

THE NATIONAL ENDOWMENT FOR THE HUMANITIES  
DURING THE ADMINISTRATION OF  
PRESIDENT LYNDON B. JOHNSON  
November 1963 - January 1969

VOLUME I

CONTENTS OF VOLUME I

	<u>Page</u>
I. Provisions of Public Law 89-209, the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities Act of 1965	1
II. Background of the Legislation	6
III. First Steps in Implementation	27
The initial appropriation	27
Appointment of Chairman and Council	30
IV. The Endowment under the Chairmanship of Henry Allen Moe	37
Initial organization and staffing	37
Development of initial programs	44

\* \* \* \* \*

Appendix A: Sponsors of the legislation, 89th Congress, 1st session	62
Appendix B: Documentary supplement	70



I. PROVISIONS OF PUBLIC LAW 89-209,  
THE NATIONAL FOUNDATION ON THE ARTS AND THE HUMANITIES ACT OF 1965

The National Endowment for the Humanities was established by Public Law 89-209, signed by President Johnson on September 29, 1965. The main provisions of the act, before its amendment in June 1968,<sup>1/</sup> were as follows:

Declaration of purpose. Section 2 of the act provides--

"The Congress hereby finds and declares--

"(1) that the encouragement and support of national progress and scholarship in the humanities and the arts, while primarily a matter for private and local initiative, is also an appropriate matter of concern to the Federal Government;

"(2) that a high civilization must not limit its efforts to science and technology alone but must give full value and support to the other great branches of man's scholarly and cultural activity;

"(3) that democracy demands wisdom and vision in its citizens and that it must therefore foster and support a form of education designed to make men masters of their technology and not its unthinking servant;

"(4) that it is necessary and appropriate for the Federal Government to complement, assist, and add to programs for the advancement of the humanities and the arts by local, State, regional, and private agencies and their organizations;

"(5) that the practice of art and the study of the humanities requires constant dedication and devotion and that, while no government can call a great artist or scholar into existence, it is necessary and appropriate for the Federal Government to help create and sustain not only a climate encouraging freedom of thought, imagination, and inquiry but also the material conditions facilitating the release of this creative talent;

---

<sup>1/</sup> Public Law 90-348, June 18, 1968.

"(6) that the world leadership which has come to the United States cannot rest solely upon superior power, wealth, and technology, but must be solidly founded upon worldwide respect and admiration for the Nation's high qualities as a leader in the realm of ideas and of the spirit; and

"(7) that, in order to implement these findings, it is desirable to establish a National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities and to strengthen the responsibilities of the Office of Education with respect to education in the arts and the humanities."

Organizational structure. With the National Endowment for the Humanities, the act establishes a coordinate agency, the National Endowment for the Arts. Each Endowment reports directly to the President. The two are loosely combined in one over-all organization, the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities.

Within each Endowment, the act provides for an advisory body, the National Council on the Humanities and the National Council on the Arts.<sup>2/</sup>

Finally, the act establishes a Federal Council on the Arts and the Humanities. This group has certain advisory and coordinating functions and is composed of the chairmen of the two Endowments and several other federal agency representatives.

Definition of the humanities. Section 3(a) of the act provides--

"The term 'humanities' includes, but is not limited to, the study of the following: language, both modern and classic; linguistics; literature; history; jurisprudence; philosophy; archaeology; the history, criticism, theory, and practice of the arts; and those aspects of the social sciences which have humanistic content and employ humanistic methods."

---

<sup>2/</sup> The National Council on the Arts was established by earlier legislation, Public Law 88-579, September 3, 1964, and placed in the Executive Office of the President. Public Law 89-209 transferred the Arts Council to the National Endowment for the Arts.

Programs of the Humanities Endowment. Section 7(c) authorizes the chairman of the Humanities Endowment, with the advice of the Federal Council and the National Council on the Humanities, to--

"(1) develop and encourage the pursuit of a national policy for the promotion of progress and scholarship in the humanities;

"(2) initiate and support research and programs to strengthen the research potential of the United States in the humanities by making arrangements (including grants, loans, and other forms of assistance) with individuals or groups to support such activities;

"(3) award fellowships and grants to institutions or individuals for training and workshops in the humanities. Fellowships awarded to individuals under this authority may be for the purpose of study at appropriate nonprofit institutions selected by the recipient of such aid, for stated periods of time;

"(4) foster the interchange of information in the humanities;

"(5) foster, through grants or other arrangements with groups, public understanding and appreciation of the humanities; and

"(6) support the publication of scholarly works in the humanities without regard to the provisions of section 87 of the Act of January 12, 1895 (28 Stat. 622), and section 11 of the Act of March 1, 1919 (40 Stat. 1270; 44 U.S.C. 111)."

Functions of the National Council on the Humanities. Section 8(f) of the act provides--

"The Council shall (1) advise the Chairman with respect to policies, programs, and procedures for carrying out his functions, and (2) shall review applications for financial support and make recommendations thereon to the Chairman. The Chairman shall not approve or disapprove an application until he has received the Council's recommendation unless the Council fails to make a recommendation on the application within a reasonable time."

Appointments. The Chairman of the Humanities Endowment is appointed by the President with the advice and consent of the Senate. The Humanities Council consists of the Chairman of the Endowment and twenty-six other members appointed by the President for staggered six-year terms. Appoint-

ments to the Council are to be made--

"on the basis of distinguished service and scholarship or creativity and in a manner which will provide a comprehensive representation of the views of scholars and professional practitioners in the humanities and of the public throughout the United States." (Section 8(b).)

Funding.

(a) General program funds. The basic authorization for appropriations to carry out the programs of the Humanities and Arts Endowments is contained in section 11(a) of Public Law 89-209. This subsection authorized up to \$10 million for each of the fiscal years 1966, 1967, and 1968, and stated, "Sums appropriated under the authority of this subsection shall be equally divided between the Endowments of the Foundation, and shall remain available until expended."

(b) Matching funds. By sections 10(a)(2) and (3) the act authorized each Endowment to accept gifts to the agency. In the case of gifts that were unrestricted, that is, made "without condition or restriction other than that it be used for the purposes of the Foundation or one of its Endowments," additional appropriations were authorized. Section 11(b) provided for appropriations to match the unrestricted gifts received by each Endowment up to an annual maximum of \$5 million for the humanities and \$2.25 million for the arts.

(c) Arts Endowment grants to states. Besides the basic program funds and the matching funds authorized for the Arts Endowment, an additional appropriation for special state programs was authorized by section 11(c). The ceiling provided was \$2.75 million for each fiscal year beginning with fiscal 1967.

(d) Administrative expenses. By section 11(d), the act authorized appropriation of such administrative funds as might be necessary to carry out the act.



## II. BACKGROUND OF THE LEGISLATION

For practical purposes the events within the Johnson Administration leading to establishment of the Endowment may be taken as beginning with the report of the Commission on the Humanities, dated April 30, 1964. <sup>1/</sup> The Commission was a private group, acting under the joint sponsorship of the American Council of Learned Societies, the Council of Graduate Schools in the United States, and the United Chapters of Phi Beta Kappa. Its twenty members were drawn primarily from among university presidents and faculty members but also included representatives of colleges, scholarly organizations, public schools, the federal government, and the business community. Barnaby C. Keeney, then president of Brown University and now chairman of the National Endowment for the Humanities, served as the Commission's chairman.

In its report, the Commission recommended federal legislation establishing a National Humanities Foundation. The report argued the importance of the humanities; the needs in the humanities, especially in comparison to the better financed sciences; the national interest in providing support; and the feasibility of providing federal support without federal control. The report proposed the National Humanities Foundation as a parallel to the National Science Foundation. Moderately specific suggestions on the programs and the organization of the foundation were included in the 15-page body of the report. To this

---

Footnotes appear at the end of this section.

were appended over 200 pages of special reports on the needs of the schools, of libraries, and of 24 learned societies in various fields of the humanities.

On August 17, 1964, Congressman William S. Moorhead of Pennsylvania became the first member of Congress to introduce legislation to carry out the Commission's recommendations. His bill, H. R. 12406 (88th Cong., 2d sess.), "to provide for the establishment of the National Humanities Foundation to promote progress and scholarship in the humanities," followed the report of the Commission closely in its more general and substantive provisions. Other aspects of the bill were adapted from the National Science Foundation Act of 1950. <sup>2/</sup> No action was taken on the bill before the close of the 88th Congress.

President Johnson endorsed the concept of a National Humanities Foundation on September 28, 1964, in a speech at Brown University. Speaking on the occasion of the university's two hundredth anniversary, the President asked his audience to consider "the future of an old and fruitful partnership, the partnership of campus and country." He referred to the "great truth" that "the answer for all of our national problems, the answer for all the problems of the world, comes down, when you really analyze it, to one single word--education"; and he added that "a great Nation and a great civilization feeds on the depth of its scholarship as well as the breadth of its educational opportunity." He spoke then of the extent of Federal fellowships and traineeships in higher education, especially in the sciences, and of the extent of Federal support for research in universities. Then he added:

"And there just simply must be no neglect of humanities. The values of our free and compassionate society are as vital to our national success as the skills of our technical and scientific age. And I look with the greatest of favor upon the proposal by your own able President Keeney's Commission for a National Foundation for the Humanities."

In his State of the Union message at the beginning of the 89th Congress, the President did not refer directly to the establishment of a National Humanities Foundation, but he did include an oblique reference in connection with a proposal for a National Foundation on the Arts:

"I propose that we honor and support the achievements of thought and the creations of art.

". . . .

"We must also recognize and encourage those who can be pathfinders for the Nation's imagination and understanding.

"To help promote and honor creative achievements, I will propose a National Foundation on the Arts." 3/

In the first week of the 89th Congress, 76 bills were introduced to establish a National Humanities Foundation, and the number of cosponsors of these bills eventually grew to 105 members of the House and 40 members of the Senate. (See Appendix A.) There were two separate versions of this legislation, one with Congressman Moorhead as the chief sponsor in the House (H. R. 334, introduced January 4, 1965) and Senator Gruening in the Senate (S. 111, introduced January 6, 1965). The second version was under the principal sponsorship of Senator Pell (S. 316, introduced January 7, 1965) and Congressman Fogarty (H. R. 2043, introduced January 7, 1965). The chief difference between the measures was in their treatment of the arts.

Up to a point, both versions were in agreement. Both provided for the establishment of an agency whose purpose it would be "to develop and promote a broadly conceived policy of support for the humanities and the arts." Both vested the general authority of the Foundation in a National Humanities Board and created the office of Director of the Foundation as the chief executive officer of the agency. Beyond this point the bills diverged.

The Moorhead and Gruening bills were not identical, but each was a revision of the bill Moorhead had introduced in the previous Congress, and they followed the same general pattern, which had been based on the report of the Commission on the Humanities. On the relationship of the arts to the humanities, the Commission had said:

"The Foundation's definition of the humanities and the arts should be broad and inclusive in character. The humanities are generally agreed to include the study of languages, literature, history, and philosophy; the history, criticism, and theory of art and music; and the history and comparison of religion and law. The Commission would also place the creative and performing arts within the scope of the Foundation. As we have said, these are the very substance of the humanities and embrace a major part of the imaginative and creative activities of mankind. (If the present proposal to establish a National Arts Foundation should become law, the Commission hopes that this foundation would be combined with the National Humanities Foundation, or, at least, that the activities of the two would be coordinated.) Likewise, those aspects of the social sciences that have humanistic content and employ humanistic methods should come within the purview of the Foundation. . . ." <sup>4/</sup>

The proposal to establish a National Arts Foundation, referred to by the Commission, had not succeeded in the 88th Congress but had been deleted before enactment, late in 1964, from the legislation establishing the National Council on the Arts. <sup>5/</sup>

In line with the Commission's recommendation, both the Gruening and Moorhead bills defined the "humanities and the arts" as a single term, within which the arts appeared to be a discipline within the humanities like other disciplines. Moorhead's version said:

"The term 'humanities and the arts', as used in this Act, includes, but is not limited to, the study of languages, literature, history, and philosophy; the history, criticism, and theory of the arts; the history of law, religion, and science; the creative and performing arts; and those aspects of the social sciences that have humanistic content and employ humanistic methods."

The Gruening bill added linguistics, political theory, and history of politics to the definition, but it did not differ substantially with respect to the arts.

Senator Gruening's bill made no reference to the National Council on the Arts. Congressman Moorhead dealt with the newly authorized Arts Council by providing that its chairman, along with the heads of three other agencies, should be an ex officio member of the National Humanities Board.

The bills introduced by Senator Pell and Congressman Fogarty, unlike those of Moorhead and Gruening, reflected not only the work of the Commission on the Humanities but also the separate efforts in previous years to obtain a National Arts Foundation. Senator Pell had served in both the 87th and 88th Congresses as chairman of the Special Subcommittee on the Arts, which did not become the Special Subcommittee on Arts and Humanities until the beginning of the 89th Congress. 6/ When Pell introduced S. 316, to establish a National Humanities Foundation, he also introduced at the same time another bill (S. 315,

89th Cong., 1st sess.) to establish a National Arts Foundation; and he characterized the former as "more comprehensive" and the two bills as allowing "a choice--of either advancing our cultural endeavors through progressive stages and building more gradually on what we have begun; or of taking, ideally, one inclusive stride forward." <sup>7</sup>/ Congressman Fogarty introduced the same two bills on the House side (H. R. 2042 and H. R. 2043, 89th Cong., 1st sess.), while the chief House advocate of federal support for the arts, Frank Thompson of New Jersey, introduced only a bill to create a National Arts Foundation (H. R. 3617, 89th Cong., 1st sess., introduced January 26, 1965).

The Pell and Fogarty bills provided separate definitions of "humanities" and "arts"; added to the functions of the National Humanities Foundation that of "insofar as practicable, . . . carrying out the purposes of this Act in a manner consistent with, and in support of, the activities of the National Council on the Arts . . . ."; authorized not only programs for the humanities and the arts generally but also additional programs directed toward the arts specifically; and required that there be within the Foundation a separate division pertaining to "creative, interpretive, and professional performance." As in the Moorhead bill, the Chairman of the Arts Council was to be an ex officio member of the National Humanities Board. Finally, the Pell-Fogarty proposal called for Foundation expenditures "in accord with the principle that there shall be an equal distribution of funding between (A) the humanities and (B) the arts."

Hearings were held, beginning in February 1965, on all the bills mentioned, 8/ both those to establish a National Humanities Foundation and those to establish a National Arts Foundation, and, in addition, on still another Arts Foundation bill introduced by Senator Javits (S. 310, 89th Cong., 1st sess.).

The hearings opened on February 23 before a joint session of the Senate Special Subcommittee on Arts and Humanities, chaired by Senator Pell, and the House Special Subcommittee on Labor, chaired by Congressman Thompson. The first witness was Roger Stevens, then the President's Special Assistant on the Arts. Although Stevens was said not to be appearing in the capacity of an Administration witness, 9/ he stated that the Administration would send to the committees its legislative recommendations in the near future. 10/

Further hearings before the Administration bill was sent up were held as follows:

February 24 - Senate and House hearings, held separately.  
February 25-26 - Senate hearings.  
March 3 - Joint House-Senate hearing.  
March 4-5 - Senate hearings.

The testimony at these hearings was almost unanimous in supporting federal legislation for support of the arts and humanities. The main issues raised were, first, whether an independent agency should be established or whether support should be provided through an existing agency such as the Smithsonian Institution, the Office of Education, or the National Science Foundation; and second, how the relationship between the humanities and the arts should be reflected in the organization and funding of the supporting agency.

The question of an independent agency had been raised even before publication of the report of the Commission on the Humanities. <sup>11/</sup> At the hearings, it was framed mainly by an offer of the Smithsonian Institution "to provide shelter" for the foundation. <sup>12/</sup> The Secretary of the Smithsonian made it clear, however, that this would involve something more than physical shelter, although he declined to commit himself on how much control over the foundation would be exercised. <sup>13/</sup> Senator Pell, Senator Javits, and Congressman Thompson all agreed that an independent agency would be their first choice, <sup>14/</sup> and the great weight of the testimony was in accord.

Opinion was divided at the hearings on the proper structure of the agency and on equal funding. Roger Stevens, the present Chairman of the Arts Endowment, supported

"the concept of a combined Arts and Humanities Foundation as an autonomous agency with equal funding for both cultural areas and a virtually autonomous division between the two areas, with each side entitled to receive funding from private and/or public sources which would be specifically used for their own particular programs." <sup>15/</sup>

Barnaby Keeney suggested, on organization, that

"there be one board and one director; that the board be composed of distinguished people in both the arts and the humanities; . . . that beneath . . . the director there be two deputy directors responsible to the director and to the board through him, one for the arts and one for the humanities; and that there be an advisory committee or council for each area." <sup>16/</sup>

He opposed a requirement for equal funding because "it might be desirable in some years to emphasize one and, in others, the other, and we do not really know whether equal sums are necessary." <sup>17/</sup>

Other witnesses for the humanities took positions similar to Mr. Keeney's on equal funding. <sup>18/</sup> Some witnesses for the arts, on the other hand, expressed a wish for assurances that funds would be divided equitably. <sup>19/</sup>

Other issues raised in the hearings included the following:

(1) the definition of the humanities: the place of religion, law, archaeology, linguistics, and other fields; (2) the inclusion of support for libraries; (3) the inclusion of new authority for the Office of Education to support teacher training institutes and special teaching equipment; <sup>20/</sup> and (4) grants to other federal agencies. <sup>21/</sup> A number of other specific amendments were suggested by Mr. Keeney. <sup>22/</sup>

The Administration's recommendations were sent to the Congress on March 10, 1965, <sup>23/</sup> and were introduced on the same day by the subcommittee chairmen, Senator Pell (S. 1483, 89th Cong., 1st sess.) and Congressman Thompson (H.R. 6050, 89th Cong., 1st sess.). A total of 44 Senators and 53 Congressmen joined in sponsoring the legislation. (See Appendix A.)

In most respects, the Administration bill as introduced was similar to the legislation finally enacted as Public Law 89-209. The House subcommittee held three additional days of hearings on March 22-24, 1965; the Senate subcommittee circulated the bill to earlier witnesses for comment.

The main suggestions of witnesses again concerned the relationship between the arts and the humanities. The bill called for separate Endowments for the arts and the humanities, but the definition of "humanities" still included the creative and performing arts. And

although the humanities included the arts by definition, the sections on the functions of the Humanities Endowment and the members of the Humanities Council referred to both arts and humanities specifically. Frederick Burkhardt, president of one of the organizations sponsoring the Commission on the Humanities, objected that the bill gave the arts an endowment and a half and the humanities only half an endowment. <sup>24/</sup>

Regarding equal funding, the bill retained the principle of the Pell-Fogarty proposal but changed it to a more workable form. Rather than requiring equal expenditures, S. 1483 first authorized a basic appropriation which was "to be divided equally" between the two Endowments, and then authorized separate appropriations to each Endowment for the matching of unrestricted gifts, thus recognizing that the amounts of gifts received might not be equal. Several witnesses for the humanities again objected that the needs were unlikely to be identical. To one, Thompson replied:

"We have what amounts to a policy on the committee . . . of adding an amendment which will require that the legislation be brought back before the committee periodically . . . and . . . the needs will be reevaluated by the legislative committee." <sup>25/</sup>

Action beyond hearings on the Administration bill came first on the Senate side. The bill S. 1483 was reported from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare on June 8, 1965. <sup>26/</sup> Committee amendments included the following:

Declaration of purpose, section 2. A new subsection was added to the findings, section 2(5) of P.L. 89-209.

Definitions, section 3.

"Humanities": The Senate committee added linguistics and jurisprudence, specified that both "modern and classic" languages were included; struck out "the creative and performing arts"; and added "the study of . . . the practice of the arts." The addition of jurisprudence was responsive to the objections of witnesses that all reference to law had been omitted from S. 1483. The Senate committee report states:

"The intent is to include appropriate areas of humanistic study related to the more than 100 law schools in the Nation; such aspects of the law as those dealing with comparative law, Roman law, legal history, and legal philosophy would be legitimate humanistic studies." <sup>27/</sup>

"Arts": To conform the definition of "arts" to the definition of "humanities," the Senate committee added that the arts are "not limited to" those listed. The report stated, however,

"that if any additional subjects should be added to either definition, these should be fully explained and justified and published by Executive order in the Federal Register. At the same time, the committee intends that the present definitions be broadly applied to encompass the purposes of the act." <sup>28/</sup>

Arts Endowment, section 5. As introduced, S. 1483 had authorized the Arts Endowment to establish and carry out "a program of grants-in-aid to groups or, in appropriate cases, to individuals." The term "group" was defined, as it is in P.L. 89-209, to include "any State or other public agency" as well as nonprofit groups. The Senate committee added an amendment introduced by Senator Javits <sup>29/</sup> providing separate authority for "a program of grants-in-aid to assist the several States" through state agencies.

Humanities Endowment, section 7.

The Chairmanship: In order to provide "every opportunity to carry out consecutive and meaningful programs," <sup>30/</sup> the committee added that the chairman shall have a four-year term and shall be eligible for reappointment.

Programs: The committee changed references to the "humanities and the arts" to "humanities" in subsections (3), (5), and (6). The purpose was "to avoid a possible ambiguity of language" since "the definition of the humanities was considered sufficiently broad to make such references to the arts superfluous." <sup>31/</sup>

Humanities Council, section 8. The Administration bill had said that members should be appointed to represent "the views of professional practitioners in the humanities and the arts throughout the United States." The Senate committee changed this to read, "the views of scholars and professional practitioners in the humanities and of the public throughout the United States." The number of Council members was increased from 24 to 26, and other amendments were also adopted.

Federal Council, section 9. The Federal Council's functions were enlarged to include planning and coordination of appropriate participation in major and historic national events.

Administrative provisions, section 10.

Matching of gifts: In language which witnesses objected to as unclear, S. 1483 had authorized the matching of restricted as well as unrestricted gifts, the former "in the discretion of the Chairman" and

"where appropriate." (The unclarity was that the matching authorization was to be used for unrestricted gifts only.) The Senate committee omitted all reference to the matching of restricted gifts.

Annual report: S. 1483 had provided for annual reports by the Chairman of each Endowment; the Senate committee authorized each Council to submit an annual report as well.

Authorization, section 11.

(a) To carry out the general programs of each Endowment. S. 1483 had authorized \$10 million for fiscal 1966, "to be divided equally" between the two endowments, and provided an open-ended authorization thereafter. The Senate committee changed the authorization to that in P.L. 89-209--\$10 million a year for fiscal 1966, 1967, and 1968 only, after which reauthorization would be required. The phrase on equal funding was retained.

(b) S. 1483 had authorized, to match unrestricted gifts, up to \$5 million for each Endowment for each fiscal year. The Senate committee retained the humanities authorization of \$5 million; reduced the arts matching authorization to \$2.25 million; and added a new subsection (c) authorizing \$2.75 million for each fiscal year for assistance to state arts agencies under the Javits amendment, section 5(h). Congressman Thompson later explained on the floor of the House, "The sums appropriated by the States are presumed to be gifts to carry out the purposes of this act." <sup>32/</sup>

Office of Education provisions, sections 12 and 13. The committee changed the authorization to \$500,000 a year under each section for fiscal 1966, 1967, and 1968.

Appointments, section 14. The Senate committee added a new section to S. 1483, requesting the President to make appointments within 90 days after enactment of the act.

With the committee amendments and one minor floor amendment not affecting the humanities, the Senate passed S. 1483 on June 10, 1965. No opposition was expressed, and no record votes were taken. <sup>33/</sup>

In the House, the companion bill to S. 1483 (H. R. 6050) was approved by the Committee on Education and Labor, with amendments, on June 24, 1965, and a clean bill ordered to be introduced. <sup>34/</sup> Congressman Thompson introduced the clean bill, H. R. 9460, and the accompanying report was filed on July 14. <sup>35/</sup> In general, H. R. 9460 incorporated the Senate-passed amendments to the Administration bill and included a few additional changes:

--A definition of "workshop" was added, and provisions on workshops were included in sections 5(c)(4), 7(c)(3), 7(e), and 11(e).

--Certain revisions were made in the Javits amendment on state arts programs.

--Membership on the Federal Council was changed by the addition of the director of the National Gallery of Art and the Chairman of the Commission of Fine Arts.

The House committee report included minority views signed by seven of the ten Republican members of the full Committee on Education and Labor. Objections stated by the minority were--

(1) That the bill had been "railroaded" through the committee with only about 15 minutes' consideration, and that it included a number of significant amendments which the minority members had not seen before.

(2) That a confusing administrative structure would be created, consisting of one Foundation, two Endowments, and three Councils.

(3) That enactment of such legislation should await recommendations by the National Council on the Arts, created the previous fall.

(4) On the merits of the bill, that "a Federal program of direct subsidies to the arts. . . . may well result in a lowering, rather than an elevation, of the cultural level of our Nation."

(5) That the "claim that the American public is denied adequate contact with the arts because of the starved financial condition of the arts is subject to challenge," because of the large number of museums, symphony orchestras, and libraries in the United States, among other groups.

(6) That the committee had failed to consider alternative means for encouraging cultural development such as changes in the tax and copyright laws, inclusion of facilities in urban renewal projects, and making surplus federal property available on favorable terms to nonprofit cultural organizations.

Additional views were filed by Congressman Albert Quie, who said he agreed with the minority views so far as an Arts Endowment was concerned but that a Humanities Endowment was subject to a different objection: that grants in the humanities should be made "only to institutions who in turn would select the individual to work on the

projects," because he did not believe "grants to specific investigators . . . to be a major factor in the encouragement of the humanities" and because grants to individuals may be "disruptive of the normal university relationships and . . . [such situations]" ought not to be encouraged by Federal programs."

The House Rules Committee did not take action on H. R. 9460. According to Congressman Thompson on the floor, "It was decided by that great committee that it had business which it considered to be of greater consequence and that the Committee on Rules could not reach this legislation." <sup>36/</sup> The bill was therefore brought to the floor under the 21-day discharge rule on September 13, 1965, when the House approved the resolution for consideration of the bill by a record vote of 260 to 114. <sup>37/</sup>

House action on the bill itself came two days later, on September 15, 1965. <sup>38/</sup> The debate included colloquies between Thompson and other members on several points of interpretation: that both the definitions of "humanities" and "arts" were broad enough to include grants related to matters such as urban planning and design <sup>39/</sup>; that the definition of "humanities" includes rhetoric, speech, or elocution <sup>40/</sup>; and that the definition of "group" would include interstate programs. <sup>41/</sup> Seven amendments were offered, one of which, on a minor point affecting only the Arts Endowment, was accepted by Thompson and agreed to. <sup>42/</sup> The others included three amendments offered by H. R. Gross, to include belly dancing, baseball, poker, and various other things in the definition of the arts <sup>43/</sup> and to insure appropriate funding for "Appalachia and the

poverty-stricken areas of New York and New Jersey." <sup>44/</sup> All Mr. Gross's amendments were rejected. Another Republican amendment, to require Senate confirmation of the chairman of the Arts Endowment, was offered by Albert Quie and was rejected on a division vote, 39 to 86. <sup>45/</sup> A Republican sponsor of the bill, Ogden Reid of New York, proposed an amendment to place the decision-making power in the Arts and Humanities Councils rather than in the two Endowment chairmen; this also was rejected on a division vote, 27 to 86. <sup>46/</sup> Finally, a point of order was sustained against an amendment, by Barratt O'Hara of Illinois, to delete several subsections from the declaration of purpose. <sup>47/</sup>

Before final passage of the bill, a motion to recommit to the Committee on Education and Labor was offered by Congressman Griffin of Michigan, the ranking Republican member of the Thompson subcommittee. The motion failed on a record vote, 128 to 251. <sup>48/</sup> The bill was then passed on a voice vote, and the Senate bill number substituted. The Senate concurred in the House amendments, without significant debate or record votes, on September 16, 1965 <sup>49/</sup>; and the act was signed by the President on September 29, becoming Public Law 89-209. <sup>50/</sup>

Footnotes, section II, pages 5-21

- 1/ American Council of Learned Societies, Council of Graduate Schools in the United States, and United Chapters of Phi Beta Kappa, Report of the Commission on the Humanities (1964) (hereafter Report of the Commission).

At least one member of Congress had proposed federal support for the humanities before the Commission's report was issued. See H. R. 11045, 88th Cong., 2d sess., introduced by Congressman John E. Fogarty of Rhode Island on April 28, 1964, proposing the establishment of a National Institute of the Arts and Humanities within the Office of Education.

- 2/ Public Law 507, 81st Cong. (1950), as amended.

- 3/ 111 Cong. Rec. 29, 30 (Jan. 4, 1965).

- 4/ Report of the Commission, p. 10.

- 5/ Public Law 88-579, September 3, 1964.

- 6/ See S. Rep. 300, 89th Cong., 1st sess., p. 4 (1965).

- 7/ 111 Cong. Rec. 381, 382 (Jan. 7, 1965).

- 8/ National Arts and Humanities Foundations, Joint Hearings before the Special Subcommittee on Labor of the House Committee on Education and

Labor and the Special Subcommittee on Arts and Humanities of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, Part 1, 89th Cong., 1st sess. (1965); National Arts and Humanities Foundations, Hearings before the Special Subcommittee on Arts and Humanities of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, Part 2, 89th Cong., 1st sess. (1965); National Arts and Humanities Foundations, Hearings before the Special Subcommittee on Labor of the House Committee on Education and Labor, Part 2, 89th Cong., 1st sess. (1965).

9/ Joint Hearings, note 8 above, p. 25.

10/ Id. at 27, 29.

11/ Report of the Commission, p. v.

12/ See Joint Hearings, note 8 above, p. 82.

13/ Id. at 82-83.

14/ Id. at 85-86.

15/ Id. at 25.

16/ Senate hearings, note 8 above, p. 200.

17/ Id. at 225; see also id. at 231.

18/ See testimony of the Council of Graduate Schools in the United States, Senate hearings, note 8 above, pp. 357, 364, and of the American Council of Learned Societies, id. at 369, 372.

- 19/ Senate hearings, note 8 above, pp. 393, 471.
- 20/ Requested by the Office of Education, Joint Hearings, note 8 above, pp. 49-51, and by Congressman Fogarty, id. at 92-93.
- 21/ Requested by the Librarian of Congress, Joint Hearings, note 8 above, pp. 88-90; opposed in other testimony, House Hearings, note 8 above, p. 203.
- 22/ House Hearings, note 8 above, pp. 236-37.
- 23/ See White House Press Release, March 10, 1965.
- 24/ House Hearings, note 8 above, p. 279.
- 25/ Id. at 286.
- 26/ S. Rep. 300, 89th Cong., 1st sess. (1965).
- 27/ Id. at 14.
- 28/ Ibid.
- 29/ See id. at 4.
- 30/ Id. at 16.
- 31/ Ibid.
- 32/ 111 Cong. Rec. 23939 (1965).
- 33/ Id. at 13103-11.

34/ Id. at D341.

35/ H. Rep. 610, 89th Cong., 1st sess. (1965).

36/ 111 Cong. Rec. 23619 (Sept. 13, 1965).

37/ Id. at 23618-21.

38/ 111 Cong. Rec. 23937-84 (Sept. 15, 1965).

39/ Id. at 23958.

40/ Ibid.

41/ Id. at 23974.

42/ Id. at 23977.

43/ Id. at 23973-74.

44/ Id. at 23977-78.

45/ Id. at 23976-77.

46/ Id. at 23975-76.

47/ Id. at 23978.

48/ Id. at 23980-81.

49/ 111 Cong. Rec. 24163-68 (1965).

50/ See White House Press Release, Sept. 29, 1965.



### III. FIRST STEPS IN IMPLEMENTATION

#### The initial appropriation

On the same day that the act was signed, the President sent to Congress a request for a supplemental appropriation with which the agency might begin its programs.<sup>1/</sup> The request included the full authorization for the Humanities Endowment; for the Arts Endowment, the full authorization less \$150,000 which had already been appropriated, or included in an earlier supplemental request, for the National Council on the Arts; and funds for administration. The total request was as follows:

Humanities, general program funds	\$ 5,000,000
Humanities, matching funds	5,000,000
Arts, general program funds	4,850,000
Arts, matching funds	2,250,000
Administration	<u>810,000</u>
	\$17,910,000

At the time the request was made and justification material presented to the appropriations committees, neither the chairman of the Humanities Endowment nor the members of the Humanities Council had been appointed. For the arts, the new act provided that the individual appointed as chairman of the Arts Council under pre-existing law should also serve as chairman of the Arts Endowment.<sup>2/</sup> Thus Roger Stevens, who had already been confirmed as chairman of the Council, became chairman of the Endowment automatically on signing; and it was he who testified in support of the request on behalf of the whole Foundation.

The House Appropriations Committee held hearings on the request on October 7, 1965, before its Subcommittee on Department of Interior and Related Agencies.<sup>3/</sup> The subcommittee chairman, Winfield K. Denton of Indiana, questioned particularly the time within which the two Endowments could get into operation. Stevens answered a number of questions as to how the Humanities Endowment would operate,<sup>4/</sup> and the point was made that the Report of the Commission on the Humanities had already provided an outline for the Endowment's programs.<sup>5/</sup> Denton repeated, however, that "once the Council is appointed you have a lot of guidelines to establish and you have applications to review, and that will take time."<sup>6/</sup> He took a similar position concerning the Arts Endowment, notwithstanding Stevens's statement that that Council had met and had discussed advisable projects, because "there are so many other factors that have a bearing on your budget requirements. We want to make this program a success but we do not want to endanger it by moving too fast."<sup>7/</sup>

The House committee recommendation, reported on October 13, 1965,<sup>8/</sup> was for about half of the general program funds requested. The committee report stated in part:

"Of the total amount [\$10,700,000], \$5,000,000, to be divided equally between the National Endowment for the Arts and the National Endowment for the Humanities, is provided to implement sections 5(c) and 7(c) of Public Law 89-209.

"...

"The Committee endorses the objective of this program, but feels the reductions it has recommended are in order in view of the fact that the budget request was for the total amounts authorized in the Act on an annual basis. Funds provided in this bill will be available for a little more than one-half of fiscal year

1966, but more important, a great deal of organization remains to be completed before the Foundations will be in a position to function at full capacity. In the opinion of the Committee, it will be more prudent to first establish sound and practical operating procedures for this activity than to administer the program in haste and commit costly and serious errors in carrying out the objectives of the Foundation."<sup>9/</sup>

Specifically, the committee's recommendations were these:

	<u>Recommendation</u>	<u>Amount of reduction</u>
Humanities, general program funds	\$ 2,500,000	\$2,500,000
Humanities, matching funds	3,000,000	2,000,000
Arts, general program funds	2,500,000	2,350,000
Arts, matching funds	2,000,000	250,000
Administration	<u>700,000</u>	<u>110,000</u>
Total	\$10,700,000	\$7,210,000
Previous Arts Council appropriation	+ 50,000	
Separate Arts supplemental disallowed	<u>                    </u>	<u>+ 100,000</u>
	\$10,750,000	\$7,310,000

The recommendations were approved by the House on October 14<sup>10/</sup> as part of a \$4 billion supplemental appropriations bill.<sup>11/</sup>

In the Senate, appropriations hearings were held on October 15, with Senator Pastore presiding.<sup>12/</sup> Stevens had appealed for restoration of the full amount requested, with the argument that, since the law provided for funds to remain available until expended, it was immaterial how much the agency could obligate by the end of the fiscal year.<sup>13/</sup> For the Humanities Endowment, there was also testimony by Frederick Burkhardt, president of the American Council of Learned Societies, who appeared unofficially since the Endowment's chairman had not been chosen. Burkhardt

argued, similarly, that the Congress had authorized a total of \$15 million for the humanities over three years and that "if \$2.5 million is lost in the first [year] it is lost forever."<sup>14/</sup> The committee was not impressed.

The Senate Appropriations Committee's report<sup>15/</sup> recommended no change from the House allowances, and Senate action on the bill<sup>16/</sup> included no debate concerning the Foundation. The supplemental appropriations act, providing the Humanities Endowment with \$2.5 million in general program funds and \$3 million in matching funds, was signed by the President on October 31, 1965, as Public Law 89-309.

#### Appointment of Chairman and Council

On November 18, 1965, the President announced the appointment of Barnaby C. Keeney as chairman of the National Endowment for the Humanities and the National Council on the Humanities. Mr. Keeney's appointment was to become effective on about July 1, 1966, when he was to resign the presidency of Brown University at the end of the academic year. To serve as chairman until July 1, the President at the same time announced the appointment of Dr. Henry Allen Moe.<sup>17/</sup>

For Mr. Keeney, the appointment was a continuation of the work he had begun as chairman of the Commission on the Humanities, which had been an important force in the establishment of the Foundation.<sup>18/</sup> Dr. Moe's qualifications for the office also were impressive. By profession a lawyer, he had been the chief executive officer of the Guggenheim Foundation for nearly forty years, until his retirement in 1963, and he

had served as advisor or trustee for innumerable other cultural and educational organizations. At the Senate hearing on his nomination, which was held before the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, Senator Lister Hill said:

"I may say that the doctor has a wonderful record. . . . I think that anyone who will look at your record will certainly be absolutely persuaded that . . . your life's work has certainly eminently prepared you for this position to which you have been nominated. . . . Dr. Moe, . . . with this record you have here, there is no need for you to even speak; it speaks so beautifully, so magnificently for your qualifications for this position."<sup>19/</sup>

Senator Javits, similarly, said:

"We are very proud of him in New York.

"It may perhaps characterize Henry Allen Moe to my colleagues in the Senate if I tell them this: I have only one question about Dr. Moe, and that is, notwithstanding the fact that he will now be an official of the U. S. Government, I very much hope he will nevertheless be able to continue on a personal and informal basis to advise with the wide range of people who need advice as to where to go and how to go for foundations. He is the one person in all of New York, perhaps in the United States, who knows the whole range of foundations, and just how to go about applying to them, and who to go to for each particular subject. There are many projects that might be marvelous in themselves, but still can't get anywhere because they are applying to the wrong foundation.

"I just say that to characterize what we think about Dr. Moe in New York."<sup>20/</sup>

The appointments of the members of the National Council on the Humanities were announced by President Johnson on January 27, 1966.<sup>21/</sup>

They were as follows:

Terms expiring in January 1968:

Gustave O. Arlt, President  
Council of Graduate Schools in the U. S.  
Washington, D. C.

Robert F. Goheen, President  
Princeton University  
Princeton, New Jersey

Emil W. Haury, Professor of Anthropology  
University of Arizona, Tucson

Adelaide Cromwell Hill  
African Studies Center  
Boston University

John W. Letson, Superintendent  
Atlanta Public Schools  
Atlanta, Georgia

Robert M. Lumiansky, Professor of English  
University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia

G. William Miller, President  
Textron, Inc.  
Providence, Rhode Island

John Courtney Murray, S. J.  
Professor of Theology  
Woodstock College  
Woodstock, Maryland

Meredith Willson  
Music director, conductor and composer  
Los Angeles, California

Terms expiring in January 1970:

Germaine Bree  
Institute for Research in the Humanities  
University of Wisconsin, Madison

John M. Ehle  
Writer  
Winston-Salem, North Carolina

Emily Genauer  
Art critic  
New York, New York

David R. Mason  
Dixon Professor of Law  
University of Montana, Missoula

Barnaby C. Keeney  
President, Brown University  
Providence, Rhode Island

James C. O'Brien  
Committee on Older and Retired Workers  
United Steelworkers of America  
Washington, D. C.

Ieoh Ming Pei  
I. M. Pei and Partners, Architects  
New York, New York

Emmette S. Redford  
Professor of Government  
University of Texas, Austin

Robert Spike, Professor  
Divinity School  
University of Chicago

Terms expiring in January 1972:

Edmund F. Ball  
Chairman of the Board  
Ball Brothers Company, Inc.  
Muncie, Indiana

Robert T. Bower, Director  
Bureau of Social Science Research, Inc.  
Washington, D. C.

Kenneth B. Clark, President  
Metropolitan Applied Research Center, Inc.  
New York, New York

Gerald F. Else, Chairman  
Department of Classical Studies  
University of Michigan, Ann Arbor

Paul Horgan  
Center for Advanced Studies  
Wesleyan University  
Middletown, Connecticut

Albert William Levi  
Professor of Philosophy  
Washington University  
St. Louis, Missouri

Soia Mentschikoff  
Professor of Law  
University of Chicago

Charles E. Odegaard, President  
University of Washington, Seattle

Footnotes, section III, pages 27-34

- 1/ H. Doc. 295, 89th Cong., 1st sess. (Sept. 29, 1965).
- 2/ P. L. 89-209, section 5(d)(1).
- 3/ Supplemental Appropriation Bill, 1966, Hearings before Subcommittees of the House Committee on Appropriations, 89th Cong., 1st sess., Part 3 (1965).
- 4/ Id. at 40-41.
- 5/ Id. at 41-42.
- 6/ Id. at 42.
- 7/ Id. at 45.
- 8/ H. Rep. 1162, 89th Cong., 1st sess. (1965).
- 9/ As reprinted in Supplemental Appropriations for 1966, Hearings before Subcommittees of the Senate Committee on Appropriations, 89th Cong., 1st sess., p. 887 (1965).
- 10/ 111 Cong. Rec. 26967-27006 (1965).
- 11/ H. R. 11588, 89th Cong., 1st sess. (1965).
- 12/ Supplemental Appropriations for 1966, Hearings before Subcommittees of the Senate Committee on Appropriations, 89th Cong., 1st sess. (1965).

13/ Id. at 886-90.

14/ Id. at 895, 898.

15/ S. Rep. 912, 89th Cong., 1st sess. (Oct. 19, 1965).

16/ 111 Cong. Rec. 27529, 27532-76. (Oct. 20, 1965).

17/ See White House press release, Nov. 18, 1965.

18/ Mr. Keeney's nomination was confirmed without a Senate hearing.

112 Cong. Rec. 14898 (June 30, 1966). For biographical background, see Appendix B, Documentary Supplement. See also White House press releases of June 28 and July 14, 1966, and "Remarks of the President at the swearing-in ceremony for Barnaby Keeney as Chairman of the National Endowment for the Humanities," Office of the White House Press Secretary, July 14, 1966.

19/ Nomination, Hearing before the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, 89th Cong., 2d sess., pp. 1, 3, 7 (Feb. 25, 1966).

20/ Id. at 2. Dr. Moe's nomination was confirmed on February 28, 1966. 112 Cong. Rec. 4318 (1966).

21/ White House press release, Jan. 27, 1966. See also "Remarks of the President at swearing-in ceremony for Dr. Henry Allen Moe and the 25 members of the National Council on the Humanities," Office of the White House Press Secretary, March 3, 1966.



#### IV. THE ENDOWMENT UNDER THE CHAIRMANSHIP OF HENRY ALLEN MOE

##### Initial organization and staffing

Dr. Moe was sworn in as chairman of the Endowment on December 1, 1965,<sup>1/</sup> and went to work on the problems involved in starting up a new government agency. One of the first questions to arise, necessarily, was that of staffing. On this, as on most things during the early months of the Endowment, Dr. Moe worked in close consultation with Mr. Keeney.

The original thinking on staffing, as stated by Mr. Keeney, was in terms of obtaining coverage of the various fields of the humanities. He said in a speech before the Council of Graduate Schools on December 2, 1965:

"I hope that initially the staff of the Endowment will be rather small and that it will represent, in addition to supporting personnel (such as accountants and counsels), generalists in literature, philosophical and analytical thinking, analysis and history of religion, criticism and history of art, history, aesthetics, and analytical and theoretical aspects of the social studies."

The thought was spelled out further in a number of letters in which Mr. Keeney asked for staffing suggestions from his academic colleagues:

"Henry Moe and I are attempting to recruit a staff for the National Humanities Endowment. I should like to secure the services of a number of substantive people who would give broad coverage to the humanities and to the appropriate social studies. We are looking for people with capacities of generalists rather than of specialists, whose services we can secure through consultantships.

"It occurs to us that it might be profitable to bring in two or three people close to retirement or who have just retired in order to give stability to the organization in its early stages and to give the possibility of the further development of other people after their retirement. We would also like some young men at the assistant or associate professor level."<sup>2/</sup>

The early recruiting efforts, however, did not produce the response that had been hoped for.<sup>3/</sup> Dr. Moe did select a deputy chairman, Philip Broughton, who had formerly been with the Mellon Trust in Pittsburgh; but this appointment was made with the understanding that Mr. Keeney would wish to choose his own deputy when he took over the chairmanship on July 1.<sup>4/</sup> The only other humanities staff member above the level of GS-11, during nearly all of Dr. Moe's tenure, was John Gardner, a former assistant dean at Brown, who was appointed on March 21 and who became special assistant to the Chairman. The rest of the staff consisted of Anne von der Lieth, secretary to the National Council on the Humanities; Joan Rafter, assigned to a junior position in what was then expected to become the Division of State, National, and Community Programs; and five secretaries.<sup>5/</sup>

As might be inferred from the actual makeup and size of the staff, recruitment continued to be a major concern for a good many months. But to make real progress in staffing, it was necessary also to have an overall staffing plan, taking into account the full range of functions to be performed, the salary budget available, and the number of positions authorized.

A very early staffing plan discussed by Dr. Moe and Mr. Keeney shows a total of 48 Humanities Endowment employees.<sup>6/</sup> This listing raised the question of the relationship between the Humanities Endowment and the Arts Endowment; for the Budget Bureau authorized the number of staff positions, and the Congress had appropriated administrative funds,

not for the two Endowments individually but for the Foundation as a whole. The supplemental appropriations request for fiscal 1966, sent to the Congress immediately after Public Law 89-209 was signed and before Mr. Moe or Mr. Keeney had been appointed, had stated on staffing:

"The . . . estimate provides for 100 permanent positions to be filled by the end of fiscal year 1966, including 6 positions previously requested for the National Council on the Arts. Approximately 50 of the positions are for the National Endowment for the Arts, 40 are for the National Endowment for the Humanities, and 10 are for an Administration Office which will serve both Endowments."<sup>7/</sup>

There exist early organization charts for the Arts Endowment and the shared staff accounting for the 50 positions and the 10 positions; but how the Humanities' share of 40 positions was arrived at does not appear.

There had been several further developments by the time Dr. Moe arrived on December 1 that affected the staffing possibilities. The Congress had acted on the 1966 budget request, appropriating somewhat less for administration than the amount requested.<sup>8/</sup> The Arts Endowment had become a going operation, with about a dozen employees, some of whom had been employed by the National Council on the Arts under the earlier legislation and some of whom had been hired immediately after the 1966 appropriation act was signed on October 31.<sup>9/</sup> Besides its own employees, the Arts Endowment had obtained the detail for three months of an acting director of administration, who was to serve the whole Foundation.<sup>10/</sup> In addition, a budget request for fiscal year 1967 had been submitted to the Budget Bureau, and the Bureau had notified the Foundation of its allowances, which included a reduction in the number of authorized positions from 100 to 75.<sup>11/</sup> Finally, the remaining positions had been

reallocated, with 30 to 34 for the Arts Endowment; 27 or 28 for the Humanities Endowment; and 14 to 18 for the shared staff, now including the office of the general counsel as well as the office of administration.<sup>12/</sup> Again, it is not clear to what extent the Humanities Endowment was consulted on the allocation.

A tentative plan for the use of the Humanities Endowment positions was sent by Dr. Moe to Mr. Keeney on December 6, 1965. Outside the immediate office of the Chairman, the plan called for an Office of Research with a director at grade GS-16; an Office of Training with a director at grade GS-15; an Office of Studies and Analysis headed by a GS-14; an Office of Special Humanities Programs with three program directors, one at GS-15 and two GS-14's; and an Office of Grant Review with the highest grade a GS-11. In his December 6 letter to Mr. Keeney, Dr. Moe wrote that he and the acting director of administration, Frank Schmidtlein, had

" . . . [gone] over table of organization (revised in light of his talk with you and me) and here's a copy of it. Of course, it does not represent our ideas very well; but I gather (a) that it is a conventional type of organization and so will be understood in the Budget Bureau and (b) that we may shift the titles about to suit our needs. And it seems to me that there are enough highish level grades to meet our needs. Concerning this kind of thing, I start from scratch: your views will be appreciated."

A series of letters between Moe and Keeney went back and forth in the next month; and Dr. Moe reported on January 6 that John Macy had told him "we need pay no attention to conventional types of governmental organization of agencies."<sup>13/</sup>

At this stage, still without a settled organization plan, one additional staff appointment was decided on. The appointment was that of Mrs. Gladys Hardy, who finally became, in mid-July, director of

planning and analysis. As early as January 26, Mr. Broughton, the deputy chairman, instructed Mr. Schmidtlein to prepare a job description for Mrs. Hardy, placing her in charge "of both Studies and Analysis and the Grants Review function," at a grade GS-16, and to prepare the necessary request for Schedule A hiring authority.<sup>14/</sup> Schmidtlein replied with a description of the requirements of the Civil Service Commission. He explained:

"For each position that we wish to have established we must have an approved position description. The description must accurately describe the duties of the person. These duties must meet the standards for complexity and responsibility established by the Commission for the particular grade at which we wish to have the job rated. For this reason it is necessary to have a staffing and grade pattern established and carefully defined before we request Schedule A authority. Departures always can be made from a staffing pattern but to the extent that changing the duties of one position affects another position the other position must also be amended. Any changes in the title or significant change of duties in a Schedule A position requires Civil Service approval of the revised position."

Schmidtlein went on to explain that there were various types of temporary appointments that could be used to hire personnel immediately, and he concluded:

"Despite appearances there are some good reasons and purposes behind this system of appointments. I don't defend the system as a whole because I feel it has a vast opportunity for decentralization and streamlining. However, until this streamlining takes place we have to comply with its rules and regulations."<sup>15/</sup>

No attempt appears to have been made to use one of the temporary appointment techniques to bring Mrs. Hardy to work immediately. Eventually, all the procedures outlined by Mr. Schmidtlein were followed, but he seems not, in the memo just quoted, to have stated a case that was convincing to Mr. Broughton. Broughton wrote to Dr. Moe on February 1,

". . . I wish to ask whether at least some of the difficulties we have blamed on the Office of Administration may not be due to structure. Is it possible that a new administrator, no matter how good, might find himself in the same box--a box of 'shared staff' hanging leaderless between two agencies of differing responsibility and clientele? Did I say 'leaderless'? Two heads are worse than none.

". . .

"We are now undertaking to fill the administrative post, not merely with someone personally more aggressive, but someone of a stature to be . . . the Management Deputy in both endowments. . . . The problem is not to interpret the Government to us, or us to the Government, but to enable us to do a job."

Just before this series of memoranda, Schmidtlein had proposed still another organization plan, calling for a structure "based on the functions provided us by our Act." This memorandum also emphasized that professional staff could be hired only as experts or consultants until "these basic decisions are made."<sup>16/</sup> The reply that Schmidtlein received was Mr. Broughton's memorandum of January 26,<sup>17/</sup> instructing him to proceed with Mrs. Hardy's employment papers and the request for Schedule A authority "along the lines of the established staffing list." As for Schmidtlein's revised staffing plan, Broughton said the memorandum contained "some interesting observations" and would "be given proper attention as we proceed" but that "reorganization will probably come after Dr. Keeney is on the job." By February 4, 1966, Mr. Schmidtlein had returned to the agency from which he had been detailed,<sup>18/</sup> and his place as acting administrative officer was taken on February 7 by Merrill J. Collett.<sup>19/</sup>

At about the same time, Mr. Broughton himself proposed a revised organization plan, based in most respects on Schmidtlein's. It called

for the following structure outside the Office of the Chairman:

"Data and Control [Office of Studies and Analysis]: Studies and analyses which tell us what is needed, what we are doing, how well we are doing it, what we are failing to do, and why. The 'clients' to whom this Division relates are the Chairman and the three Division Chiefs; through it they are to be informed in depth on all programs.

"Humanities Research and Publication [Office of Research]: The substantive business, the corpus of knowledge in the humanities. The clients to be worked with are scholars, universities, schools, libraries, special groups, or other institutions which serve or harbor scholars.

"Education, Training, Teaching [Office of Advanced Studies]: The accent is personnel: Increasing the quality and competence and numbers of persons who serve the humanities. The clients may range from students on their way up to an experienced professor with ideas about teaching; the methods may range from scholarships to post-graduate or professional stipends. The more obvious clients are teachers, schools, colleges, and aspiring people in them.

"Society and Community [Office of Special Humanities Programs]: Special programs largely outside the academic preserves (though sometimes developing relationships which improve the university impact on life outside). Identification of the constituency and the design of effective relationships would, indeed, be part of the task of this Director; let it suffice here to say 'Humanities in the Community,' archeological and historical museums, national events, etc." 20/

It was to about this point that the thinking on organization had progressed when, two weeks later, the Endowment submitted its first description of its programs to the Congressional committees on appropriations.

### Development of initial programs

The act provided the Endowment's basic authority to operate humanities programs in section 7(c), quoted at page 3 above. Because the language of the section was very general, it left wide discretion to the agency to determine the nature of its programs, not only in their precise detail but also in the definition of objectives. Indeed, the first function of the agency listed in section 7(c) was to develop national policy for the humanities.

Numerous suggestions for Endowment programs had, of course, been proposed in the report of the Commission on the Humanities in 1964. Some of these could be traced, through the language of the successive bills to establish a new agency, and into Public Law 89-209;<sup>1/</sup> others were dropped from what became section 7(c) because of the enactment of other legislation.<sup>2/</sup> In general, however, the legislative history provided little guidance as to what the Endowment's programs should and should not include.

What the law and the history did make clear was that the Endowment must have both programs useful to scholars in the humanities and programs useful to a broader audience. Support for the public side of the humanities was called for, not only because the act contained one subsection authorizing such programs, but also because this was one of the main grounds on which federal support had been justified. The report of the Commission on the Humanities, for example, had said, "The Commission conceives of the humanities, not merely as academic disciplines confined to schools and colleges, but as functioning components of society which affect the lives and well-being of all the population."<sup>3/</sup> Even in a

section titled "Problems of Academic Humanists,"<sup>4/</sup> the emphasis was less on scholarly needs of the sort identified by many learned societies in the supplement to the report than on the need to improve teaching for the sake of "a fully educated people."

Support for the scholarly side of the humanities, on the other hand, was demanded because another selling point had been the imbalance of support between the sciences and the academic humanities. In addition, the demand for federal support had originated within the scholarly groups, and their hopes of benefiting from the legislation could not well be ignored.<sup>5/</sup>

Theoretically, perhaps, there should have been no conflict between the public and the scholarly aspects of the humanities--if the scholarship was not sterile and if the education of non-scholars enabled them to comprehend its uses. But such a harmony of aims was the long-term objective to be worked for, not something to be assumed as already existing and as providing a basis for a single set of programs that would be useful to everyone.

The outside demands for support of the public and scholarly sides were anything but equal. The general public was scarcely aware that the Endowment existed, so that it fell to the Chairman to insist on that side of the program. In early speeches before academic groups, Dr. Moe said, for example:

"[W]hat the Humanities Endowment does with the taxpayers' money must, to merit continuing support, make some impact--visible, recognizable impact--upon the lives of people outside the academic community. In Mr. Justice Holmes' language, what the National Endowment for the Humanities does, must become one of the felt necessities of our time."<sup>6/</sup>

And again:

"[T]he Humanities Endowment is not all yours as scholars: it belongs to the wider public no less.

"In other words, the Humanities Endowment must insist upon achieving a balance--the all-important balance--between the need to help imaginative scholarship and the parallel need to make that scholarship have an impact on a wider public. . . ." <sup>7/</sup>

From the learned societies, on the other hand, there came not only early requests for funds but representations as to what the Endowment's initial programs might look like. The first such statement, predating the selection of the Humanities Endowment's chairman, was prepared by Frederick Burkhardt of the ACLS and was incorporated by Roger Stevens into his oral testimony at the October 1965 House appropriations hearings. <sup>8/</sup> This statement, which expanded on the rather slight humanities section in the written budget justification, said that a tentative program could be based on the consensus of needs as expressed by learned societies in the humanities in the Commission's report. The programs proposed were:

1. Grants and fellowships to individuals for research and study:
  - a. Post-doctoral fellowships for scholars at various stages of their careers.
  - b. Short term grants in aid of summer research.
  - c. Other programs designed to foster the development of fields with a particular priority, e.g., selected areas or cultures of the world; research development in new fields and disciplines, like linguistics; and the use of modern techniques in humanistic research.
2. Grants in support of publication of scholarly works in the humanities (citing a survey made in the 1950's and the learned societies' reports).

3. Grants to institutions for the development of the humanities. Examples given were:
  - a. Proposals from universities and colleges to expand and enrich their curriculums in the humanities.
  - b. Proposals for the establishment of institutes for humanistic research, such as those at Wesleyan and Wisconsin.
  - c. Proposals for conferences and workshops devoted to significant problems to which humanistic scholarship can make a contribution.
  - d. Large scale research projects involving institutions as well as individuals, such as the Modern Language Association's editions of American authors and various scholarly tools.
  
4. Collaboration with international organizations and the academies of other countries:
  - a. Cooperation with other countries' national agencies and with UNESCO.
  - b. Sending representatives to international congresses and conferences abroad and sponsoring or supporting such conferences in the United States.
  
5. Improvement of public understanding and appreciation:

"The major manner in which the Endowment will foster public understanding and appreciation . . . will, of course, be through the efficient and successful implementation of its programs. . . . [But it will also] want to make more direct approaches to the public, perhaps by means of its own publications and use of mass media."

On November 22, 1965, four days after Dr. Moe had been appointed, Burkhardt wrote to him saying that, at an ACLS Board of Directors meeting two days earlier, there had been "a good deal of discussion about the National Endowment for the Humanities and the relationship which the ACLS might have with it." Burkhardt said he had been "specifically asked to discuss with you the possibility of the Endowment's providing funds for a program of post-doctoral summer fellowships for scholars. . . ." and "to explore with you the possibility that this and other fellowship programs in which the Endowment may engage might be contracted

out to the ACLS for the screening of candidates and nomination of persons to be given grants." The letter indicated there were also "several other questions . . . of interest to both the Endowment and the Council" which he wished to discuss. Dr. Moe sent a copy of the letter to Mr. Keeney with the remark, "I hope nobody thinks we are going to be just their agent!"<sup>9/</sup>

The ACLS followed up this first communication, during the first several months of the Endowment's operation, with proposals requesting well over a million dollars a year.<sup>10/</sup>

Besides the need to find a balance between the academic and public sides of the humanities, it was essential, in deciding on the Endowment's beginning activities, to choose programs which could be defined and implemented fairly quickly and which could be predicted to have at least a reasonable chance of success. In the abstract, perhaps any number of programs might have met this need; practically, the possibilities were limited by personnel and by timing. The appropriations process required a budget presentation to be submitted to the Congress in mid-February 1966, roughly eleven weeks after Dr. Moe came to the Endowment; this submission was to justify the Administration's fiscal 1967 request for the Endowment, which included the full \$5 million authorized in general program funds.<sup>11/</sup> Making it more difficult to meet the February deadlines, there was the fact that the National Council on the Humanities, whose function it was to advise on programs and policies, was not appointed until January 27, 1966, too late to hold a meeting before the budget was written. Given the limited staff available to Dr. Moe at the time, the

programs selected for inclusion in the 1967 budget presentation had to be primarily the work of the chairman and the chairman-designate, with such informal consultation with others as they might be able to obtain.

Mr. Keeney's thinking during this time about initial programs is best set out in a speech he made to the Council of Graduate Schools on December 2, 1965.<sup>12/</sup> He said:

"The purpose of the Congress is clearly not simply to support the activities of learned men in the humanities. Nor was it the intention of the Commission on the Humanities that this should be the case. It is hoped that programs will be developed which will bring the humanities and the arts to a major segment of our lay population, and that the results will be better understanding and control of our society and amelioration of the conditions under which we live. Therefore, I believe that we must consider the relevance of each proposal to the public welfare and to the national interest, for Congress would not and should not have passed the legislation if it had not believed that the accomplishment of its purposes was for the public welfare and in the national interest. The decisions resulting from this policy, if it is accepted, will be disappointing to many humanists.

". . .

"Obviously, the easiest area in which to operate is the granting of fellowships and grants-in-aid for research, publication, and personal development. There are already successful methods of choosing people for such grants which can be adopted and implemented. The Council, however, must decide how much of its funds will be used for these purposes.

"More difficult will be decisions to support teaching programs, either at the college level or in cooperation with the Office of Education at the school level. Obviously, we need to do a great deal to make the straightforward humanities better taught at every level and better learned by all students.

"Our greatest contemporary need may be to develop programs in which the humanities and social studies--and, perhaps, even the sciences--are brought to bear upon one another and the relevance of the various bodies of material to one another made more clear, more meaningful. Another great need is for programs which will develop the habit in the students--and in people after they have been students--of using humane learning in support of their

judgments of value. Those two things will not be easy. Much simpler and much more straightforward is the need for support of enlarged teaching of exotic languages and cultures.

"The Endowment is also authorized to support research programs as well as the research of individual scholars. I hope the Endowment will succeed in identifying those fields that are moving forward and will help to keep them moving forward; that it will identify areas of life in presently stagnant fields; that it will identify cross-disciplinary researches that may be fertile; and that it will find tools which must be constructed before more can be accomplished.

"The Council is authorized to operate in adult education, in extramural education, and in the area that is the boundary between education and entertainment--obviously, television. Extramural education has in its quality an even greater range than American education in general. One can easily find extension or adult education programs that provide a mere pastime to those whose hours are not fully occupied. One can, on the other hand, find such programs that have great meaning and great importance to those who participate in them. Little that is significant is done through the mass media, and much more could be. Perhaps, with the decline in attention to popular television, this is an opportune time to propose commercial programming of serious intellectual content.

"Programs such as these can be set in action fairly quickly."

Dr. Moe made some use of Mr. Keeney's speech in preparing the budget submission, but in general the speech suggested directions of program development rather than providing ready-made program descriptions. Many of the programs included in the final version of the budget, therefore, such as fellowships and support for museums and historical societies, reflected the areas in which Dr. Moe had the special competence enabling him to work up a creditable program, with little or no outside advice, in a very short length of time.

The program categories were these:<sup>13/</sup>

- A. Fellowships for "scholars and teachers at, very roughly indicated, the assistant professorship level."

- B. Grants to individuals who are "accomplished in scholarly investigation"; ". . . the touch-stone of choice will be their creative powers."
- C. Grants to scholarly groups:
1. Editing and publishing the papers of great Americans.
  2. Editing and publishing definitive editions of great American authors.
  3. Archaeological-historical excavations, carried on by American institutions, both in the United States and abroad.
  4. Training programs to improve the quality of editing and publishing by non-profit university presses.
  5. Computer research in the study of foreign languages and in preparing concordances to the greatest of creative literature.
  6. The development of needed training programs if humanistic studies are to progress.
  7. Assistance to humanistic learned societies, as for grants to significant journals and publication subvention.
- D. Grants to groups whose activities relate not so much to scholarly production as to education of the citizenry to the end that they shall better their understanding and appreciation of "the American way":
1. Humanistic museums and historical societies.
  2. Educational television.
  3. Talking books.
  4. American history.

That some kind of post-doctoral fellowships and grants-in-aid for individual scholars should be included in the budget appears to have been clear. All agreed that the Endowment was to support scholarship; the ACLS wanted such a program; and, as Mr. Keeney had said, successful methods for running such programs already existed and could be drawn upon.

In the area of research programs, the 1967 budget deferred, for later implementation, Mr. Keeney's suggestion of identifying particularly fertile areas for development;<sup>14/</sup> but it did specify several kinds of research and related activities in which grants might be made in the Endowment's first year. Some of these can be traced to particular developments before the budget was written, and most of them had a basis in the reports of the twenty-four learned societies that were published as a supplement to the Commission's report. The areas were--

1) Editing and publishing the papers of great Americans. The American Historical Association, in the Humanities Commission's report had expressed the need for a "fund for editing the papers of American statesmen."<sup>15/</sup> The National Historical Publications Commission, which had a small appropriation for just this purpose, had communicated with both Mr. Keeney and Dr. Moe shortly after their appointment, and the Commission had formally resolved "that . . . [it] take the initiative in proposing close cooperation in areas of mutual interest in ways that will have to be worked out in detail in discussion between representatives of the two agencies."<sup>16/</sup> After a meeting between Dr. Moe and the Commission's representatives, the executive director of the NHPC wrote to him:

" . . . we promised to keep you informed as to our budget requests. I am enclosing therefore the portion . . . that contains the justification for the item covering grant funds for the NHPC program. . . . I am also sending along for your information a list of pending proposals for new projects that are now before the Commission and for which we have no funds. . . . This list is followed by two pages of additional projects that represent some of the things in which this Commission would like to take the initiative. . . ."<sup>17/</sup>

2) Editing and publishing definitive editions of great American authors. A major project in this area, under the auspices of the Modern Language Association, had been proposed for the Humanities Endowment support in the supplement to the Report of the Commission,<sup>18/</sup> in the hearings on the authorizing legislation,<sup>19/</sup> and in the testimony prepared by Frederick Burkhardt for the October 1965 appropriations hearings.<sup>20/</sup> The MLA had sent copies of its proposal to both Mr. Keeney and Dr. Moe by late November 1965.<sup>21/</sup>

3) Archaeological-historical excavations. The need for support was mentioned in the Humanities Commission's report by both the Archaeological Institute of America<sup>22/</sup> and the American Oriental Society.<sup>23/</sup> In addition, at least three relatively strong applications for support of excavations had been received before the end of January.<sup>24/</sup>

4) Training programs to improve the quality of editing and publishing by non-profit university presses. The program proposed was essentially a description of an application from the Association of American University Presses,<sup>25/</sup> transmitted to Dr. Moe on January 28, 1966, by a letter stating, "It has taken longer than we hoped to place before you the enclosed proposal. This is the application for support for an Editorial Institute, a project we had the privilege of discussing briefly with you in November."

5) Computer research in the study of foreign languages and in preparing concordances to the greatest of creative literature. In the only available draft of the budget, dated February 6 and signed by the deputy chairman, Mr. Broughton, "computer research in the study of

foreign languages" was listed as among the kinds of requests for support that had come in so far.<sup>26/</sup> The source of the particular reference to concordances has not been accounted for. The general area of computer uses, however, is known to have been one of special interest to the future chairman.

6) Assistance to humanistic learned societies (such as grants to journals and toward publication of scholarly works of great merit).

This section was presumably responsive to the needs of many learned societies, as they had been stated in the Commission's report, and also to the special subsection in the act authorizing the Endowment to "support the publication of scholarly works in the humanities . . . ."

Footnotes, section IVInitial organization and staffing, pp. 37-43

- 1/ Letter from Dr. Moe to Ralph A. Sawyer, December 13, 1965; see also personnel records, not on microfilm.
- 2/ Letters from Mr. Keeney, December 7, 1965, to J. E. W. Sterling, Franklin L. Ford, Herman B. Wells, Edmund S. Morgan, and Charles Odegaard. For a similar statement by Dr. Moe, see his letter to Ralph A. Sawyer, note 1 above.
- 3/ See, e.g., letter from Dr. Moe to Mr. Keeney, April 27, 1966.
- 4/ See letters from Dr. Moe to Mr. Keeney, Jan. 10 and Jan 13, 1966, and from Mr. Keeney to Dr. Moe, Jan. 5, 1966.
- 5/ See "National Foundation on the Arts & the Humanities, National Endowment for the Humanities--Staffing Pattern, Fiscal Year 1966."
- 6/ This memorandum, titled "National Endowment for the Humanities, New Positions," is unsigned and undated; but two copies of it carry similar handwritten notes by Dr. Moe and Mr. Keeney.
- 7/ National Foundation on the Arts and Humanities, Supplemental Budget Estimate, Fiscal Year 1966 (Oct. 4, 1965), p. 11.
- 8/ See page 29 above.
- 9/ Information from personnel records, not on microfilm.

- 10/ See memorandum from Roger Stevens to Executive Officer, U. S. Office of Education, November 16, 1965.
- 11/ See unsigned memorandum, "National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities, Financial Status," dated December 1, 1965.
- 12/ An allocation providing 34 positions in the Arts Endowment, 27 in the Humanities Endowment, and 14 to the shared staff appears in Department of the Interior and Related Agencies Appropriations for Fiscal Year 1967, Hearings before a Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Appropriations, Part 2, pp. 1591-92 (1966); see explanatory cover memoranda by Merrill J. Collett of April 1, 1966, and March 9, 1966. For testimony to an allocation of 30 positions in the Arts Endowment, 27 in the Humanities Endowment, and 18 in the shared staff, see Department of the Interior and Related Agencies Appropriations for 1967, Hearings before a Subcommittee of the House Committee on Appropriations, Part 3, p. 312 (1966). For an allocation of 33 positions to the Arts Endowment, 28 to the Humanities Endowment, and 14 to the shared staff, see "National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities, Staffing Plan," dated December 6, 1965.
- 13/ Letter from Dr. Moe to Mr. Keeney, Jan. 6, 1966.
- 14/ Unsigned handwritten memorandum from Philip Broughton to Frank Schmidtlein, Jan. 26, 1966.
- 15/ Memorandum from Mr. Schmidtlein to Mr. Broughton, "Appointment of Staff in the Civil Service," Jan. 28, 1966.

- 16/ Memorandum from Mr. Schmidtlein to Dr. Moe, "Organizational and Staff Planning," Jan. 25, 1966.
- 17/ See note 14 above.
- 18/ See letter from Dr. Moe to Mr. Schmidtlein, Feb. 3, 1966.
- 19/ Information from personnel files, not on microfilm.
- 20/ Memorandum from Mr. Broughton to Dr. Moe, Feb. 2, 1966, and attached organization chart.

Development of initial programs, pp. 44-54

- 1/ E.g., subsections 7(c)(4), authorizing the Endowment to foster the interchange of information in the humanities, and 7(c)(6), authorizing support for the publication of scholarly works in the humanities, were derived from recommendations in the Report of the Commission, p. 14. For intervening versions, see, e.g., H. R. 12406, 88th Cong., 2d sess., sections 7(a)(5) and 13(8) (1964); S. 316, 89th Cong., 1st sess., sections 7(a)(5) and 12(8) (1965).
- 2/ These included (1) specific authority for the support of libraries (see Report of the Commission, pp. 13-14), because of separate library legislation, enacted or proposed (Library Services and Construction Act, P. L. 88-269, Feb. 11, 1964; Title II, Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, P. L. 89-10, April 11, 1965; Title II, Higher Education Act of 1965, P. L. 89-329, Nov. 8, 1965; see also Library

Services and Construction Act Amendments of 1966, P. L. 89-511, July 19, 1966); and (2) specific authority for support of teacher training institutes (see Report of the Commission, p. 12), because the act gave that function to the Office of Education (P. L. 89-209, section 13).

- 3/ Report of the Commission, p. 2.
- 4/ Id. at 6.
- 5/ For reports on the needs of twenty-four learned societies, see the supplement to the Commission's report, pp. 47-218.
- 6/ Address by Henry Allen Moe before the American Council of Learned Societies, Washington, D. C., January 20, 1966.
- 7/ Address by Henry Allen Moe before the Southern Humanities Conference, Auburn, Alabama, April 1, 1966.
- 8/ Supplemental Appropriation Bill, 1966, Hearings before Subcommittees of the House Committee on Appropriations, Part 3, pp. 32-34 (1965); cf. memorandum from Frederick Burkhardt to Charles Mark, Oct. 5, 1965.
- 9/ Memorandum from Dr. Moe to Mr. Keeney, Nov. 29, 1965.
- 10/ See applications HO-1063-1-01 (establishment of two post-doctoral fellowship programs in the humanities, dated Feb. 22, 1966); HO-1088-1-01 (Chinese studies, dated Feb. 22, 1966); and HO-1165-1-01

(international meetings and international research projects, dated April 14, 1966). Microfilmed copies of these applications may be found, respectively, in the agenda papers for the first Council meeting, appendix IV-A, and the agenda papers for the second Council meeting, appendix Q and appendix M.

11/ The Foundation's request to the Budget Bureau for fiscal 1967 had been submitted and acted on before Dr. Moe's arrival; see page 39 above. As included in the Administration's budget released in January 1966, the request for fiscal 1967 included the following:

Humanities, general program funds	\$ 5,000,000
Humanities, matching funds	-0-
Arts, general program funds	5,000,000
Arts, State program funds	2,750,000
Arts, matching funds	-0-
Administration	<u>1,180,000</u>
	\$13,930,000

While no new matching funds were provided in the request, it did include appropriations language extending for another year the availability of the matching funds already appropriated for fiscal 1966; and it was estimated that each Endowment would use \$1 million of those matching funds during fiscal 1967.

12/ For the full text of the speech, as well as a memorandum from the same period and on the same subject, see Appendix B, Documentary Supplement.

13/ National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities, "Annual Estimate of Appropriations, Fiscal Year 1967" (Feb. 15, 1966), printed in

Department of the Interior and Related Agencies Appropriations for Fiscal Year 1967, Hearings before a Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Appropriations, 89th Cong., 2d sess. Part 2, pp. 1567-88 (1966) (hereafter "1967 Budget").

14/ 1967 Budget, p. 9.

15/ Report of the Commission, p. 121.

16/ Letter from Robert H. Bahmer, Acting Chairman, to Dr. Moe, Dec. 16, 1965; letter from Oliver Wendell Holmes, Executive Director, to Mr. Keeney, Nov. 29, 1965.

17/ Letter from Oliver Wendell Holmes to Dr. Moe, Feb. 8, 1966.

18/ Report of the Commission, pp. 130-31.

19/ Prepared statement of John Hurt Fisher, Executive Secretary of the Modern Language Association of America, Senate hearings, note 8, part II above, pp. 480, 482.

20/ See p. 47 above.

21/ Letters from William M. Gibson and John H. Fisher to Mr. Keeney, Oct. 26, 1965; letter from William M. Gibson to Dr. Moe, Nov. 24, 1965.

22/ Report of the Commission, p. 73: "[T]he knowledge of valuable ancient remains is often permanently lost to us for the lack of as little as \$5,000."

- 23/ Report of the Commission, p. 173: "[W]e may sum up the overriding requirements of the ancient field of Near Eastern Studies in one word, 'archaeology' . . . ."
- 24/ Applications Nos. HO-1056-1-01, Princeton University (Jan. 31, 1966); HO-1065-1-01, University of North Carolina and Duke University (Jan. 14, 1966); HO-1054-1-01, New York University (Jan. 27, 1966). For microfilmed copies, see agenda papers for the first meeting of the Council, appendices VIII-X.
- 25/ Application No. HO-1066-1-01; see agenda papers for the first meeting of the Council, appendix XI.
- 26/ Memorandum from Mr. Broughton to Dr. Moe, Feb. 6, 1966, page V.



SPONSORS OF HUMANITIES LEGISLATION,  
89th Congress, First Session

<u>HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES</u>	<u>Moorhead and Fogarty bills (to establish a National Humanities Foundation)</u>	<u>Administration bill (to establish a National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities)</u>
1. Adams, D, Washington	H.R. 2941	--
2. Andrews, R, N. Dak.	H.R. 2169	--
3. Annunzio, D, Illinois	H.R. 2363	H.R. 6243, 9707
4. Ashley, D, Ohio	H.R. 348	H.R. 6057
5. Bingham, D, New York	H.R. 5559	--
6. Brademas, D, Indiana	H.R. 356	--
7. Brown, D, California	H.R. 363	H.R. 6187, 9844
8. Burton, R, Utah	H.R. 3357	--
9. Burton, D, California	--	H.R. 6058, 9664
10. Byrne, D, Pennsylvania	H.R. 346	H.R. 6245
11. Callan, D, Nebraska	H.R. 391	--
12. Cameron, D, Calif.	H.R. 364	--
13. Carey, D, New York	H.R. 1663	H.R. 6054, 9740
14. Carter, R, Kentucky	H.R. 386	--
15. Cleveland, R, N. H.	H.R. 365	--
16. Conte, R, Mass.	H.R. 2185	--
17. Conyers, D, Mich.	H.R. 376	--
18. Cunningham, R, Nebr.	H.R. 353	--
19. Daddario, D, Conn.	H.R. 1684	H.R. 6246, 9924
20. Daniels, D, New Jersey	H.R. 1534	H.R. 6059, 9683

	<u>Moorhead and Fogarty bills (to establish a National Humanities Foundation)</u>	<u>Administration bill (to establish a National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities)</u>
21. Dent, D, Pa.	H.R. 354	H.R. 6188, 9698
22. Donohue, D, Mass.	H.R. 338	--
23. Dyal, D, Calif.	H.R. 389	--
24. Edmondson, D, Okla.	H.R. 986	--
25. Edwards, D, Calif.	H.R. 366	--
26. Ellsworth, R, Kansas	H.R. 260	H.R. 6055, 9600
27. Farbstein, D, N. Y.	H.R. 4168	H.R. 6250
28. Fogarty, D, R. I.	H.R. 2043	H.R. 6052, 9579
29. Ford, D, Michigan	H.R. 6002	--
30. Fraser, D, Minn.	H.R. 5387	--
31. Friedel, D, Md.	H.R. 2198	H.R. 6777
32. Fulton, R, Pa.	H.R. 336, 2202	H.R. 6511, 9534
33. Fulton, D, Tenn	H.R. 367	H.R. 6436, 9685
34. Garmatz, D, Md.	H.R. 339	H.R. 6189
35. Gibbons, D, Fla.	H.R. 1011	--
36. Gilbert, D, N.Y.	H.R. 387	H.R. 6060
37. Gilligan, D, Ohio	H.R. 2044	--
38. Gray, D, Ill.	H.R. 3373	--
39. Greigg, D, Iowa	H.R. 377	
40. Halpern, R, N.Y.	H.R. 2427	H.R. 6326, 9911
41. Hawkins, D, Calif.	H.R. 368	--
42. Hays, D, Ohio	H.R. 340	H.R. 6252

	<u>Moorhead and Fogarty bills (to establish a National Humanities Foundation)</u>	<u>Administration bill (to establish a National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities)</u>
43. Hechler, D, W. Va.	H.R. 357	H.R. 6061, 10705
44. Helstoski, D, N.J.	H.R. 2988	H.R. 6190, 9741
45. Holland, D, Pa.	H.R. 1547	H.R. 6191, 9925
46. Horton, R, N.Y.	H.R. 392	H.R. 6062, 9652
47. Irwin, D, Conn.	H.R. 375	--
48. Johnson, D, Okla.	H.R. 5604	--
49. Keogh, D, N.Y.	H.R. 335	H.R. 6063, 9729
50. Krebs, D, N.J.	H.R. 4261	H.R. 6492, 9796
51. Kunkel, R, Pa.	H.R. 344	H.R. 9768, 6192
52. Leggett, R, Calif.	H.R. 369	--
53. Lindsay, R, N.Y.	--	H.R. 9742, 9154
54. Love, D, Ohio	H.R. 378	--
55. McCarthy, D, N.Y.	H.R. 379	H.R. 7136
56. McDade, R, Pa.	H.R. 370	--
57. McGrath, D, N.J.	H.R. 4499	H.R. 6193, 9804
58. McVicker, D, Colo.	H.R. 2619	H.R. 9660, 10031
59. Machen, D, Md.	H.R. 380	H.R. 6194, 9732
60. Mackay, D, Ga.	--	H.R. 6064
61. Madden, D, Ind.	H.R. 2620	--
62. Mathias, R, Md.	H.R. 361	--
63. Matsunaga, D, Hawaii	H.R. 371	--
64. Meeds, D, Wash.	H.R. 4639	--

	<u>Moorhead and Fogarty bills (to establish a National Humanities Foundation)</u>	<u>Administration bill (to establish a National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities)</u>
65. Moeller, D, Ohio	H.R. 385	--
66. Monagan, D, Conn.	--	H.R. 6493, 9701
67. Moorhead, D, Pa.	H.R. 334	H.R. 6051, 9482
68. Mosher, R, Ohio	H.R. 6195	--
69. Moss, D, Calif.	H.R. 390	--
70. Multer, D, N.Y.	H.R. 393	--
71. Murphy, D, N.Y.	H.R. 2074	--
72. Nedzi, D, Mich.	H.R. 3816	--
73. Nix, D, Pa.	H.R. 3006	--
74. O'Brien, D, N.Y.	H.R. 345	--
75. O'Hara, D, Mich.	--	H.R. 6053
76. Olsen, D, Mont.	H.R. 362	--
77. O'Neill, D, Mass.	H.R. 347	H.R. 6300, 9689
78. Ottinger, D, N.Y.	H.R. 3309	--
79. Patten, D, N.J.	H.R. 4793	--
80. Pepper, D, Fla.	H.R. 5772	H.R. 6196, 9704
81. Perkins, D, Ky.	--	H.R. 6281, 9753
82. Philbin, D, Mass	H.R. 5053	H.R. 7962, 9929
83. Price, D, Ill.	H.R. 337	--
84. Pucinski, D, Ill.	--	H.R. 6886
85. Race, D, Wisc.	H.R. 2240	--
86. Reid, R, N.Y.	--	H.R. 9074

	<u>Moorhead and Fogarty bills (to establish a National Humanities Foundation)</u>	<u>Administration bill (to establish a National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities)</u>
87. Resnick, D, N.Y.	H.R. 381	H.R. 6197, 9980
88. Reuss, D, Wisc.	H.R. 349	--
89. Rhodes, D, Pa.	H.R. 388	--
90. Rivers, D, Alaska	H.R. 358	--
91. Rodino, D, N.J.	H.R. 341	H.R. 6198, 9735
92. Roosevelt, D, Calif.	H.R. 350	H.R. 6199, 10200
93. Rosenthal, D, N.Y.	--	H.R. 6065, 9710
94. Roush, D, Ind.	H.R. 359	--
95. Ryan, D, N.Y.	H.R. 2651	H.R. 6200, 9873
96. St. Germain, D, R.I.	H.R. 1799	H.R. 6697, 9809
97. St. Onge, D, Conn.	H.R. 372	--
98. Saylor, R, Pa.	H.R. 342	H.R. 6285, 9752
99. Scheuer, D, N.Y.	--	H.R. 6056, 9839
100. Schisler, D, Ill.	H.R. 2654	H.R. 6430, 9773
101. Schmidhauser, D, Iowa	H.R. 382	--
102. Senner, D, Ariz.	H.R. 373	--
103. Sickles, D, Md.	--	H.R. 6555, 9694
104. Sisk, D, Calif.	H.R. 351	--
105. Stafford, R, Vt.	H.R. 4807	--
106. Sweeney, D, Ohio	H.R. 1736	--
107. Thompson, D. N.J.	--	H.R. 6050, 9460
108. Toll, D, Pa.	H.R. 2087	--

	<u>Moorhead and Fogarty bills (to establish a National Humanities Foundation)</u>	<u>Administration bill (to establish a National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities)</u>
109. Tupper, R, Maine	H.R. 2089	--
110. Udall, D, Arizona	H.R. 1594	--
111. Ullman, D, Oregon	H.R. 355	--
112. Vigorito, D, Pa.	H.R. 383	--
113. Vivian, D, Mich.	H.R. 384	H.R. 6201, 9923
114. Wilson, Charles H., D, California	H.R. 374	--
115. Wright, D, Texas	H.R. 352	--
116. Yates, D, Ill.	H.R. 6202	--
117. Zablocki, D, Wisc.	H.R. 343	--

<u>SENATE</u>	<u>Sponsors of S. 111 (Gruening)</u>	<u>Sponsors of S. 316 (Pell)</u>	<u>Sponsors of S. 1483 (Administration bill)</u>
1. Anderson, D, N. Mex.	X		X
2. Bartlett, D, Alaska			X
3. Bass, D, Tennessee	X	X	X
4. Bayh, D, Indiana	X	X	X
5. Brewster, D, Md.	X	X	X
6. Burdick, D, N. Dak.	X	X	X
7. Byrd, D, W. Va.			X
8. Case, R, New Jersey	X		X
9. Clark, D, Pa.	X	X	X

	<u>Sponsors of S. 111 (Gruening)</u>	<u>Sponsors of S. 316 (Pell)</u>	<u>Sponsors of S. 1483 (Administration bill)</u>
10. Cooper, R, Kentucky			X
11. Dodd, D, Connecticut	X	X	X
12. Douglas, D, Illinois	X	X	X
13. Fong, R, Hawaii	X	X	X
14. Gore, D, Tennessee	X		
15. Gruening, D, Alaska	X	X	X
16. Harris, D, Oklahoma	X		
17. Hart, D, Michigan	X	X	X
18. Hartke, D, Indiana	X	X	X
19. Inouye, D, Hawaii	X	X	X
20. Jackson, D, Washington			X
21. Javits, R, New York			X
22. Kennedy, D, Mass.		X	X
23. Kennedy, D, New York			X
24. Kuchel, R, Calif.	X		X
25. Long, D, Missouri		X	X
26. McCarthy, D, Minn.			X
27. McGee, D, Wyoming	X	X	X
28. McGovern, D, S. Dak.	X	X	X
29. McIntyre, D, N. H.		X	X
30. Metcalf, D, Montana	X	X	X
31. Miller, R, Iowa	X		X

	<u>Sponsors of S. 111 (Gruening)</u>	<u>Sponsors of S. 316 (Pell)</u>	<u>Sponsors of S. 1483 (Administration bill)</u>
32. Mondale, D, Minn.		X	X
33. Montoya, D, N. Mex.	X	X	X
34. Morse, D, Oregon	X	X	X
35. Moss, D, Utah	X	X	X
36. Mundt, R, S. Dak.	X		
37. Murphy, R, Calif.			X
38. Muskie, D, Maine	X	X	X
39. Nelson, D, Wisconsin	X	X	X
40. Neuberger, D, Oregon	X	X	X
41. Pastore, D, R. I.	X	X	X
42. Pell, D, R. I.	X	X	X
43. Randolph, D, W. Va.	X	X	X
44. Ribicoff, D, Conn.	X	X	X
45. Tydings, D, Maryland	X	X	X
46. Williams, D, N. J.	X	X	X
47. Yarborough, D, Texas	X	X	X
48. Young, D, Ohio	X	X	



Appendix B: Documentary SupplementContents

	<u>Page</u>
Biographical sketch of Barnaby C. Keeney	71
Address by Barnaby C. Keeney before the Council of Graduate Schools, December 2, 1965	72
Memorandum from Mr. Keeney to staff members, July 6, 1966, on Endowment programs, procedures, and staff	89

## BARNABY C. KEENEY

Barnaby C. Keeney was appointed Chairman of the National Endowment for the Humanities by President Johnson on July 14, 1966. He came to Washington from Brown University, where he was President for eleven years. As Chairman of the Endowment, Mr. Keeney also serves as Chairman of the National Council on the Humanities, the presidentially appointed advisory body of the Endowment.

Born in Halfway, Oregon on October 17, 1914, Mr. Keeney spent his boyhood in various parts of the country. After graduating from the Hartford Public High School in 1932, he attended the University of North Carolina, where he was awarded his A.B. in 1936. He received his M.A. in 1937 and his doctorate in 1939, both from Harvard University. Upon completion of his graduate work, he became an instructor of history at Harvard. In 1942 he entered the army, and served as an intelligence officer with the 35th Infantry Division in Europe. He rose to the rank of Captain and won the Silver Star, the Bronze Star and the Purple Heart. While still in the army, he received a Guggenheim fellowship for work in medieval history.

In the fall of 1946, Mr. Keeney went to Brown as an assistant professor, and became a full professor in 1951. In administrative posts at Brown, he served in succession as Associate Dean of the Graduate School, Dean of the Graduate School, Acting Dean of the College, and Dean of the College, before becoming President of the University in 1955.

Mr. Keeney is the author of "Judgment by Peers" and of several articles on history, education and other subjects. He is a member of the American Philosophical Society, the American Historical Association, the Mediaeval Academy of America, and Phi Beta Kappa, and a Fellow of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences.

NATIONAL FOUNDATION FOR THE ARTS AND HUMANITIES

by President Barnaby C. Keeney, Brown University

297

(Keeney)  
2/10/68

It seems appropriate that I should speak about the events which led to the establishment of the National Foundation for the Arts and Humanities and, in particular, about how I hope the Humanities Endowment of that Foundation will operate.

In doing so, I shall tell some of you things that you already know and I shall speak also about what I hope will be some operations of the Endowment which are not of direct concern to graduate schools, though perhaps they should be.

In the early part of this decade, various leading figures in the American Council of Learned Societies and others began to believe that the time had come for the establishment of a Federal program of support for the humanities and the arts similar to the program of the National Science Foundation and the activities of other Federal agencies in support of science and scientific education.

This belief developed both in learned circles and out of them.

One of the early indications was the almost spontaneous introduction into Congress of bills to authorize a Federal program of support for the humanities and the arts, particularly by the members of the Rhode Island delegation. Another was the preliminary work that resulted in the publication of the Rockefeller Brothers report on the performing arts.

In the spring of 1963, Mike Cates, Bob Lumiansky, and Fred Burkhardt asked me to join them in forming a Commission on the Humanities, supported by the American Council of Learned Societies, and to serve as its chairman.

I agreed, thinking that perhaps in five or ten years we might accomplish something, and it would be well to start then.

We chose a Commission, attempting to find members who would be broadly representative of the various disciplines in the humanities, of educational leadership, of the business and professional community, and of the various arts.

We quickly came to the decision that the arts and the humanities are intellectually inseparable.

At each meeting this decision became unstuck, for neither the representatives of the arts -- in or out of the Commission -- nor the laymen, either, really believed in such inseparability.

Finally, we ended with a simple declaration that the humanities and the arts belong together, but we did not ultimately go further than this.

In the course of our endeavors, we quickly came to the conclusion that not much research was necessary to tell us what we already knew.

We were subsequently criticized for lack of such data, and also for selecting a commission representative of the establishment, rather than of young and vital scholars. On the other hand, we were congratulated for our superb documentation and for the breadth and wisdom of the commission.

To assist in forming our conclusions, we invited each of the constituent members of the American Council of Learned Societies to prepare a statement of its needs and objectives.

Unfortunately, the reports of the Princeton Commission on the Humanities were not ready in time for real use, but we had access to some of them through persons who had participated in their preparation.

The report of the Rockefeller Brothers on the performing arts was only in its early stages and we did not have the benefit of using it, though it played an important part in the ensuing debate.

The Report was published on 30 April 1964.

Initially, it did not attract so much attention as we had hoped.

However, the Report became better known and began to receive considerable attention from some members of Congress, particularly Congressman Moonhead of Pennsylvania, who introduced a bill embodying its principal recommendations late in the 88th Congress.

If any organization is responsible for the establishment of the Foundation, it is the Council of Graduate Schools in the United States.

If any individual is responsible, it is your president, Gustavo Arlt, who labored tirelessly, on and off of Capitol Hill, for the development and passage of suitable legislation.

Gustavo Arlt has done many useful things in his life and doubtless will do more, but perhaps this is the most significant thing he has done.

To this time at least, it is the most significant accomplishment of the Council of Graduate Schools.

Intellectuals had received the Report with mixed feelings.

Those who were on the artistic side of the house were dubious of the marriage of the humanities and the arts and were inclined to feel that they were being shortchanged, as perhaps they were.

Meanwhile, moreover, Senator Pell of Rhode Island had secured the passage of a bill authorizing the establishment of a National Council for the Arts, and it was hoped that this would be followed by a National Foundation for the Arts.

Initial popular reception was one of limited enthusiasm, but interest gradually grew, as people perceived the relevance of the humane studies and the arts to their daily lives and to our national policy.

The press and the magazines did not become very much involved until the establishment of the Foundation was almost a matter of fact.

The greatest enthusiasm seems to have come from the Congress itself.

Congressman Moorhead's bill was widely endorsed and, when he reintroduced it in the 89th Congress, it was co-sponsored by a great many Senators and Congressmen. This, again, can be attributed in good part to the quiet efforts of Gustave Arlt and others.

President Johnson, in October of 1964, endorsed the proposal in a speech at Brown University.

Subsequently, he exerted considerable effort toward its passage and considerable interest in its form.

Also, in the early days of the 89th Congress, Senator Poll introduced a bill, which was ultimately enacted with some modification.

It contained the substance of the Commission's Report and more, but differed from it in one major respect -- it proposed two separate endowments within the Foundation and a common board, one endowment for the Arts and one for the Humanities.

Each endowment was to have an advisory committee and a chairman.

The program of the Humanities Endowment was substantially that recommended in the Report.

The major omission is support for libraries, which may be the subject of separate legislation.

Congressman Moorhead and his colleague in the Senate, Senator Gruening, swung their support to this bill, which appeared to be -- and indeed was -- easier of enactment.

It remains to be seen whether it is easier of implementation. I believe that it is.

Support continued to develop, and the bill was passed early in the summer by the Senate, by a voice vote, and early in the fall by the House, after an acrimonious debate which was really about other things.

The supplementary appropriations act provided about \$10 million for the funding for the first fiscal year, which is about half that authorized for a full fiscal year.

The President signed the bill on September 29.

On November 18 President Johnson appointed Henry Allen Moe, formerly president of the John Simon Guggenheim Memorial Foundation, to serve as chairman until the first of July and me to serve as chairman thereafter.

Henry Moe is at least as able as any foundation executive I have met in twenty years of working with them and will without any doubt get the Endowment off to a sound and good start.

The members of the Council are now being invited to serve.

We have, therefore, a National Foundation for the Arts and Humanities well before any of us really thought that we would when we set out to get one.

I come now to how I hope it will operate.

I shall confine myself here to the Humanities side, including what might be called the academic arts -- that is, that part of the arts which relates to teaching and research.

The scope of the measure is very broad.

The Endowment is authorized to operate through grants to individuals, through support of programs of teaching and research, through adult and extramural education.

It is permitted to provide facilities, but obviously, with the present funding, it cannot do much in that area.

It is important to note that the law itself includes authorization for the Office of Education to promote better teaching and better facilities and equipment in the humanities and arts for the schools.

The purpose of the Congress is clearly not simply to support the activities of learned men in the humanities.

Nor was it the intention of the Commission on the Humanities that this should be the case.

It is hoped that programs will be developed which will bring the humanities and the arts to a major segment of our lay population, and that the results will be better understanding and control of our society and amelioration of the conditions under which we live.

Therefore, I believe that we must consider the relevance of each proposal to the public welfare and to the national interest, for Congress would not and should not have passed the legislation if it had not believed that the accomplishment of its purposes was for the public welfare and in the national interest.

The decisions resulting from this policy, if it is accepted, will be disappointing to many humanists.

The first task of the Endowment is to form policy. The legislation provides that the Council shall be almost purely advisory, but it is felt by many of those closest to the establishment of the Foundation that, at least in the early days, the Council must be very active in establishing policy, and that it must permanently be involved in major decisions and changes in policy. I feel that the advisory council must meet very frequently for the first year at least, until it has mapped out the broad lines, at which point it can select an executive committee to carry out its business through monthly meetings, subject to the confirmation of the whole body.

It can also set up a few advisory groups, from which it can secure greater expertise than is available through its membership, and can engage consultants to assist with particular programs.

Obviously, the easiest area in which to operate is the granting of fellowships and grants-in-aid for research, publication, and personal development.

There are already successful methods of choosing people for such grants which can be adopted and implemented.

The Council, however, must decide how much of its funds will be used for these purposes.

More difficult will be decisions to support teaching programs, either at the college level or in cooperation with the Office of Education at the school level.

Obviously, we need to do a great deal to make the straightforward humanities better taught at every level and better learned by all students.

Our greatest contemporary need may be to develop programs in which the humanities and social studies -- and, perhaps, even the sciences -- are brought to bear upon one another and the relevance of the various bodies of material to one another made more clear, more meaningful.

Another great need is for programs which will develop the habit in the students -- and in people after they have been students -- of using humane learning in support of their judgments of value.

These two things will not be easy.

Much simpler and much more straightforward is the need for support of enlarged teaching of exotic languages and cultures.

The Endowment is also authorized to support research programs as well as the research of individual scholars. I hope the Endowment will succeed in identifying those fields that are moving forward and will help to keep them moving forward; that it will identify areas of life in presently stagnant fields; that it will identify cross-disciplinary researches that may be fertile; and that it will find tools which must be constructed before more can be accomplished.

The Council is authorized to operate in adult education, in extracurricular education, and in the area that is the boundary between education and entertainment -- obviously, television.

Extracurricular education has in its quality an even greater range than American education in general.

One can easily find extension or adult education programs that provide a mere pastime to those whose hours are not fully occupied.

One can, on the other hand, find such programs that have great meaning and great importance to those who participate in them.

Little that is significant is done through the mass media, and much more could be.

Perhaps, with the decline in attention to popular television, this is an opportune time to propose commercial programming of serious intellectual content.

Programs such as these can be set in action fairly quickly.

For a longer period, the Endowment should develop with the United States Office of Education a survey and a justification of needs for space and means to pursue the humanities.

With other government agencies, it may wish to develop programs to supply national needs for persons with rare competence in unusual fields.

Obviously, area specialists would be included.

With learned societies, the Endowment must identify necessary basic work that needs to be supported and done before further progress can be made.

The Arts Endowment and the Humanities Endowment can work out a program of joint support of cultural activities.

The only major portion of the proposed program omitted in the legislation is support of libraries.

I hope that this was omitted because the Congress felt that in another year it could enact a more substantial program for the support of libraries, separated from both established foundations.

The Humanities Endowment should work with the American Library Association, with the Office of Education, and with the National Science Foundation on a program of support to libraries.

A good many persons are justifiably concerned with Federal control through this new instrument.

The concern, I think, is greater than it need be.

One way of reducing the possibility of Federal control would be to work closely with the private foundations and with private donors in developing their programs of support to the humanities.

Indeed, the legislation provides that additional Federal funds may be secured by the Endowment if such contributions occur.

I hope that initially the staff of the Endowment will be rather small and that it will represent, in addition to supporting personnel (such as accountants and counsels), generalists in literature, philosophical and analytical thinking, analysis and history of religion, criticism and history of art, history, aesthetics, and analytical and theoretical aspects of the social studies.

A modest staff is surely in keeping with modest resources. It would be better to grow as resources grow rather than to dissipate the resources in support of the staff.

However modest its beginnings, the National Humanities Endowment is a very great potential for the immediate and for the remote future.

Much of its success will depend upon the proposals of humanists represented here and elsewhere.

It will not flourish if it uses its funds to support work that does not have a broader interest than that of the highly specialized professional scholar.

Nor will it flourish if it refuses to support the basic work upon which broader interpretations may be based.

It must, therefore, select very carefully the programs that it will support and inevitably, at first, its support will be modest.

We shall not dwell in marble halls, but we may certainly hope before too long really to have the rooms to carry on our work.

Barnaby C. Keeney

Council of Graduate Schools  
2 December 1965

Mr. Edgerton  
Mrs. Hardy  
Mr. Gardner

July 6, 1966

Barnaby C. Hoanay

The attached are some ideas that I jotted down last October about how the Endowment might proceed and what things ought to be considered initially. I think it might be well to reconsider some of these ideas.

## HUMANITIES ENDOWMENT

## Program - initial

Fellowships and grants-in-aid (research and publication) - easy

Teaching programs at college level

Interdisciplinary - hard

Judgments of value - hard

New areas including languages - easy

## Research

Identify moving fields and keep them moving - easy

Identify areas of life in stagnant fields - hard

Identify areas of cross-disciplinary research that may be  
fertile - chancy

Identify tools that must be constructed before more can be  
accomplished - tendentious

## Adult and extramural education

Seminars, alumni colleges, lectures, etc. - uneven

Uses of television and radio - oh boy

## Program - to wait

Develop, with Office of Education, needs for space and means - generate  
applications

with Government in general, programs of national necessity - danger

with learned societies, necessary basic work

with Arts Endowment, cultural activities - hold your hat

with American Library Association and Office of Education,  
library programs

Work with private foundations

- 2 -

### Procedure

Monthly meetings of advisory council for first year or until  
general agreement reached

Replace monthly meetings by executive committee as soon as possible

Set up advisory groups in various areas, as few as possible

Enlist a few consultants

### Staff

Chairman

Executive

Some experienced government person

Counsel

Accountant

Literature

Philosophical, analytical, religious (content)

Historical including religion

Aesthetics

Social studies - analytical and theoretical

Et al.