

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

VOLUME II

CONTENTS OF VOLUME II

	<u>Page</u>
IV. The Endowment under the Chairmanship of Henry Allen Moe (continued from Volume I)	92
Development of initial programs (continued from Volume I)	92
Presentation of the 1967 budget request	96
First Council meeting: March 3-4, 1966	102
Further developments on the 1967 appropriation	107
Further development of program categories for fiscal 1967	112
Content of initial programs: "Programs for progress in humanistic studies"	119
Further development of organization and staffing	134
* * * * *	
Footnotes	138
Appendix: Documentary supplement	156

IV. THE ENDOWMENT UNDER THE CHAIRMANSHIP
OF HENRY ALLEN MOE (CONTINUED)

Development of initial programs (continued)

The most difficult part of the 1967 budget^{1/} to prepare was undoubtedly that proposing programs directed to public understanding of the humanities. In the view of the Commission on the Humanities in 1964, the main way of reaching a wide public was through the improvement of teaching, above all in the schools, but also at all other educational levels.^{2/} By the time the arts and humanities legislation was enacted, this concept had to be modified if it were to serve as a base for Endowment programs; for it did not take into account the new authority that had meanwhile been given to the Office of Education. This included the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965,^{3/} the Higher Education Act of 1965,^{4/} and, in Public Law 89-209 itself, authority for the Office of Education to support training institutes in the arts and humanities for elementary and high school teachers. In addition, National Defense Education Act pre-doctoral fellowships had been extended to a number of fields in the humanities that were previously ineligible.^{5/} The possible relationships between these programs and the Endowment's activities were just beginning to be explored when the 1967 budget was written.

Public Law 89-209 indirectly recognized the new Office of Education programs. As finally enacted, section 7(c) omitted all direct reference to teachers and the improvement of teaching.^{6/} Instead, it authorized the Endowment to "foster . . . public understanding and appreciation

of the humanities"; and it also contained a provision authorizing "fellowships and grants to institutions or individuals for training and workshops in the humanities."

The 1967 budget followed the pattern suggested by the act, in that it emphasized reaching the public as such--not the public, present and especially future, as potential students in some kind of educational institution. Four program areas were proposed:

1) Educational television, described by quotation from Mr. Keeney's speech of December 2.^{7/}

2) Humanistic museums and historical societies, an area permitting a broad public to be reached since attendance was estimated at 75 million visitors a year.^{8/}

3) Talking books, to be made available to persons--quadriplegics, for example--who cannot read for reasons other than legal blindness. This program, the need for which had been brought to Dr. Moe's attention not long before he was appointed to the Chairmanship, was intended to supplement a Library of Congress program then limited by law to serving the blind.^{9/}

4) American history. The 1967 budget had opened with a definition of the humanities that was offered, rather clearly, for the benefit of members of the appropriations committees who might need a definition:

"There is nothing esoteric, nothing 'egghead' about this word humanistic. This is what it means: that we know our culture and tradition, the roots of our history, and that we pay discerning attention to the ideas that made America what it is."^{10/}

The object of the Endowment's public programs, similarly, was stated in a way that might appeal to members of Congress who would not find

self-evident the value of programs "to foster public understanding and appreciation of the humanities." Rather than using this language from the act, the budget spoke of programs to enable citizens to "better their understanding and appreciation of 'the American way.'"^{11/} The final program area listed under this heading carried out the theme: a program "to further both original historical research and to increase popular understanding of the meaning of the United States," in part through support for activities covered more generally under other headings of the budget, such as fellowships, and in part through support for special projects such as "the writing and publishing of first-rate readable articles and books for the lay public."^{12/} The budget was careful, however, to define as broadly as possible the studies that would be relevant to Americans' understanding of themselves, and thus to encompass the whole of human history within the definition.

These four programs, directed at the public in general, still said nothing about improving the teaching of the humanities in the institutions of formal education. That topic, significant as it was considered, was especially difficult to deal with, not only because of the open questions of how much was being done or could be done by the Office of Education, but also because there was not available to the Endowment a body of experience with such programs in any degree comparable to the experience that could be drawn upon in designing programs for scholars and for historical societies and museums. Consequently, the budget treated the improvement of teaching in the most general terms:

First, in proposing postdoctoral fellowships for "scholars and teachers at . . . roughly . . . the assistant professorship level," the

budget argued that a main purpose would be to promote good teaching:

". . . the young scholar who usually has the doctorate, usually has a large teaching load, often has a family coming along . . . simply hasn't the time and energy for creative scholarship. Not incidentally, creative teaching largely depends on good scholarship"

"To make opportunities for such young persons, say in their thirties, to develop themselves would seem to be a prime and proper objective of the Humanities Endowment. Creative college and university teachers more often than not are good scholars; and among the objectives of fellowships for such young scholars would be to recapture the importance of teaching and to put the scholar and teacher into some kind of balance-- which is important and is recognized to be needed." 13/

That fellowships for the pursuit of "creative scholarship" might succeed in recapturing the importance of teaching was assumed but not explained.

Second, under the rubric "grants to scholarly groups," the budget included a category titled "the development of needed training programs if humanistic studies are to progress."14/ The wording of this title, as well as the placement of the section amid the categories of scholarly activity already described, suggest the production of primarily scholarly rather than teaching personnel. However, a more general educational goal was suggested by the conclusion of the budget, where a solitary reference to "training programs for teachers" was included.15/ The content of the section itself was rather vague:

"The development of needed training programs if humanistic studies are to progress. There will be many of these; and it is . . . [the Chairman's] expectation that members of the Endowment's Council will be in position to choose those that may provide break-throughs both as respects content and method. It is the Chairman's hope that the Classics may be emphasized; because as a member of the Endowment's Council, Dr. Else, has written, '. . . the role of the Classics in present-day American life is nil, while their relevance is enormous.'" 16/

Some light on what was intended here is provided by the February 6 outline for the budget prepared by Mr. Broughton. This paper, in summing up some of the kinds of requests "that have come in so far," included one category "on the development of needed training programs if work in the humanities is to progress" and juxtaposed this with another category "on the improvement of established educational programs."^{17/} From applications on hand by February 6, it appears that Mr. Broughton may have had in mind training programs such as these:

HO-1004, University of Wisconsin, "Program for the comparative study of the colonial history of the Americas," January 27, 1966. A proposal to develop graduate courses, "the aim being, eventually, the addition of a major field to our history offerings."

HO-1007, University of Wisconsin, "Development of Anglo-Norman studies at the University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee," January 31, 1966. A proposal for research, the development of a doctoral program, and graduate scholarships.

HO-1025, University of Wisconsin: "Promoting research in Malayo-Polynesian languages by providing instruction in Malay-Indonesian and Pilipino-Tagalog," January 24, 1966. A proposal to hire a professor to teach these languages in order to strengthen the university's program of Southeast Asian studies.

HO-1073, American Society of Papyrologists: Summer training institute in papyrology.^{18/}

Presentation of the 1967 budget request

For most of the areas covered by the Endowment's initial programs, Dr. Moe brought to the chairmanship an exceptionally strong background, both in substantive knowledge of the humanities and in wide familiarity with the relevant programs and procedures of private foundations and other non-federal organizations. On matters such as the way in which

a budget should be drafted for submission to the Congressional appropriations committees, however, he was almost wholly dependent on others' advice.

There are at least two evidences of the kind of advice received. One is a memorandum, dated February 17, 1966, by which Dr. Moe sent copies of the budget to the newly appointed members of the Council. He wrote:

"Since coming to Washington, I have had to learn, from scratch, something about the ways of getting things done in Government. One of the things I have had to learn is what is called a 'budget justification'--for presentation to the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and to the Finance Committee [sic] of the Senate.

"Never in my life had I seen a budget justification; so I had no models, neither for guidance nor to create inhibitions, to rely upon. After mine had been written, I thought it probably a budget justification never seen on land or sea before and, as such, not acceptable; but when that thought impinged, I argued to myself that neither had an agency such as the National Endowment for the Humanities been seen on American land or sea before." (Emphasis added.)

The other is an exchange with the chairman of the House appropriations subcommittee, some ten days later:

"Mr. Denton. . . . What did you recommend to the Bureau of the Budget and what did they do with your recommendation?

"Mr. Moe. I have no information about what the Budget Bureau did, sir."1/

Dr. Moe's main advisor on the budget presentation appears to have been Philip Broughton, the deputy chairman, who had had eleven years of federal government experience. 2/ There was also at least some informal discussion with officials of other agencies, 3/ but these men cannot have felt themselves responsible for the quality of the final document. The present chairman has since suggested the

establishment of a cadre of highly qualified and experienced people to help new agencies establish themselves.^{4/}

As written without real assistance, the 1967 budget followed these lines: It first quoted from the act on the functions of the Council, explained that the Council had not yet met, and proceeded to the description of programs in a section headed, "Suggestions, subject to the Council's amendment, concerning policies and programs."^{5/} Near the conclusion of the budget, the Chairman added:

"Again, it should be said, and emphasized, that the policies and programs suggested herein represent only part of the thought of the Endowment's Chairman as of this date. Indeed, others are in process of being drafted for the consideration of the Council; but the Chairman has no doubt that equally good or better programs will be suggested by the Council: that's what the Council is for. . . .

"At this point someone may ask for price tags on specific projects. We have hesitated to put on price tags for two reasons.

"First, under the law, we must consult with the Council on the Humanities before going forward on policies and programs. If, in our first two or three meetings, the Council should shape programs quite differently than suggested herein, we would then seem to have misled your committee."^{6/}

The Chairman then indicated "reasonable cost probabilities" for groups of programs--totalling the \$5 million requested--but again emphasized that the amounts were quite uncertain.^{7/} The concluding sentence stated:

"[T]here is so much utterly first-rate work to be done . . . that, whether or not the suggested programs be approved by the Council, others equally good or better surely will be available for granting to the limit of the available funds."^{8/}

The budget might have stood a better chance of success had it said that the programs described were the programs of the Endowment, that each was estimated at a particular cost, and that the committee

would be informed should any changes later be proposed. It would perhaps have helped also if these programs had been described as carrying forward programs to be instituted in the remainder of fiscal year 1966 with the \$2.5 million initial appropriation. A stumbling block to such a presentation, however, was the Chairman's concept of his relations with the Council. This concept, which enlarged the Council's role far beyond that required on a literal reading of the statute, comes through most clearly in the opening statement prepared for the House Appropriations hearing. It stated:

"The budget justification that we have presented is, I realize, not 'according to Hoyle'; and the reason it is not is that it cannot be at this date. The reason for that situation, in turn, is implicit in the Act: It says that the National Council on the Humanities: '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.'

". . . .

"If I should present to you programs and policies stating specific appropriations, I should, as I see it, be violating the Statute; for the Statute, as above quoted, is clear that I am not entitled either to initiate policies and programs nor to approve or disapprove an application until I have received the Council's recommendation upon policy, programs and the particular application.

"Further, were I now to go into specifics of appropriations, I should be guilty of an impertinence in respect to the Council; for not only is it legally imperative that I consult with the Council but also I feel a great need to obtain the benefit of their experience, knowledge and wisdom."⁹ (Emphasis added.)

On March 1, 1966, in his oral testimony before the House subcommittee, Dr. Moe again explained, "Now, because of what the law says in

reference to the dependence of the Chairman on the advice of the Council, I could not come before you with approved programs at this time."10/

This exchange followed:

"Mr. Denton. What do you expect us to do?

"Mr. Moe. Sir, I don't know, but what do you expect me to do, if I may ask the question? I have submitted all that I can submit. I think there will be approved programs by the Council and I have been unable to put a price tag on any of them, I am sorry to say.

"Mr. Denton. Mr. Moe, the statement I am about to make is not made in a critical vein but is made in an effort to obtain a better understanding of what you propose to do in this program in 1967. I am aware of the fact that you and your associates are perhaps not too familiar with Government operations, but it somewhat surprises me that someone with overall responsibility for this program did not have the foresight to furnish you with capable and experienced budget personnel to assist in the preparation of your justifications.

"I have read your justifications carefully and, while the information they contain is most interesting, I did not find any specific information on just how you plan to spend the \$5 million you are requesting for grants under section 7(c) of the act or the \$1 million available for matching funds under section 11(b) of the act.

"On page 24 of the justifications, you list three general categories in which you say probable totals would be \$1.5 million for one activity; the cost for another activity 'could well total an additional \$1.8 million'; and you state for the third activity, 'I could visualize projects which would use well not less than \$1.7 million.' These are very general statements. Probably one of the reasons for these generalities is the fact that you are not sufficiently organized yet to make specific plans.

"Now, there is nothing more you want to say about that, is there?

"Mr. Moe. No sir; except to call your attention to the fact that I am in the position of not having had a Council meeting, not having had the opportunity to have a Council meeting prior to this hearing.

"Mr. Denton. What did the Bureau of the Budget do when you submitted this justification to them? What did you recommend to

the Bureau of the Budget and what did they do with your recommendation?

"Mr. Moe. I have no information about what the Budget Bureau did, sir."^{11/}

This was the extent of the testimony on proposed humanities programs.

What the committee objected to, as Denton stated it, was less the possibility of changes in the programs than the refusal to assign price tags to the programs that were described. Congressman Reifel stated the objection similarly:

"I think it is regretted and it is not entirely your fault, Mr. Moe, that there are not any dollar amounts as to the program for the humanities, and appropriations are primarily concerned with dollar amounts and how they are going to be spent."^{12/}

In support of the reading that dollar amounts were more important than firm program content, it may be noted that the submission of the Arts Endowment also included a number of programs not yet approved by the National Council on the Arts.^{13/} Precise dollar amounts were attached to each.^{14/} Mr. Denton did bring out in the hearing that the programs might be changed, but he appeared to have been satisfied by Stevens's statement that any changes would be submitted to the committee;^{15/} and he later stated on the House floor in defense of the Arts Endowment's appropriation, "Mr. Chairman, I have a list here of the actual projects to be funded. I do not know how they could have been any more specific."^{16/}

For the Humanities Endowment to have assigned meaningful price tags to its programs, of course, it was necessary to have decisions on what the programs were to be and on the priorities among them. Dr. Moe's refusal to commit the Endowment without Council concurrence, apart

from its effect on the appropriations committee, might have been important both for his relations with the Council and to insure that the best possible program decisions were made. Because of the pressures on the Council at its first meeting, however, very little of the latter benefit, at least, was realized.

First Council Meeting: March 3-4, 1966

The first meeting of the National Council on the Humanities began on March 3, two days after Dr. Moe's appearance before the House appropriations subcommittee. His testimony in the Senate was scheduled for just a week later, on March 10.^{1/} This time schedule largely pre-determined the main actions of the meeting.

The meeting began with a report on the budget situation, which evidenced a certain amount of confusion about what the appropriations committees required. The deputy chairman reported, for example, that a subcommittee staff member had said nothing less than an individual justification for every proposed grant would be acceptable.^{2/} The Council promptly agreed that such a justification was impossible to produce;^{3/} and the meeting proceeded on the assumption that a statement of programs approved by the Council, with specific dollar amounts assigned to each, would suffice. It was not entirely clear whether the House would accept such a statement, submitted after the hearings,^{4/} but in any event, it was reported, the Senate submission was due by about March 8, five days later.^{5/}

After the report on appropriations, the Council moved to its main business, an agenda heading titled, "Discussion by Council members

concerning policies and programs of the Humanities Endowment, using in the first instance the Chairman's 'budget justification' . . . to provide topical headings for the discussion."^{6/} Time for Council members to make suggestions of their own was allotted only after all thirteen of the Chairman's topical headings had been discussed.^{7/} The budget had, however, been mailed to the Council in time for them to read it in advance,^{8/} and a number of members attempted at the outset to raise questions about whether the document as a whole was on the right track. During discussion of the first topical heading, "fellowship matters"--which the Chairman called "one of the principal areas of our operation"^{9/}--one member questioned whether the suggested program was imaginative enough;^{10/} another thought there was "a serious question whether fellowships as such would be an appropriate charge against a \$5 million budget," although they would be "a very appropriate charge against a \$100 million budget";^{11/} and a third, speaking to the proposed programs generally, said he was "restive about the assumptions underlying the proposals, especially the narrow definition of the humanities implied."^{12/} There had been an earlier suggestion that the Council spend several months in simply laying out guidelines;^{13/} and one or two members again appeared inclined to ignore the proposals in the budget so as to advance their own ideas about what the programs should be.^{14/}

Mr. Keeney at this point restated the budget situation:

"We have an immediate problem of setting up an immediate program for this year and next year, and we need things we can define. [We] also [have] a major problem of setting up long range programs. We cannot do this in time for the Senate budget hearings."^{15/}

And again,

"Our authorization is a token thing. The three years are expected to be used in developing the program."16/

The meeting thereafter proceeded in more orderly fashion. For most programs, the agenda suggested establishment of an advisory committee, including Council members and others; and the Council made suggestions about committee membership. The main actions, however, were the assignment of price tags to the various programs and, in some cases, modification of the program definition. These actions are summarized below.

Budget category

Council action17/

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

(1) Approved the program in principle, and requested the chairman to provide a draft spelling out details. Suggested allocation of \$800,000 to \$1,600,000.

(2) Approved an additional program of summer fellowships, suggested by the ACLS, subject to discussion with ACLS and report at the next meeting. Suggested allocation of \$300,000 to \$600,000. By implication, agreed that this program also should be for younger scholars and teachers.

B. Grants to individuals who are "accomplished in scholarly investigation."

Suggested allocation of \$750,000.

C. Grants to scholarly groups:

1) Editing and publishing the papers of great Americans.

The meeting agenda suggested that this category be understood to include the papers of American scientists as well as statesmen. A Council member suggested addition of the papers of American philosophers. The allocation suggested was \$500,000 for the papers of statesmen and \$200,000 for papers of philosophers and scientists.

2) Editing and publishing definitive editions of great American authors.

The meeting agenda omitted the word "American" from the heading, since a request for a major edition of an English author's works had been received. The Council recommended limiting the program to American works for the time being, and recommended allocation of \$500,000.

3) Archaeological-historical excavations, carried on by American institutions, both in the United States and abroad.

Suggested allocation of \$100,000.

4) Training programs to improve the quality of editing and publishing by non-profit university presses.

The agenda changed this budget heading to "matters concerning publication," and included under it both the training programs suggested in the budget and "other questions concerning the subventioning of publications." The Council reacted negatively to the training program proposal and suggested allocation of funds only for "subvention of publications," at the level of \$250,000.

5) Computer research in the study of foreign languages and in preparing concordances to the greatest of creative literature.

The agenda referred only to "computer-oriented humanistic research," without specific reference to the ways in which computers would be used. The Council suggested allocation of \$400,000.

6) The development of needed training programs if humanistic studies are to progress.

In lengthy discussion, the Council made it clear for the first time that this heading was to be taken as expressing a concern for educational quality in general.¹⁸ To accommodate the interest of some members in "community projects," however, the word "training" was deleted from the program title. An allocation of \$750,000 was suggested.

7) Assistance to humanistic learned societies.

The Council reacted favorably to the proposed program, but it did not suggest allocation of funds in the 1967 budget request because the extent of the need had not been determined.

D. Grants to groups whose activities relate not so much to scholarly production as to education of the citizenry . . .

1) Humanistic museums and historical societies.

Suggested addition of support for special libraries to this category, and proposed the allocation of \$750,000 for museums, historical societies, and special libraries. Also suggested referral of the question of supporting libraries to the inter-agency Federal Council on the Arts and the Humanities.

2) Educational television.

The Council heard a report that the Carnegie Corporation was sponsoring a study of educational television and that the Ford Foundation was making grants in the area. It recommended allocation of \$100,000 to \$1,000,000, the lower amount to be used for a study dependent on the Carnegie and Ford results. The program was expanded to include educational radio as well as television at a Council member's suggestion.

3) Talking books.

Suggested allocation of \$100,000.

4) American history.

Suggested allocation of \$200,000.

E. Contingencies.

The budget had made no provision for supporting projects outside the named categories. The Council suggested allocation of \$500,000 for this purpose.

The program amounts recommended by the Council totalled well over the Endowment's \$5 million authorization. At the minimum levels suggested for fellowship programs and educational television, they amounted to \$6.2 million; at the maximum, to \$8.2 million. Efforts were not made at the meeting to reduce the suggested figures, however, because the 1966 appropriation of \$2.5 million was already available.^{19/}

The review of the Chairman's budget, with the results set out above, lasted until noon on the second day of the two-day meeting. By the second afternoon, when the Council reached the point designated on

the agenda for "suggestions by Council members concerning programs and policies,"^{20/} most of the suggestions that came out were fairly minor. One member, however, who had not been present on the first morning, again raised questions about the budget as a whole.^{21/} One point was that much of what was proposed was already being done, or could be done, by other federal agencies; another, that the budget contained "a rather unhappy absence of emphasis on interdisciplinary projects." The emphasis was said to be on "breaking things down by disciplines and learned groups" rather than, as it should be, "on bringing together." The importance of both points was acknowledged.^{22/}

Further developments on the 1967 appropriation: March-May 1966.

Immediately after the Council meeting, on March 7 and 8, 1966, Dr. Moe wrote to the chairman of the House and Senate appropriations subcommittees,

" . . . I now am, for the first time, in position to describe approved programs, and to indicate the amounts of dollars that reasonably will be needed for these approved programs . . . in fiscal 1967."^{1/}

In order to keep the request within \$5 million, he made reductions in the estimates for several of the programs. These were as follows:^{2/}

Fellowships for young scholar-teachers (academic year):
reduced from Council-suggested minimum of \$800,000 to \$750,000, for 100 fellowships.

Summer fellowships (described in the text as also for young scholar-teachers): estimated at the minimum level suggested by the Council, \$300,000 (for 200 awards).

Papers of great Americans: For the papers of statesmen, reduced from \$500,000 to \$300,000; for the papers of philosophers and scientists, reduced from \$200,000 to \$50,000.

Editions of great American authors: Reduced from \$500,000 to \$350,000.

Subvention of publication ("assistance toward publication of first-rate humanistic manuscripts"): Reduced from \$250,000 to \$150,000.

Computer research (now described as including "training programs in data-processing techniques for humanistic studies" as well as actual research): Reduced from \$400,000 to \$350,000.

Educational radio and television: Estimated at the minimum suggested by the Council, \$100,000.

Contingencies: The revised budget submission included no funds for contingencies, as against \$500,000 recommended by the Council.

Other amounts estimated in the March 7 submission were as proposed by the Council:^{3/}

For grants to mature scholars (now specified as expected to provide 50 grants at about \$15,000 each), \$750,000.

For archaeology, \$100,000.

For programs for progress in humanistic studies (now also called, synonymously, "general educational programs in humanistic subjects"), \$750,000.

For museums and historical societies, \$750,000.

For talking books, \$100,000.

For American history, \$200,000.

The House Appropriations Committee reported a bill on March 31, 1966,^{4/} which took no account of the March 7 submission. The committee report stated that it had passed over the Humanities Endowment's request without prejudice:

"Although the budget estimate contained a request for the appropriation of \$5,000,000 to the Endowment for the Humanities under Section 7(c) of the Act, no funds are provided in this Bill for this activity. At the time of the hearings on this appropriation item, the Council on the Humanities had not met. The witness for the request was able to give the Committee no specific information whatsoever as to what the request of \$5,000,000 would be used for. Therefore, the Committee has passed over this item of the request without prejudice with the understanding that it may be taken up at a later date by the Senate."^{5/}

The committee report also repeated, from the 1966 report, that it recommended funding with certain reservations; that sound operating procedures must first be established; and that there were many potential pitfalls to be avoided if the program were to continue to merit support.^{6/} These reservations appear to have been directed mainly toward the Arts Endowment,^{7/} but this is not entirely clear.

The amounts recommended by the House committee were as follows:

	<u>Recommendation</u>	<u>Amount of reduction</u>
Humanities, general program funds	-0-	\$5,000,000
Humanities, matching funds ^{8/}	-0-	-0-
Arts, general program funds	\$4,000,000	1,000,000
Arts, State program funds	2,000,000	750,000
Arts, matching funds ^{9/}	-0-	-0-
Administration	<u>1,000,000</u>	<u>180,000</u>
Total	\$7,000,000	\$6,930,000

The committee bill, by taking into account the differing stages of organization of the two Endowments, contravened the authorization language of the act providing that appropriations for general programs "shall be equally divided between the Endowments."^{10/} No point of order, however, was raised, and no amendment was offered on the floor to provide humanities funds. In the House floor debate,^{11/} which took

place on April 5, 1966, H. R. Gross proposed an amendment to delete all funds for the Foundation; this failed on a division vote, 36 to 63.^{12/}

In the Senate, meanwhile, Dr. Moe had appeared before the appropriations subcommittee on March 10.^{13/} The only member present was Senator McGee, a cosponsor of the authorizing legislation.^{14/} In his opening statement, Dr. Moe addressed himself for the first time to the relationship between the \$5 million now requested, for which specific allocations to programs had been proposed after the Council's meeting, and the \$2.5 million appropriated for the previous year. He said:

"We have submitted a budget justification requesting \$5,000,000 for the fiscal year 1967; the Congress already has appropriated to us \$2,500,000 for fiscal 1966--a total of \$7,500,000.

". . . it is abundantly clear that the Humanities Endowment will be able to use, and use well, \$7,500,000 in the fiscal years 1966 and 1967.

". . .

"If your Committee should wish a breakdown between the fiscal years 1966 and 1967, it would be quite accurate to say that in fiscal 1966 we shall get going on about half the allocations proposed for fiscal 1967--that is, allocate in 1966 about half the sums of money requested for the programs stated in our justification for fiscal 1967. But it should be added that the Humanities Council at their first meeting last week proposed additional, but rather small programs for fiscal 1966; these are now under study and will be reported on at the Council's next meeting to be held probably in April 1966.

". . . programs approved by the National Council on the Humanities at their first meeting are long range. They will apply equally to fiscal 1966 and to 1967 and, I should hope--with variations of detail--to succeeding years."^{15/}

When the Senate committee's report was filed on May 10, it included \$2 million for Humanities Endowment programs, exactly half the amount recommended for general Arts Endowment programs.^{16/} Added to the 1966 appropriation, however, none of which had yet been obligated, the recommendation gave the humanities \$4.5 million, or ninety percent of the general program funds authorized for any single fiscal year.

The Senate committee report also specified the particular programs for which the funds were to be used. It stated:

"The \$2 million recommended for the National Endowment for the Humanities is to be distributed as follows:

"For fellowships:

100 1-year fellowships for young scholar-teachers . .	\$750,000
200 summer fellowships for scholar-teachers	300,000

"For 50 grants to individual (mature) scholars 750,000

"For studies of educational radio and television 100,000

"For 'talking books' to be made available for other than blind persons 100,000"^{17/}

The report added, "Any amount above the sums proposed for each of the endowments for grants-in-aid shall be obtained from funds available under section 11(b) of the act [matching of unrestricted gifts]."^{18/} The Humanities Endowment's justification had said nothing specific about the way in which unrestricted gifts and matching funds were to be used.

The committee's recommendations were approved by the Senate,^{19/} accepted by the conference committee,^{20/} and signed into law on May 31, 1966.^{21/} The amounts appropriated were, in summary, as follows:

Humanities, general program funds	\$2,000,000
Humanities, matching funds	-0-*
Arts, general program funds	4,000,000
Arts, State program funds	2,000,000
Arts, matching funds	-0-*
Administration	<u>1,000,000</u>
Total	\$9,000,000

*Although no new appropriation was provided, the availability of the previous year's appropriation was extended, thus providing up to \$3 million in matching funds for the humanities and up to \$2 million in matching funds for the arts.

Further development of program categories for fiscal 1967

From the time the Chairman sent a revised budget, with price tags, to the committees on appropriations until the Endowment mailed out its first formal announcement of programs^{1/} in August 1966, about five months elapsed, and a number of changes were made in the programs in the interim.

The first such changes came up at the second meeting of the Council, held on May 6 and 7, before the Senate Appropriations Committee's recommendation was known. At this meeting, three new program categories were approved in addition to the thirteen described in the March 7 budget submission. They were as follows:

Support for scholarly tools; and support for travel to international scholarly meetings. The Council at its first meeting had reacted favorably to a proposed program for assistance to humanistic learned societies; but no funds were included in the subsequent submission to the Congress because the extent of the need had not been determined.^{2/}

Also at the first meeting, two Council members had been requested to obtain a statement from ACLS on the needs of learned societies;^{3/} and assurance was given that, even if no amount were included in the 1967 budget justification, some support in that category could be given from the 1966 appropriation.^{4/} It is not clear whether the Council members made their request of ACLS, but the Chairman did meet with Frederick Burkhardt on April 5. Burkhardt on April 14 wrote the Chairman as follows:

"It seemed to me that a summary record of our talk on April 5 might be useful to both of us, so I would like you to look the following over and correct or add as you think necessary.

". . .

"3. Study of needs of learned and professional societies. We agreed that such a study might result in a good many cooked-up needs and requests and that it would be sufficient to see to it that the Endowment's policies and programs were given wide publicity among all the learned societies, leaving it to their initiative to present requests.

". . .

"5. Participation by U. S. in International Scholarly Activities. You asked me to write a letter defining the problem and suggesting what might be done about it. This letter is enclosed.^{5/}

"6. Basic Research Tool Works. You expressed agreement with my view that these works were an important category and indicated that applications for assistance would be given consideration by the Endowment. . . ."

Dr. Moe replied that he would present the letter on international scholarly activities--which covered the need for funds to send Americans to scholarly meetings abroad and for support of American collaboration in international research projects--to the Council at its next meeting. He

also asked Burkhardt to develop further the thought behind "basic research tool works," with particular reference to the domestic side.^{6/} Burkhardt sent back, a few days later, a list of projects for preparation of research tools having immediate or future need of funds. The list had been compiled from a questionnaire sent some time previously to ACLS members and other societies. Burkhardt noted,

"The list is a formidable one because until now financial support for research tools in the humanities has been almost nonexistent and a large backlog has developed. Even without dollar estimates, it is evident that the total need far exceeds the present resources of the National Endowment for the Humanities. . . . [I]t would be splendid if the Endowment were to give recognition to the importance of research tools by establishing a program or announcing the availability of funds for this purpose in its very first year of operations."^{7/}

Both the letters on international activities and on research tools were brought to the Council at the May meeting.

On support of scholarly tools, the Council reacted favorably, and it was noted that applications had already been received for funding of a number of the projects listed.^{8/} For support of travel by Americans to international conferences in the humanities, the Council voted to recommend its first grant: \$25,000, to be used by ACLS in support of travel by members of its constituent societies, especially those who were officers of international organizations. At the same time, the Council agreed that travel requests from societies not belonging to ACLS should be handled by the Endowment directly.^{9/} At the close of the meeting, in brief consideration of a draft of a general information statement on the Endowment's programs, it was noted that both scholarly tools and international travel should be added as program categories.^{10/}

General support for scholarly research. The addition of this category came about in a somewhat more complicated manner. At the first meeting, the Council had agreed to three kinds of programs under which research in the humanities could be supported: (a) fellowship programs for younger scholars; (b) a program of grants to individual mature scholars; and (c) support for special categories of scholarly work: editions of papers, editions of the works of American authors, archaeology, computer research, and American history.^{11/} Research supported under (a) was to be subject to some form of an upper age limit;^{12/} research under (c) would be limited to the particular categories named. The limitations on research to be supported under (b) had not been finally fixed, but the March 7 submission to the Congress had said that awards were expected to average about \$15,000,^{13/} and the grants had sometimes been referred to as "fellowships."^{14/}

After the first meeting, it became clear to the staff that some kinds of humanistic research could not be supported under any of the three categories; and the \$500,000 contingency fund suggested by the Council had been omitted entirely from the March 7 budget submission. The question was raised with the Chairman--framed in various ways--whether the exclusions were intentional.^{15/} Dr. Moe responded by preparing the following memorandum for the second Council meeting:^{16/}

"Memorandum on Grants to Mature Individuals

"As agreed, these should be available to scholars and also to popularizers, both at high levels of accomplishment. . . .

"Studies in all fields listed in our Statute should be eligible for support but all fields listed in our Statute are not included in our approved programs. At this time, 'grants to mature individuals' is the only category of grants (except in our fellowship programs) with which we can, so to say, cover the waterfront. It seems to me important that we do so.

"Most, or at least many, of the applications and inquiries we already have received from mature individual scholars request funds for secretarial assistance, research assistance, and also for materials of one kind or another, in addition to salary payments. Such items are not items ordinarily includable in fellowship stipends.

"The questions, therefore, are:

"1. Should all our grants to mature high-level scholars and popularizers be subsumed under the fellowship concept with consequent limitations in the nature of such persons' requests and our grants? Or,

"2. Shall the Council approve another program of research grants for individuals (as distinguished from fellowship grants) and for institutions which would enable us to support all fields covered in the Statute and with more flexibility than might be possible by fellowships alone. N.S.F. distinguishes between fellowships and support for research projects by having two separate programs."

The remainder of the memo pointed out that such a program could be established from the 1966 appropriation.

At its second meeting the Council, with scarcely any discussion, approved the setting up of a new category. (It was made clear, however, that "research grants for individuals" did not necessarily mean the individual was to be the legal grantee rather than the institution by which he might be employed.)^{17/}

When this action was taken, the assumption remained that the original program of "grants to mature scholars" was a program of fellowships. The Chairman appointed a committee of the Council to recommend on appropriate stipends and allowances under both this and the younger scholar fellowship programs.^{18/} When the committee reported back at the next day's session, it recommended "that the Council should consider abandoning the fellowship for mature individuals at this time in

favor of project grants." Mr. Odegaard, presenting the recommendation, said he preferred project grants and noted that "one of the difficulties [with fellowships] is that there are considerable variations in the costs associated with particular projects." He felt that panels could decide whether budgets for particular projects were reasonable.^{19/}

The Council did not consider the recommendation for abandoning senior fellowships seriously. The committee had made it easy for the Council to avoid confronting the issue, in that it also offered a set of recommendations on stipends and allowances in case senior fellowships were not abandoned.^{20/} Thus, without reaching the point of a vote on whether to abandon fellowships, the Council moved off into a discussion of senior fellowship stipends.^{21/} A formal motion on stipends for the program was adopted which assumed that such a program would exist.^{22/}

* * * * *

The actions taken at the second Council meeting increased the number of program categories approved by the Council from 13 to 16. Three days after the Council meeting, on May 10, the Senate Appropriations Committee recommended funding for the Endowment of only \$2 million in fiscal 1967, and specified in its report that the funds were intended for (1) fellowships for young scholar-teachers; (2) summer fellowships; (3) grants to individual (mature) scholars; (4) studies of educational radio and television; and (5) talking books.^{23/} This left eleven programs to be funded from the 1966 appropriation of \$2.5 million.

Alternate proposals for the allocation of the 1966 funds were worked out by the special assistant to the Chairman, John Gardner, Both Dr. Moe's and his views were taken to Mr. Keeney for a decision. Gardner wrote on May 22,^{24/}

"Do we announce, and thereby solicit applications in, all the program areas approved by the Council at one time or another? The effect is some such distribution of funds as indicated on the paper marked 'A'. . . . or . . . Do we announce a few in which we can be reasonably certain of spending all funds on reasonable applications? One such program limitation and allocation of funds might be that on paper 'B'."

The papers sent to Mr. Keeney included a breakdown of applications by then received, of which the great preponderance were in the new general categories of scholarly research and research tools. Mr. Keeney replied on May 23 that he much preferred alternate "B", "because I think we would be wise to call our shots," and that because of the action of the Congress he did not feel the Endowment was bound to conduct programs in every area by then mentioned in speeches, correspondence, and in the one press release issued to that time.^{25/} Mr. Keeney proposed certain amendments in "B",^{26/} which were accepted by Dr. Moe and presented to the Council for approval at the third meeting in June.^{27/} This allocation, to which the Council made no objection,^{28/} was as follows:

A. Programs specified by the Senate Committee on Appropriations, with funds "to be distributed as follows":

For fellowships:	
--100 one-year fellowships for young scholar-teachers	\$750,000
--200 summer fellowships for scholar-teachers	300,000
For 50 grants to individual (mature) scholars	750,000

For studies of educational radio and television	\$100,000	
For "talking books" to be made available for other than blind persons	<u>100,000</u>	\$2,000,000

B. Other programs

For contingencies related to above fellowships and grants to mature scholars programs	\$200,000	
For editions of American authors	350,000	
For humanistic museums and historical societies	300,000	
For programs for progress in humanistic studies, including institutes and workshops	500,000	
For travel to international humanistic congresses	50,000	
For humanistic research projects, including archaeology	600,000	
For scholarly tools	300,000	
For special studies in history, particularly American history	<u>200,000</u>	<u>2,500,000</u>
Total available		\$4,500,000

C. Programs to be funded only as appropriate under other categories

1. Archaeological investigations (budget request \$100,000)
2. Publication subvention (budget request \$150,000)
3. Computer research (budget request \$350,000)
4. Papers of great Americans (budget request \$350,000)

Content of initial programs: "Programs for progress in humanistic studies"

Nothing has yet been said of the content of the several program areas, as distinguished from the titles given to programs and the funds allocated to them. In most of the areas for which money was allotted, the program titles were all that was needed to enable the staff and the Council to get down to the specific questions involved in implementation.

The signal exception was the program originally titled, in the February 15 budget, "Training Programs for Progress in Humanistic Studies." Some of the difficulties in arriving at a clear statement of purpose in this budget section have been noted above, namely, the lack of a usable body of experience for operating such programs and the need for a thorough familiarity with the relevant activities of the Office of Education--many of which were not readily identifiable as such. At least equally important was the necessity of narrowing down the scope of the Endowment's program, which might ideally have included something for every school, college, and university in the country, to match the possible funding for the program, which at best could only be some fraction of \$5 million.

At the first meeting of the Council, Dr. Moe recommended, for many of the programs proposed, the establishment of advisory panels including both members of the Council and scholars outside the Endowment.^{1/} Their function, presumably, was to be the giving of expert advice in particular scholarly fields, both by suggesting general program guidelines and by recommending for or against particular applications. In contrast to this approach, the agenda stated on training programs:

"There are many propositions for training programs already in our files but they are pretty standard stuff--fellowships, bibliographic tools, summer training institutes, etc.

"What we need are recommendations that have scope and guts and don't cost too much. I should like to have the Council act as a committee-of-the-whole on this subject; but this wouldn't work, so I shall suggest

"John Ehle
 . . . [the names of 12 other Council members followed]

"and any other members who will volunteer."^{2/}

The reasons for John Ehle's appointment as chairman of the committee have nowhere been set out. Although primarily a novelist, he had been involved with educational programs at the school level, had been with the Ford Foundation for the two years just preceding his appointment to the Council, and had before that been on the faculty of the University of North Carolina. Apart from John Letson, superintendent of the Atlanta Public Schools, he was perhaps the only Council member whose concern was as much with education in schools as in colleges and universities; and Ehle's interests also included educational programs outside traditional institutional structures.^{3/} It appears that Ehle expressed a wish to withdraw from the chairmanship after the first meeting of the Council but that the chairman and deputy chairman refused to accept his resignation.^{4/}

Discussion of educational programs at the first Council meeting^{5/} was exploratory. Some suggestions were made in terms of areas of possible activity--such as the schools, as opposed to higher education. Besides the schools, the main area brought up at the first meeting was the training of critics writing in newspapers and other periodicals for the general public. Later meetings added suggestions that the Endowment involve itself in legal education,^{6/} vocational education,^{7/} junior college programs,^{8/} and other areas.

A second kind of suggestion at the first meeting dealt with intellectual areas where improvements in teaching should be made. The fields mentioned included history, the arts, and classical languages.

Still a third sort of suggestion raised at early meetings focused

on the kinds of people the Endowment ought to try to reach. Minority groups were mentioned, and particularly Mexican-Americans, in whom one or two members of the Council had a special interest; gifted students were another; high school teachers another.

These several kinds of suggestions, of course, overlapped. A number of members cited particular projects with which they were familiar and which might suggest useful directions for the Endowment to follow. Such concrete examples involved all three dimensions; one program mentioned, for instance, was conducted by a university, dealt with the classics, and was directed to talented high school students. The Council was not yet ready to talk in broader terms about the priorities among the things that might be done.

The conclusions of the March Council meeting were that Mr. Ehle's committee on educational programs was enlarged by the appointment of several more Council members, plus Miss Kathryn Bloom, director of the Office of Education's arts and humanities program; a price tag of \$750,000 was assigned; and the scope of the program area was further broadened by deleting the word "training" from its title in order to cover informal as well as formal educational projects.^{9/}

The first meeting of the committee on educational programs was scheduled for May 5, the day before the second meeting of the Council. In preparation John Ehle spent a day in Washington during April going through the applications received so far.^{10/} The agenda he developed for the committee's meeting included two items based on the applications by then received; two more items on project ideas worked up by Council

members; and some more general discussion topics: one on teacher training and the relation between colleges and schools; another asking whether labor unions might have any role in Endowment programs; and another on the role of the Office of Education.^{11/} Ehle announced at the outset of the meeting that his purpose was not to decide on any specific grants but to "set down some guidelines and get the temperature of the group."^{12/}

The first item taken up was a project suggestion prepared by Mr. Ehle himself.^{13/} This called for Endowment sponsorship of three "national summer high schools," patterned after the Governor's School in North Carolina. The idea, as Ehle had expressed it at the first meeting, was that demonstration schools would let the country know what the Humanities Endowment was all about. "I am afraid," he had said, "we are going to have to get a campus and do it--maybe just for three months. It would be sort of 'a little light goes on for a time.'"^{14/} The proposal he had worked out for the May 5 meeting called for three schools, each to last for eight or ten weeks during the summer, and to involve high school students, high school teachers, and scholars or other "resource people" in developing and using good curricula or instructional ideas. Each school would be on a particular subject matter representing "major problems of high schools in America." The three areas with which he proposed to begin were American history, visual arts, and Mexican-American culture.

The proposal did not meet with favor in the committee. Mr. Keeney, Mr. Letson, and Miss Bloom all doubted whether demonstrations were the most effective way to get results in the improvement of teaching

over-all.^{15/} The pattern of National Science Foundation summer institutes, reaching a significant proportion of high school teachers and students nationwide, was raised as an alternative. The difficulty was that broad coverage could not be achieved with the funds available, then expected to be \$750,000 for the year.^{16/}

Two members of the committee picked up the theme of American history proposed for one of the summer high schools, wanting not "pure history" but an effort to relate history to current issues. The term "American heritage" was suggested as a substitute for "American history."^{17/} A little later Adelaide Hill, whose field was African studies, suggested that the concept of the American heritage needed to be broadened.^{18/} Six or seven African studies applications had been included on the agenda; her proposal was to bring African studies, the American heritage, and Mexican-American culture all together into one broader program area. The committee agreed.^{19/} Toward the close of the meeting, Mr. Ehle announced there was a consensus on emphasizing such an area, which he called "the cultures of the American peoples."^{20/} On the other subjects discussed he remarked that the committee did not yet have enough information to reach a conclusion.^{21/}

When the full Council met the next day, Mr. Ehle reported fully on all the threads of the discussion.^{22/} Among them were "professors to high schools and high school teachers to colleges," a subject on which the discussion had been inconclusive but in no way negative,^{23/} and an application for a conference on high school Latin teaching, which had been sidetracked when a member objected to the ad hoc consideration of

proposals without prior determination of the criteria for judgment.^{24/}

The report concluded:

"Out of our talking came the view that the scattering of our money over a variety of efforts would not result in much national impact or benefit, and that instead of being led about by the projects which come to us we should announce one or more programs and then solicit ideas and proposals accordingly.

"We discussed several possible programs and agreed on one: the cultures of the American peoples. By selecting it, the panel simply made known to itself and the staff that it stood ready to recommend investments in this field, should the staff bring to us proposals of special merit. These proposals might have to do with the history and culture of our country or of sub-groups in our country. Our panel is more or less limited to instructional matters, so in effect we are now seeking proposals which teach the American people about themselves, their history, their arts and other achievements, and their dignity and membership in this remarkable experience which is our country. Of the proposals we reviewed yesterday a few seem to fall within the boundaries of this specific program, though none was approved or rejected and none seem to be quite detailed enough.

". . .

"In conclusion, our panel has approved only one action. That approval was enthusiastic and unanimous. We recommend that the Council announce a program for educational projects dealing with the cultures of the American peoples and solicit project ideas and proposals in this field. . . ."^{25/}

Ehle then moved that the Council approve his committee's recommendation.^{26/} The first objection was made by Father Murray, a member of the committee, who said:

"Though I voted for this yesterday I am not sure I have anything adequate in mind [as to the content of the program]. Surely we aren't going to start analyzing the melting pot once more. More particularly, I don't understand how this bears on the humanities, the function and purpose of this Council."^{27/}

Mr. Odegaard added:

"We shouldn't adopt a program with no detailed document in front of the board. If members of the board ask what it means, think what the public will think."^{28/}

The upshot was a modification of Mr. Ehle's motion, by which the Council merely expressed interest in a program on the cultures of the American peoples and asked the staff to work up the idea further for continued Council consideration.^{29/}

Up to this point, midway in the second meeting of the Council, it appeared that the Chairman was delegating responsibility to Mr. Ehle and his committee for setting the direction of the Endowment's educational programs. The Chairman's next actions, however, intentionally or not, ignored the committee's jurisdiction. After the action on Mr. Ehle's report, the Chairman called separately on Dr. Else, the Council's classicist, to report on the proposal for a conference on Latin teaching^{30/} -- as to which no judgment had been reached in the Ehle committee, either on its merits or as a possible program area.^{31/} After the background of the proposal had been explained, the Chairman appointed an ad hoc committee, not drawn exclusively from the Ehle committee's members, to bring in a statement of position on the request.^{32/}

A little later the Chairman brought up an application,^{33/} submitted by the American Society of Papyrologists, asking support for a six-week training institute to be held during the summer of 1966. The application had been discussed at the March meeting as an example of a type of application received;^{34/} reactions had been favorable; and final action had been deferred only because of reservations about approving grants before a general canvass of potential applicants and about whether the Endowment's first grant should be in so esoteric a subject as papyrology.^{35/} The conclusion in March had been the Chairman's saying he

would use his own judgment in the matter;^{36/} and the proposal was placed on the May agenda for a further report by the Chairman.^{37/}

In May, there was again a long discussion on the propriety of making the grant immediately, without prior general announcement of the Endowment's program intentions.^{38/} One member tried to focus the discussion on the procedure for selecting applications to be approved,^{39/} to no avail. The question was also raised as to what category of the budget the grant fitted into; but neither was that question settled.^{40/} The conclusion was that the Chairman would bring the application back again at the June meeting.^{41/}

The Chairman next called on Miss Genauer to report on a possible program for the training of critics^{42/}--a matter which had been treated at the March meeting as within the Ehle committee's purview and discussed with considerable interest,^{43/} but which had not been raised since. At the end of the report, the Chairman again said he would appoint a committee, and made no reference to the Ehle committee's possible jurisdiction.^{44/}

* * * * *

Before the Council or the committee met again, the amount of the 1967 appropriation was settled at \$2 million rather than the \$5 million requested.^{45/} At the \$5 million level, the area of general educational programs was to have received \$750,000.^{46/} In the reallocation required for a \$2 million appropriation (giving a total available of \$4.5 million for fiscal 1966 and 1967 together), Mr. Keeney wrote that he would like to see general educational programs

"cut down to perhaps \$500,000, and the difference distributed among research projects and scholarly tools. I am a little nervous about some of the thinking that was evident at the panel and at the meeting of the Council itself on the broad field of educational projects, and I think we had better get hold of it before we spend an awful lot of money on it."^{47/}

Dr. Moe apparently had a similar opinion: he later wrote to Mr. Keeney,

"I'm pleased that you will come to the Ehle committee meeting /on June 22⁷: a lot of nonsense could come out of it. John Gardner and I are now preparing agenda items for the Ehle committee to try to crowd out the nonsense."^{48/}

* * * * *

The Council held its third meeting on June 23 and 24, 1966; the committee on general educational programs again met a day ahead, on June 22. Before that, however, on June 4, a few committee members had come together for a planning session.^{49/} The main business at this session was to try to pick up the loose ends left from the full Council's meeting in May. The session resulted in a tentative definition of general educational programs as covering four areas,^{50/} which were a simple aggregation of topics in which interest had at some time been expressed:

1. Contributions and participation by various subcultures in the American heritage.
2. Training of critics.
3. Humanistic institutes and teacher training.
4. Special projects, i. e., Shakespeare, classics.

In preparation for the June 22 meeting, the staff was asked to go through all applications on hand so that the committee might have before it information on those falling in the designated categories;^{51/} and Miss Genauer was asked to propose an experimental project on the training of

critics, showing if possible what might be accomplished with \$50,000 or \$100,000.^{52/}

When the full committee met again on June 22, Mr. Ehle reported on the four program areas, presenting the American heritage and the training of critics as areas of activity pretty well agreed upon.^{53/}

For the rest, he reported:

"On item 3 [humanistic institutes and teacher training], we knew least what to do under this item with the money we have-- \$500,000 for the year for the whole country. The estimates in these areas we came up with were beyond our means. We should be able to do for humanities what NSF does for science in the area of teacher training.

"Our purpose was to define our mission in such a way that we could eliminate proposals.

"Item 4 is 'special projects.' Having eliminated everything else, we put back in 'special projects,' which got us right back where we started. We were trying to set up some titles under which proposals coming in could be put for this panel.

"Believing we could not do everything, we did try to do the first two things. If we can get some money, we will do the third. We put down the fourth, recognizing that we couldn't eliminate everything."^{54/}

During the committee meeting, there was further discussion of the American heritage, or "cultures of the American peoples," program, and in that connection of Mr. Ehle's proposed summer school in American history. Mr. Keeney offered a counterproposal, also involving bringing students and teachers together, but which he suggested would be a more effective means "to improve teaching in the schools" and not just the individuals involved. Ehle acquiesced in delegating further work on the program to the staff.^{55/}

On the third program area, "humanistic institutes and teacher training," Ehle at one point asked, "Can't we make the judgment that we cannot afford teacher training institutes?" The answer was, "We have to have a rationale for the Papyrologists' institute."^{56/}

As for the training of critics, Miss Genauer reported that she had planned a pilot project and had discussed it with the Graduate School of Journalism at Columbia, "thinking we might start it there because of its location." The response, she said, was that "the dean wanted to start it at once"; "they said we don't need money from NEH; we have our own"; and that she herself had been invited to teach the course.^{57/} She was to let the school know the next Monday whether she would do so and hoped to be able to say that the Council supported the idea in principle.^{58/} This was repeated at the full Council meeting the next day: "They said they didn't need money. But they wanted me to start teaching. I would feel happier without the NEH name on it. I would feel freer to experiment."^{59/}

Some members of the Council, wishing to endorse the project publicly but fearing to bring in a flood of requests for endorsements of unknown projects, proposed a small grant to Columbia if use for the funds could be found.^{60/} Mr. Keeney tried unsuccessfully to remind the Council of the conflict-of-interest resolution it had adopted,^{61/} but the motion to recommend a grant was carried,^{62/} leading to some rather unpleasant negotiations later on.^{63/} The project did not ultimately receive Endowment support.^{64/}

The only other business accomplished in the area of education

programs at the June meeting was the recommendation for three grants, to the American Society of Papyrologists for its summer training institute; to the American Classical League for its conference on the teaching of Latin; and to the Frederick Douglass Institute for educational programs concerning the Negro's African heritage.^{65/}

Mr. Ehle again asked that the Council's interest in the cultures of the American peoples be publicly announced,^{66/} and the press release issued after the meeting, on June 29, did state that grants had been approved, and more would be, "to study the contributions to the American cultural heritage of the many national and racial strains represented in our population."^{67/} The formal announcement of programs for fiscal 1967, however, which came out in August 1966, referred only to "grants for general educational programs in humanistic subjects, including institutes and workshops, to improve and revitalize humanistic education."^{68/}

* * * * *

The Council's reactions in May and June 1966 to an educational program on the contributions of various subcultures to the American heritage are rather interesting to compare with their reactions to a not totally dissimilar program two years later. The Endowment's announcement of programs for fiscal 1969 states that it will give "high priority . . . to proposals attempting to relate humanistic instruction to . . . urban and minority problems";^{69/} one of the agency's most successful activities to date has been a series of workshops for college teachers on Negro history and culture, held during the summer of 1968;^{70/} and planning to enlarge these activities in fiscal 1970 is, in November 1968,

well under way--all with the Council's fullest approval.

In May and June 1966, the "cultures of the American peoples" program had the clear, express support of only two members of the Council, Mr. Ehle and Mrs. Hill. It was true that the Council as a whole was willing to consider particular grants within the concept, if the project were competitive with other kinds of applications: it voted a grant in June enthusiastically for the educational programs of Washington's Frederick Douglass Institute, a museum of African art and Negro history.^{71/} It was also true that Ehle had not argued the need for the program well. He did not talk about Negro history in particular but spoke as if every minority or immigrant group had an equally neglected history in which its members should be instructed. This was carried at least once to absurdity, when Dr. Moe, a Minnesotan of Scandinavian extraction, refused to own himself a member of a neglected minority.^{72/}

Nevertheless, the legitimate thrust of the program was clear enough for a receptive listener, and most of the Council were not receptive to Ehle's idea. It is inconceivable that Father Murray would have said two years later, "Surely we aren't going to start analyzing the melting pot once more?" At the close of the June 1966 meeting, there was a discussion that made it clear that most of the members felt what the Ehle committee had been proposing did not reach to the heart of education in the humanities at all. John Letson, of the Atlanta public schools, spoke of "the importance of keeping a relative balance in our activities." The concern he expressed was that the Endowment was in danger of overemphasizing the "upper level" of activities in the humani-

ties, as through research fellowships, and of losing sight of the need "to broaden the application of the general area of the humanities as the equipment of all citizens." "In the minds of too many people," he said, "the humanities are completely removed from the average citizen. Somehow we must reestablish the fact that it is the opposite, and that what we are really talking about are the basic insights that contribute to man's richness." Mr. Letson spoke particularly of the "educational experiences of children, elementary and high school," and of vocational education, in which he thought the humanities were apt to be so completely neglected that growing numbers of students would grow to maturity without even the minimum equipment for good citizenship.^{73/}

Mr. Letson's statement drew strong support from Dr. Moe, Mr. Keeney, Miss Bree, and other members of the Council. Dr. Moe's response was in terms of the great educational potential of historical museums;^{74/} Miss Bree's suggestion was that a program reaching in the right direction would be one to make widely available the classics of American literature in inexpensive, authoritative editions.^{75/} Mr. Keeney remarked, "This is what needed to be said at the last meeting."^{76/} No one suggested that the program on the "cultures of the American peoples" had any bearing on the aims being discussed. In short, by the end of the June 1966 meeting, the Council had reopened all the questions about the proper direction of "general educational programs" that it had been the Ehle committee's function to determine.

Further development of organization and staffing

As has already been noted, the Endowment had only four professional staff members during nearly all of Dr. Moe's tenure, of whom three were part of the immediate office of the Chairman. The planning for the use of additional professional staff, as it stood in mid-February 1966, called for the establishment of three offices to operate the Endowment's various programs and a fourth for work such as analyzing and coordinating the program operations. Early personnel plans would have called for these offices to be headed by one GS-16, one GS-15, and two GS-14's.^{1/}

On February 2, the deputy chairman proposed to raise all four jobs to GS-16's "on the ground that I saw no way to make a distinction of quality between function and required personnel for the several posts and was told this was as high as we could go."^{2/} By February 15, the proposed grade levels had been raised again to provide three GS-18's and one GS-16.^{3/} By this time the operating offices were being called the Division of Fellowships and Stipends, the Division of Research and Publications, and the Division of National, State, and Community Programs.^{4/}

In about the middle of March, it appears, either Mr. Broughton or the acting administrative officer of the Foundation, Merrill Collett, placed before Dr. Moe a set of papers aimed at carrying out the February 15 proposal.^{5/} There were a request to the head of the Civil Service Commission for Schedule A authority covering ten Endowment positions, a request that supergrades be assigned for four of them, a form 57 for Mrs. Hardy, for whom a GS-16 was asked as director of planning and analysis, and a

form 57 for Mr. Collett, for whom a GS-18 was requested as Director of the Division of National, State, and Community Programs. Dr. Moe did not approve the package.

Some of the complications involved in employing three grade 18's and a GS-16 as division directors had been mentioned in memoranda by both Mr. Broughton and Mr. Collett.^{6/} Collett had found that staff salaries for the Foundation as a whole in fiscal 1967--estimating on the basis of actual salaries or, for positions still vacant, on the basis of estimates in the 1967 budget request--would exceed the requested appropriation by about \$7,000. The budget submission had called only for grades 14, 15, and 16 for division heads. If three grade 18's were to be employed, the Foundation's deficit would be not \$7,000 but \$56,000--or more if the Congress appropriated less than the full administrative funds requested. Moreover, Mr. Broughton had been told, the assistant to each GS-18 division head would command a GS-17 or at least a GS-16, because "the Civil Service Commission takes a dismal view of a spread of more than one or two grades." He therefore proposed to eliminate altogether the directors' professional assistants, at least for the time being.

The mid-March draft request for Schedule A authority and three GS-18's may (or may not) have been the subject of Mr. Keeney's letter to Dr. Moe on April 5. Mr. Keeney hoped "that by the time you get this our flap will have subsided from Friday, April 17. . . . I hope it did some good." On about Friday, April 1, Mr. Collett left the Endowment permanently. He was shortly replaced by a new administrative officer,

Robert Cox.^{7/}

In Mr. Keeney's letter of April 5, and another of April 13, he commented on the organization and job descriptions then proposed, presumably those in the March 15 draft. The draft had said of the duties of the director of the Division of National, State, and Community Programs:

"The major responsibilities . . . include . . . the development, administration, and evaluation of pioneering national programs designed to provide grants to private individuals, groups, historical societies and local, state and Federal agencies engaged in the following activities:

"1. development of pilot projects concerning new and more interesting ways of presenting historical and archaeological exhibits at museums . . . ;

"2. preparing and presenting programs commemorating events of historical and cultural significance such as campaigns, discoveries, trials, famous speeches, etc.;

"3. restoring and identifying sites of interest to the American people such as battlefields, famous homes, scenes where discoveries were made or where important cultural events took place, etc.;

"4. preparation of special displays and exhibits concerning such subjects as contributions made by writers, inventors and other noted Americans; American industrial and social development; and other areas of special interest."^{8/}

Mr. Keeney wrote that he was uneasy about the division:

"I do not think, in the first place, that we want to get into the box of operating through locally-based programs, particularly if they are attached to political units. I think, moreover, that the whole intent of this division is different from what I would wish it to be. I hope to see it oriented toward bringing the humanities to the public, which is quite a different thing than what is described in the job description. . . ."^{9/}

He added that a GS-18 probably would not be needed. In a subsequent letter he added on the organization:

"It occurred to me this morning that the major defect in our proposed organization is the lack of emphasis on the improvement of teaching. I suggest, therefore, that the Division of National, State, and Community Programs be replaced by a Division of Teaching and Extramural Education. The job description would have to be changed to include a section on the development of programs to improve teaching in the humanities and social studies from the school through the graduate school and should emphasize collaboration with the Office of Education. It could then go on to talk about extramural education, particularly adult education, and probably some mention of leisure would be useful. It could then go on to include all the things that are presently included"^{10/}

On April 29, just a little over two weeks after Mr. Keeney's final comments on the organization, a formal request was submitted to the Civil Service Commission for Schedule A authority for a total of eight positions and for supergrades for two of the eight: a GS-16 for the Director of Planning and Analysis, and a GS-18 for the Director of Educational Programs and Special Projects--the latest title for what had been "State, National and Community Programs."^{11/} The latter request was shortly revised downward to a GS-16 as well.^{12/} The Civil Service Commission approved the Schedule A request on June 9, 1966, and Mrs. Hardy's supergrade not long afterward.^{13/} It took another six months to obtain approval of the second GS-16 position, but that created no immediate problem because no one to fill the position had yet been found.^{14/}

Footnotes

Footnotes, section IV (continued from volume I)

Development of initial programs (continued
from volume I) (pp. 92-96)

- 1/ 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").
- 2/ See Report of the Commission, pp. 11-14, on means for carrying out the functions of the proposed foundation.
- 3/ Public Law 89-10, April 11, 1965.
- 4/ Public Law 89-329, November 8, 1965.
- 5/ See 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 the Arts and Humanities of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, 89th Cong., 1st sess., Part 1, pp. 49, 61-62 (1965); U.S. Office of Education, "Notification to Members of Congress, NDEA Title IV Graduate Fellowship Program," Nov. 8, 1965 (not microfilmed).
- 6/ Earlier versions of the bill specifically authorized the agency, for example, to insure that "suitable means" are provided for

"educating and developing" teachers "at any stage of their growth" and "to support improved teaching at all levels of education by encouraging experiments in presentation and organization"

E.g., S. 111, 89th Cong., 1st sess. (1965), sections 10(a)(2) and 13(d); S. 316, 89th Cong., 1st sess. (1965), sections 7(a)(2) and 12(4).

7/ Quoted at page 50 above.

8/ 1967 Budget, p. 16.

9/ See letter from L. Quincy Mumford, Librarian of Congress, to Dr. Moe, Dec. 13, 1965; letter from Dr. Moe to Dr. Mumford, Dec. 20, 1965.

10/ 1967 Budget, "National Endowment for the Humanities," p. 1.

11/ Id. at 16.

12/ Id. at 21.

13/ Id. at 8.

14/ Id. at 15.

15/ Id. at 24.

16/ Id. at 15.

17/ Memorandum from Mr. Broughton to Dr. Moe, Feb. 6, 1966, page V.

- 18/ See letter of inquiry from William H. Willis to Dr. Moe, Jan. 27, 1966 (not microfilmed).

Presentation of the 1967 budget request (pp. 96-102)

- 1/ Department of the Interior and Related Agencies Appropriations for 1967, Hearings before a Subcommittee of the House Committee on Appropriations, 89th Cong., 2d sess., Part 3, p. 309 (1966).
- 2/ See letter from Dr. Moe to John W. Macy, Chairman, U. S. Civil Service Commission, March 2, 1966.
- 3/ See memorandum from Mr. Broughton to Dr. Moe, Feb. 14, 1966.
- 4/ Department of the Interior and Related Agencies Appropriations for 1969, Hearings before a Subcommittee of the House Committee on Appropriations, 90th Cong., 2d sess., Part 3, p. 784 (1968).
- 5/ 1967 Budget, pp. 4-7.
- 6/ Id. at 23-24.
- 7/ Id. at 24-25.
- 8/ Id. at 26.
- 9/ Reprinted in Hearings, note 1 above, pp. 306-7.
- 10/ Id. at 308.

11/ Id. at 308-9.

12/ Id. at 328.

13/ See id. at 275.

14/ Id. at 275-79.

15/ Id. at 289-91, 313.

16/ 112 Cong. Rec. 7685 (April 5, 1966).

First Council meeting: March 3-4, 1966 (pp. 102-107)

1/ See Minutes, first Council meeting, p. 5.

2/ Transcript of notes, first Council meeting, p. 3.

3/ Id. at 4.

4/ See Minutes, first Council meeting, p. 5.

5/ Transcript of notes, first Council meeting, p. 3.

6/ Agenda, first Council meeting, item VII, pp. 2-7.

7/ Id., item VIII, p. 7.

8/ See memorandum from Dr. Moe to members of the National Council on the Humanities, Feb. 17, 1966.

- 9/ Transcript of notes, first Council meeting, p. 7.
- 10/ Id. at 8-9, see also id. at 13-14.
- 11/ Id. at 11.
- 12/ Ibid.
- 13/ Id. at 5.
- 14/ Id. at 8-10.
- 15/ Id. at 10.
- 16/ Id. at 11.
- 17/ Minutes, first Council meeting, pp. 8-20, 24-26.
- 18/ Cf. pp. 95-96 above.
- 19/ See Minutes, first Council meeting, pp. 24-26.
- 20/ See transcript of notes, first Council meeting, p. 63.
- 21/ Id. at 63-65; cf. Minutes, first Council meeting, p. 11.
- 22/ Transcript of notes, first Council meeting, pp. 63-64.

Further developments on the 1967 appropriation:
March-May, 1966 (pp. 107-112)

- 1/ Letter from Dr. Moe to Senator Hayden, March 7, 1966; letter from Dr. Moe to Congressman Denton, March 8, 1966.

- 2/ Attachments to the letters cited in note 1 above, reprinted 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 3, pp. 1603-7 (1966).
- 3/ Ibid.
- 4/ H. R. 14215, 89th Cong., 2d sess. (1966); H. Rep. 1405, 89th Cong., 2d sess. (1966).
- 5/ H. Rep. 1405, 89th Cong., 2d sess., p. 36 (1966).
- 6/ Id. at 36-37.
- 7/ Ibid.
- 8/ For matching, the committee recommended, in accordance with the Administration's request, an appropriation "equal to the total amounts of gifts . . . received by the Endowments, during the current fiscal year . . . but not to exceed \$2,000,000 for the Endowment for the Arts and \$3,000,000 for the Endowment for the Humanities, less the amounts respectively appropriated to such Endowments for the purposes of section 11(b) in the Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1966." (H. R. 14215, 89th Cong., 2d sess. (1966); see The Budget of the United States Government, 1967--Appendix, p. 965 (1966).)

The effect of this language was to extend for another year the time during which the previous year's \$2 million and \$3 million could be drawn against.

- 9/ See note 8 above.
- 10/ Public Law 89-209, section 11(a).
- 11/ 112 Cong. Rec. 7650-91 (1966).
- 12/ Id. at 7684-86.
- 13/ Hearings cited in note 2 above, pp. 1559, 1603-11.
- 14/ Id. at 1543; see p. 68 above (volume I, Appendix A).
- 15/ Hearings cited in note 2 above, pp. 1608-9.
- 16/ S. Rep. 1154, 89th Cong., 2d sess., p. 33 (1966).
- 17/ Ibid.
- 18/ Ibid.
- 19/ 112 Cong. Rec. 10399, 10404 (May 12, 1966).
- 20/ H. Rep. 1538, 89th Cong., 2d sess. (1966).
- 21/ Public Law 89-435.

Further development of program categories for FY 1967 (pp.112-119)

- 1/ See appendix, page 157.
- 2/ See page 105 above.

- 3/ Transcript of notes, first Council meeting, March 1966, pp. 47-48.
- 4/ Id. at 65.
- 5/ Letter from Frederick Burkhardt to Dr. Moe, April 14, 1966.
For a microfilmed copy, see agenda papers for the second meeting of the Council, appendix M.
- 6/ Undated letter from Dr. Moe to Frederick Burkhardt.
- 7/ Letter from Frederick Burkhardt to Dr. Moe, April 21, 1966.
For a microfilmed copy, see agenda papers for the second meeting of the Council, appendix K.
- 8/ Transcript of notes, second Council meeting, May 1966, pp. 39-40 (first series of page numbers).
- 9/ Id. at 31-32 (second series of page numbers).
- 10/ Id. at 32 (second series of page numbers).
- 11/ Minutes, first Council meeting, March 1966, pp. 9-13, 19.
- 12/ Id. at 9.
- 13/ See attachment to letters from Dr. Moe to Senator Hayden, March 7, 1966, and to Congressman Denton, March 8, 1966, reprinted 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 3, pp. 1603-7, at 1604 (1966).

14/ E.g., address by Dr. Moe before the Southern Humanities Conference, Auburn, Alabama, April 1, 1966; "General Information on Programs to be Supported," draft program announcement, in agenda books for second Council meeting, May 1966, appendix F.

15/ For example:

"What provision if any is there for support of group or institutional research or studies, other than computer oriented, if . . . [grants for mature scholars are] narrowly viewed as grants to individuals only?" (Memorandum from Roland Peterson, grant management officer of the Foundation, to John B. Gardner, April 20, 1966.)

"[H]ow are stipends to be determined? Are they to be based on the man's salary for some period of time, or on a project budget? Should we aim for a \$15,000 average if it means eliminating some good but expensive proposals?" (Memorandum from Anne von der Lieth to Dr. Moe, April 28, 1966, not microfilmed.)

". . . NSF senior postdoctoral fellowships . . . are not to be used for 'research projects as such.' Should the Endowment follow this pattern, or is it inappropriate in the absence of a separate large-scale program of research support?" (Draft agenda for second Council meeting, April 30, 1966, not microfilmed.)

"Should the Endowment distinguish between grants to individuals for research projects and fellowship grants? (If . . . [fellowships do not include indirect costs and provision for research and secretarial assistance], then there may be few categories in the programs approved by the Humanities Council on March 3-4 which will specifically permit general research in the humanities by individuals unless the individual leaves his home institution and foregoes secretarial or research assistance. . . .)" ("Guidelines to accompany general information statement and application forms being developed for release by the Endowment," unsigned memorandum by John Gardner, agenda books for second Council meeting, May 1966, appendix F.)

16/ Agenda papers for second Council meeting, May 1966, appendix E.

- 17/ Transcript of notes, second Council meeting, May 1966, pp. 15-16 (first series of page numbers); see Minutes, second Council meeting, p. 7.
- 18/ Transcript of notes, second Council meeting, May 1966, p. 20 (first series of page numbers).
- 19/ Id. at 16 (second series of page numbers); and "Fellowship Stipends," written version of committee report, microfilmed as an attachment to transcript of notes.
- 20/ "Fellowship Stipends," note 19 above.
- 21/ Transcript of notes, second Council meeting, May 1966, pp. 16-20 (second series of page numbers).
- 22/ Id. at 20; Minutes, second Council meeting, May 1966, p.6.
- 23/ See p. 111 above.
- 24/ Letter from John Gardner to Mr. Keeney, May 22, 1966, with attachments.
- 25/ Letter from Mr. Keeney to Dr. Moe, May 23, 1966.
- 26/ Ibid.
- 27/ Agenda, third Council meeting, June 1966, item III.
- 28/ Minutes, third Council meeting, June 1966, pp. 3-4.

Content of initial programs: "Programs for
progress in humanistic studies" (pp. 119-133)

- 1/ Agenda, first Council meeting, March 1966, pp. 3-7.
- 2/ Id. at 5.
- 3/ Primarily from biographical data supplied by Mr. Ehle (not micro-filmed).
- 4/ See letter from Philip Broughton to Mr. Ehle, April 13, 1966.
- 5/ Transcript of notes, first Council meeting, March 1966, pp. 33-46;
Minutes, first Council meeting, pp. 13-17.
- 6/ "A Few Areas Needing Support to Promote the Humanistic Tradition in
the Study of Law," memorandum by David R. Mason, in agenda papers,
meeting of the Committee on Programs for Humanistic Studies, June 22,
1966; transcript of notes on meeting, pp. 12-15.
- 7/ See Minutes, fourth Council meeting, September 1966, p. 7.
- 8/ Ibid.
- 9/ Minutes, first Council meeting, March 1966, pp. 17, 25.
- 10/ See letter from Philip Broughton to Mr. Ehle, April 13, 1966.
- 11/ See agenda, Panel on Programs in the Humanities, May 5, 1966.
- 12/ Transcript of notes, meeting of Ehle committee, May 5, 1966, p. 1.

- 13/ "Three National Schools Dealing with Major Problems in High Schools in America," in agenda papers, second Council meeting, May 1966, appendix H-1.
- 14/ Transcript of notes, first Council meeting, March 1966, p. 35.
- 15/ Transcript of notes, meeting of Ehle committee, May 5, 1966, pp. 2-3, 5-6.
- 16/ Id. at 4, 5-6.
- 17/ Id. at 4-6.
- 18/ Id. at 6.
- 19/ Id. at 14.
- 20/ Id. at 15, 19-20.
- 21/ Id. at 20.
- 22/ Transcript of notes, second Council meeting, May 1966, pp. 21-22 (first series of page numbers); and written version of committee report, attached to transcript.
- 23/ Transcript of notes, meeting of Ehle committee, May 5, 1966, pp. 7-9.
- 24/ Id. at 10-12.
- 25/ Transcript of notes, second Council meeting, May 1966, p. 21 (first series of page numbers); and written version of committee report,

attached to transcript.

26/ Transcript of notes, second Council meeting, May 1966, p. 23 (first series of page numbers).

27/ Ibid.

28/ Ibid.

29/ Id. at 25-26.

30/ Id. at 26.

31/ See note 24 above.

32/ Transcript of notes, second Council meeting, May 1966, p. 27 (first series of page numbers).

33/ Id. at 29.

34/ Minutes, first Council meeting, March 1966, p. 23; id. at 10; agenda, first Council meeting, item X. For a copy of the application, see agenda papers, first Council meeting, appendix XVIII.

35/ Minutes, first Council meeting, March 1966, p. 23.

36/ Ibid.

37/ Agenda, second Council meeting, May 1966, item IX.

38/ Transcript of notes, second Council meeting, May 1966, pp. 29-34 (first series of page numbers).

39/ Id. at 32, 33.

40/ Id. at 32.

41/ Id. at 34.

42/ Ibid.

43/ Minutes, first Council meeting, March 1966, pp. 16-17.

44/ Transcript of notes, second Council meeting, May 1966, p. 37.

45/ See pp. 111-12 above.

46/ See p. 108 above.

47/ Letter from Mr. Keeney to Dr. Moe, May 23, 1966.

48/ Letter from Dr. Moe to Mr. Keeney, June 13, 1966.

49/ See transcript of notes, meeting of Ehle committee, June 4, 1966.

50/ Id. at 3.

51/ Id. at 5-6, 11.

52/ Id. at 10.

53/ Transcript of notes, meeting of Ehle committee, June 22, 1966, p. 1.

54/ Ibid.

55/ Id. at 10-12.

56/ Id. at 27.

57/ Id. at 3-4.

58/ Id. at 7.

59/ Transcript of notes, third Council meeting, June 1966, p. 66.

60/ Transcript of notes, meeting of Ehle committee, June 22, 1966, pp. 4, 7, 9; transcript of notes, third Council meeting, June 1966, pp. 25, 27-29, 64.

61/ Transcript of notes, meeting of Ehle committee, June 22, 1966, p. 9; see transcript of notes, third Council meeting, June 1966, p. 29 (motion designed to avoid the issue).

62/ Transcript of notes, third Council meeting, June 1966, p. 66.

63/ See generally transcript of notes, fifth Council meeting, January 1967, pp. 44-54.

64/ See Minutes, fifth Council meeting, January 1967, p. 219.

65/ Minutes, third Council meeting, June 1966, pp. 8-9.

66/ Transcript of notes, third Council meeting, June 1966, pp. 66-69.

67/ NEH press release, "National Endowment for the Humanities Announces Initial Programs," June 29, 1966, pp. 4-5.

68/ NEH, "Program Information 1967."

- 69/ NEH, "Program Information 1969," p. 2.
- 70/ See NEH press release, "Humanities Endowment Awards Grants for Workshops on Negro History and Culture," July 17, 1968.
- 71/ Transcript of notes, third Council meeting, June 1966, pp. 25-26, 66-69.
- 72/ Transcript of notes, meeting of Ehle committee, June 4, 1966, p. 11.
- 73/ Transcript of notes, third Council meeting, June 1966, pp. 81-82.
- 74/ Id. at 82.
- 75/ Ibid.
- 76/ Ibid.

Further development of organization and staffing (pp. 134-137)

- 1/ See pages 38-43 above.
- 2/ Memorandum from Philip Broughton to Dr. Moe, February 2, 1966.
- 3/ Handwritten memorandum from Philip Broughton to Merrill Collett, attaching draft memorandum from Dr. Moe to John Macy, Feb. 15, 1966.
- 4/ Ibid.
- 5/ Draft letter from Dr. Moe to John Macy dated March 15, 1966, with

attachments, bearing a note in the handwriting of Dr. Moe's secretary, "Received by Dr. Moe 3-22-66--not signed or mailed yet, 3-31-66."

- 6/ Memorandum from Philip Broughton to Dr. Moe, March 18, 1966; memorandum from Merrill Collett to Dr. Moe and Roger Stevens, March 15, 1966.
- 7/ Although, according to personnel records (not microfilmed), Mr. Collett's appointment did not terminate until May 6, 1966, his successor, Mr. Cox, was appointed on April 3.
- 8/ Attachment to letter cited in note 5 above.
- 9/ Letter from Mr. Keeney to Dr. Moe, April 5, 1966.
- 10/ Letter from Mr. Keeney to Dr. Moe, April 13, 1966.
- 11/ Letter from Dr. Moe to John Macy, April 29, 1966.
- 12/ See letter from Dr. Moe to John Macy, May 19, 1966.
- 13/ Letter from O. Glenn Stahl, Director, Bureau of Policies and Standards, U. S. Civil Service Commission, to Dr. Moe, June 9, 1966; on approval of the GS-16 see unmailed memorandum from Dr. Moe to Donald Harvey, Director, Bureau of Recruiting and Examining, U. S. Civil Service Commission; attached memorandum from John Gardner to Dr. Moe; and personnel records (not microfilmed) showing Mrs. Hardy's appointment at a GS-16 on July 11, 1966.

14/ See memoranda to the file by Mr. Keeney, July 20 and 21, 1966; letter from John Macy to Mr. Keeney, August 10, 1966; letter from Mr. Keeney to Mr. Macy, September 1, 1966; letter from Seymour S. Berlin, Director, Bureau of Executive Manpower, U. S. Civil Service Commission, to Dr. Moe, December 5, 1966.

Appendix

Appendix: Documentary SupplementContents

	<u>Page</u>
NEH program announcements, fiscal year 1967	
1) Program Information 1967	157
2) Post-Doctoral Fellowships and 1967 Summer Stipends for Younger Teacher-Scholars in the Humanities	161
Papers cited but not microfilmed	
1) Letter from Frederick Burkhardt, President, American Council of Learned Societies, to Dr. Moe, April 14, 1966	165
2) Letter from Philip S. Broughton to John Ehle, April 13, 1966	167

NATIONAL FOUNDATION ON THE ARTS AND THE HUMANITIES

1800 G STREET, N.W., WASHINGTON, D.C. 20506



National Endowment for the Humanities

PROGRAM INFORMATION

1967

PURPOSE OF THE ENDOWMENT

The Endowment was established by Congress to develop and encourage the pursuit of a national policy for the promotion of progress and scholarship in the humanities; to initiate and support research and programs to strengthen the research potential of the United States in the humanities; to award fellowships and grants to institutions or individuals for training and workshops in the humanities; to foster the inter-change of information in the humanities; to foster public understanding and appreciation of the humanities; and to support the publication of scholarly works in the humanities.

It is the intention of the National Endowment for the Humanities to support inquiry into the unknown, the unidentified, and the misinterpreted in man's humanistic heritage. It is also the intention of the National Endowment to serve the public educational interest in ways not always possible through the teaching media of our schools. It will give assistance to the two great acts of education—discovery, and teaching what is discovered—as it carries out the will of the Congress.

The term "humanities" as defined in Public Law 89-209, the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities Act of 1965, "includes, but is not limited to, the study of the following: language, both modern and classical; linguistics; literature; history; jurisprudence; philosophy; archeology; the history, criticism, theory, and practice of the arts; and those aspects of the social sciences which have humanistic content and employ humanistic methods."

PROGRAMS APPROVED FOR SUPPORT BY THE NATIONAL COUNCIL ON THE HUMANITIES

A. POST-DOCTORAL FELLOWSHIPS AND SUMMER STIPENDS

The National Endowment for the Humanities will initiate, to commence in the summer of 1967, two programs of post-doctoral fellowships to provide support for younger scholar-teachers of great promise. These programs will provide summer and six to eight month fellowships to individuals within five years of the Ph.D. Candidates for these fellowships must be nominated by their institutions by October 10, 1966, and each institution may nominate only one candidate. Announcement of the details will be made separately to heads of institutions. The award of pre-doctoral fellowships is not now contemplated.

B. SENIOR FELLOWSHIPS

The Humanities Endowment will offer, in addition to the summer and six to eight month fellowships for younger scholar-teachers, senior fellowships to individuals of already distinguished achievement as humanists.

These fellowships will carry a maximum stipend of \$15,000, but may not exceed the individual's present salary. An individual whose salary exceeds \$15,000 may supplement his award from the Endowment with funds from other sources **provided** that the total compensation, exclusive of travel and costs, in the form of grants and salary does not exceed the individual's present salary rate. In the event of excess compensation, the award from the Endowment will be reduced accordingly. In addition to his stipend, the recipient of one of these fellowships may receive, when justifiable, travel expenses for himself and dependents, round trip to one institution in the United States or abroad with a maximum allowance of \$2,000. Allowances for travel to foreign institutions will be paid only when American (U. S.) flag carriers are used. First-class accommodations are not authorized unless no other means of transportation are available. Payment for costs (of supplies, etc.) associated with the individual's proposal will be negotiated.

Proposals for these fellowships may be made in any field of the humanities within the scope of Public Law 89-209, the Statute which established this Endowment.

Applications for senior fellowships must be submitted by October 17, 1966, to be considered for awards to be announced February 1, 1967.

C. SUPPORT FOR PROJECTS

Proposals in the following categories may be made in any field of the humanities as defined in Public Law 89-209. Proposals may be submitted either by individuals or institutions unless otherwise specified. Applications must be submitted by October 17, 1966, to be considered for awards to be announced February 1, 1967. Except for category 8, awards will be made from funds appropriated by Public Law 89-309.

- 1) Grants for scholarly research projects in the humanities, including humanistic archeological excavations.
- 2) Grants for the support and development of bibliographies, indexes, and other aids to scholarship in the humanities.
- 3) Limited grants, to be made through appropriate American learned societies, for travel to international scholarly meetings by individuals. Applications will be made directly to the appropriate society.
- 4) Grants for the preparation of comprehensive scholarly editions of important American authors.
- 5) Grants for general educational programs in humanistic subjects, including institutes and workshops, to improve and revitalize humanistic education.
- 6) Grants for educational programs in humanistic museums and historical societies.
- 7) Grants for special studies in history, especially American history (including biography).
- 8) Grants for the preparation of "talking books" to be made available to other than blind persons.

In addition to the programs above, the National Endowment for the Humanities will accept proposals in the categories listed below. They will be considered for support if funds become available.

- 9) Grants for editing and publishing the papers of great Americans, both of the Founding Fathers and of other statesmen, philosophers, scientists, and artists.
- 10) Grants to assist publication of first-rate humanistic manuscripts and translations, classical, medieval, and modern.
- 11) Grants for development of humanistically oriented computer research, and for training programs in data processing techniques for humanistic studies.

The National Endowment for the Humanities hopes to help create a climate for scholarship in which programs can be developed which are valuable enough and broad enough to be felt throughout the nation. As a part of that task the Humanities Endowment will undertake study of ways to make better use of educational television, radio, and films. The function of the Humanities Endowment relates in many different ways to the educational process. The kinds and range of proposals that the Endowment will entertain, as indicated above, are a beginning. The Endowment will welcome proposals outside of these program areas for future consideration, but at this time will emphasize the areas designated.

WHO MAY APPLY

Requests for grant support of proposals in the above areas may be submitted by individuals, colleges and universities, public agencies, and private nonprofit groups and organizations. Applications from private profit organizations and foreign institutions will **not** be considered nor, at this time, applications from individuals of foreign nationality, unless they have been lawfully admitted for permanent residence in the United States (including the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa, or the Virgin Islands).

WHERE TO GET INFORMATION

Inquiries or requests for application forms for **senior** fellowships and for project grants should be addressed to:

National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities
Office of Grants
1800 G Street, N. W.
Washington, D. C. 20506

1970-71

1970-71

Faint, illegible text, likely bleed-through from the reverse side of the page.

**NATIONAL FOUNDATION ON THE ARTS
AND THE HUMANITIES**

**NATIONAL ENDOWMENT FOR THE HUMANITIES
1800 G STREET NW., WASHINGTON, D.C. 20506**

OFFICIAL BUSINESS

**POSTAGE AND FEES PAID
NATIONAL FOUNDATION ON THE ARTS
AND THE HUMANITIES**

Faint, illegible text, likely bleed-through from the reverse side of the page.

NATIONAL FOUNDATION ON THE ARTS AND THE HUMANITIES

1800 G STREET, N.W., WASHINGTON, D.C. 20506



National Endowment for the Humanities

POST - DOCTORAL FELLOWSHIPS

AND

1967 SUMMER STIPENDS

For Younger Teacher-Scholars In The Humanities

Closing Date For Receipt Of
Nomination Papers: October 10, 1966
Awards Announced March 1, 1967

REQUIREMENTS FOR BOTH PROGRAMS

Candidates for both programs must be within five years after completion of the Ph.D. or equivalent professional training. They must be citizens or nationals of the United States or have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence. Awards will be for the academic year 1967-68 and for the summer of 1967. Nominations for these awards should imply that the nominee has a bright future as both a teacher and a scholar.

The humanities, for purposes of these fellowships, include but are not limited to, the study of the following: language, both modern and classical; linguistics; literature; history; jurisprudence; philosophy; archeology; the history, criticism, theory, and practice of the arts; and those aspects of the social sciences which have humanistic content and employ humanistic methods.

SUMMER STIPENDS

Institutions in the United States (including the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa, and the Virgin Islands) are invited to nominate one individual each, on the basis of his teaching and productivity in scholarship, for a summer stipend to provide two months of free time for study, writing, and research. Institutions, in this context, are defined as colleges, universities, museums, historical societies, and special libraries. Candidates will be rated by regional panels and then by a national panel which will recommend individuals to the National Endowment for the Humanities for awards. Approximately 200 awards will be made for the summer of 1967, including, so far as practicable, at least one award in each state.

The stipend will be two-ninths of the individual's 1966-67 academic year salary at the rate prevailing as of October 10, 1966, for individuals whose institutions pay salaries on a nine-month basis. For institutions with a differing contract formula, the stipend will be adjusted accordingly. Nominees may not receive other fellowship support during the tenure of this award.

Institutional nominations must be made by a letter signed by an individual authorized to commit the nominating institution. Completed application papers from the nominee should be forwarded **with** the nominating letter.

POST-DOCTORAL FELLOWSHIPS

Institutions in the United States (including the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa, and the Virgin Islands) are invited to nominate one individual each, on the basis of his teaching and productivity in scholarship, for a fellowship to provide six to eight months of released time for study, writing, and research, the length of time to depend on the nature of the individual's proposal. Institutions, in this context, are defined as colleges, universities, museums, historical societies, and special libraries. Candidates will be rated by regional panels and then by a national panel which will recommend individuals to the National Endowment for the Humanities for awards. Approximately 100 awards will be made on March 1, 1967, including, so far as practicable, at least one award in each state.

Nominees should apply for six to eight months of released time from a period including the 1967-68 academic year and the summers of 1967 and 1968. Determination of the length of time to be covered by the award shall be the prerogative of the National Endowment for the Humanities. The stipend will be the salary actually to be received by the nominee for the comparable months in 1966-67. For that reason the nominee should specify the exact months for which he requests his award, e.g., July 1967 through January 1968; January 1968 through August 1968; September 1967 through March 1968; or whatever period best fits the needs of the individual and his institution. A nominee may not receive other fellowship support nor may he accept sabbatical salary during the tenure of this award. However, a fellowship and a sabbatical may be sequential.

In addition to the stipend these fellowships will include, when justified, an allowance for travel to one institution, for the fellow only, one way within the United States or round trip abroad. Allowances for travel to foreign institutions will be paid only when American (U. S.) flag carriers are used. First-class accommodations are not authorized unless no other means of transportation are available. An allowance of up to \$150 for costs of research will be paid when justified, as well as an institutional allowance of up to \$500 for the institution where the fellow will do his work, if the institution requests it.

Institutional nominations must be made by a letter signed by an individual authorized to commit the nominating institution. Completed application papers from the nominee should be forwarded **with** the nominating letter.

FORMS AND INSTRUCTIONS

Forms and instructions for both programs are enclosed herewith. All material must reach the Endowment by October 10, 1966, and should be addressed to:

National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities
Office of Grants
1800 G Street, N. W.
Washington, D. C. 20506

Awards will be announced on March 1, 1967.

**NATIONAL FOUNDATION ON THE ARTS
AND THE HUMANITIES**

**NATIONAL ENDOWMENT FOR THE HUMANITIES
1800 G STREET NW., WASHINGTON, D.C. 20506**

OFFICIAL BUSINESS

**POSTAGE AND FEES PAID
NATIONAL FOUNDATION ON THE ARTS
AND THE HUMANITIES**



AMERICAN COUNCIL OF LEARNED SOCIETIES

345 EAST 46TH STREET, NEW YORK, NEW YORK 10017

CABLE ADDRESS: ACOLSOC NEWYORK

TELEPHONE: YUKON 6-7393

April 14, 1966

Dr. Henry Allen Moe
National Endowment for the Humanities
1800 G Street, N. W.
Washington, D. C. 20506

Dear Henry,

It seemed to me that a summary record of our talk on April 5 might be useful to both of us, so I would like you to look the following over and correct or add as you think necessary.

1. Fellowship Programs.

a) On the summer fellowship program: I agreed to submit a description of it and how ACLS would administer it. You will receive this next week.

b) We discussed other possible fellowship and grant activities and their relationship to the on-going ACLS activities. I raised the general question of the Endowment's using the ACLS as its operational agency for administration of such programs, as the NSF now uses NAS/NRC.

2. Publication Subsidy Program.

You informed me that, although no publication subsidy program was listed in your statement of March 20, the Endowment is definitely authorized to set up such a program and plans to do so.

3. Study of needs of learned and professional societies.

We agreed that such a study might result in a good many cooked-up needs and requests and that it would be sufficient to see to it that the Endowment's policies and programs were given wide publicity among all the learned societies, leaving it to their initiative to present requests.

APR 15 1966

Dr. Henry Allen Moe
April 14, 1966
Page 2

4. Support of Studies in Chinese Civilization.

You stated that you would prefer that consideration of the proposal in this area submitted by the ACLS be deferred without prejudice until the longer range prospects for budget and program were clarified.

5. Participation by U.S. in International Scholarly Activities.

You asked me to write a letter defining the problem and suggesting what might be done about it. This letter is enclosed.

6. Basic Research Tool Works.

You expressed agreement with my view that these works were an important category and indicated that applications for assistance would be given consideration by the Endowment.

It was very good to have a chance to discuss these and other matters with you. I hope that by this time the outlook for increased appropriations is brightening.

In any case, my warm good wishes go to you.

Yours sincerely

Fred

Frederick Burkhardt
President

Enclosure

April 13, 1966

Mr. John M. Ehle
104 Cascade Avenue
Winston-Salem, North Carolina

Dear Mr. Ehle:

The attached notice of meeting has been mailed today to all the members of your committee. Dr. Moe has suggested that you come either on April 19th or the morning of the 20th. He was not impressed by your desire to withdraw from the chairmanship, and indeed when I mentioned to him the several ideas you expressed to me over the phone, he felt even surer that he had been right when he appointed you.

At this writing, I have not talked with Bob Spike. I reached his office on the telephone and dictated a message to his secretary with instructions that he telephone me collect if he wanted to know more. It may turn out that he will telephone you instead.

Tentatively our intention is to provide for your committee meeting the same NSF conference room where the Council will meet on the following two days. If the prospect of a dinner is a factor and you prefer to be elsewhere let me know. There are, of course, nearby restaurants and a superlative cafeteria in the basement of the building is open for dinner, not crowded but lacks a bar. But that indeed might be the most innovative element a Washington conference has produced for years.

Tomorrow I will check on the availability of Miss Bloom on Tuesday and Wednesday. She was not available today.

Don't hesitate to call me collect at Area Code 202 382-7465 any time we can be of help in preparing for your visit. If you should call when I am not available Anne von der Lieth can take the call and make any arrangements that you request for your reconnaissance.

Sincerely yours,

Philip S. Broughton
Deputy Chairman

CR'p

1