- At Chicago State University, an NEH grant of \$110,000 is supporting a collaborative project on ancient history and literature for elementary and secondary school teachers of social studies and English from the Chicago public school system.

A third point I'd like to emphasize about our efforts is the way in which we have tried to stimulate a wide discussion of problems and solutions in humanities education, as well as to provide focus for our efforts, through a number of major reports. In 1987 the Endowment released American Memory: A Report on the Humanities in the Nation's Public Schools. This congressionally-mandated report cited evidence of the unsatisfactory state of cultural memory among American students. The report noted that insufficient time was devoted to teaching the humanities in our schools; that textbooks used to teach the humanities often make subjects like history and literature seem dull and unrewarding; that humanities teachers often do not have sufficient opportunity to study their subjects either in their training or once they are in the schools.

Two major Endowment programs grew out of American Memory. The first is the NEH/Reader's Digest Teacher-Scholars program, which provides sabbatical leave opportunities for school teachers to

increase their understanding of the subjects. The second is the NEH/UCLA History Center. Now engaged in compiling a major report on essential historical knowledge that students should have before graduation from high school, the Center also is developing a comprehensive collection of exemplary materials on the teaching of history that will be useful for schools around the nation.

In 1988, the Endowment released Humanities in America. This congressionally-mandated report noted the decline of the humanities on our college campuses: In 1966, one out of every six students majored in the humanities; in 1986, the figure was one in sixteen. Part of the reason for this decline, the report suggested, was that many students go to college without knowing much about the humanities, and once there are not required to study them. In 1988-89, it was possible to graduate from 37 percent of the nation's colleges and universities without taking a course in history, 45 percent without taking a course in American or English literature, and 77 percent without studying a foreign language.

The humanities, like other areas of human inquiry, suffer when teaching is insufficiently valued. Humanities in America noted that neither reputation nor reward is typically linked to teaching in higher education and that remedies are needed. In June, 1989, the NEH announced a program of Distinguished Teaching Professorships that will bring recognition to outstanding college and university teachers.

While the humanities have not done well on our college campuses in the past few decades, they have flourished in what Humanities in America called the "parallel school." In museums, historical societies and libraries, on radio and public television, public programming in the humanities has burgeoned. The funding the Endowment has provided through our Division of General Programs and the fine work of the state humanities councils have both been crucial to this growth.

Central to these public programs are scholars who are dedicated to bringing what Matthew Arnold called "the best that has been thought and known" to their fellow citizens. To recognize these scholars, the Endowment recently established the Charles Frankel Prize. This annual award draws national attention to individuals whose efforts have deepened the general public's understanding of the humanities.

In October 1989 the Endowment released its third major report of the current authorization period: 50 Hours: A Core Curriculum for College Students. This report recommended a required course of studies--a core of learning--that would ensure that undergraduates have opportunities to explore in ordered and coherent ways, the major fields of human inquiry: science, mathematics, and the social sciences, as well as the humanities. The report discussed issues of curricular reform and provided examples of colleges and universities that have undertaken the hard work of conceiving and implementing rigorous and coherent plans of general education for their students. Many of these efforts have been encouraged by NEH funding. For example:

- With an Endowment grant of \$352,343, Queens College of the City University of New York is developing a two-year course that will offer students a strong foundation in Western culture as well as encouraging understanding of other cultures and civilizations.
- An Endowment grant of \$423,430 has helped Piedmont Virginia Community College in Charlottesville, Virginia, introduce a one-year, historically organized course that engages students with primary works of literature, art, and philosophy from Homer to Picasso.
- With \$166,089 in FY 1987 funds, the University of North Texas established a "Classic Learning Core." Throughout the classes that comprise the core certain themes are stressed, such as reason, virtue, and civility. In sophomore English, for example, students might consider these themes as they read Shakespeare; in American history, they may discuss ways in which reason, virtue, and civility relate to our experiment in republican government.

The NEH's efforts to improve undergraduate education continue. Particularly noteworthy is a grant recently made to the Association of American Colleges (AAC). At our February 1990 Council meeting, the Endowment awarded \$359,037 to AAC to support a two-year project that will emphasize the importance of core curricula in the humanities in higher education institutions. The funds will support a major national conference focusing on model core programs, a follow-up mentoring service, and dissemination of two publications on the project's proceedings and findings.

Serious, thoughtful scholarship is the foundation on which humanities education rests, and thus we have devoted a significant portion of our resources to projects that expand knowledge and understanding. We have supported or are continuing to underwrite major works of scholarship such as authoritative editions of the papers and writings of George Washington, Frederick Douglass, Mark Twain, Jane Addams, and Martin Luther King, Jr., and the development of important research tools such as the Encyclopedia of Islam, The Great Dictionary of the Yiddish Language, a dictionary of the family of Sioux languages spoken by native Americans in the Great Plains region, and a computerized bibliography of the holdings of the Schomburg Center for Research in Black Culture at the New York Public Library.

We have also greatly expanded our efforts to preserve humanities research resources. The Endowment is providing leadership and support to institutions and organizations that are attempting to deal with the problems posed by the deterioration of materials in America's libraries, archives, museums, and other repositories. Recent estimates suggest that 80 million volumes comprising 25 to 30 percent of the holdings in the country's research facilities are disintegrating,

primarily because of the acid content of their paper. Other resources such as newspapers, periodicals, photographs, and audio and visual recordings are similarly threatened by factors inherent to their physical structure or by the way they are stored or handled.

In April 1988, the Endowment presented to Congress, at the request of the House Appropriations Subcommittee on the Department of the Interior and Related Agencies, a multi-year plan for accelerating our efforts to combat these and other preservation problems. The centerpiece of the plan is enhanced support for projects to microfilm brittle books. The remainder of the effort is devoted to collateral activities such as education and training projects and research and development projects to improve preservation methods and technology. Now in its second year of operation, the NEH plan has already helped to quicken the pace of the preservation effort throughout the nation: Major projects have been organized in seventeen U.S. research libraries that when completed will have microfilmed over 167,000 brittle books and serials. Training programs are underway to increase the number and expertise of preservation professionals.

Building on these efforts, in FY 1990 the Endowment expanded its commitment to preservation by launching a new National Heritage Preservation program that will be making its first grants later this year to institutions for needed improvements in the storage and protection of their material culture collections. Formed during a period when there was a more limited understanding of how best to maintain and conserve objects of material culture, many collections are inadequately housed. We have earmarked \$4.2 million of next year's Office of Preservation budget to support projects to improve the storage of these items.

The Endowment is committed to ensuring that Americans of all backgrounds and from all regions of the country have opportunities to learn about the humanities. In November 1986, the Endowment established a program entitled Access to Excellence to help make individuals and groups that may not be familiar with our programs more aware of them. Aimed at rural, inner-city, tribal and minority communities, this program promotes the Endowment's work nationally while also providing grant-writing assistance to first-time applicants on an individual basis. To date, the Access to Excellence program coordinator has traveled extensively (over 110 separate trips) in all 50 states, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, and the U.S. Virgin Islands. He has held over a thousand meetings or workshops in elementary and secondary schools, two- and four-year colleges, public libraries, historical organizations, and other institutions. The coordinator also has attended numerous national, regional, state, and local conferences, sent out over 30,000 individual packets of materials explaining the grant opportunities of the Endowment, and provided hundreds of potential applicants with counsel over the phone or through the mail. In addition, the coordinator has consulted with many non-profit associations, Congressional staffs, state offices, and state humanities councils in building this extensive outreach effort.

Since 1982, the Endowment has also supported President Reagan's and President Bush's federal initiatives on behalf of the nation's historically black colleges and universities (HBCUs). Through our regular grant programs we have pursued a number of special emphases to help HBCUs improve their education and public programming in the humanities and to assist their faculty members in conducting projects of humanities research and scholarship. We will be continuing these emphases on behalf of HBCUs in FY 1991. For example: Our Fellowships division again will sponsor a special competition for HBCU faculty members for fellowships to work on their Ph.D.'s in the humanities; the Access category in the Research division will encourage applications from HBCUs with collections of primary source materials important for humanities scholarship; and the Challenge Grants program guidelines will highlight the availability of support for HBCUs to improve the financial stability and fund-raising capacity of their institutions.

As the Congress recognized in 1965 in the original language of our authorizing legislation and as it has reaffirmed during every reauthorization since, encouraging education, research, and public knowledge of the humanities is not, and never should be, primarily the responsibility of the federal government. Such responsibility historically and properly lies with the states, individual citizens, foundations, the corporate sector, and the nation's educational and cultural institutions. Thus, Endowment funding in any given year will be but a small proportion of the total funding devoted to the humanities from all sources. Congress also created an effective mechanism, however, for leveraging nonfederal funds by authorizing the Endowment to match gifts from private donors to humanities projects and institutions that are recipients of NEH grants. Since 1985 when NEH was last reauthorized, using our authority to make Treasury matching grants and Challenge Grants, we have stimulated over one-third of a billion dollars in third-party contributions to these grantees. This extraordinary record of giving attests to both the vitality of public interest in the humanities and to the power of an NEH award to serve as a "seal of approval" that lets other funders know that the project is significant and of the highest caliber. By stimulating third-party contributions, we also help projects and institutions establish firmer roots in their communities.

Mr. Chairman, I hope you can see from this statement that the National Endowment for the Humanities does not need any major revisions in its enabling legislation. The NFAH Act as it now stands, we feel, is working well. In the legislative bill we have presented to Congress, we are proposing only minor modifications. These are amendments that either make technical corrections in the existing language or make small changes in our authority. Let me call your attention to just a few of these proposed amendments.

Section 4 of the bill would give NEH the authority to support preservation projects for renovation and construction purposes; currently, NEH makes awards for the construction of facilities only within our Challenge Grants program. As I mentioned earlier, the preservation of humanities research resources and important material

culture collections is a major emphasis of ours and will continue to be so in the coming years. This authority will permit us to meet the renovation and construction needs of institutions, should they arise.

Another preservation-oriented amendment can be found in Section 10 of the bill, which would give the Chairperson explicit authority to "foster programs and projects that provide access to and preserve materials important to research, education, and public understanding of the humanities." Such authority would formally recognize the Endowment's already significant activities in this area. Section 10 also makes a number of technical changes in the Act.

Sections 13 and 14 of the bill suggest changes in the legislative language pertaining to the data the state humanities councils must report to the Endowment. Annual reporting of data from the preceding year for which information is available is more compatible with existing state council information systems.

Section 17 of the bill updates and makes minor technical changes in the passages of the Act having to do with the Endowment's "national information and data collection system" and the timing of the submission to Congress of "state of the humanities" reports. We are proposing to submit reports on October 1, in 1990 and 1992 and "quadrennially thereafter" rather than the current legislative requirement of a report every two years.

Section 18 of the bill would give the Endowment express authority to make annual awards for the "Jefferson Lecturer in the Humanities" and the "Charles Frankel Prize." These awards have been given in the past by NEH with the knowledge and implicit approval of Congress; this proposed amendment would formalize these activities. The explicit authority to make these awards would parallel the authority the National Endowment for the Arts now has for its National Medal of Arts award program.

Sections 22, 25, 27, and 30 of the bill provide for authorization of appropriations for the Endowment's definite, Treasury, Challenge, and administrative funds, respectively, for the years FY 1991 through FY 1995. Allocations for FY 1991 are set at the levels contained in our current FY 1991 Budget request to Congress and "such sums as may be necessary" are recommended for the remaining fiscal years covered by the bill. Section 30 of the bill also would make the current \$35,000 cap on the use of funds for reception and representation expenses apply to appropriated funds only. Monies from other sources, such as gifts and bequests, would not be subject to the cap. Over the years, primarily as a result of inflation, the cost of such events as the annual Jefferson Lecture have increased. The Charles Frankel Prize, which we recently initiated, also involves representational expenses. Thus we are seeking this statutory change.

Mr. Chairman, thank you for this opportunity to talk about the important work of the National Endowment for the Humanities. I would be happy now to respond to any questions you or other members of the Subcommittee may have.

OPEN HEARING
SENATE SUBCOMMITTEE ON EDUCATION, ARTS AND HUMANITIES
430 DIRKSEN SENATE OFFICE BUILDING
APRIL 5, 1990
10:00 AM

REAUTHORIZATION OF THE NATIONAL FOUNDATION ON THE
ARTS AND HUMANITIES ACT
NATIONAL ENDOWMENT FOR THE HUMANITIES

Honorable Lynne V. Cheney
Chairman
National Endowment for the Humanities
Washington, DC

PANEL I:

Dr. Vartan Gregorian
President
Brown University
Providence, Rhode Island

PANEL II:

Dr. John D'Arms
Dean
Horace H. Rackham School of Graduate Studies
University of Michigan
Ann Arbor, MI

Dr. Andrew Debicki
Director
Hall Center for the Humanities
University of Kansas
Lawrence, KS

Dr. Theodore Ziolkowski
Dean
Graduate School
Princeton University
Princeton, NJ

PANEL III:

Mr. Thomas H. Roberts
Executive Director
Rhode Island Committee for the Humanities
Providence, RI

Mr. Delmont Oswald
Executive Director
Utah Endowment for the Humanities
Salt Lake City, UT

Dr. Robert H. Dyson, Jr.
Director
University Museum
University of Pennsylvania
Philadelphia, PA

Remarks Before the Annual Meeting of the
American Council of Learned Societies

by

Lynne V. Cheney

Chairman

National Endowment for the Humanities

April 27, 1990

I know it isn't necessary for me to report to you on the whole range of what the National Endowment for the Humanities has done during the past year since many of you follow our activities closely. We are grateful for your interest--mostly. During 1989, some staff members of this organization--and Doug Greenburg, I don't want you to worry; I'm not going to mention any names--but certain staff members in this organization did during 1989 become so interested in the Endowment's activities that ACLS actually sponsored a report setting forth the error of our ways.

Now, I know some institutions take badly to criticism, but the NEH is not one. No, not at all. To the contrary, we regard criticism as a challenge. Among the points made by the ACLS report, for example, was one about, and I quote, "the insuperable difficulties of constructing a core of courses that . . . all students should take." Insuperable? Impossible? Were we actually encouraging something that could not be done? I mean, the directors of five humanities centers right here on the East Coast had said so--and this certainly helped focus our thinking as we prepared the Endowment's most recent report: 50 Hours: A Core Curriculum for College Students. 50 Hours details the ways in which many fine colleges and universities across the country have, in fact, developed rigorous and

coherent cores of learning for undergraduates. It holds up as models core curricula at institutions on the East coast and the West coast and at scores of points in between. Faculty at the University of Dallas and the University of Denver, at Saint Anselm in New Hampshire and at the University of Tennessee in Chattanooga, at Dixie College in Saint George, Utah and Thomas Aquinas in Santa Paula, California, at Brooklyn College and Queens College and Columbia University, all right here in New York--faculty at institutions like these do not, fortunately, understand constructing a core to be a task of "insuperable" difficulty.

We have been enormously gratified by the response to 50 Hours. Although it is our experience generally at the Endowment that the topic of postsecondary education is not of as much general interest as elementary and secondary education, 50 Hours has been an exception. We have had as many requests for copies of this report as we did for American Memory, our report on the schools, in its first six months. To date, we have distributed some 60,000 copies.

Now, to be honest, a few people have frankly admitted they wanted the report for its reading lists; and there are some fine ones in 50 Hours, from St. John's College's junior year Western civilization syllabus to Columbia University's "Oriental Civilizations" reading list. The curious reader can

find African epics, Asian poetry and Middle Eastern and Latin American novels recommended for study.

But the majority of people requesting 50 Hours seem to be those with interests in matters curricular, particularly faculty members undertaking the hard, seldom-recognized work of gaining consensus on what should be taught and organizing courses and programs for faculty development. We have heard from colleges in every part of the nation that are working to make sense out of undergraduate education, including one in California that hopes to derive its entire plan of general education from 50 Hours. The distinguished educator John Goodlad, who is president of the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, wrote to say that his organization "will urge that the core curriculum described in the monograph be mandated as the prerequisite for all prospective teachers." Goodlad continued:

The scope and coverage of content advocated by you and your colleagues will do much to enhance the knowledge and understanding beginning teachers carry to elementary and secondary schools. The effort to focus on both Western and non-Western cultures, the attention to the integration of concepts and ideas, and the concern about how the core should be taught are important elements of the study.

We have also heard from parents trying to help their children make wise choices about colleges and universities. And we have heard from students who feel frustrated with the programs of study they find in place. A new, nationwide student newspaper called Campus is starting up. Its first issue, of which 100,000 copies have been distributed, has as the subject of its three lead articles the NEH report and related curricular matters.

Many people also wrote us to ask for copies of the Gallup survey released at the same time as 50 Hours. This is the poll showing that one out of four college seniors do not know in which half century Columbus first landed in the Western hemisphere, that one out of four have Churchill's and Stalin's words hopelessly confused, that one out of four can't tell Karl Marx's thoughts from the ideas of the United States Constitution.

The question I am asked more than any other is usually prefaced by a comment about how appalling it is that people about to be awarded bachelor's degrees don't know these things; but, the questioner wants to know, shouldn't they have learned them in school? And the answer is yes, of course. They should have done projects on Columbus's voyage in the early grades, perhaps read a biography later on. And then in college in a course in world or Western history, they should have

opportunities to explore what it meant for people around the globe to have Magellan and Columbus and Vasco DeGama sailing the seas, what it meant for Europeans to encounter "brave new worlds" and be encountered by them. There are events and epochs that one can profitably study more than once, at increasing levels of sophistication, and that one should study more than once. If this were happening, people about to graduate from college would not only know when Columbus sailed but have understanding of the import of such events--which is, as 50 Hours notes, the ultimate goal of education.

Still, the point needs to be emphasized that the responses to the Gallup survey reflect sixteen years of education, not just the last four; and it is the first twelve years I want to focus on for a few minutes today, partly because we are now, for the first time, taking up solutions to the problems of our schools that are sufficiently radical to meet those problems. The panel this morning made clear the deep rethinking that technology has given impetus to about the nature of scholarship and libraries. I want to focus on elementary and secondary education for a few minutes, not only because it affects the cohort of college students with whom you will be dealing in a few years, but because the rethinking going on there is fascinating. Driven by crisis, it is quickly becoming as radical as any paradigm shift being driven by technology.

We are, for example, profoundly revising our concept of what it means to be a teacher. We used to accept as a truism that the activity of teaching in our schools was greatly different from the activity of being a faculty member at a college or university. "Schoolteachers teach students," the conventional wisdom went, "and faculty members teach subjects." This meant that schoolteachers studied how to teach--often at the expense of what to teach. They could only get into the classroom by taking hours and hours of courses in education as an undergraduate. The way to sustain teachers professionally once they were in the classroom, it was widely believed, was with more courses in education. A recent report from the Abell Foundation in Maryland shows the results of this view. The Baltimore school system, the researchers pointed out, makes it very easy for teachers to take such courses as "Creative Teaching Strategies." The teacher who wants instead to study the modern novel or ancient history or quantum mechanics must expend not only additional effort--but additional time and money.

What a shift in thinking we are undergoing about this. Alternative certification plans are springing up across the nation, plans that make it possible for people with bachelor's degrees in subject areas to become teachers in our schools. A plan to certify teachers on a national basis is being developed, and those involved in the project have been heroic

in holding fast to the idea that anyone who has taught for three years in either public or private school may sit for certification examinations. They will not require, they have said decidedly on several occasions, that candidates have completed a traditional program of courses in education. Farsighted states--and I'm thinking of Texas now--are putting upper limits on the number of hours in education that can be required of future teachers. Farsighted colleges of education--are instituting programs that emphasize--in the hours that are required--bringing prospective teachers together with master teachers so that the art, the craft of teaching, may be absorbed as subjects are being taught and learned. Farsighted colleges and universities are emphasizing the importance of good teaching so that prospective teachers will have models of what teaching should be in their undergraduate years.

People have been lamenting throughout my lifetime the waste involved in the way we prepare teachers for our schools; now, at last, there are signs we are going to do something about it. And we are changing as well the way we think about the sustenance of teachers. Good teachers want to know more about the subject that they are teaching. NEH seminars and institutes and seminars sponsored by state humanities councils are opening up these opportunities for them. A new Endowment program called "Masterworks" provides schools with ways to use in-service days, that are automatically scheduled, in the

productive study of subjects like history, literature, and philosophy. All of these efforts depend on scholars' working with teachers. All of these efforts are possible only because of the rethinking that is going on in higher education about what a faculty member's responsibilities should be. Increasingly there is understanding that part of what our colleges and universities must value are faculty members who care about our schools and the teachers in them, and I congratulate the ACLS for your efforts to help bring about this realization.

A second area of radical rethinking concerns the matter of who decides what school a child attends. Across the country in different localities and states, plans are being implemented that allow parents and students to choose. The idea of choice is gaining converts partly because it makes sense. Institutions do not spontaneously improve. They need motivation to improve, and that is what choice provides. Inserting the dynamic of competition into education--a dynamic that our national system of higher education has long enjoyed--introducing this dynamic gives schools powerful reason to get better. If a school wants to be chosen, it has to strive for excellence.

Choice not only makes sense in the abstract. It works. Now, it's not a panacea. It doesn't work magic. But in

District 4 in East Harlem, where a choice plan has been in place for more than a decade, test scores have risen. District 4 isn't at the top: it ranks sixteenth out of thirty-two school districts. But before choice, it ranked thirty-second out of thirty-two. On the other side of the country in Richmond, California, a choice plan has resulted in higher test scores and lower drop-out rates.

Most choice plans mean choice among public schools, but even more venturesome thinking is going on in Wisconsin. There the Republican Governor, Tommy Thomson, joined forces with Polly Williams, a Democratic legislator; and the two of them got through the legislature a bill that will allow about a thousand poor children in inner-city Milwaukee to choose between private and public schools next year. The Wisconsin story is a revealing one, partly because it shows the non-partisan nature of the radical reforms that are taking place. Both the Governor and Mrs. Williams have made clear a vital point about choice: it results in a sense of ownership. It makes parents feel involved with schools. I had the good fortune to talk to Mrs. Williams a few weeks ago, and she explains it this way: "If we can empower poor people to decide for themselves, that's going to involve them in the schools in a whole new way." Mrs. Williams' words take on special force, since she was once on welfare herself.

The last point I want to make today is a related one, and I'd like to make it by telling a story. I had an opportunity in February to visit Asia and talk to educators and visit classrooms there. At one school, Kyungbok High School in Seoul, Korea, I visited Mr. Hong's 3 p.m. English class; and at the end of the hour, I was asked if I would like to say a few words. I used the time to ask the seventeen-year-olds in Mr. Hong's class a question from a survey that the Endowment funded a few years ago to find out what seventeen-year-olds in the United States know about history and literature. The question was: When did the American Civil War occur? Given fifty-year blocks of time to choose from, more than two-thirds of the American seventeen-year olds could not say when the Civil War occurred. There were fifty-one students in Mr. Hong's English class, and fifty got the answer right.

Now this is a breathtaking difference, and there are many explanations for it: a longer school year in Korea, a national curriculum, a national examination that expects students to have mastered such knowledge. But perhaps the most crucial element in the Korean students' success can be found in a gift I was given as I left the school: a wooden pencil holder with four Chinese characters on it. The first said, "Be loyal to your country;" the second, "Honor your parents;" the third, "Work hard in the daytime;" and the fourth, "Read at night." These words--the work of a nineteenth-century calligrapher--are

Kyungbok High School's motto. They are part of the environment within which learning takes place.

An ethos that so nurtures learning cannot be created by classroom teachers alone. It's up to parents--it's up to all of us--to emphasize the importance of hard work and the inestimable value of education through our words and our example. Indeed, it may be that the most profound rethinking _ that we are doing about education has to do with a steadily growing realization that we are all teachers, no matter what our occupation. If ours is a society in which young people are eager to learn, we can all take credit; and if it is not, we can all take blame.

I look forward to working with the American Council of Learned Societies to encourage learning and to make sure that the rising generation has the schools, the colleges, and the universities that it deserves.



NATIONAL ENDOWMENT FOR THE HUMANITIES

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20506

STATEMENT
OF
LYNNE V. CHENEY
CHAIRPERSON, NATIONAL ENDOWMENT FOR THE HUMANITIES
AND
CHAIRPERSON, NATIONAL COUNCIL ON THE HUMANITIES
before the
SUBCOMMITTEE ON POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION
of the
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

May 2, 1990

NATIONAL ENDOWMENT FOR THE HUMANITIES

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Subcommittee:

I am honored to appear here today to speak on behalf of the reauthorization of the National Endowment for the Humanities. The Administration is proposing that our legislative authority be extended for another five years, and I urge this Subcommittee, which has been a strong supporter of the Endowment over the years, to endorse this proposed continuation. It is an easy task for me to sing the praises of NEH: As Chairman of the agency for the last four years, I've come to know first hand the important contribution that the Endowment makes to the life of our nation. I've come to know first hand the crucial work it does in advancing education, scholarship, and public understanding of the humanities. The late Charles Frankel once observed that it is through the humanities that a civilized society talks to itself about the things that matter most. As Chairman of NEH, I take great pride in acknowledging the small but significant role the Endowment has played for almost 25 years in helping the people of our nation deepen and broaden their understanding of ideas that are truly important.

The Humanities Endowment that the 89th Congress and the Johnson Administration created in 1965, and that every Congress and every Administration since have endorsed, has proved to be an effective way for the federal government to promote the study of history, literature, philosophy, and the other disciplines of the humanities throughout the nation. President Bush, in his FY 1991 budget request to Congress, commended the Endowment for its efforts in serving as a catalyst to help preserve and pass on the knowledge of our own and other cultures to future generations of Americans. This small agency has, through the thousands of grants it has made, complemented and fortified the vital work being done by public and private humanities institutions and individual teachers and scholars.

As you know, the Administration's bill that we submitted to Congress in March recommends that only minor changes be made in the existing language of the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities Act. Before turning to a discussion of our legislative proposals, I would like to make a few points about our efforts over the last four years.

We have, first of all, stressed repeatedly that the humanities are not being taught or learned as well as they should be. An NEH-funded survey of seventeen-year-olds showed two-thirds could not identify, within a fifty-year period, when the American Civil War occurred. An Endowment-funded survey of college seniors showed that one out of four had Churchill's words confused with Stalin's. One out of four also thought that one of Karl Marx's favorite phrases--"from each according to his ability, to each according to his need"--was in the United States Constitution.

schools; that textbooks used to teach the humanities often make subjects like history and literature seem dull and unrewarding; that humanities teachers often do not have sufficient opportunity to study their subjects either in their training or once they are in the schools.

Two major Endowment programs grew out of American Memory. The first is the NEH/Reader's Digest Teacher-Scholars program, which provides sabbatical leave opportunities for school teachers to increase their understanding of the subjects they teach. The second is the NEH/UCLA History Center. Now engaged in compiling a major report on essential historical knowledge that students should have before graduation from high school, the Center also is developing a comprehensive collection of exemplary materials on the teaching of history that will be useful for schools around the nation.

In 1988, the Endowment released Humanities in America. This congressionally-mandated report noted the decline of the humanities on our college campuses: In 1966, one out of every six students majored in the humanities; in 1986, the figure was one in sixteen. Part of the reason for this decline, the report suggested, was that many students go to college without knowing much about the humanities, and once there are not required to study them. In 1988-89, it was possible to graduate from 37 percent of the nation's colleges and universities without taking a course in history, 45 percent without taking a course in American or English literature, and 77 percent without studying a foreign language.

The humanities, like other areas of human inquiry, suffer when teaching is insufficiently valued. Humanities in America noted that neither reputation nor reward is typically linked to teaching in higher education and that remedies are needed. In June, 1989, the NEH announced a program of Distinguished Teaching Professorships that will bring recognition to outstanding college and university teachers.

While the humanities have not done well on our college campuses in the past few decades, they have flourished in what Humanities in America called the "parallel school." In museums, historical societies and libraries, on radio and public television, public programming in the humanities has burgeoned. The funding the Endowment has provided through our Division of General Programs and the fine work of the state humanities councils have both been crucial to this growth.

Central to these public programs are scholars who are dedicated to bringing what Matthew Arnold called "the best that has been thought and known" to their fellow citizens. To recognize these scholars, the Endowment recently established the Charles Frankel Prize. This annual award draws national attention to individuals whose efforts have deepened the general public's understanding of the humanities.

of Islam, a dictionary of the family of Sioux languages spoken by native Americans in the Great Plains region, and a computerized bibliography of the holdings of the Schomburg Center for Research in Black Culture at the New York Public Library.

We have also greatly expanded our efforts to preserve humanities research resources. The Endowment is providing leadership and support to institutions and organizations that are attempting to deal with the problems posed by the deterioration of materials in America's libraries, archives, museums, and other repositories. Recent estimates suggest that 80 million volumes comprising 25 to 30 percent of the holdings in the country's research facilities are disintegrating, primarily because of the acid content of their paper. Other resources such as newspapers, periodicals, photographs, and audio and visual recordings are similarly threatened by factors inherent to their physical structure or by the way they are stored or handled.

In April 1988, the Endowment presented to Congress, at the request of the House Appropriations Subcommittee on the Department of the Interior and Related Agencies, a multi-year plan for accelerating our efforts to combat these and other preservation problems. The centerpiece of the plan is enhanced support for projects to microfilm brittle books. The remainder of the effort is devoted to collateral activities such as education and training projects and research and development projects to improve preservation methods and technology. Now in its second year of operation, the NEH plan has already helped to quicken the pace of the preservation effort throughout the nation: Major projects have been organized in seventeen U.S. research libraries that when completed will have microfilmed over 167,000 brittle books and serials. Training programs are underway to increase the number and expertise of preservation professionals.

Building on these efforts, in FY 1990 the Endowment expanded its commitment to preservation by launching a new National Heritage Preservation program that will be making its first grants later this year to institutions for needed improvements in the storage and protection of their material culture collections. Formed during a period when there was a more limited understanding of how best to maintain and conserve objects of material culture, many collections are inadequately housed. We have earmarked \$4.2 million of next year's Office of Preservation budget to support projects to improve the storage of these items.

The Endowment is committed to ensuring that Americans of all backgrounds and from all regions of the country have opportunities to learn about the humanities. In November 1986, the Endowment established a program entitled Access to Excellence to help make individuals and groups that may not be familiar with our programs more aware of them. Aimed at rural, inner-city, tribal and minority communities, this program promotes the Endowment's work nationally while also providing grant-writing assistance to first-time applicants on an individual basis. To date, the Access

is significant and of the highest caliber. By stimulating third-party contributions, we also help projects and institutions establish firmer roots in their communities.

In conclusion, I would like to give you some examples of NEH-funded projects that illustrate the important work we are doing:

- The American Library Association received a grant from the Endowment in FY 1989 to support a major traveling exhibition about the history of the U.S. Congress. The ALA, in cooperation with the Library of Congress, developed a series of prints, photographs, documents, and other materials that depict the history of Congress's first two centuries. The exhibition is traveling to public libraries in 30 cities across the nation including Billings, Montana; St. Louis, Missouri; Madison, Wisconsin; Detroit, Michigan; Louisville, Kentucky; Rapid City, South Dakota; and Olympia, Washington;
- The Montana Historical Society received \$72,000 in FY 1989 through the Endowment's Challenge Grants program in support of its fund raising efforts to establish an endowment fund for educational, preservation, and library acquisitions programs in the humanities;
- The Chicago Historical Society received \$300,000 from the Endowment in FY 1989 to help it mount a major new exhibition: "A House Divided: America in the Age of Lincoln." The exhibition draws on the museum's extensive and rich collections of American Civil War artifacts, daguerrotypes, historical paintings, and the personal effects of Lincoln and his family. It explores the causes and conflicts leading to the Civil War, the war itself, and its aftermath, with a special emphasis on the historical role and symbolic importance of Abraham Lincoln during this era. In addition to the exhibition, the museum has published a catalogue, developed educational materials for local schools, and sponsored a scholarly symposium;
- The University of Kentucky in Lexington recently received a grant of \$137,563 from the Endowment to continue its state-wide program of cataloguing and microfilming historically important newspapers held by Kentucky repositories. NEH has been supporting this project since 1983 as part of the nationwide U.S. Newspaper Program, which is a major component of the preservation efforts of our Office of Preservation;
- The Wisconsin Humanities Committee received a \$10,000 State and Regional Exemplary Award from the Endowment's Division of State Programs to support a series of meetings of scholars, writers, and authorities on American Indian education to plan a statewide reading and discussion program on American Indian history and culture;

Sections 13 and 14 of the bill suggest changes in the legislative language pertaining to the data the state humanities councils must report to the Endowment. Annual reporting of data from the preceding year for which information is available is more compatible with existing state council information systems.

Section 17 of the bill updates and makes minor technical changes in the passages of the Act having to do with the Endowment's "national information and data collection system" and the timing of the submission to Congress of "state of the humanities" reports. We are proposing to submit reports on October 1, in 1990 and 1992 and "quadrennially thereafter" rather than the current legislative requirement of a report every two years.

Section 18 of the bill would give the Endowment express authority to make annual awards for the "Jefferson Lecturer in the Humanities" and the "Charles Frankel Prize." These awards have been given in the past by NEH with the knowledge and implicit approval of Congress; this proposed amendment would formalize these activities. The explicit authority to make these awards would parallel the authority the National Endowment for the Arts now has for its National Medal of Arts award program.

Sections 22, 25, 27, and 30 of the bill provide for authorization of appropriations for the Endowment's definite, Treasury, Challenge, and administrative funds, respectively, for the years FY 1991 through FY 1995. Allocations for FY 1991 are set at the levels contained in our current FY 1991 Budget request to Congress and "such sums as may be necessary" are recommended for the remaining fiscal years covered by the bill. Section 30 of the bill also would make the current \$35,000 cap on the use of funds for reception and representation expenses apply to appropriated funds only. Monies from other sources, such as gifts and bequests, would not be subject to the cap. Over the years, primarily as a result of inflation, the cost of such events as the annual Jefferson Lecture have increased. The Charles Frankel Prize, which we recently initiated, also involves representational expenses. Thus we are seeking this statutory change.

Mr. Chairman, thank you for this opportunity to talk about the important work of the National Endowment for the Humanities. I would be happy now to respond to any questions you or other members of the Subcommittee may have.

Reauthorization 1985: Amendments
Update of NEH Actions and Responses

TAB D (page 1)
(reauthorization book)

Table of Contents

<u>Subject</u>	<u>Page</u>
Alternative funding sources, GAO study of.....	32
Construction authority.....	3,15
Cultural diversity/Minorities/"Underrepresented":	
Added to statutory definition.....	2
Authorization to support programs for.....	4
"Particular regard".....	9
Data collection system.....	16
Davis-Bacon Act compliance.....	15
Definition of the humanities, expansion of.....	2
Education study mandate.....	28
Evaluation of grants and programs.....	25
International programs and exchanges.....	8
Minimum wage requirements.....	14
Museums study mandate.....	21
National Council on the Humanities	
Qualifications of.....	18
Oversight of grants.....	25
Preamble of NFAH Act, expansion of.....	1
Review system:	
Panelists, selection and service of.....	22
Report mandate.....	31
(Testimonials to NEH review system).....	23
State Councils:	
Certification of third-party gifts.....	31
Gubernatorial appointments.....	13
Reports required re: public meetings, etc.....	11
State of the Humanities report mandate.....	16

OPB
4/27/90
2681T, p. 98

(80)

SECRETS OF SUCCESS

COMMENCEMENT ADDRESS
BOWLING GREEN STATE UNIVERSITY
BOWLING GREEN, OHIO
MAY 5, 1990

By Lynne V. Cheney, Chairman
National Endowment for the Humanities

Graduates, parents, faculty members, and guests--it's a great pleasure for me to be here today and to join with you in celebrating this occasion. I have a college-age daughter myself, and another daughter who graduated recently, so I feel as though I have a great deal in common with the parents in this audience.

And I also feel I have something in common with the graduates. I know that young people today often look for role models, people who have succeeded in ways they want to succeed. Well, let me just say that people in their forties look for role models, too; and I'd like to tell you I have found mine. You all know who she is: Her name is Sandra Day O'Connor. What you don't know is why she's my role model. It has nothing to do with her being a Supreme Court Justice. It doesn't even have anything to do with her being a thoroughly nice person. No, the reason Sandra Day O'Connor is my role model--and this is going to make all of you very happy--the reason she is my role model is that she has perfected the art of giving short commencement speeches.

Not long ago, Justice O'Connor gave a commencement speech that lasted just five minutes. I'm not sure I can tie that record, but in an attempt to live up to it, I'm going to make just five points today. I'm going to talk about five traits that are pretty widely shared among successful people that I've observed--and offer them to you as you head off into new worlds and new lives.

One secret of success, I have observed, is to act as if you know what you're doing. Now, I suspect this point doesn't need much elaboration. I have found college seniors to be pretty well-practiced at acting as if they know what they're about. They have a remarkably high degree of self-confidence--which in the case of my own children I have felt an absolute motherly obligation to lower from time to time--but not too much. Watching Douglas MacArthur operate, Franklin Roosevelt observed that you should "never underestimate a man who overestimates himself." There's wisdom there--as well as a jab at MacArthur--and all of this coming from a President who demonstrated a thing or two in his time about acting confidently.

Take your self-confidence with you as you move to the next stage of your life. It will help you, even though you're a beginner, to behave with assuredness, to act as if you know what you're doing. And that is a key to success. But there's a second secret--one that goes right along with the first--and that is to know what you're doing. Sooner or later, you'll be tested. You'll have to make decisions and live with results that will show how hard you've worked, how much you've learned, how much you are to be respected. True expertise, orchestra conductor Victoria Bond observed not long ago in the New York Times, "is the most potent form of authority." Those are words worth remembering. When your chance comes along to make the music, you will find it a very good thing, indeed, to know the notes.

A third rule for success I would offer you is this: Have a place to stand. Archimedes theorized he could move the world with a big enough lever--but he needed a firm place to stand the fulcrum. We all need that firm place--that base of conviction from which to act. I know that college has been a time when you've been encouraged to ask a lot of questions, to call all manner of practice and belief into doubt. And that is a crucial part of the examined life which Socrates thought the only kind worth living. But having questioned and doubted, it is also important to arrive at some answers and beliefs.

Find that base of conviction that will give you direction, that place to stand from which you try to move the world. That's the third secret of success I would offer you, and the fourth is to be aware--and respectful--of where other people are standing. Let me tell you a story I heard not long ago. It was about a British naval commander, Roger Wilson, let's call him, who was sailing her majesty's yacht with the Prince and Princess of Wales on board. Commander Wilson, so the story goes, saw lights ahead, bearing straight down on the yacht. So he signalled: "Please yield." But the lights kept coming. "No, you please yield," they signalled back. The commander tried again: "Please yield." And again, the negative answer: "No, you please yield," So the commander decided to pull rank. "I am commander Roger Wilson of her majesty's yacht, I have the Prince and Princess of Wales on board, and by royal decree, I order you to yield."

And back flashed the answer: "I am John Smith, and I have been in charge of this lighthouse for fifteen years."

You will encounter some immovable objects in your lifetime. Some movable ones, too, of course. The crucial thing--no matter how exalted you might become--is to be clearsighted about the difference. Having a healthy estimate of yourself can be a fine thing--unless it keeps you from a realistic estimate of others. I mentioned Douglas MacArthur at the beginning of this speech, and if you've studied history as much as I hope you have during your time at this university, you'll remember that his career ended when he tried sailing into a lighthouse named Harry Truman.

The last secret of success I'd offer--and the most important one--is this: Know what success is. It may be connected with fame and fortune, but it well may not be. It almost certainly will be connected with work that you love, work that involves you deeply quite apart from whatever rewards it may bring.

How do you discover what that work is for you? With intensity of effort, I would suggest, because knowledge of what that work is will grow out of learning what you do well. And there is no way to be sure of your capacities except by testing yourself, pushing yourself. "Whatsoever thy hand findeth to do, do it with thy whole might," wrote Thomas Carlyle, a man who thought long and deeply on the subject of meaningful work.

And how will you know when you have found work you love? One symptom is that you will lose track of time. You'll look at your watch and wonder where the hours have gone, at your calendar and wonder what happened to the week. And that loss of time sense is symbol as well as symptom. We are time-bound creatures, but meaningful work can make us forget our mortal limitation--because it helps us transcend it.

Whether we create sonnets or families, make machines or harvest crops, work takes on meaning for us when we feel it to be a part of something that endures. Whether we undertake the business of business or scholarship or nations, work becomes beloved when it joins us with something larger than ourselves, something worthy that extends beyond us. Willa Cather put it this way: "That is happiness; to be dissolved into something complete and great."

And it is also success--or at least the most critical element of it I know. Photographer Margaret Bourke White once called her beloved work "a trusted friend, who never deserts you." And because you will never want to desert it, it is an energizing source like no other, getting you out of bed before dawn, inspiring you late into the night. There may be people in this world who become the very best at what they do who do not love their work--but I have never met them nor can I imagine from

where they derive the commitment, day after day, that excellence demands.

There are many things that those of us on the podium wish for you as you set forth from this fine school. Indeed, you have many blessings already--this joyous occasion, proud parents, good friends, teachers who have cared for you and will continue to.

To all of these, let me add my blessing. May you find success. May you discover the work you love--and prosper in it.

NATIONAL ENDOWMENT FOR THE HUMANITIES

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20506



MEMORANDUM

June 12, 1990

TO: NEH Staff
FROM: Marguerite H. Sullivan *MHS*
SUBJECT: Address to National Association of Scholars

NEH Chairman Lynne V. Cheney addressed the National Association of Scholars convention in New York City last Friday. I thought you would be interested in reading her remarks. They are attached.

Attachment

THE IMPORTANCE OF STORIES

By

**Lynne V. Cheney, Chairman
National Endowment for the Humanities**

**The Second National Conference
of the National Association of Scholars**

**New York City, New York
June 8, 1990**

Over the past few months, I have most carefully avoided doing anything that might cause people to confuse the National Endowment for the Humanities with the National Endowment for the Arts. As I see it, we in the humanities have a sufficient number of our own disputes, without taking on those that our sister agency generates. So I have been very precise lately about which Endowment I am not in charge of as well as which one I do run.

But even at the risk of causing some confusion, I want to begin today by talking about art, in particular about a Native American form of art that has recently emerged from the Pueblo tradition. This art form began in the early 1960s when a potter from the Cochiti pueblo in New Mexico created the figure of a storyteller. This potter, Helen Cordero, thought of her grandfather as she shaped the clay; and remembering him telling stories to his grandchildren, she molded five smaller figures to go with the larger one, five children to nestle around the storyteller as he told his tales.

That first storyteller and the ones Cordero subsequently created won much acclaim. Other talented Cochiti potters began creating their own storytellers, as did gifted potters from other pueblos. The entire figurative tradition of Pueblo

pottery was revitalized, and storyteller figures became sought after by collectors around the world.

As is often true of art, the more one learns about the Pueblo storytellers, the more deeply one appreciates them. But even those who know nothing about the history of these figures find them arresting. No background knowledge is required to look into the faces of the storytellers and see something that is at once mysterious and familiar. Their mouths are usually open, often in a stylized "O." Their eyes are shut or gazing fixedly upward as they perform an amazing feat that we all take for granted: creating other worlds in this one; vivifying times that have passed, people that are gone forever, events that are known only through memory.

Meanwhile, some of the children gathered around--and often there are dozens of the small pottery figures--gaze off into space themselves, absorbed in the storyteller's story. But others play with baskets and dogs and baby brothers. Others climb on one another and on the storyteller. Others sleep. It is a scene any teacher instantly recognizes: the adult intent on communicating age-old stories to an audience only gradually becoming aware that there has ever been any age besides the present one.

Alfred Korzybski, a pioneer in the field of semantics, identified human beings as "time-binding" creatures. The ability to move out of the narrow circle of the moment by remembering the past, building upon it, and transmitting it into the future was, Korzybski noted, a uniquely human capacity. While there are some characteristics that we share with other living things, we alone are able to transcend time, to bind the past, present and future together with words. "Humanity," Korzybski wrote, "has time-binding capacity as its characteristic, its discriminant, its peculiar and definitive mode."

Although the young have a natural inclination to become time-binders, they have to learn about the past before their potential power becomes actual, and that is part of what the Pueblo storyteller is about. He or she--there are both male and female storytellers--is teaching the children gathered round, offering them knowledge they need to move beyond the immediate pleasures of childhood and to connect, as only human beings can do, with the on-going chronicle.

The Pueblo artists who create the storytellers say that these figures represent an older way of life. They say that television and other distractions as well as the increasingly busy pace of daily existence mean that the scene of the storyteller gathered with children occurs less frequently than

it once did. I think most of us would acknowledge that this is true of our culture generally, that storytelling has declined--at least if one defines it as the telling of tales that enlarge perspective, that move us beyond the present into an understanding of the continuity of past, present and future.

Now, if one is willing to extend the definition of story to include all narratives, whether they move us beyond the present or not, then it is possible to say that our society is saturated with stories: from tabloids through talk shows to MTV. Soap operas are a quintessential example of present-tense narrative. The characters move in various combinations and permutations through a world constantly being liberated from the past. The viewer can miss a few months or a few years, no matter. It is possible to join right in again, because the story as it has unfolded is of little importance. The story as it is unfolding is everything. Days of Our Lives, one soap opera is aptly named. Years aren't the issue, nor are the lives of any generation besides our own.

But what about the other kind of story, the kind that opens our eyes, wakes us up to the fact that we are part of a continuity extending through time? What happens when these stories are neglected? Let me suggest there are grave consequences when we fail to awaken the time-binding capacity

in the young. People who grow up without a sense of how yesterday has affected today are unlikely to have a strong sense of how today affects tomorrow. They are unlikely to understand in bone-deep way how the decisions they make now will shape and affect their future. It is only when we become conscious of the flow of time that the consequences of action--whether it is taking drugs or dropping out of school--become a consideration. It is only when we have perspective on our lives that motives besides immediate gratification can come into play.

Now I do not mean to place on storytelling a weight it will not bear, but what else so encourages our time-binding sense? In an essay called "Fame and the Founding Fathers," Douglass Adair pointed out the importance that stories had for our nation's founders. They recommended narratives of the past as a guide to correct behavior. "Imitate Jesus and Socrates," Franklin wrote. Jefferson hung pictures of Bacon, Newton and Locke in his Washington lodgings, declaring them to visitors to be "the three greatest men the world had ever produced."

Consciousness of the past made the founders acutely aware of the future. They acted in the knowledge that the narrative that they were living might someday illumine the world. And what was the result of this absorption with story? Adair suggests that the founders' profound sense of being part of the

ongoing human chronicle accounts for the period's vitality. The setting of noble goals that their historical awareness encouraged and their desire to act in ways that would be honored by posterity accounts, in Adair's view, for a small nation's producing a pantheon of heroes. Virginia, you will remember, with a population about the size of today's Baltimore or Indianapolis, gave us Washington, Mason, Henry, Jefferson, Madison and Marshall.

The idea that stories of the past can provide instruction for the present is an enduring one. It lies behind the tales told in the Old Testament and the parables in the New. It informed Plutarch's Lives of the Noble Greeks and Romans almost two thousand years ago. It is present in Alfred North Whitehead's modern formulation: "Moral education is impossible," he wrote, "apart from the habitual vision of greatness." Vision is a key word here, for as Whitehead sees it, abstract concepts are insufficient inspiration to moral action. They must be given human face in order to uplift us, material form--such as narrative provides.

It's also important to note what Whitehead does not say on this topic as well as what he does. He does not say that knowing greatness will guarantee moral action, merely that it is necessary to it. It's easy enough to pick the wrong hero or to interpret wrongly the one chosen. As Simon Schama points

out in his highly acclaimed book on the French Revolution, even Robespierre had his role models.

Knowledge of how others have coped with adversity and failure and success does not ensure wisdom and virtue. But it can be an animating force for them, as the example of the founders shows. And it is guarantee that to all our choices we will bring some perspective--an ingredient crucial to deciding both wisely and well.

Traditionally, stories have been told to the young not just in families, but in schools; and all the fields of knowledge have their animating stories. One of the real pleasures of working on the Endowment's latest report, 50 Hours: A Core Curriculum for College Students, came from the opportunity it provided to range across fields of knowledge and encounter their diverse stories. One that I found particularly striking, perhaps because I am a lapsed mathematics major, begins in third-century Greece with Euclid setting down five postulates--five geometric ideas assumed to be true--and deriving the rest of geometry from them. The fifth of these postulates troubled people from the beginning. It was a peculiar thing that appeared to depend on the other four postulates, but everyone who tried to prove the connection failed. Finally, some two thousand years after Euclid worked, an Italian scholar, Girolamo Saccheri, decided to take a new

approach and see what would happen if one assumed the fifth postulate wasn't true. Negating it should have caused a contradiction, but no matter how hard Saccheri tried, he couldn't come up with any inconsistency that was really satisfying. It was an amazing moment in the history of human thought. Another step or two and Saccheri would revolutionize the way people thought not just about geometry, but about the world. He was on the verge of an enormous discovery--perhaps so enormous he couldn't conceive it--and he didn't take the next few steps.

About a hundred years later, a famous German mathematician, Carl Friedrich Gauss, did. Working through Saccheri's approach, Gauss saw that Euclid's first four postulates and the negation of his fifth could be used as the basis for an entirely new geometry, an entirely new way of describing space. But how could such a thing be? Wasn't mathematics certain? Didn't it describe the world? How could there be two different descriptions? Or three? Or four? The discovery that there could be more than one geometry, more than one consistent and workable way of describing the world was so astonishing that Gauss was reluctant to reveal it. Some suggest that he did not publish his findings because so much of Immanuel Kant's philosophy rested on the notion of a single, Euclidean geometry; and Gauss had no wish to oppose Germany's great philosopher.

But within a few years, there were several men who not only saw what Gauss had seen, but were willing to publish it. These men, in particular a Russian mathematician, Nicolai Lobachevsky, changed the world. They unsettled thought; and by doing so opened whole new domains to exploration. In their footsteps, thinkers like Einstein followed.

Mathematics and science have many stories that not only help us better understand what mathematicians and scientists do, but to see them as human beings whose imaginations sometimes fail, as human beings who are sometimes too fearful for reputation, and who also, on occasion, act with both insight and courage. But mathematicians and scientists, I find, are somewhat ambivalent about their stories. Often their stories are about mistakes--mathematical ideas or scientific theories that are no longer accepted. "Why bother students with errors?" mathematicians and scientists ask. Why take up their time with bygone days when people thought there was only one geometry? Move them right on to the latest thinking, the argument goes.

I have noticed, however, that these same mathematicians and scientists are often very concerned that the population at large has an excessive reverence for mathematically stated conclusions and scientific findings. How better for students to understand the limitations--indeed, the nature--of

mathematics and science than by learning how concepts have evolved, by hearing the stories of their emergence? Moreover, when we move students right to the latest thinking, we sometimes leave them ignorant of basic concepts. I had a chance not long ago to talk with a group of young people who had recently finished college. We were discussing a film funded by the National Science Foundation that shows Harvard graduates explaining why the seasons occur. On this film, Harvard graduates in their caps and gowns explain the phenomenon of the seasons with great authority--and total inaccuracy. In the group of young people I was talking with, there was a bright young woman who was quite sure she could arrive at the correct explanation. But, please, she said, before she started figuring it out, would I remind her whether the earth went around the sun or the sun around the earth?

This young woman, an honors graduate from a highly regarded school, had taken science in college, a course in relativity. She knew a great deal about that, but was missing one of science's most basic stories, the one with Ptolemy and Copernicus as its protagonists.

Mathematicians and scientists frequently consign their stories to those of us in the humanities. Social scientists behave this way too, handing over to us--or at least rejecting for themselves--anything that isn't rigorously mathematized.

figures that can give us what Whitehead called the "vision of greatness." We debate, even, over whether narrative history, no matter the protagonist, is possible. In literature, we argue about whether there are "great books," with some suggesting there is no essential difference between Shakespeare and subway graffiti. The ephemeral stories that saturate our society are regarded as worthy of the classroom. I recently discovered that at two of the three institutions of higher education from which I have earned degrees, students can take courses in soap operas. I am afraid to look very closely at the catalog for the third school.

Across the humanities, many have adopted what Paul Ricoeur calls a "hermeneutics of suspicion." Every narrative is suspected of serving the ends of groups struggling for power and every narrator of being implicated in ideology. Storytelling is not seen as a wondrous act, whereby lost worlds are recovered and new ones created, nor as a moral act whereby we can find meaning for our lives, but as an act of manipulation which ought to make us wary. Indeed, encouraging wariness, rather than encouraging students to look to books for what they might learn from them becomes the end of education.

Curricular changes recently proposed at the University of Minnesota illustrate all of these points. The humanities department there wishes to do away with its chronologically

organized Western civilization sequences and substitute three new courses: "Discourse and Society," "Text and Context," and "Knowledge, Persuasion, and Power." Instead of reading Dante and Milton and grappling with what they have to say about sin and salvation, students will study--and I quote from course description--"the ways that certain bodies of discourse come to cohere, to exercise persuasive power, and to be regarded as authoritative, while others are marginalized, ignored, or denigrated." Instead of reading George Eliot or T. S. Eliot and trying to understand what they have to say about disappointment and fulfillment, students will study--and again, I quote--"hegemony and counter-hegemony."

More advanced humanities courses are also planned at Minnesota, such as one on "Music as Discourse," for which the syllabus includes music video, a Heavy Metal concert, and songs sung at a workers' strike. Other proposed humanities courses include advertising and mass market fiction on their syllabi.

Scholars may well have insights to offer into these products of mass culture. Debating that point is not my purpose today. Instead, I want to ask a question: What is mass culture doing in the undergraduate curriculum? We have a nation of young people who have never read Plato or Shakespeare or Jane Austen, who can't tell Churchill from Stalin, or Karl Marx's words from the words of the United States Constitution.

We have people graduating from our colleges and universities who can't identify Magna Carta, the Missouri Compromise, or Martin Luther King, Jr.'s "Letter from Birmingham Jail."

These same students often do know everything about music groups like Guns 'n' Roses and their album "Appetite for Destruction." With no trouble at all, students can identify Public Enemy, Andrew Dice Clay, and Teenage Mutant Ninja Turtles. And so what do students need to learn about in schools and colleges and universities? What should they study if they are to have choices in their lives, alternative ways of thinking about themselves and society and the human condition? Not mass culture. And what should they study if they are to perceive what Whitehead called the "vision of greatness?" Should they listen in class to Beethoven or Bon Jovi? Should they read Charlotte Bronte or Harlequin Romances? I'd say that the answers are obvious.

But putting great works before students is not enough. What is taught is important, but how it is taught is as well. If we teach students to read only so they can unmask racism or sexism or imperialism, we diminish their experiences. We leave them unaware of the complexity and variety of thought and perception that the humanities offer. Indeed, we leave them unaware of a complexity and variety of topics. Human experience is not just about struggles for domination, and it

is reductive of the history and literature growing out of that experience to read them as if they were.

Many of our students--the most discerning of them, I would suggest--know that there is often more than the instructor is teaching. A student senator at the University of Minnesota, Michael Handberg, has started a campaign to save the university's Western and world civilization courses. He bases his case on the principle of intellectual diversity. "The new course proposals . . . have a language of their own and . . . a methodology," Handberg writes. "Within the old curriculum, a professor . . . could look through many different interpretive eyes." Handberg goes on: "I am offended when a faculty member decides what the 'right' way is and doesn't give me any alternative way to look at things."

Handberg is well aware of the importance of academic freedom and departmental autonomy; nevertheless, he writes, "If a department welches on what I feel is its responsibility to its undergraduate students to teach a pluralistic curriculum, then I think outside sources have a legitimate interest to stick their noses into places that normally they wouldn't belong." Handberg's activities have not gone unnoticed. The associate chair of the English department has called him "brutally coercive" and compared his campaign to save the Western Civilization course to the Spanish Inquisition.

I came across another frustrated student recently, this one in Robert Coles's new book. "When I have some big moral issue," Coles quotes the student as saying, "some question to tackle, I . . . try to remember what my folks have said, or I imagine them in my situation--or even more these days I think of [characters from novels, like] Jude Fawley [in Jude, the Obscure] or Jack Burden [in All the King's Men] . . . There's a lot of me in them, or vice-versa. I don't know how to put it, but they're voices and they help me make choices . . . Why don't college professors teach that way?"

Many professors do, of course, including many in this room. On campuses around the country, there are men and women who read with their students in ways that are receptive to books, open to the variety of questions they pose. But the newest critical movements in our time run in a very different direction. And, judging by much of what is being said and written today, we in the humanities, who have been put in charge of so many stories, are largely suspicious of them. We in the humanities seem often not to like the stories we have in our keeping.

Let me close by suggesting that it is time we focus again--and not just in the humanities, but in the sciences and social sciences as well--on stories that can clarify and enrich our lives and those of our children and students as well. It

is not enough that we give them only numbers and the latest thinking. It is not enough that we teach them how readers are "situated" in reference to texts. We must offer them the texts themselves, the old stories that they can explore and develop--and pass on, as only human beings can do, to generations yet unborn.

STATEMENT
OF
LYNNE V. CHENEY
CHAIRMAN, NATIONAL ENDOWMENT FOR THE HUMANITIES
AND
CHAIRMAN, NATIONAL COUNCIL ON THE HUMANITIES
before the
GOVERNMENT ACTIVITIES AND TRANSPORTATION SUBCOMMITTEE
of the
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

June 21, 1990

NATIONAL ENDOWMENT FOR THE HUMANITIES

Madame Chairwoman and Members of the Subcommittee:

Thank you for this opportunity to appear before this Subcommittee to discuss the policies and programs of the National Endowment for the Humanities. The Endowment is dedicated to ensuring that Americans from all backgrounds and from all regions of the country have opportunities to study and learn about the humanities. In addition, I want you to know that I personally am deeply committed to the principle of equal opportunity for all Americans. You have my assurance that NEH will continue to act on this principle.

I would like to focus my remarks today on three areas--on the Endowment's employment profile and the employment opportunities for minority students in the humanities, on the Endowment's record in making awards to projects on culturally diverse topics, and, finally, on our efforts to make groups and individuals that may not be very familiar with our grant opportunities more aware of them.

Employment of Minority Professionals in the Humanities

The Endowment annually receives thousands of applications for grant support for projects on almost every conceivable topic and theme in the humanities. Because of the nature of the work involved--reading and evaluating these proposals, consulting with applicants, selecting peer panelists and other reviewers, conducting panel meetings, and discussing the applications with members of the National Council on the Humanities--NEH staff must have extensive background in and knowledge of the humanities. In most of the Endowment's professional program positions staff hold a Ph.D. in the humanities.

In November 1989, we submitted to this Subcommittee data on the employment of minorities in professional positions at NEH and discussed our efforts to recruit more candidates for these positions. I would like to supplement that material by pointing out that the biggest challenge we face in finding minority candidates for these jobs is the relative shortage nationwide of minority Ph.D.'s in the humanities. The number of minorities taking Ph.D.'s in the humanities each year in the United States is very small. There were only 276 in 1988. Nevertheless, NEH's employment profile in terms of minority Ph.D.'s compares favorably with the national average; for example: of the Ph.D. holders employed at NEH, 5.4 percent are African American; of the Ph.D.s employed nationwide, 2.0 percent are African American.

Increasing the number of minority professionals in the humanities is not only a concern you and I share, it is also a widely held concern of American colleges and universities. This spring I gave commencement addresses on college campuses in the east, midwest, and west, and everywhere I went I heard administrators and faculty talk about the need for more minority faculty--and the difficulties of meeting this need. NEH is committed to this same goal, but we also share the same difficulties. All of us in the humanities community are confronted with the problem of the limited pool of minority Ph.D.'s and we compete

with one another to employ the individuals who are in the pool. For example, one African American woman who recently took her doctorate in English from Stanford received 19 job offers. The Endowment is at a disadvantage in this competition because most people, whatever their ethnic background, undertake doctoral studies with the idea of a career in research and teaching and when a given pool of new doctorates is very small, the percentage of individuals in it who are interested in government careers becomes infinitesimal. A recent Survey of Earned Doctorates conducted by the National Research Council showed that in 1988 no new African, Hispanic, or Native American humanities Ph.D.'s planned to work for the federal government upon completion of their degrees.

We all need to continue to work to help increase the pool of minority Ph.D.'s in the humanities. Recent efforts in this area have had positive results. While total graduate enrollment went up by 2.9 percent between 1986 and 1988, African American graduate enrollment went up by 9 percent; Hispanic American graduate enrollment went up by 8.4 percent; and Asian American graduate enrollment went up by 13.1 percent.

The Endowment is contributing to the effort to expand the pool of minority Ph.D.'s through our Graduate Study Program for Faculty at Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCU), which is housed in our Division of Fellowships and Seminars. As one of the several NEH efforts in support of the HBCU initiatives of the Bush Administrations, this program provides year-long fellowships to HBCU faculty who are working to complete their humanities Ph.D.'s.

Raising the awareness of minority college students of the opportunities that await them if they go on to graduate work in the humanities should be part of this important effort, and I hope that one of the results of this hearing will be to do exactly that.

NEH Grants on Culturally Diverse Topics

I hope that today's hearing will also increase awareness of the phenomenal vitality of scholarship today in topics and programs relating to our nation's multicultural heritage. The Endowment, for its part, annually makes many awards for projects that reflect the full richness and diversity of American life and culture as well as the record and achievements of other cultures of the world. In the last few years, we have awarded many millions of dollars for projects on African American, Hispanic American, Asian American, and Native American subjects. These are burgeoning areas of scholarship as a recent round in our Museums Program makes clear. At the May 1990 meeting of the National Council on the Humanities, about one-third of the total dollars awarded in this program involved Native American exhibits and topics.

I attach to this statement and ask to have made part of the record a press release prepared by the Endowment for Black History Month that sets forth some of the African American projects we have funded. I

attach similar documents relating to Hispanic, Asian American, and Native American history and ask that these be made part of the record. I attach a fifth document as well, "Selected Projects on Diverse Cultures and Heritages," and ask that it be made part of the record. Although I am aware that in this Committee hearing the focus will be primarily on four ethnic groups, I am sure that all members of this Committee will agree on the importance of emphasizing that our society has been enriched by people from a multitude of backgrounds. The attachment on "Diverse Cultures and Heritages" shows that NEH has funded projects that reflect this nation's rich diversity. We have funded projects on the art of the Yoruba, on the Latin American Spirit in American art, and on the Hungarian avant-garde. We have funded an edition of Plains Indian literature and an exhibition of Polish Jewish art. We have funded projects on China and India in world history and on Italian Americans in Philadelphia, on the historical roots of the European family, and on the history of Hispanics in the United States. We have funded an oral history of the Tlingit, a tribe in the Pacific Northwest, and a grammar of the Hmong, a Laotian people. We have funded an Albanian-English dictionary and a bibliography of Arab-Americans. We have funded a project to study Japanese immigration to the United States between 1885-1924 and Jewish resistance in Lithuania to German occupation during World War II. We are enormously proud of all these projects and the hundreds upon hundreds of others we have funded that encourage understanding of the diversity of our culture and of the many cultures of the world. Most of our projects have the effect of stimulating still further scholarship. The Martin Luther King, Jr. papers project at Stanford, the Frederick Douglass papers, the Black Periodical Literature Project--these will provide scholars of American history and literature a wealth of materials to study and analyze as they interpret and explain our nation's past. The Endowment will continue to encourage and to support humanities projects of the scope and depth represented by these fine grants.

NEH Outreach Activities

Since I am a resident of an essentially rural state, Wyoming, I think you can appreciate how determined I am to insure that opportunities to study and learn about the humanities are available to Americans of all backgrounds and to all regions of the country. NEH supports a number of efforts, such as technical assistance workshops directed by our program staff, to encourage proposals from minorities and other groups that traditionally have not applied to the agency in large numbers. During the last two years, for example, the Humanities Projects in Museums and Historical Organizations program has done extensive outreach at NEH-initiated regional meetings for the professional staffs of small museums and historical associations, including many that serve minority, tribal, inner city, and rural communities. At one recent regional meeting in Atlanta, Endowment staff met with representatives of the Seminole Tribal Center, the Appalachian Museum, and the Hampton University Museum. At a Southwest regional meeting, Endowment staff spoke with representatives of museums interpreting the cultures of Japanese Americans, (the Japanese American National Museum), Native Americans, (the Southwest Museum of Los

Angeles), and African Americans (the Afro-American Museum). At the American Association of Museums's Mountain-Plains Regional Meeting, NEH program staff participated in sessions designed specifically for Native American museums.

In 1986, I established a special Access to Excellence program to serve as a mechanism for expanding and implementing these and other outreach activities. Aimed particularly at rural, inner-city, tribal and minority communities, the Access to Excellence program promotes the Endowment's work nationally while also providing grant-writing assistance to first-time applicants on an individual basis. To date, the program coordinator has traveled extensively (over 110 separate trips) in all 50 states, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, and the U.S. Virgin Islands. Madame Chairwoman, I am pleased to report that our coordinator has done extensive work in the west and south sides of Chicago and has consulted with, among others, Richard Kerr of the Chicago Alliance of Black School Educators, Chernoh Segay, Dean of Arts and Sciences at Chicago State, Daryl Burrows of the Look Backwards to Move Forward group, Amina Dickerson of the Chicago Historical Society and the DuSable Museum, and Preston Bryant, Assistant Superintendent of the Chicago Public Schools. Our program coordinator is planning another visit to the Chicago area this fall; we welcome any counsel you or your staff could provide him.

The Access to Excellence coordinator has held over a thousand meetings or workshops in elementary and secondary schools, two- and four-year colleges, public libraries, historical organizations, and other institutions across the nation. The coordinator also has attended numerous national, regional, state, and local conferences, sent out over 30,000 individual packets of materials explaining the grant opportunities of the Endowment, and provided hundreds of potential applicants with advice over the telephone or through the mail. In addition, he has consulted with dozens of non-profit associations and organizations in building this extensive outreach effort such as the National Alliance of Black School Educators (including local chapters of the Alliance in Chicago, Pittsburgh, Oakland, and other cities), the National Council of Black Studies, the Hispanic Congressional Caucus Institute, the National Council of La Raza, the American Indian Higher Education Consortium, and the Affiliated Tribes of Northwest Indians. The Endowment's Access to Excellence program has been applauded nationwide by educators, administrators, and other individuals concerned with the humanities, and we have received many testimonials to the tireless efforts of the coordinator.

As I mentioned above, the Endowment enthusiastically supports President Bush's initiatives on behalf of the nation's Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCU). Through our regular grant programs we have pursued a number of special emphases to help HBCUs improve their education and public programming in the humanities and to assist their faculty members in conducting projects of humanities research and scholarship. We will be continuing these emphases on behalf of HBCUs in FY 1991. For example: Our Fellowships division again will sponsor a special competition of fellowships for HBCU

faculty members to work on their Ph.D.'s in the humanities; the Access category in the Research division will encourage applications from HBCUs with collections of primary source materials important for humanities scholarship; and the Challenge Grants program guidelines will highlight the availability of support for HBCUs to improve the financial stability and fund-raising capacity of their institutions.

* * * * *

In conclusion, let me just repeat that I hope that one of the outcomes of today's hearing will be to publicize the opportunities in the humanities that are available to minority citizens--both in employment and in terms of grant support for humanities projects through the National Endowment for the Humanities. I would be happy now to answer any questions the Subcommittee may have about the operations and policies of the Endowment.

Attachments

Archival Projects

"Preservation of Major Indological Series from the South Asian Subcontinent" -- Microfilming of 4,000 brittle volumes from the South Asian collections of the University of Chicago and Harvard University on classical and ancient India. Contact James H. Nye at the University of Chicago, 312/702-8430.

"Access to the Mexican-American Archival Collection" -- A project to catalog and survey 69 archival collections of Mexican-American texts in the General Libraries at the University of Texas at Austin. At the project's end, information on the materials will be available on both an international database and a local online catalog, as well as a printed guide. Contact Harold W. Billings at University of Texas at Austin, 512/471-3811.

"U.S. Newspaper Project: Cataloging and Microfilming" -- This grant supports the cataloging of 4,900 English-language newspapers, as well as 1,150 Jewish, Slavic and Oriental newspapers. Approximately 500,000 newspaper pages will be microfilmed. Contact is Irene M. Percelli at the New York Public Library, 212/930-0639.

Research Conducted by Individual Scholars

"Ethnicity and Religion: The Case of Finnish-Americans" -- This grant supported research at the Immigration History Research Center in St. Paul, Minn., on the complex relationship between religious identity and ethnic identity for a distinct group, Finnish-Americans. Contact Peter J. Kivisto at Augustine College, Rock Island, Ill., 309/794-7296.

"Native American Myths, Poetry, Science and Petroglyphs" -- A study of Native American rock carvings and inscriptions, set to begin in fall 1990, that will explore connections between the Indian mythological view and modern man's scientific perspective. Contact Leonora B. Durrett at Taylor Middle School, Albuquerque, N.M., 505/898-3666.

"Ethnicity and American Popular Music, 1920-1950" -- This grant allowed an American history scholar to examine the way in which ethnic cultures affected American popular music in the three decades after 1920. Contact Victor R. Greene at University of Wisconsin, Milwaukee, 414/963-7063.

"The Asian Immigrant in American History: A Comparison of Asian Ethnic Groups, 1850-1980" -- A comparative social history of five Asian-American ethnic groups: the Chinese, Japanese, Koreans, Filipinos and Southeast Asians. Contact Reed Ueda at Tufts University, Boston, Mass., 617/381-3520.

"The Great Powers and Revolutionary Mexico, 1934-40" -- A study of the relations between the revolutionary government of Lázaro Cárdenas of Mexico and the governments of the United States, Nazi Germany, Great Britain, the Soviet Union and the Spanish Republic. Contact Friedrich Katz at the University of Chicago, 312/962-8378.

Books, Editions and Reference Works (continued)

"Dictionary of Unconventional Russian" -- This grant supported the creation of a two-volume work which lists and defines the argot, jargon, slang and popular vernacular used by citizens of the USSR. Contact Horace G. Lunt at Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass., 617/495-4032.

"Ethnic Music on Records: A Discography" -- This grant supported the publication of a seven-volume discography of ethnic music recordings that were produced in the United States between 1894 and 1942. Contact Judith M. McCulloh at University of Illinois, Urbana, 217/244-4681.

"The Frederick Douglass Papers Project" -- A projected 15-volume edition of Douglass' letters, essays, speeches and autobiographical writings between 1840 and 1895. Three volumes have been published so far. Contact John W. Blassingame at Yale University, New Haven, Conn., 203/436-3124.

"Tlingit Oral Literature Text Translation" -- An effort to collect, transcribe, translate and annotate the oral traditions of the Tlingit, a major tribe in the Pacific Northwest. Contact Richard L. Dauenhauer at the Sealaska Heritage Foundation, Juneau, Alaska, 907/463-4844.

"A Functional Reference Grammar of Hmong" -- This grant supports the creation of a reference grammar of Hmong, an important minority language of southern China and southeast Asia that is spoken in the United States by a large community of refugees from Laos. Contact Charles N. Li at University of California, Santa Barbara, 805/472-3581.

"Black Periodical Literature Project" -- Scholars will collect, codify and disseminate information on more than 20,000 African-American short stories and serialized novels. Contact Henry Louis Gates at the National Humanities Center, Research Triangle Park, N.C., 919/549-0661, or Cynthia Bond at Cornell University, Ithaca, N.Y., 607/255-4390.

"Albanian-English Dictionary" -- The Endowment supported preparation of a comprehensive dictionary and database of Albanian, consisting of some 75,000 entries. Contact Leonard D. Newmark at University of California, San Diego, 619/534-6246.

"The Martin Luther King, Jr., Papers Project" -- An effort conducted by the Martin Luther King, Jr., Center, in association with Stanford University, that plans to publish 12 volumes of Dr. King's writings. The University of California Press will be the publisher. Contact Clayborne Carson at Stanford University, 415/723-2092.

"Bela Balazs: The Man and the Artist, by Joseph Zsuffa" -- This grant supported the publication of Joseph Zsuffa's biography of Hungarian filmmaker and cultural figure Bela Balazs. Contact is Lynne E. Withey at University of California Press, Berkeley, 415/642-5393.

Conferences, Lectures and Programs for the General Public (continued)

"The Lower East Side Immigrant Heritage Trail: A Social History Walking Tour Series" -- A series of "living history" walking tours interpreting the immigrant communities that existed on New York's Lower East Side from 1850 to 1910. Contact Ruth J. Abram at Lower East Side Tenement Museum, New York, 212/431-0233.

"The Waverly Consort Quincentenary Humanities Program" -- Three years of programs that explore the interactions -- in music and related humanities fields -- among nations, events and ideas preceding the Columbian voyages and through the scientific revolution. Contact is Michael Jaffee at Waverly Consort, Inc., New York, 212/666-1260.

"First Annual Zora Neale Hurston Festival of the Arts" -- A four-day festival, including public programs, a research conference and programs for teachers, all focusing on the life and work of African-American writer Zora Neale Hurston. The festival was held in January 1990 in Eatonville, Fla., Hurston's childhood home. Contact N.Y. Nathiri in Eatonville, Fla., at 407/628-2308.

"Contemporary Russian Culture and Soviet Society: An Introduction" -- A series of public lectures, film discussions and two symposia on the cultural life of the Soviet Union with an emphasis on 20th-century Russian art and literature. Contact Grigory E. Tamarchenko at Boston University, 617/353-8912.

"Leo Janacek and Czech Music" -- This grant supported an international conference on Leo Janacek to explore his music. The conference coincided with a festival of Czech music that featured the first American performance of Janacek's Third Symphony. Contact Michael Beckerman at Washington University, St. Louis, Mo., 314/889-5566.

"In Search of the Netherlandish Tradition in Art, 1400-1700" -- This grant will support an international, interdisciplinary conference that will explore patterns of continuity and define a tradition of art produced in the Netherlands. Contact Barbara J. Haeger at Historians of Netherlandish Art, New York, 614/292-7481.

Books, Editions and Reference Works

"Arab-Americans: An Annotated Bibliography" -- This grant supports the preparation of an annotated bibliography of works focusing on the experiences of Arab-Americans in the United States. Contact Michael Suleiman at Kansas State University, Manhattan, 913/532-6842.

"In Their Own Words: Plains Indian Native Literatures" -- An ongoing project to edit five collections of historical texts in Sioux and Pawnee. Contact Raymond J. DeMallie at Indiana University, Bloomington, 812/335-4086.

Radio, Film and Television Productions

"Old Traditions -- New Sounds" -- A 13-part series of radio programs focusing on the immigrant experience and the surviving cultural heritage of first- and second-generation American musicians. Contact Rebecca S. Miller at World Music Institute, New York, 212/535-6700.

"The Restless Conscience: A Documentary on the Underground German Resistance" -- A 90-minute film exploring the motivating principles and activities of a small group of individuals who comprised the anti-Nazi underground. Contact is Hava Kohav Beller at New York Foundation for the Arts, 212/877-1667.

"The Mahabharata: The Great Story of Mankind" -- A six-hour dramatic film for television based on the Sanskrit epic, The Mahabharata. Contact Barbara S. Miller at Brooklyn Academy of Music, New York, 212/226-2560.

"Russian Modernism: The Life and Work of Anna Akhmatova" -- A 60-minute documentary about the life and work of poet Anna Akhmatova (1889-1966). This film is the first in a five-part series about individual Russian artists of the modernist period. Contact Jill Janows at New York Center for Visual History, New York, 212/777-6900.

"Simple Justice" -- A five-part dramatic miniseries, now in production, based on Richard Kluger's Simple Justice, a history of the Supreme Court decision Brown vs. Board of Education. New Images Productions, Inc., in association with WGBH-TV of Boston, is producing the series. Contact Avon Kirkland of New Images Productions, Berkeley, Calif., 415/548-1790.

"Partisans of Vilna" -- A film and viewer's guide concerning the struggle to organize Jewish resistance to the German occupation of the Lithuanian ghetto. Contact Aviva H. Kempner at Ciesla Foundation, Washington, D.C., 202/462-7528.

Conferences, Lectures and Programs for the General Public

"Historical Roots of the European Family: The Evolution of Family Relations in Italy" -- This grant will support an international conference on the history of the family in Italy from Roman times to the 19th century. Contact Richard P. Saller at University of Chicago, 312/702-7986.

"China and Beyond: Creating an Understanding of Asia for the American Public" -- This grant supported local and regional interpretive public programs on the history and cultures of the Asia-Pacific region. Contact Anthony J. Kane at Asia Society, Inc., New York, 212/288-6400.

Exhibitions in Museums and Other Cultural Organizations

"Three Hundred Years of Polish Jewish Art" -- A temporary, traveling exhibition, catalog and public programs that focus on the artistic achievements of Poland's Jewish community from the 17th through the early 20th centuries. Contact Morris A. Fred at Spertus College of Judaica, Chicago, 312/922-9012.

"Latin American Presence in the United States, 1920-1970" -- This exhibition, which opened in January 1988, featured more than 150 works by 80 artists from Mexico, South and Central America and the Caribbean. The exhibition visited four cities across the country. Contact Luis Cancel at the Bronx Museum of the Arts, New York, 212/681-6000.

"America's Polyglot City: Contributions of Ethnic and Racial Groups to Chicago's Urban Linguistic Story" -- Educational programs and exhibitions focusing on Chicago dialects and the contributions of Chicago's myriad ethnic and racial groups to American English. Contact J. Ingrid Lesley at Chicago Public Library, 312/269-3042.

"Japanese Immigration to Hawaii and the Mainland U.S., 1885-1924" -- Planning for a traveling exhibition that focuses on the early period of Japanese immigration to the United States. Contact Dr. James Hirabayashi at Japanese American National Museum, Los Angeles, 213/625-0414.

"Yoruba: Nine Centuries of African Art and Thought" -- This exhibition and its accompanying educational programs will examine 900 years of Yoruba art. The exhibition, developed by the Center for African Art in New York, has visited several sites nationwide. Contact Susan M. Vogel, 212/861-1200.

"'Of Land and People': Mennonites on the Central Plains" -- A permanent exhibition on the Mennonites of the central plains, including slide and tape shows, workshops, publications and new exhibition graphics. Contact is John M. Janzen at Bethel College, North Newton, Kan., 316/283-1612.

"The Uses of Tradition: Arts of Italian Americans in Philadelphia" -- An exhibition, catalog and interpretive programs that explore ethnicity and the nature of tradition in Italian-American material culture. Contact Deborah Kodish at Samuel S. Fleisher Art Memorial, Philadelphia, 215/787-5477.

"Holy Image: Icons and Frescoes from Greece" -- An exhibition explaining the form, history and meaning of Byzantine icons and the continuation of post-Byzantine icon painting traditions on Crete through the 16th century. Contact Ann C. Townsend at Trust for Museum Exhibitions, Washington, D.C., 202/745-2566.

FACTS

National Endowment
for the Humanities

A Federal Agency

1100 Pennsylvania Ave., N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20506

202/786-0449

NEH-90-027-F2

SELECTED PROJECTS ON DIVERSE CULTURES AND HERITAGES

The descriptions below represent a selection of Endowment-supported projects in education, research, preservation and public programs in the humanities.

Programs for Teachers

"China and India in World History" -- Two four-week institutes for 30 elementary and secondary school teachers from the Northwest on the history of China and India. Contact Nancy C. Hull at Oregon International Council, Salem, 503/378-4960.

"Building Blocks for a New American History" -- A program of 12 four-day workshops for 180 college teachers to be conducted in summer 1990. The discussion will focus on the use of documentary sources -- treaties, oral literature, sacred texts, material objects, autobiographies, and maps -- in the study of Native American history. Contact Frederick Hoxie of the Newberry Library, Chicago, 312/943-9090.

"Russia and Its Borderlands" -- A summer seminar for college and university faculty on the historical relationship between Russia and the non-Russian peoples of the borderlands, including those who became part of the Soviet state and those who remained apart. Contact Alfred J. Rieber at University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, 215/644-6737.

"Hispanic Culture Institute" -- A six-week institute on the Hispanic history and culture of New Mexico for 30 state elementary and secondary school teachers. Participants examined the impact of cultural contact and exchange on the evolution of New Mexico's Hispanic culture. Contact Sabine B. Ulibarri at the Hispanic Culture Foundation, Albuquerque, N.M., 505/277-5616.

"Introduction to Afro-American Studies" -- A project to develop instructional modules to be used in individually tailored introductory courses in Afro-American studies. This summer, the sponsors will hold a workshop based on these models for faculty at Harvard University, Brandeis University and the University of Massachusetts, Boston. Contact Randall K. Burkitt at Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass., 617/495-4192.

"Modern French Politics" -- A summer seminar for college and university faculty on the response of French political parties to modernization. Participants read seminal works by French and foreign observers and met with several of the authors. Contact Bernard E. Brown at the City University of New York, 212/642-2355.

-OVER-

Conferences, Lectures and Other Public Programs

"To Carry the Dream Wheel: Native American Voices in the Old/New World" -- A program of lectures, conferences, reading-discussion groups and rural school programs on contemporary native American fiction and poetry. Contact Marilyn Melton at the **Nevada Humanities Committee, Reno, 702/784-6587.**

"Reading and Discussion Series on Native American Literature and History" -- An effort involving scholars, writers and specialists in Native American education to plan a reading and discussion program on Native American history and culture. Contact Douglas A. Northrop at the **Wisconsin Humanities Committee, Madison, 414/748-6267.**

Books, Editions and Reference Works

"The Land Base in Native American Dispossession" -- Preparation of a book exploring the effects of the shrinking landbase on the economies, ecologies and cultures of Native Americans living in eastern Nebraska and adjacent Iowa and Wisconsin during the 19th century. Contact David J. Wishart at the **University of Nebraska, Lincoln, 402/472-3576.**

"Native American Families, 1880-1930" -- Preparation of a book and computer database on the history of the Native American family. Contact Frederick Hoxie at the **Newberry Library, Chicago, 312/943-9090.**

"In Their Own Words: Plains Indian Native Literatures" -- An ongoing project to edit five collections of historical texts in Sioux and Pawnee. Contact Raymond J. DeMallie at **Indiana University, Bloomington, 812/335-4086.**

"Tlingit Oral Literature Text Translation" -- An effort to collect, transcribe, translate and annotate the oral traditions of the Tlingit, a major tribe in the Pacific Northwest. Contact Richard L. Dauenhauer at the **Sealaska Heritage Foundation, Juneau, Alaska, 907/463-4844.**

Other Research Projects

"War, Peace, and the Collapse of Maya Civilization: The Art and Archaeology of the Petexbatun Region" -- An archaeological project in Guatemala to study the role and consequences of warfare among the Maya during the period 300-900 B.C. Contact Arthur A. Demarest at **Vanderbilt University, Nashville, Tenn., 615/322-7524.**

"Native American Myths, Poetry, Science and Petroglyphs" -- A study of Native American rock carvings and inscriptions, set to begin in fall 1990, that will explore connections between the Indian mythological view and modern man's scientific perspective. Contact Leonora B. Durrett at **Taylor Middle School, Albuquerque, N.M., 505/898-3666.**

"The Impact of the Oral Tradition on Contemporary Native American Literature" -- A study that will focus on the literature of certain tribal groups in their cultural, aesthetic and historical contexts, giving special attention to the way traditional songs, chants, myths and legends have influenced today's Native American fiction and poetry. Contact Lawrence Abbot of the **Benson Village School, Benson, Vt., 802/537-2491.**

FACTS

National Endowment
for the Humanities

A Federal Agency

1100 Pennsylvania Ave., N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20506

202/786-0449

NEH-90-027-F4

PROJECTS ON NATIVE AMERICANS AND THEIR CULTURE

The descriptions below represent a selection of Endowment-supported projects in education, research, preservation and public programs in the humanities.

Programs for Teachers

"Building Blocks for a New American Indian History" -- A program of 12 four-day workshops for 180 college teachers to be conducted in summer 1990. The discussion will focus on the use of documentary sources -- treaties, oral literature, sacred texts, material objects, autobiographies, and maps -- in the study of Native American history. Contact Frederick Hoxie at the Newberry Library, Chicago, 312/943-9090.

"American Indian Language/Culture Institute" -- An institute for Arizona schoolteachers, now in the planning stages, focusing on Native American language and culture. Contact Kathryn S. Begaye at the Arizona Department of Education, Tempe, 602/542-4391.

"American Indian Literatures: Oral and Written" -- A summer seminar for college teachers, held in summer 1989, on Native American narratives. Topics discussed included cultural contexts, myth, autobiography and the impact of the oral tradition on 20th-century Native American novels. Contact A. LaVonne B. Ruoff at the University of Illinois, Chicago, 312/413-2246.

"Myth, Memory and History: Sources for Writing American Indian History" -- A five-week institute at the Newberry Library in Chicago for 25 college faculty members who will study Native American history during summer 1990 in order to help develop an undergraduate curriculum. Topics will include written oral accounts, art traditions, and time and space concepts. Contact Clara Sue Kidwell in Washington, 202/543-0373.

Exhibitions in Museums and Other Cultural Organizations

"Upstate New York History" -- A permanent exhibition exploring the continuing cultural adaptations of New York's native peoples from 2000 B.C. to A.D. 1500. Contact Martin E. Sullivan at the New York State Education Department, Albany, 518/474-2865.

"Plants and People of the Sonoran Desert" -- A permanent exhibition exploring the relationships between desert dwellers of the American Southwest and their environment from prehistoric times to the present. Contact Ruth Greenhouse of the Desert Botanical Garden, Phoenix, Ariz., 602/941-1225.

"Native Alaskans and the Western World" -- A traveling exhibition that examines changes in 18th- and 19th-century Alaskan native art and material culture as a result of foreign trade contact. Contact Nelson H.H. Graburn of the University of California, Berkeley, at 415/642-2120.

Exhibitions in Museums and Other Cultural Organizations

"Japanese Immigration to Hawaii and the Mainland U.S., 1885-1924" -- Planning for a traveling exhibition that focuses on the early period of Japanese immigration to the United States. Contact Dr. James Hirabayashi at Japanese American National Museum, Los Angeles, 213/625-0414.

"Installation of Asian Art Collections" -- This grant supported the permanent installation of the museum's collections of Asian art. Contact Hiram W. Woodward, Jr., at Walters Art Gallery, Baltimore, Md., 301/547-9000.

Books, Editions and Reference Works

"A Functional Reference Grammar of Hmong" -- This grant supports the creation of a reference grammar of Hmong, an important minority language of southern China and southeast Asia that is spoken in the United States by a large community of refugees from Laos. Contact Charles N. Li at University of California, Santa Barbara, 805/472-3581.

"The Rise of Chinese Communism, 1921-49: A Documentary History" -- Selection and translation of sources on the Chinese Communist Party from 1921 to 1949. Scholars were only recently granted access to these documents from the regional archives in the Chinese People's Republic. Contact Roderick MacFarquhar at Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass., 617/495-4046.

"The Chinese Communist Revolution: A Complete Annotated Translation of Mao Zedong's Pre-1949 Works" -- Preparation of an edition and translation of Mao Zedong's pre-1949 speeches and writings. Contact Benjamin I. Schwartz at Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass., 617/495-4046.

"Cambridge History of China Project" -- Research and editorial expenses for continuing work on Volumes 4, 5 and 6 (A.D. 589-1367) and the beginning of work on Volume 2 (A.D. 221-581) of the Cambridge History of China. Contact Denis C. Twitchett at Princeton University, Princeton, N.J., 609/452-5267.

Research Conducted by Individual Scholars

"The Asian Immigrant in American History: A Comparison of Asian Ethnic Groups, 1850 to 1980" -- A comparative social history of five Asian-American ethnic groups: the Chinese, Japanese, Koreans, Filipinos and Southeast Asians. Contact Reed Ueda of the Department of History, Tufts University, Boston, Mass., 617/381-3520.

"Intellectuals, Resistance and Popular Culture in Modern China, 1937-45" -- A study of how Chinese intellectuals used spoken dramas, films, political cartoons and newspapers to wage a cultural battle against the Japanese forces occupying China during the Sino-Japanese War, 1937-45. Contact Chang-tai Hung at Carleton College, Northfield, Minn., 507/663-4211.

#

FACTS

National Endowment
for the Humanities

A Federal Agency

1100 Pennsylvania Ave., N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20506

202/786-0449

NEH-90-027-F1

PROJECTS ON ASIAN CULTURE AND HERITAGE

The descriptions below represent a selection of Endowment-supported projects in education, research, preservation and public programs in the humanities.

Programs for Teachers

"Asia in Western History and World History" and "Masterworks of Asian Literature in Comparative Perspective" -- Two summer institutes for faculty on ways to enrich core curriculum courses by using Asian materials. Contact Roberta Martin at Columbia University, New York, 212/280-4278.

"China and India in World History" -- Two four-week institutes for 30 elementary and secondary school teachers from the Northwest on the history of China and India. Contact Nancy C. Hull at Oregon International Council, Salem, 503/378-4960.

"Summer Institute on Teaching the Vietnam War" -- A five-week institute for 25 college faculty members who will study the Vietnam War and its impact on American culture and society. Contact Nguyen M. Hung at George Mason University, Fairfax, Va., 703/323-2690.

Programs for the General Public

"China and Beyond: Creating an Understanding of Asia for the American Public" -- This grant supported local and regional interpretive public programs on the history and cultures of the Asia-Pacific region. Contact Anthony J. Kane at Asia Society, Inc., New York, 212/288-6400.

"Public Programs for the Festival of Indonesia" -- This grant supported planning for a series of public programs on the history and culture of Indonesia that complemented exhibitions and performances. Contact Ted M. G. Tanen at Festival of Indonesia Foundation, New York, 212/213-5810.

Film and Television Productions

"China in Revolution, 1911-49" -- A historical documentary film that explores the turbulent years in China, 1911-49. Contact Susan Williams at Film News Now Foundation, New York, 212/226-2560.

"The Mahabharata: The Great Story of Mankind" -- A six-hour dramatic film for television based on the Sanskrit epic, The Mahabharata. Contact Barbara S. Miller at Brooklyn Academy of Music, New York, 212/280-5416.

-OVER-

Archival Projects

"Access to the Mexican-American Archival Collection" -- A project to catalog and survey 69 archival collections of Mexican-American texts in the General Libraries at the **University of Texas at Austin**. At the project's end, information on the materials will be available on both an international database and a local online catalog, as well as in a printed guide. Contact Harold W. Billings at the General Libraries, 512/471-3811.

"Improving Access to Library Resources in Latin American Studies" -- A project conducted by eight major research libraries to make their holdings in Latin American studies available on national databases. Contact David Weber at the Green Library, **Stanford University, Stanford, Calif.**, 415/723-2015.

Exhibitions in Museums and Other Cultural Organizations

"Cuzco Art and Colonial Life in the Land of Peru" -- Circulating program packages that explore the history, culture and art of the viceroyalty of Peru and examine and analyze colonialism as an influential part of the American experience. Contact Frances M. Leonard at the **Texas Humanities Resource Center, Inc., Austin**, 817/273-2767.

"Seeds of Change" -- A traveling version of "Seeds of Change," a major exhibition on the Columbian Quincentenary now being planned by the Smithsonian Institution's National Museum of Natural History. Contact Peggy Barber at the **American Library Association, Chicago**, 312/944-6780.

"Spanish Colonial Art and Society" -- An exhibition on the Spanish colonial arts of Mexico and Peru. Contact Kevin L. Stayton at the **Brooklyn Museum, New York**, 718/638-5000.

Research Conducted by Individual Scholars

"The Conquest of Mexico: An Examination of Conflicting Accounts and Interpretations" -- A study of Spanish and Indian accounts of the conquest, as well as 20th-century interpretations, using primary sources, historical accounts, literature and art. Contact Karen Steadman at **Gonzales Union High School, Gonzales, Calif.**, 408/675-2495.

"The Great Powers and Revolutionary Mexico, 1934-40" -- A study of the relations between the revolutionary government of Lázaro Cárdenas of Mexico and the governments of the United States, Nazi Germany, Great Britain, the Soviet Union and the Spanish Republic. Contact Friedrich Katz at the **University of Chicago**, 312/962-8378.

"The Mexico City Riot of 1692: Fault Lines of a Colonial Society" -- A study of the 17th-century Indian uprising in Mexico City, focusing on race and class differences and governmental institutions. Contact R. Douglas Cope at **Brown University, Providence, R.I.**, 401/863-2131.

FACTS

National Endowment
for the Humanities

A Federal Agency

1100 Pennsylvania Ave., N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20506

202/786-0449

NEH-90-027-F3

PROJECTS ON HISPANIC AND HISPANIC-AMERICAN CULTURE AND HERITAGE

The descriptions below represent a selection of Endowment-supported projects in education, research, preservation and public programs in the humanities.

Programs for Teachers

"Latin American Early Texts" -- A four-week institute for 30 college faculty members who will study indigenous and Spanish writing in the New World from the colonial period to the present. The institute, which meets in summer 1990, will focus on the process of cultural exchange. Contact Julio C. Ortega at Brown University, Providence, R.I., 401/863-2564.

"Hispanic Culture Institute" -- A six-week institute on the Hispanic history and culture of New Mexico for 30 state elementary and secondary school teachers. Participants examined the impact of cultural contact and exchange on the evolution of New Mexico's Hispanic culture. Contact Sabine B. Ulibarri at the Hispanic Culture Foundation, Albuquerque, N.M., 505/277-5616.

"The Origins of a Central American Ethos" -- A summer seminar for schoolteachers which focused on America's oldest literary work, the Popul Vuh, the sacred book of the Quiche-Maya. The four-week seminar met during the summers of 1986 and 1988. Contact Hewson A. Ryan at Tufts University, Medford, Mass., 617/381-3436.

Books, Editions and Reference Works

"Latinos: A Comparative History of Hispanics in the United States" -- A project now underway to write a comparative history of the various Latino groups in this country, including Mexicans, Puerto Ricans, Cubans and other Caribbean people, Central Americans and South Americans. Among the topics to be explored are colonial heritage, native roots, American annexation, community building, ethnic politics, culture and changing identities. Contact Mario T. Garcia at the University of California, Santa Barbara, 805/961-4076.

"The Cambridge History of Latin American Literature" -- A collaborative, multivolume scholarly study of the history of Latin American literature, intended to replace or complement earlier outdated or fragmentary studies. Contact Enrique Pupo-Walker at Vanderbilt University, Nashville, Tenn., 615/322-2527.

"Bibliography of Old Spanish Texts" -- A comprehensive, multi-edition catalog of the primary sources of medieval Spanish literature. Contact Charles B. Faulhaber of the University of California, Berkeley, 415/642-2107.

Conferences, Lectures and Other Public Programs

"The Black Tradition in American Modern Dance" -- A variety of public programs, including panel discussions, symposia and a booklet of essays, examining the achievements of African-American choreographers in the development of 20th-century modern dance. Events are planned for the spring and summer of 1990. Contact Gerald E. Myers, American Dance Festival, Inc., Durham, N.C., (New York telephone) 212/586-1925.

Digging in the Afro-American Past: Historical Archaeology and the Black Experience -- A research conference held in May 1989 at the University of Mississippi, Oxford, focusing on the contributions of recent archaeological research to an understanding of the history of African Americans. Contact Ronald W. Bailey at Northeastern University, Boston, Mass. at 617/437-3148.

"First Annual Zora Neale Hurston Festival of the Arts" -- A four-day festival, including public programs, a research conference and programs for teachers, all focusing on the life and work of African-American writer Zora Neale Hurston. The festival was held in January 1990, in Etonville, Fla., Hurston's childhood home. Contact N.Y. Nathiri in Etonville, Fla., at 407/628-2308.

"City Lights" -- A series of scholar-led discussions at five Washington, D.C., public housing projects, focusing on themes such as migration, work and community. The discussions, which begin in March 1990, also use film, dance and dramatic presentations and encourage the participants to talk about their own histories. Contact Joseph Jordan at the D.C. Humanities Council, 202/347-1732.

Programs for Teachers

"Four Classic Afro-American Novels" -- This five-week summer seminar for 15 schoolteachers will focus on four key works of modern African-American fiction: Zora Neale Hurston's Their Eyes Were Watching God, Richard Wright's Native Son, Ralph Ellison's Invisible Man and Toni Morrison's Song of Solomon. Contact James A. Miller at Trinity College, Hartford, Conn., 203/297-2429.

"African-American Literature, Art and the Search for Identity in 20th-Century America" -- A four-week institute on modern African-American literature, including works by James Weldon Johnson, Jean Toomer, Zora Neale Hurston, Richard Wright and Lorraine Hansberry. Contact Ralph Bogardus, at the University of Alabama, Tuscaloosa, at 205/348-5940.

"Introduction to Afro-American Studies" -- A project to develop instructional modules to be used in individually tailored introductory courses in Afro-American studies. This summer, the sponsors will hold a workshop based on these models for faculty at Harvard University, Brandeis University, and the University of Massachusetts, Boston. Contact Randall K. Burkitt at Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass., 617/495-4192.

"African Poetry and the Modern English Tradition" -- A seminar for elementary and secondary school teachers focusing on the dynamic relationships between the modern English poetry and modern African verse as represented in the work of Brutus, Awoonor and Soyinka. Contact Gessler Nkondo at Vassar College, Poughkeepsie, N.Y. at 914/437-5657.

Archival Projects

"A Bibliography of the Afro-American Novel, 1853-1990" -- This research will result in a comprehensive checklist of all the novels by African-Americans published from 1853 to the present. Contact Maryemma Graham, University of Mississippi, 601/232-7670.

"Spelman College Archival Access Project" -- An effort to prepare inventories and a guide to the college's archival holdings, which are of interest to scholars in social and cultural history, the history of women and the history of education for African Americans and women. Contact Beverly Guy-Sheftall at Spelman College, Atlanta, 404/681-3643.

Television and Radio Productions

"James Baldwin: The Price of the Ticket" -- This 90-minute documentary film, which examined the life and work of James Baldwin, was broadcast on PBS in 1989. Contact Karen Thorsen, New York Foundation for the Arts, 212/582-6050.

"Simple Justice" -- A five-part dramatic miniseries, now in production, based on Richard Kluger's Simple Justice, a history of the Supreme Court decision Brown vs. Board of Education. New Images Productions, Inc., in association with WGBH-TV of Boston, is producing the series. Contact Avon Kirkland of New Images Productions, Berkeley, Calif., 415/548-1790.

"Ralph McGill and His Times" -- A 90-minute documentary film (now in post-production) on the southern journalist and civil rights advocate, Ralph McGill, focusing on the period of changing race relations that he wrote about and influenced. Contact Jed Dannenbaum at the Center for Contemporary Media, Inc., Atlanta, 404/875-6076.

"One Summer in Mississippi" -- A feature-length dramatic film on the 1964 Mississippi Freedom Summer Project. Contact Connie E. Field, Clarity Educational Productions, Inc., in San Francisco, 415/841-3469.

"Duke Ellington: Reminiscing in Tempo" -- A one-hour film, now in production, that will analyze Duke Ellington's career as a composer and orchestra leader. Contact Robert S. Levi at the New York Foundation for the Arts, 212/924-0739.

Other Research Projects

"Black Families: The Rowanty Evidence" -- A study of the social and demographic character of the rural, Southern black family, from the late antebellum period to 1910. The study is based on an 1878 survey of African-American households in the magisterial district of Rowanty in Virginia. Contact JoAnn Manfra at Worcester Polytechnic Institute, Mass., 508/755-7910.

"Plantation Dissidents: Runaway Slaves" -- An inquiry into those aspects of the master-slave relationship that moved the slave to take the desperate step of running away. The project looks at slaves' personal, social and occupational characteristics and the routes they traveled. Contact John Hope Franklin at Duke University, Durham, N.C., 919/684-2465.

"Black Abolitionist Papers Project" -- An editing effort that is collecting writings by African Americans involved in the antislavery movement. In addition to collecting and microfilming several thousand documents in this country and abroad, the project has published two (of a projected five) volumes of papers. Contact C. Peter Ripley at Florida State University, Tallahassee, 904/644-4527.

Museum and Library Exhibitions

"Afro-American Life and Labor in the Antebellum South" -- A temporary exhibition interpreting the history of African Americans in the South between 1790 and 1865. Scheduled to open in June 1991, the exhibition has been planned and developed by the Museum of the Confederacy, Richmond, Va. Contact (Ms.) Kym S. Rice in Richmond, Va., 804/649-1861.

"The Alonzo Herndon Family" -- An exhibition, now being planned, on the history of late 19th- and early 20th-century Atlanta from the perspective of a prominent African-American family. Contact Carol E. Merritt at the African American Family History Association, Atlanta, 404/581-9813.

"A History of Blacks in the Delaware Valley" -- An exhibition, now being planned, on the history of African-American life in the Delaware Valley region. Contact Irene Burnham in the Afro-American Historical and Cultural Museum, Philadelphia, Pa., at 215/574-0380.

"Black Art: Ancestral Legacy" -- An exhibition organized by the Dallas Museum of Art, which examines the importance of African cultural heritage in the work of contemporary black artists in the United States and the Caribbean. Currently on display at the Dallas Museum of Art, the exhibition will travel to Atlanta, Milwaukee and Richmond in the next year. Contact Melanie Wright in Dallas, 214/922-1312.

"The Marcus Garvey Centennial Exhibition" -- A traveling exhibition on the life and times of African-American nationalist Marcus Garvey. Created by the Schomburg Center for Research in Black Culture at the New York Public Library, the exhibition opened in 1987 and is currently at the African American Museum in Cleveland, Ohio. Contact Harold Anderson at the New York Public Library, 212/862-4000.

"Yoruba: Nine Centuries of African Art and Thought" -- This exhibition and its accompanying educational programs will examine 900 years of Yoruba art. The exhibition, developed by the Center for African Art in New York, is currently on display at the Art Institute of Chicago. Contact Susan M. Vogel, 212/861-1200.

"The Essential Gourd: Art and History in Northeastern Nigeria" -- This exhibition and catalog, developed by the UCLA Museum of Cultural History, has appeared in Los Angeles, New York, Honolulu, Iowa City and St. Paul. Currently on display at the Smithsonian Institution's National Museum of African Art in Washington, D.C., the exhibition examines decorated gourds from northeastern Nigeria and explains the ethnography and socio-cultural history of gourd use and decoration. Contact Doran H. Ross in Los Angeles at 213/825-4259.

"A Stronger Soul Within a Finer Frame" -- A traveling exhibition for libraries about the emergence of a new African-American self-identity and cultural sensibility in the Black Renaissance of the 1920s and 1930s. Contact Austin McLean at the University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, at 612/624-3855.

MEDIA ADVISORY

National Endowment
for the Humanities

A Federal Agency

1100 Pennsylvania Ave., N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20506

202/786-0449

NEH-090-006-A

ATTENTION: Feature Writers and Editors; Columnists

IDEAS AND CONTACTS FOR BLACK HISTORY MONTH

Here are a number of projects in history and literature offered to suggest story ideas and contacts for features you may be considering for Black History Month, celebrated in February. The books, films, museum exhibitions and other projects listed below were all funded by the National Endowment for the Humanities (NEH) or its affiliated state councils.

Aimed at academic and general audiences, these projects examine the civil rights movement in the United States, slavery and the Atlantic passage, African-American literature and art, the life and times of figures such as Marcus Garvey, Martin Luther King, Jr., and a range of other topics.

We invite you to consider these ideas or to use the contacts as resources for other stories. If we can be of further help, please call NEH Media Relations at 202/786-0449.

Books, Editions and Reference Works

"The Martin Luther King, Jr., Papers Project" -- An effort conducted by the Martin Luther King, Jr., Center, in association with Stanford University, that plans to publish 12 volumes of Dr. King's writings. The University of California Press will be the publisher. Contact Clayborne Carson at Stanford University, 415/723-2092.

"The Frederick Douglass Papers Project" -- A projected 15-volume edition of Douglass' letters, essays, speeches and autobiographical writings between 1840 and 1895. Three volumes have been published so far. Contact John W. Blassingame at Yale University, New Haven, Conn., 203/436-3124.

"The Marcus Garvey and Universal Negro Improvement Association Papers" -- The first scholarly edition of selected documents by and about the African-American nationalist Marcus Garvey (1887-1940) and the worldwide movement he organized. Six volumes have been published so far. Contact Robert A. Hill at the University of California, Los Angeles, 213/825-7623.

"Freedmen and Southern Society Project" -- A multi-volume edition of selected documents illustrating the transformation of African-American life in the United States in the wake of emancipation. Two volumes of Freedom: A Documentary History of Emancipation, 1861-1867 have already been published; two more are scheduled to appear this year. Contact Ira Berlin at the University of Maryland, College Park, 301/454-3783.

"Black Periodical Literature Project" -- Scholars will collect, codify and disseminate information on more than 20,000 African-American short stories and serialized novels. Contact Henry Louis Gates at the National Humanities Center, Research Triangle Park, N.C., 919/549-0661, or Cynthia Bond at Cornell University, Ithaca, N.Y., 607/255-4390.

- OVER -

REMARKS TO THE 1990 NATIONAL HUMANITIES CONFERENCE

BY LYNNE V. CHENEY, CHAIRMAN

THE NATIONAL ENDOWMENT FOR THE HUMANITIES

PORTLAND, OREGON

OCTOBER 27, 1990

NATIONAL ENDOWMENT FOR THE HUMANITIES

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20506



MEMORANDUM

October 31, 1990

TO: NEH Staff
FROM: Marguerite H. Sullivan *MHS*
SUBJECT: Remarks to the 1990 National Humanities Conference

NEH Chairman Lynne V. Cheney addressed the National Humanities Conference in Portland, Oregon on Saturday, October 27. I thought you would be interested in reading her remarks. They are attached.

Attachment

REMARKS TO THE 1990 NATIONAL HUMANITIES CONFERENCE

BY LYNNE V. CHENEY, CHAIRMAN

THE NATIONAL ENDOWMENT FOR THE HUMANITIES

PORTLAND, OREGON

OCTOBER 27, 1990

I have had the interesting experience of thinking about what I would say today from a physical perspective very different from Portland, Oregon's. Just a little more than a week ago, I was in the Soviet Union--in Moscow for three and a half days; and I spent my time there talking to students, scholars, citizens of all kinds.

The Soviet Union is a place amazingly changed from the last time I was there, seven years ago. St. Basil's, the onion-domed cathedral on Red Square, has been consecrated recently. Danilov Monastery, which was in ruins when I visited before, has been restored. Masses are held every day, and Sunday school is being held every Sunday--and Saturdays, as well. On the Arbat, a pedestrian mall near the Kremlin, arts and crafts are sold--not all of them as respectful of Soviet leadership as they might be. You can buy a Gorbachev matrioshka. Matrioshki are the dolls within dolls within dolls that Russia is famous for. Usually they are female figures, but now you can also buy a Gorbachev, and inside him is a Brezhnev, and inside him a Khrushchev, and inside him a Stalin, and inside all of them, a tiny little Lenin. In some ways that tiny figure of Lenin is symbolic of Lenin's diminished presence in everyday life. There used to be big banners of him everywhere, and while there are still some, there are not nearly so many. And there are

fewer statues. I understand that the television announcer on the nightly news now provides a daily round-up of statues of Lenin that have been attacked.

Perhaps the most welcome change is the possibility that exists now for free and open conversations with Soviet citizens. When I was in Leningrad and Moscow seven years ago, I very seldom had the sense that anyone was speaking candidly. Only those who had bravely set themselves against the state--refusniks who were intent on emigrating, for example--were willing to talk openly. One man I remember particularly well was a mathematician. He was Jewish and had applied for a visa to go to Israel, and as a consequence he had lost his job as a mathematician and was put to work shoveling coal. He was stoical enough talking about the consequences for himself of his action, but it was another matter when he talked about his son. Because of the father's defiance of the state, the son--a brilliant boy his father said--was not permitted to attend university. And when the father told that story, he cried.

But now it's not just refusniks who candidly assess life in the USSR. Soviets young and old are willing to talk about their troubles, and I'd say the topic foremost in everyone's mind is the economy. Perhaps I can convey some sense of how troubled it is by telling you about a reporter I met, a man of

about thirty-five who told me that he earns 600 rubles a month and that his wife, a schoolteacher, earns 200. Now to give you some idea of what that means, a Gorbachev matrioshka can cost 200 rubles. Not many Soviet citizens can buy them. The reporter had had an opportunity to travel in the United States summer before last and he told me he had returned with a VCR. His wife decided to sell it. She didn't want the kids watching too much television, he said; and so they did sell the VCR--for 8,000 rubles, or ten months' salary.

The reporter was very concerned about food for his family this winter. A newspaper shortly before I came to Moscow had a front page story describing how much of this fall's harvest was rotting in the fields. The story's headline was "What shall we do this winter?" and famine was a possibility I heard many Soviet citizens worrying about aloud. People talked about food--about the scarcity of food--constantly. The long lines you've read and heard about are everywhere. I went to a meat store on the Moscow Arbat one night about 6 p.m. and saw the lines. They were mostly of women, I will report. The reporter I talked to made it quite clear to me that it was his wife, not he, who stood in line for food. That was woman's work. So there were long lines, and at the end of them only a couple of sausages--and for reasons that no one could explain, huge stacks of chamomile tea which seemed to be of no interest to anyone.

In any case, at one point in my conversation with the reporter, he said, "We had potatoes in the newspaper this morning." I did not know what he meant. Potatoes in the paper? Was he talking about an advertisement? What was he talking about? He explained that he meant real potatoes. His newspaper, like many other institutions in the Soviet Union, is bypassing traditional routes of distribution. They have found someone on the outskirts of Moscow who grows potatoes who will supply them to the newspaper staff. There had been potatoes in the paper that morning for people to take home to their families.

Food seems to be on everyone's mind most of the time, but another topic of great interest to Soviets right now is the subject of your gathering: "The Politics of Culture." I visited school number 45 in the Sevastopol District of Moscow and found the principal worrying about the politics of culture. Perestroika and glasnost have deep implications for the schools--specifically in terms of depoliticizing--or deideologizing--teaching. For generations, history has been taught exclusively from a Marxist viewpoint. Many events were left out and others deliberately distorted. As one education official I met put it, "The political climate took precedence over documents." Now, an objective, scholarly approach is the ideal, but it is extraordinarily hard to realize in a society where teaching has so long been equated with indoctrination.

New textbooks are being produced, but they can scarcely keep up with the newspapers. The daily press will frequently write about events of the past--such as the Hitler-Stalin pact of 1939--that still haven't made it into the newest textbooks. Many archives are still closed, and even those newly opened haven't been open long enough for scholars to write about the periods they cover. School textbook writers frequently find themselves in the business of having to do original research--a task, which is, of course, enormously complicated by the fact that so much history has been falsified and so many documents are suspect.

And, not surprisingly, not everyone is comfortable with the new approach to knowledge. There are people who think the old way was better, that young people not indoctrinated in Marxist-Leninism are likely to go astray, that historians allowed to explore freely are a danger to social order. Teachers who have taught the old way sometimes find it difficult to teach the new. Indeed, they lack the knowledge to teach the new. Scholars who have spent a lifetime producing the multivolume series that the Soviets are famous for--the series of tomes that make an art form out of saying nothing--realize that all of that energy, all of that work, years and years of it, is useless. And they know that everyone knows it.

Many scholars are embarrassed by the situation they find themselves in. "Ten years ago," one scholar told me, "I attended a conference on Roosevelt, and my colleagues and I talked about FDR and we had never read any documents about him. Can you imagine that?" he asked me. He knew my doctorate was in literature. "Can you imagine evaluating Defoe or Dryden without evaluating their works?" Although it is possible now to read books written in the West, they are hard to obtain, expensive for one thing. I talked to historians at one institute who were lucky enough to have a subscription to the American journal, Foreign Affairs. But there were dozens of them, one journal, and no copying machines. "Why can't you get a Xerox?" I said, without giving my question as much thought as I should have. After all, in a world where a VCR costs almost as much as a middle-class family earns in a year, what would a Xerox cost? And if you had only one, imagine the pressure on it. It would break. Of course, it would. And if it broke, how would you get it fixed? There's a joke in Moscow about the man who finally gets on the list to get a car. He can pick it up in ten years, he is told, at 1:00 in the afternoon. "No, no," he says, "I can't do that." "Why not?" he is asked. "Because," he explains, "that's when the plumber is coming to fix my toilet."

The process of depoliticizing, deideologizing the study of the past is no easy thing, but the very fact that it is

happening is entirely positive. Societies benefit when people in them are free to seek information and draw conclusions from it. Societies benefit when people can investigate ideas and events without paying heed to what is "politically correct." Individuals benefit. And a corollary to this truth is that societies and individuals benefit when students are taught that seeking knowledge in this way is a good thing.

I met some really marvelous young people in Moscow, so full of life and ambition. I think of a small class, entirely female, at school number 45 in the Sevastopol District of Moscow. It was an English class, and the students spoke excellent English. They were reading and discussing Sue Townsend's The Secret Diary of Adrian Mole in English and trying to decide if it had the makings of a "classic," a work that would endure. I asked them what classics in English they were familiar with. The list was long and included some writers you might suspect: Dickens, Hemingway, and Dreiser, for example. Margaret Mitchell was one of the more surprising answers, perhaps accounted for by the fact that Gone With the Wind had just opened in Moscow. People were standing in line for hours to get in, even though tickets cost roughly the equivalent of \$25. Another surprising entry in the canon of school number 45 in the Sevastopol District of Moscow is Sidney Sheldon. Everyone in the class was remarkably fond of Sidney Sheldon's books, a fact for which I cannot account.

I also spent two hours one afternoon visiting with students at MGU--Moscow State University. They were history students for the most part and very good at asking provocative questions. One wanted to know what I thought of socialism. I told him that I didn't think recent years had given me or anyone else much reason to have a very high opinion of it. Free-market economies had shown themselves to be far more vital and dynamic. I added that I didn't want to be oversimple, and that, as I was sure he knew, there were very few pure systems; and that, in fact, was a good thing. It's important for capitalist societies to have community concern about those who do not thrive. It's important that there be social safety nets to help people along when nothing else is working for them. When I finished, the student stood up again and in very good English declared that I had described his way of thinking. "That's how I think of myself," he said, "as a capitalist with compassion."

Now I must explain to you exactly where we were--on the nineteenth floor of one of those gargantuan examples of Stalinist architecture that dominate the skyline of the city that is the capital of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. In that setting, it was quite amazing to hear this young man proclaim allegiance to capitalism. His fondest dream is to come to the United States. Indeed, I would say that is the hope and dream of most of the young people in that room. They know about us.

They know the bad as well as the good. They know about drugs and crime and the homeless, but they also know what a dynamic and vibrant society we are. They know how free we are; and they want to come here. Abacarov Suleiman, Vyatkina Inna, Yuri Ammasov, Catherine Suyititzka. They pressed their names on me as I left. If there are any state humanities councils that want to take on a Soviet exchange student, I have plenty of contacts for you.

Wherever I talked to people about teaching and learning, the subject of depoliticizing, deideologizing intellectual life came up. Perhaps the most reticent group with which I met, at least initially, were historians at the Military History Institute in Moscow. You have to understand that I bring a little baggage with me to a meeting like that. There's my domestic life, first of all. No one is unaware of my spouse's occupation, and that situation grows more complicated when I arrive at such a meeting with the wife of Marshall Yazov. Mrs. Yazov, as it happens, is a very warm and outgoing person who went with me to the Institute as a gesture of hospitality. But her husband is the supreme commander of all Soviet armed forces--and the military historians at the Institute are colonels in those armed forces. At least insofar as I understand Soviet insignia, they are colonels.

So there was some reticence. And when the subject of depoliticizing the subject of history came up, the first statement was very cautious. "We can never completely remove politics from the study of history," one colonel said, "because we cannot remove ourselves from politics." "True enough," I agreed, "but shouldn't we try to minimize the effect of politics on our scholarship?" There were some careful nods around the table. "If we don't work to minimize it," I asked, "don't we become horses wearing blinders?"

This was not a particularly imaginative metaphor, but it had astonishing cross-cultural resonance. It changed the tone of the meeting. Hardly was it translated when it elicited the most positive response, not just careful nods, but enthusiastic stories about projects it was now possible to work on that it hadn't been possible to pursue before. One colonel--one scholar, I should say--was working on the question of how many people were killed in the Bolshevik Revolution--hardly a politically correct problem to pursue. Another scholar, the head of the Institute, is writing a biography of Trotsky and using Trotsky's papers to do so--a project that would have been unheard of a few years ago.

There is no easy moral to be drawn from these stories, but perhaps there are questions that merit reflection, questions that bear on the topic of your conference, "The Politics of Culture." Shouldn't the goal of scholars

everywhere be to make art and inquiry as free as possible of political bias and influence? Of course, we are political creatures, but understanding that, shouldn't we try to raise ourselves up and acquire a broader perspective? If we insist that all literature, all art, be run through any single political prism, whether it be Marxist or capitalist or feminist or European or Third World, aren't we creatures of diminished vision? Indeed, if we insist, as has become fashionable in some quarters, that culture and all its creations are everywhere congruent with political struggle, isn't that the most diminished and diminishing perspective of all?

In this group I probably don't really need to raise these points, because the very best public programs--and the state councils are responsible for so many of them--take a generous and inclusive view. But there was an inescapable irony about being in the Soviet Union and hearing again and again about the importance of depoliticizing and deideologizing the study of culture when so often in the United States I read or hear about the importance of using the arts and the humanities as instruments of politics. I understand that the people advocating this view believe fervently that the political agendas they want to advance are good ones; but, however well-intentioned, using the arts and the humanities in this way

limits vision. It is putting on blinders, and what a tragedy for us to do that just as intellectuals in other parts of the world are taking them off.

Thank you for your hospitality, and thank you for your work in the humanities.

TYRANNICAL MACHINES

Educational Practices Gone Wrong and
Our Best Hopes for Setting Them Right

Remarks by

LYNNE V. CHENEY

Chairman

National Endowment for the Humanities

Before the

NATIONAL PRESS CLUB

November 14, 1990

Washington, DC

Among those who know what the humanities are, there has been much wailing and gnashing of teeth in the last several decades. One scholar, a fellow not inclined to understatement, declared the humanities to be "lying at death's door." But, in fact, it is possible if one looks across the nation and focuses on programs for the general public to find abundant evidence that the humanities are alive and well.

- o A recent survey right here in Washington, D.C., showed museum going to be the most popular leisure-time activity.
- o A survey in Boston (home of the Celtics, Bruins, and Red Sox) showed events by nonprofit cultural groups drawing more than twice as many people as professional sports events.
- o Across the country, museum attendance now surpasses 600 million every year.
- o 1.2 million acres have been added to museum space in the U.S. in the last ten years--an area almost the size of Delaware.

A survey conducted of high school history students in Alabama where I visited recently showed two-thirds unable to define capitalism and three-fourths unable to define a constitutional democracy. Three-fourths couldn't identify the Cold War. Many of the students thought it had to do with battles that occurred in the wintertime. Nor is it just high school students who don't know as much as they should. A recent nationwide survey sponsored by the National Endowment for the Humanities showed one-fourth of the nation's college seniors could not distinguish Churchill's words from Stalin's or Karl Marx's thoughts from the ideas of the U.S. Constitution.

How is it that the humanities can be doing so well in the public sphere and languishing in our schools? I think we have to begin any explanation by acknowledging that our schools have a great challenge. Their job is--and properly should be--to educate everyone--and partly because this task is so important, when we have a good idea about it, we try to set it in concrete. We institutionalize it, sometimes by giving it the force of law.

Take the way we prepare teachers, for example. There was a time in the 19th century when almost anyone could teach--even people without high school diplomas. Liberal arts faculties weren't interested in offering preparation to this group and so separate training developed for them in normal schools, which

I must confess that I find it difficult to read these textbooks without becoming indignant. They tell future teachers that there are exactly four types of thinking, exactly three ways of developing concepts. These textbooks take ideas that are subtle and reduce them to simplicities. They take ideas that are controversial or even incorrect and present them as if there were no debate. Setting a good example, one textbook declares, is not an effective way to teach values.

So teachers complain about time wasted. And they also complain about opportunities wasted, because time spent taking courses in education is, after all, time that can't be spent studying the subject one will teach, whether it's history or physics. Prospective high school teachers in Massachusetts, for example, spend one-quarter of their undergraduate careers in departments or colleges of education--which means considerably less time than their peers for studying history or physics. We have arrived at the peculiar position in this country where those who intend to teach a subject study it less than those who do not.

What was once a good idea isn't a good idea any longer; and people have been saying this for a long time. But having adopted certain ways of doing things on a large scale, we find them enormously difficult to change. Philosopher William James described such phenomena in the early 20th century as

process of European integration and unity. Students in France have to write--on topics like the foreign policy of American presidents from Harry Truman through George Bush. In Germany students have to write. On a state exam there students were asked to discuss democracy in the Weimar Republic. In Japan students have to write. Prospective entrants to Tokyo University were recently asked to describe Afghanistan's role in international relations.

The United States alone among industrialized nations has at the center of its educational system an exam that tries to avoid assessing what students have learned about the subjects they have studied. The costs of this approach have been obvious for a very long time, but the SAT machine--as tyrannical machines do--rolls on.

A last example of a tyrannical machine: the way we reward faculty members in our colleges and universities. At the end of the 19th century, a number of educational leaders realized it would be valuable to encourage the expansion of knowledge: that is, to encourage research. This good idea was institutionalized. It was made the heart of the tenure and promotion process and gradually became so powerful that the idea of the dissemination of knowledge--the idea of teaching--became a poor and attenuated thing.

required, students can often fulfill them in ways that seem to reflect faculty research interests more than students' needs. At Harvard one can fulfill core requirements by studying tuberculosis from 1842 to 1952 or pictorial and literary representations of New York and Berlin from 1880 to 1940. At Dartmouth one can fulfill distributive requirements with "Sexuality and Writing" which analyzes "the use of sexuality and its ramifications as symbols for the process of literary creativity, with particular reference to . . . potency and creative fertility; marriage or adultery and literary sterility; deviation and/or solitude and autobiography; prostitution and history; chastity and literary self-referentiality."

What may well be an interesting research topic may well not be a sensible undergraduate requirement; but in a system where research is valued so highly, the discrepancy tends to be overlooked. We end up with college seniors who haven't the least idea what Plato wrote or who Stalin and Churchill were.

In our colleges and universities, as in our schools, we have taken admirable ideas and institutionalized them in ways that have given them astonishing power--indeed, power sufficient for them to prevail even after they have become counterproductive. The error of our ways has been apparent for a very long time, but simply realizing what we are doing wrong isn't sufficient to set it right. That, I think, is one of the

People should know about alternative certification programs. Prospective teachers should be able to choose them. Similarly, we need to move beyond the SAT by encouraging alternative ways of assessing students' progress and evaluating schools. Among the promising options are the exams of the National Assessment of Educational Progress which focus very much on what students know. A blue-ribbon commission recommended three years ago that National Assessment be expanded--and it should be expanded.

Perhaps the most promising of all reforms allows parents to choose the school their children attend. A school that can be chosen can develop a specialty. Among the junior high schools in New York's District 4--one of the most famous examples in the country of the success of choice--are the Academy of Environmental Science, the East Harlem Performing Arts School, the Isaac Newton School for Math and Science, and the School of Science and the Humanities. In Prince George's County, Maryland, a student might choose an elementary school that specializes in the arts, a middle school that stresses humanities, a high school oriented toward sciences. Alternatives do not necessarily have to be innovative in order to be attractive. The Bay Haven School of Basics Plus, an elementary school in Sarasota, Florida, emphasizes traditional values and skills--and has a waiting list of more than 1200 students.

Massachusetts, are distinguished by the emphasis they place on providing students and parents with the information they need to choose wisely.

Indeed, one of the most important factors in making a system in which there is choice operate efficiently is information. This is true in elementary and secondary education. And it is true for our colleges and universities as well.

I can think of nothing that would so effectively counter the tyrannical machine that dominates American higher education as having parents and students more aware of what constitutes instructional quality. If parents and students were to begin to choose colleges and universities on the basis of how well they teach, colleges and universities would begin to honor those who teach well. Research would not be the only path to a distinguished academic career.

We at the National Endowment for the Humanities want to be useful to parents and students as they try to understand whether particular colleges or universities sufficiently value teaching, and so, in our new report we make suggestions about questions they ought to ask. Parents and students ought to read--really read--college catalogs, moving beyond the rhetoric of the opening pages to see what is actually required. Has

information about those alternatives so that people can choose wisely among them.

I want to thank the National Press Club for giving me an opportunity to talk about our schools and colleges. This organization has a distinguished history of encouraging debate on important topics, and I appreciate your inviting me to be a part of it.

Remarks by

LYNNE V. CHENEY

Chairman

National Endowment for the Humanities

at the

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF SCHOOLS OF MUSIC

Annual Meeting

November 19, 1990

Indianapolis, Indiana

Among those concerned with the humanities, there has been much wailing and gnashing of teeth in the last several decades. One scholar, a fellow not inclined to understatement, declared the humanities to be "lying at death's door." But, in fact, it is possible if one looks across the nation and focuses on programs for the general public to find abundant evidence that the humanities are alive and well.

- o A recent survey right here in Washington, D.C., showed museum going to be the most popular leisure-time activity.
- o A survey in Boston (home of the Celtics, Bruins, and Red Sox) showed events by nonprofit cultural groups drawing more than twice as many people as professional sports events.
- o Across the country, museum attendance now surpasses 600 million every year.
- o 1.2 million acres have been added to museum space in the U.S. in the last ten years--an area almost the size of Delaware.

I could cite many other examples, not just from museums, but from libraries, historical societies, and state humanities councils. Even television--the bete noire of culture--is showing its potential. Recently millions of Americans--record numbers of them--watched Ken Burns's remarkable documentary, The Civil War--a film for which I am very proud to note that the National Endowment for the Humanities provided major funding.

So there is good news about the humanities, but the pessimists have a point, an important one. While the humanities are thriving in programs for the general public, they are deeply troubled in our schools, in our colleges, and in our universities.

A survey conducted of high school history students in Alabama where I visited recently showed two-thirds unable to define capitalism and three-fourths unable to define a constitutional democracy. Three-fourths couldn't identify the Cold War. Many of the students thought it had to do with battles that occurred in the wintertime. Nor is it just high school students who don't know as much as they should. A recent nationwide survey sponsored by the National Endowment for the Humanities showed one-fourth of the nation's college seniors could not distinguish Churchill's words from Stalin's or Karl Marx's thoughts from the ideas of the U.S. Constitution.

How is it that the humanities can be doing so well in the public sphere and languishing in our schools? I think we have to begin any explanation by acknowledging that our schools have a great challenge. Their job is--and properly should be--to educate everyone--and partly because this task is so important, when we have a good idea about it, we try to set it in concrete. We institutionalize it, sometimes by giving it the force of law.

Take the way we prepare teachers, for example. There was a time in the 19th century when almost anyone could teach--even people without high school diplomas. Liberal arts faculties weren't interested in offering preparation to this group and so separate training developed for them in normal schools, which gradually evolved into colleges and departments of education. In the beginning, separate study offered teachers opportunities for schooling that were otherwise unavailable--and thus separate study was seen to be a good idea, so good that we institutionalized it. By the 1930s prospective teachers were required by law to take separate courses in education--and so they are to this day, though there is widespread doubt about whether this remains a wise course.

Now that our teachers are all college graduates, what benefit is there in offering them a segregated preparation? Is there some advantage, not readily apparent, in studying the

psychology of children in the education college rather than the psychology department? Is there some advantage gained by studying how to teach social studies apart from the study of history?

Teachers themselves don't think so. Ask them about classes they have taken in education, and you will hear them talk repeatedly about time wasted, time spent with education textbooks, for example, that take what is simple and make it complicated. Suppose a teacher wants to show children how to use the directory that is on the front page of most newspapers. According to an education textbook I have in my office, there are twelve different steps involved in teaching and applying such a skill.

I must confess that I find it difficult to read these textbooks without becoming indignant. They tell future teachers that there are exactly four types of thinking, exactly three ways of developing concepts. These textbooks take ideas that are subtle and reduce them to simplicities. They take ideas that are controversial or even incorrect and present them as if there were no debate. Setting a good example, one textbook declares, is not an effective way to teach values.

So teachers complain about time wasted. And they also complain about opportunities wasted, because time spent taking

abstract courses in teacher education is time that can't be spent in general education or in studying the subject one will teach. Prospective high school teachers in Massachusetts, to pick just one example, spend one-quarter of their undergraduate careers in departments or colleges of education--which means they have considerably less time than their peers to devote to the liberal learning that should be at the heart of general education and considerably less time for studying the field of knowledge that they will in the years ahead attempt to convey to the next generation. In the humanities, we have arrived at the peculiar position in this country where those who intend to teach a subject like history study it less than those who do not.

The situation is somewhat different in music, where your organization requires 50 percent and more of the curriculum in the major. For perspective music teachers, the crunch is likely to come in general education--and while putting the squeeze on there does encourage subject matter mastery, it may well provide students with fewer opportunities than they need to know well the context of the subject they have mastered. I would also note that the demanding majors you set forth do make general curriculum reform difficult. As I have talked to faculty members across the country about the challenges they face when they try to establish coherent and rigorous general education programs, I frequently hear that the two biggest

challenges are the engineers and the music department--a pairing I always find remarkable.

But my real point here is not music education but teacher preparation, and while the way we prepare teachers may once have had some justification, I don't think it does any longer. But having adopted certain ways of doing things on a large scale, we find them enormously difficult to change. Philosopher William James described such phenomena in the early 20th century as "tyrannical machines." Practices that begin by filling needs, James wrote, can become detached from their original purposes, even counterproductive to them; but once they are institutionalized, once expectations, organizations and even professions have grown up around them, these practices can become immune to even the most enlightened criticism.

The Scholastic Aptitude Test is an almost perfect example of the phenomenon James described. In the 1920s, it seemed like a pretty good idea to come up with a test that didn't depend on a student's having studied any specific curriculum. But as the SAT became more and more powerful, it began to send a message throughout our educational system that what schools teach about subjects like history and what students learn doesn't really matter. When the most important examination that most students ever take doesn't care whether they know

about capitalism or the Constitution or the Cold War, these subjects can come to seem not worth caring about.

As you are aware, the College Board recently announced that the SAT is going to be different in the future--but not, unfortunately, different enough to make a difference. There will be an optional test of writing. Students who choose to do so will write an essay on such topics as "the more things change, the more they remain the same." Let me just observe that students in Spain have to write--on topics like the process of European integration and unity. Students in France have to write--on topics like the foreign policy of American presidents from Harry Truman through George Bush. In Germany students have to write. On a state exam there students were asked to discuss democracy in the Weimar Republic. In Japan students have to write. Prospective entrants to Tokyo University were recently asked to describe Afghanistan's role in international relations.

The United States alone among industrialized nations has at the center of its educational system an exam that tries to avoid assessing what students have learned about the subjects they have studied. The costs of this approach have been obvious for a very long time, but the SAT machine--as tyrannical machines do--rolls on.

A last example of a tyrannical machine: the way we reward faculty members in our colleges and universities. At the end of the 19th century, a number of educational leaders realized it would be valuable to encourage the expansion of knowledge: that is, to encourage research. This good idea was institutionalized. It was made the heart of the tenure and promotion process and gradually became so powerful that the idea of the dissemination of knowledge--the idea of teaching--became a poor and attenuated thing.

To be sure, there are many faculty members who consider teaching their primary responsibility, many institutions that consider teaching their primary responsibility; but in a system that has made research central to status, these tend not to be the teachers or the institutions with the most prestige. Institutions that rank high in prestige reward their faculty members with ever-reduced teaching loads, and prestigious faculty members expect to be rewarded that way. Institutions that want prestige lure academic stars to their faculties with promises that they will never have to see an undergraduate.

This flight from teaching has financial consequences. It means that college costs more. And it has educational consequences as well. At many universities undergraduates find few senior faculty in their classrooms, few full-time faculty members of any kind willing to guide their education, and few

meaningful formal guidelines--that is, requirements--to help them on their way to a liberal education. Broadly conceived, coherent requirements need faculty to shape them, faculty to teach them, and a system that primarily rewards research provides little incentive for any of this.

It is possible today to graduate from 38 percent of the nation's colleges and universities without studying history; from 45 percent without studying American or English literature; from upwards of 75 percent without taking a course in studio or performing arts; and even at schools where these subjects are required, students can often fulfill them in ways that seem to reflect faculty research interests more than students' needs. At Harvard one can fulfill core requirements by studying tuberculosis from 1842 to 1952 or pictorial and literary representations of New York and Berlin from 1880 to 1940. At Dartmouth one can fulfill distributive requirements with "Sexuality and Writing" which analyzes "the use of sexuality and its ramifications as symbols for the process of literary creativity, with particular reference to . . . potency and creative fertility; marriage or adultery and literary sterility; deviation and/or solitude and autobiography; prostitution and history; chastity and literary self-referentiality."

What may well be an interesting research topic may well not be a sensible undergraduate requirement; but in a system where research is valued so highly, the discrepancy tends to be overlooked. We end up with college seniors who haven't the least idea what Plato wrote or who Stalin and Churchill were.

In our colleges and universities, as in our schools, we have taken admirable ideas and institutionalized them in ways that have given them astonishing power--indeed, power sufficient for them to prevail even after they have become counterproductive. The error of our ways has been apparent for a very long time, but simply realizing what we are doing wrong isn't sufficient to set it right. That, I think, is one of the lessons we learned in the 1980s. Naming our problems doesn't correct them. Bad practices will not go away simply because we demonstrate how counterproductive they are. Tyrannical machines will not dismantle themselves. We have to set alternatives to them into place, optional ways of preparing teachers and testing students and rewarding college and university faculty. We have to identify promising alternatives that are in place, nurture them and talk about them so that people are aware of these other ways, so that every state or school district that wants to move ahead with reform doesn't have to reinvent the wheel.

A case in point are alternative certification programs in states like New Jersey and Texas, ways of preparing teachers that compress the time spent in education classes and emphasize classroom experience. These alternative plans prepare people who have earned bachelor's degrees in the liberal arts to become teachers chiefly by having them work with men and women who have mastered the art, the craft of teaching. That's the way one becomes an excellent teacher--by seeing good teaching in action. In New Jersey, alternatively certified teachers have done better on the National Teachers Examination than teacher education graduates, and they are staying in the profession longer. Not only are alternative certification programs successful, they allow comparisons about the most effective ways of preparing teachers and give colleges and universities reason to improve their programs so they can compete.

People should know about alternative certification programs. Prospective teachers should be able to choose them. Similarly, we need to move beyond the SAT by encouraging alternative ways of assessing students' progress and evaluating schools. Among the promising options are the exams of the National Assessment of Educational Progress which focus very much on what students know. A blue-ribbon commission recommended three years ago that National Assessment be expanded--and it should be expanded.

Perhaps the most promising of all reforms allows parents to choose the school their children attend. A school that can be chosen can develop a specialty. Among the junior high schools in New York's District 4--one of the most famous examples in the country of the success of choice--are the Academy of Environmental Science, the East Harlem Performing Arts School, the Isaac Newton School for Math and Science, and the School of Science and the Humanities. In Prince George's County, Maryland, a student might choose an elementary school that specializes in the arts, a middle school that stresses humanities, a high school oriented toward sciences.

Alternatives do not necessarily have to be innovative in order to be attractive. The Bay Haven School of Basics Plus, an elementary school in Sarasota, Florida, emphasizes traditional values and skills--and has a waiting list of more than 1200 students.

A school that can be chosen can develop a specialty--and it will be powerfully motivated to develop it well. Choice, like alternative certification, brings the dynamic of competition into education, and by doing so encourages improvements in all areas, from teachers and textbooks to standards and expectations.

Now I know there are some people suspicious of choice. They tend not to be poor people, let me observe. They tend not

to be people of limited means who feel themselves trapped in inadequate school systems. These people, polls show, overwhelmingly support the idea of choice. They want to have some say over their children's education. People with more financial power can move if they find the local school unacceptable. They can, perhaps, pay tuition at a private school. Poor parents want to be able to choose too. They want what many other parents already have.

Still, there are people suspicious of choice. Isn't it possible, they ask, that some parents will make bad choices? And I admit the answer is yes. Some people will choose the school with the best football team rather than the school with the best academic program. But I'm willing to trust that this won't happen often, not if you give people the information they need to make good choices. Successful choice plans, like the one in District 4 in New York or the one in Cambridge, Massachusetts, are distinguished by the emphasis they place on providing students and parents with the information they need to choose wisely.

Indeed, one of the most important factors in making a system in which there is choice operate efficiently is information. This is true in elementary and secondary education. And it is true for our colleges and universities as well.

I can think of nothing that would so effectively counter the tyrannical machine that dominates American higher education as having parents and students more aware of what constitutes instructional quality. If parents and students were to begin to choose colleges and universities on the basis of how well they teach, colleges and universities would begin to honor those who teach well. Research would not be the only path to a distinguished academic career.

We at the National Endowment for the Humanities want to be useful to parents and students as they try to understand whether particular colleges or universities sufficiently value teaching, and so, in our new report we make suggestions about questions they ought to ask. Parents and students ought to read--really read--college catalogs, moving beyond the rhetoric of the opening pages to see what is actually required. Has this institution sought ways to provide a broad-based liberal arts education? parents ought to ask. Or is it possible to graduate from this college or university without studying major areas of human knowledge? I sometimes find it useful in evaluating a curriculum to make the worst case scenario. If it's possible to earn credit for graduation by studying the sociology of parties, as one can at Vassar, or the "discourse" of heavy metal concerts, as one can at the University of Minnesota, then you and I can count on some of our offspring doing it, and is that why we are investing \$50,000 to

\$100,000? In higher education, we have choices; our task is to exercise them intelligently.

What I hope our new report does is suggest an approach to education reform in the 90s. The time has passed for lament. Complaining is good for raising consciousness, but it won't dismantle education's tyrannical machines. It won't change entrenched practices in the way that offering alternatives and nurturing alternatives to those entrenched practices will. All of the things that I and others have complained about--whether it's how we train teachers or how we choose textbooks, whether it's how we evaluate our students' schools or how we reward faculty members in colleges and universities--all of these practices will benefit from the dynamic of competition. The appropriate strategy for reform in the 1990s, then, is to make alternatives available--and to make available as well information about those alternatives so that people can choose wisely among them.

I want to thank the National Association of Schools of Music for giving me an opportunity to talk about our schools and colleges. This organization has a distinguished history of encouraging debate on important topics, and I appreciate your inviting me to be a part of it.