REPORT OF

THE COMMISSION ON THE HUMANITIES

In the eyes of posterity, the success of the United States as a civilized society will be largely judged by the creative activities of its citizens in art, architecture, literature, music, and the sciences.

THE PRESIDENT'S COMMISSION
ON NATIONAL GOALS [1960]

Copies may be obtained without charge from:

THE AMERICAN COUNCIL OF LEARNED SOCIETIES

345 East 46th Street, New York, N. Y. 10017

Library of Congress Catalog Card Number 64:22353

Contents not copyright

CONTENTS

	Page
Sponsors' Foreword	V
Letter of Transmittal	VII
Members of the Commission on the Humanities	VIII
Report of the Commission on the Humanities	1
Appendix A: The Humanities and the Schools	17
Appendix B: Libraries for the Humanities	31
Supplement: Reports from Twenty-four Learned Societies	47

I must study politics and war that my sons may have liberty to study mathematics and philosophy. My sons ought to study mathematics and philosophy, geography, natural history and naval architecture, navigation, commerce, and agriculture, in order to give their children a right to study painting, poetry, music, architecture. . . .

JOHN ADAMS

SPONSORS' FOREWORD

Increasingly during the past few years concern has been expressed about the condition, in this country, of those fields of intellectual activity generally called the humanities. Responding to that concern, the American Council of Learned Societies, the Council of Graduate Schools in the United States, and the United Chapters of Phi Beta Kappa – each closely linked to humanistic endeavor – decided to join as co-sponsors of a National Commission on the Humanities. The Commission was asked to consider the state of the humanities in America and to report its findings and recommendations to the sponsoring organizations.

The Commission began its work early in 1963 and delivered its *Report* on April 30, 1964. In the opinion of the sponsors, the findings of the Commission, and its recommendation, offer guide lines of great potential significance to the progress of the humanities in the United States. The *Report* is therefore being widely distributed among persons who can – and, it is hoped, will – assist in bringing to actuality the recommendation of the Commission.

The *Report* stresses two fundamental points: (1) that expansion and improvement of activities in the humanities are in the national interest and consequently deserve financial support by the federal government; and (2) that federal funds for this purpose should be administered by a new independent agency to be known as the National Humanities Foundation.

On the first of these points the sponsors believe that there is no room for debate.

There has, however, been considerable discussion of the question of establishing a new agency rather than working through a presently existing one. It is therefore of particular interest that the Commission recommends a new, independent agency as the more desirable solution. With this conclusion the three sponsoring organizations agree. As they see it, an independent National Humanities Foundation would be more effective not only in meeting the needs of the humanities in the United States, but also in helping to correct the view of those who see America as a nation interested only in the material aspects of life and Americans as a people skilled only in gadgeteering. Mindful of the admirable record of the National Science Foundation, the three sponsoring organizations also believe that an independent agency, governed and staffed by men

who enjoy the confidence of the scholarly community, offers our best assurance against the dangers of government control.

Finally, the three sponsors of the National Commission on the Humanities wish to express their deep appreciation to the members of the Commission for their work.

AMERICAN COUNCIL OF LEARNED SOCIETIES
COUNCIL OF GRADUATE SCHOOLS IN THE UNITED STATES
UNITED CHAPTERS OF PHI BETA KAPPA

BARNABY C. KEENEY,
Chairman

HERMAN B. WELLS,
Vice Chairman

KINGMAN BREWSTER, JR.
CARL BRIDENBAUGH
PAUL H. BUCK
EDGAR M. CARLSON
ARTHUR H. DEAN
WILLIAM K. FRANKENA
E. PENDLETON HERRING
REV. THEODORE M. HESBURGH
HAROLD HOWE II
DEVEREUX C. JOSEPHS
CLARK KERR
ROBERT M. LUMIANSKY
WHITNEY J. OATES
HENRI M. PEYRE
MINA S. REES
ANDREW C. RITCHIE
GLENN T. SEABORG
THOMAS J. WATSON, JR.

CHARLES BLITZER
Staff Director

SPONSORING ORGANIZATIONS:
The American Council of Learned Societies
The Council of Graduate Schools in the United States
The United Chapters of Phi Beta Kappa

THE COMMISSION ON THE HUMANITIES
345 East 46th Street, New York 17, N.Y. Telephone: Yukon 6-7393

Letter of Transmittal
to the American Council of Learned Societies,
the Council of Graduate Schools in the United States,
and the United Chapters of Phi Beta Kappa

30 April 1964

The Commission on the Humanities, which you have sponsored, has met frequently during the past year and has prepared the enclosed report, which recommends the establishment of a National Humanities Foundation. The Commission is unanimously in support of the principles that underlie the recommendations and the recommendations themselves. Such dissent as there is relates to matters of expression and not to principles.

We recommend that the three societies take appropriate steps to promote the establishment of a National Humanities Foundation, particularly the enactment of legislation authorizing the appointment of the board of the National Humanities Foundation and the director and staff, and the appropriation of funds for organization and planning. We would hope that the board and the director would then conduct further studies and recommend an appropriation to the Congress.

This Commission is willing to continue in existence and to assist in the achievement of these ends if you so desire.

Sincerely yours,

Barnaby C. Keeney

THE COMMISSION ON THE HUMANITIES

BARNABY C. KEENEY, CHAIRMAN
PRESIDENT, BROWN UNIVERSITY

HERMAN B. WELLS, VICE CHAIRMAN
CHANCELLOR, INDIANA UNIVERSITY

KINGMAN BREWSTER, JR.
PRESIDENT, YALE UNIVERSITY

CARL BRIDENBAUGH
PROFESSOR OF HISTORY
BROWN UNIVERSITY

PAUL H. BUCK
DIRECTOR
HARVARD UNIVERSITY LIBRARY

EDGAR M. CARLSON
PRESIDENT
GUSTAVUS ADOLPHUS COLLEGE

ARTHUR H. DEAN
SENIOR PARTNER
SULLIVAN AND CROMWELL

WILLIAM K. FRANKENA
PROFESSOR OF PHILOSOPHY
UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

PENDLETON HERRING
PRESIDENT
SOCIAL SCIENCE RESEARCH COUNCIL

REV. THEODORE M. HESBURGH, C.S.C.
PRESIDENT, UNIVERSITY OF NOTRE DAME

HAROLD HOWE II
SUPERINTENDENT OF SCHOOLS
SCARSDALE, NEW YORK

DEVEREUX C. JOSEPHS
FORMER CHAIRMAN
NEW YORK LIFE INSURANCE COMPANY

CLARK KERR
PRESIDENT
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

ROBERT M. LUMIANSKY
PROFESSOR OF ENGLISH
DUKE UNIVERSITY

WHITNEY J. OATES
PROFESSOR OF CLASSICS
PRINCETON UNIVERSITY

HENRI M. PEYRE
PROFESSOR OF FRENCH
YALE UNIVERSITY

MINA REES
DEAN OF GRADUATE STUDIES
THE CITY UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK

ANDREW C. RITCHIE
DIRECTOR
YALE UNIVERSITY ART GALLERY

GLENN T. SEABORG
CHAIRMAN
UNITED STATES ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION

THOMAS J. WATSON, JR.
CHAIRMAN
INTERNATIONAL BUSINESS MACHINES CORPORATION

STATEMENT AND RECOMMENDATION

"The Commission on the Humanities recommends the establishment by the President and the Congress of the United States of a National Humanities Foundation. . . ."

I.

THE humanities are the study of that which is most human. Throughout man's conscious past they have played an essential role in forming, preserving, and transforming the social, moral, and aesthetic values of every man in every age. One cannot speak of history or culture apart from the humanities. They not only record our lives; our lives are the very substance they are made of. Their subject is every man. We propose, therefore, a program for all our people, a program to meet a need no less serious than that for national defense. We speak, in truth, for what is being defended – our beliefs, our ideals, our highest achievements.

The humanities may be regarded as a body of knowledge and insight, as modes of expression, as a program for education, as an underlying attitude toward life. The body of knowledge is usually taken to include the study of history, literature, the arts, religion, and philosophy. The fine and the performing arts are modes of expressing thoughts and feelings visually, verbally, and aurally. The method of education is one based on the liberal tradition we inherit from classical antiquity. The attitude toward life centers on concern for the human individual: for his emotional development, for his moral, religious, and aesthetic ideas, and for his goals – including in particular his growth as a rational being and a responsible member of his community.

This Commission conceives of the humanities, not merely as academic disciplines confined to schools and colleges, but as functioning components of society which affect the lives and well-being of all the population. It regards the arts, both visual and performing, as part of the humanities and indeed essential to their existence. The arts differ in important ways from the conventional academic disciplines, but the Commission is confident that in any practical matter affecting the two these differences will readily be recognized and appropriate means devised for supporting each. The Commission further considers that science, as a technique and expression of intellect, is in fact closely affiliated with the humanities. Whatever scientists may learn concerning the physical world is or should be of profound interest to the humanist, just as the findings of behavioral scientists – whether they issue in social theories and inspire social action or merely make humans understandable – fall within the humanist's purview. The natural sciences, the social sciences, and the humanities are of their nature allies.

The Commission warmly supports the statement relating science to other intellectual activity in the report of the President's Advisory Committee of November 15, 1960 (page 3):

> . . . While this report centers on the needs of science, we repudiate emphatically any notion that science research and scientific education are the only kinds of learning that matter to America. The responsibility of this Committee is limited to scientific matters, but obviously a high civilization must not limit its efforts to science alone. Even in the interests of science itself it is essential to give full value and support to the other great branches of man's artistic, literary, and scholarly activity. The advancement of science must not be accomplished by the impoverishment of anything else, and the life of the mind in our society has needs which are not limited by the particular concerns which belong to this Committee and this report.

Science is far more than a tool for adding to our security and comfort. It embraces in its broadest sense all efforts to achieve valid and coherent views of reality; as such, it extends the boundaries of experience and adds new dimensions to human character. If the interdependence of science and the

humanities were more generally understood, men would be more likely to become masters of their technology and not its unthinking servants.

Even the most gifted individual, whether poet or physicist, will not realize his full potential or make his fullest contribution to his times unless his imagination has been kindled by the aspirations and accomplishments of those who have gone before him. Humanist scholars have therefore a special responsibility in that the past is their natural domain. They have the privilege and obligation of interpreting the past to each new generation of men who "necessarily must live in one small corner for one little stretch of time." They preserve and judge the fruits of humanity's previous attempts to depict, to rationalize, and to transcend the world it inhabits. The arts and letters, and the study of them, are therefore where we look most directly for enrichment of the individual's experience and his capacity for responding to it. Through the humanities we may seek intellectual humility, sensitivity to beauty, and emotional discipline. By them we may come to know the excitement of ideas, the power of imagination, and the unsuspected energies of the creative spirit.

Over the centuries the humanities have sustained mankind at the deepest level of being. They prospered in Greece and Rome, in the Middle Ages, in the Renaissance, and in the Enlightenment. Architecture, sculpture, poetry, and music flourished, and with the growth of colleges and universities the liberal arts took shape as a body of cumulative knowledge and wisdom. In the formative years of our own country it was a group of statesmen steeped in the humanities who fused their own experience with that of the past to create the enduring Constitution of the Republic.

During our early history we were largely occupied in mastering the physical environment. No sooner was this mastery within sight than advancing technology opened up a new range of possibilities, putting a new claim on energies which might otherwise have gone into humane and artistic endeavors. The result has often been that our social, moral, and aesthetic development lagged behind our material advance. Yet

we have every reason to be proud of our artists and scholars, and new techniques have frequently served to make their work more widely available; but this is not enough. Now more than ever, with the rapid growth of knowledge and its transformation of society's material base, the humanities must command men of talent, intellect, and spirit.

The state of the humanities today creates a crisis for national leadership. While it offers cultural opportunities of the greatest value to the United States and to mankind, it holds at the same time a danger that wavering purpose and lack of well-conceived effort may leave us second-best in a world correspondingly impoverished by our incomplete success. The challenge is no less critical and direct than the one we have already met with our strong advocacy of healthy and generously supported science. It must be met in turn with equal vision and resolve.

II. AMERICA'S NEED OF THE HUMANITIES

Many of the problems which confront the people of the United States necessarily involve the humanities. They are of nationwide scope and interest. Each is of concern to every citizen, and the way in which each is solved will be of consequence to him. Among them are the following:

1. All men require that a vision be held before them, an ideal toward which they may strive. Americans need such a vision today as never before in their history. It is both the dignity and the duty of humanists to offer their fellow-countrymen whatever understanding can be attained by fallible humanity of such enduring values as justice, freedom, virtue, beauty, and truth. Only thus do we join ourselves to the heritage of our nation and our human kind.

2. Democracy demands wisdom of the average man. Without the exercise of wisdom free institutions and personal liberty are inevitably imperilled. To know the best that has been thought and said in former times can make us wiser than we otherwise might be, and in this respect the humanities are not merely our, but the world's best hope.

3. The United States is not a nation of materialists, but many men believe it to be. They find it hard to fathom the motives of a country which will spend billions on its outward defense and at the same time do little to maintain the creative and imaginative abilities of its own people. The arts have an unparalleled capability for crossing the national barriers imposed by language and contrasting customs. The recently increased American encouragement of the performing arts is to be welcomed, and will be welcomed everywhere as a sign that Americans accept their cultural responsibilities, especially if it serves to prompt a corresponding increase in support for the visual and the liberal arts. It is by way of the humanities that we best come to understand cultures other than our own, and they best to understand ours.

4. World leadership of the kind which has come upon the United States cannot rest solely upon superior force, vast wealth, or preponderant technology. Only the elevation of its goals and the excellence of its conduct entitle one nation to ask others to follow its lead. These are things of the spirit. If we appear to discourage creativity, to demean the fanciful and the beautiful, to have no concern for man's ultimate destiny – if, in short, we ignore the humanities – then both our goals and our efforts to attain them will be measured with suspicion.

5. A novel and serious challenge to Americans is posed by the remarkable increase in their leisure time. The forty-hour week and the likelihood of a shorter one, the greater life-expectancy and the earlier ages of retirement, have combined to make the blessing of leisure a source of personal and community concern. "What shall I do with my spare time" all-too-quickly becomes the question "Who am I? What shall I make of my life?" When men and women find nothing within themselves but emptiness they turn to trivial and narcotic amusements, and the society of which they are a part becomes socially delinquent and potentially unstable. The humanities are the immemorial answer to man's questioning and to his need for self-expression; they are uniquely equipped to fill the "abyss of leisure."

III. PROBLEMS OF ACADEMIC HUMANISTS

The American practitioners of the humanities – the professionals, so to speak – are now prevented in certain specific ways from realizing their full capacities and from attracting enough first-rate individuals into their ranks.

There is genuine doubt today whether the universities and colleges can insure that the purposes for which they were established and sometimes endowed will be fulfilled. The laudable practice of the federal government of making large sums of money available for scientific research has brought great benefits, but it has also brought about an imbalance within academic institutions by the very fact of abundance in one field of study and dearth in another. Much of the federal money for science requires a proportionate commitment of general university funds to sustain the higher level of activity in the scientific departments. Students, moreover, are no different from other people in that they can quickly observe where money is being made available and draw the logical conclusion as to which activities their society considers important. The nation's need for balanced education demands that this imbalance be remedied.

In public and private schools important steps have been taken to improve teaching methods in the sciences, in mathematics, and in languages. Similar steps have not been taken in the humane studies, so that a student may often enter a college or university without adequate training in the humanities or, for that matter, a rudimentary acquaintance with them. Sound education requires that the schools open equally inviting doors into all fields of instruction, so that students may discover where their undeveloped talents lie. Today, moreover, young humanists need to be scientifically literate just as young scientists need to be aware of the world outside their specialty. Only a fully educated people will be capable of sound judgment in government, in business, or in their daily lives.

IV. THE HUMANITIES AND THE NATIONAL INTEREST

These are our arguments for greater support and stronger development of the humanities. Societies traditionally support those things which their people regard as useful, and governments support those things which are thought to be in the national interest. The question arises: Is it then in the interest of the United States and of its federal government to give greater support to the humanities?

During our national life the activities of society as a whole and of government in particular have been greatly extended. Health was once considered a private problem; it is now a national one. The newer forms of transportation are heavily subsidized and, to some extent, controlled by the federal government. In World War II the federal government undertook an active role in technology and since then, as we have seen, it has greatly extended its activities in the fields of science. Education was once entirely the concern of private foundations or local government, but it has long since ceased to be so.

Traditionally our government has entered areas where there were overt difficulties or where an opportunity had opened for exceptional achievement. The humanities fit both categories, for the potential achievements are enormous while the troubles stemming from inadequate support are comparably great. The problems are of nationwide scope and interest. Upon the humanities depend the national ethic and morality, the national aesthetic and beauty or the lack of it, the national use of our environment and our material accomplishments – each of these areas directly affects each of us as individuals. On our knowledge of men, their past and their present, depends our ability to make judgments – not least those involving our control of nature, of ourselves, and of our destiny. Is it not in the national interest that these judgments be strong and good?

The stakes are so high and the issues of such magnitude that the humanities must have substantial help both from the federal government and from other sources. It is for these reasons that the Commission recommends the establishment of a Na-

tional Humanities Foundation to parallel the National Science Foundation, which is so successfully carrying out the public responsibilities entrusted to it.

V. THE HUMANITIES AND THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

It is an axiom of our intellectual life that scholarship and art are free and must remain free. Like science, they must judge their ends and means according to their own criteria. It is encouraging to note that the federal government in its massive program of subsidy for the sciences and technology has not imposed control and, indeed, has not even shown an inclination to control the thoughts and activities of scientists.

Yet there are special problems with studies involving value judgment. These are at once the aspect of our culture most in need of help and yet most dangerous to entrust to any single authority, whether of church or party or state. A government which gives no support at all to humane values is careless of its own destiny, but that government which gives too much support – and seeks to acquire influence – may be more dangerous still.

We must unquestionably increase the prestige of the humanities and the flow of funds to them. At the same time, however grave the need, we must safeguard the independence, the originality, and the freedom of expression of all who are concerned with liberal learning.

It is the conviction of this Commission that the independence of the proposed Foundation's board will be the best safeguard against interference. If the director and members of the board are men of acknowledged competence and courage, as are the director and members of the National Science Board, there should be no problem of improper control. Moreover, we feel that the Foundation, like the Smithsonian Institution, should not operate exclusively on government appropriations, but should accept grants from the widest range of sources – foundations, corporations, individuals. Plurality of support will generally strengthen the freedom and variety of scholarship in a democratic society.

In addition, we would insist upon the importance of support for the humanities from sources, both public and private, other than this foundation. The day must never come when scholars and artists can look only to the federal government for the help they need; still less should they depend on a single agency. The notion of any one "chosen instrument" of government in this area must be abhorrent to anyone who cherishes the humanities and realizes that if they are not free they perish.

VI. RECOMMENDATION OF THE COMMISSION ON THE HUMANITIES

The Commission on the Humanities recommends the establishment by the President and the Congress of the United States of a NATIONAL HUMANITIES FOUNDATION to be composed of a *Board,* a *Director,* and a *Staff.* The suggested responsibilities and duties of this Foundation are described in detail below.

VII. THE NATURE OF THE PROPOSED FOUNDATION

1. *The Purpose of the Foundation*

The National Humanities Foundation should have for its purpose to develop and promote a broadly conceived policy of support for the humanities and the arts. Under the provisions of a National Humanities Foundation Act, the Board should be empowered to determine and carry out its program with an appropriation made by the Congress of the United States. In determining and administering its policy, the Foundation should confine itself to activities exclusively in the fields of the humanities and arts. The Board should have the authority to experiment with ways in which the Foundation's general purposes can best be carried out, but under no conditions whatsoever should it attempt to direct or control the scholarship, teaching, or artistic endeavor which it supports.

The provisions for a National Humanities Foundation which follow are intended suggestively rather than exclusively.

2. *The Scope of the Foundation*

The Foundation's definition of the humanities and the arts should be broad and inclusive in character. The humanities are generally agreed to include the study of languages, literature, history, and philosophy; the history, criticism, and theory of art and music; and the history and comparison of religion and law. The Commission would also place the creative and performing arts within the scope of the Foundation. As we have said, these are the very substance of the humanities and embrace a major part of the imaginative and creative activities of mankind. (If the present proposal to establish a National Arts Foundation should become law, the Commission hopes that this foundation would be combined with the National Humanities Foundation, or, at least, that the activities of the two would be co-ordinated.) Likewise, those aspects of the social sciences that have humanistic content and employ humanistic methods should come within the purview of the Foundation. It is assumed that the National Science Foundation will continue to be concerned with social science where its principles and approaches resemble those of the natural and applied sciences.

3. *Functions of the Foundation*

A. It should be a major responsibility of the Foundation to ensure that suitable means are provided for educating and developing scholars, artists, and teachers at every stage of their growth. They must be able to continue their education, to carry on their creative work and their performances, to conduct research, and to improve their teaching. As a corollary, means of publishing or otherwise disseminating the results of their endeavors, both within the academic community and to the public at large, must be available. Grants to properly qualified and endorsed individuals are a fruitful and efficient way to accomplish these ends.

B. The Foundation should, in like fashion, assist organizations concerned with encouraging and developing scholars, artists, and teachers. A great teacher may be important to the

humanities apart from his distinction as a scholar or the renown of the institution he serves. The program should therefore be broad enough to include the many schools and colleges in which such teachers may be found.

C. The Foundation should take steps to initiate and promote programs for the improvement of teaching in the humanities and the arts.

D. The Foundation should help construct and equip the buildings of all kinds so badly needed by artistic, cultural, and educational institutions.

4. *Means*

A. Support of Individuals. In the schools, there is a great need to make the humanities relevant to the lives and interests of the students. To accomplish this, students must encounter in their elementary and secondary school classrooms teachers who can awaken young minds to the richness of humane studies. Such teachers are all too rare. A program to support humanistic studies by actual or potential teachers thus offers a promising line of attack on current deficiencies in the schools. The following kinds of support are required:

(1) Grants to acquaint teachers in training or already at work with good teaching practices, by offering them the opportunity to observe or join in successful programs and to pursue their own advanced study or creative work.

(2) Fellowships for graduate study and for attendance at summer institutes.

(3) Support to individuals for experiments and demonstration projects in the schools.

(4) Travel grants to give carefully-selected teachers a chance for direct contact with the language, art forms, or other aspects of their subject matter.

(5) Fellowships for school administrators to increase their appreciation of the values and responsibilities inherent in humanities teaching.

The Foundation may wish to act directly through individual grants to applicants screened by its own committees, or indirectly through organizations devoted to these same ends in whose selection processes the Foundation has confidence.

In the colleges and universities there is a great need for graduate scholarships and fellowships for the preliminary training of scholars, teachers, and artists at all stages; likewise, for post-doctoral fellowships in the humanities. The selection of individuals to receive these fellowships should be based upon the judgment of committees or juries composed of scholars, writers, and artists whose work has achieved distinction, with the majority of the members still productive.

B. Support of Groups and Organizations. In addition to the authority to provide scholarships and fellowships for individuals, the Foundation should be empowered to make grants to and conclude contracts with any corporate or private body involved in the humanities or the arts for the promoting of research, teaching, performance, and publication. Some examples are:

(1) Summer or full academic-year institutes for the training of elementary and secondary school teachers. Such programs should be directed primarily toward improving the participants' knowledge of their subjects, but in addition they should be concerned with developing techniques to bring the humanities and the arts to children of all levels of ability or cultural background.

(2) The Foundation should support improved teaching at all levels of education. It should encourage experiments in presentation and organization, including interdisciplinary studies where many fruitful advances may be made. This support should extend to the development of new curricular materials.

(3) Facilities.

(a) Buildings. Many cultural and educational organizations in this country stand in great need of new and expanded libraries and space for instruction, research, creation, performance, and exhibition.

The Foundation should be empowered to support the planning and construction of such buildings.

(b) Libraries. Good libraries are needed at all levels in all subjects for teaching and research. Scholars in nearly all humanistic fields deal almost entirely with information preserved and organized in book form, and they therefore need large and complex libraries. Improved methods of instruction are making the library more and more important to the schools as well as the colleges and universities. The habit of using libraries begins in the school, but most school libraries are pitifully inadequate. They must be developed and extended and must be designed to lead students into the local public libraries. Since most public libraries already are incapable of supporting the demands upon them, they too must be more generously supported, not only in the interests of the schools, but in the interests of the general public. Libraries are a source not only of learning but also of pleasure.

Fortunately the recent extension of the Library Services Act can be expected to stimulate the improvement of public library services throughout the country. In this legislation the Congress recognized the need for federal aid on a substantial scale for public libraries in urban as well as rural communities. Each state, in order to derive the maximum benefit from this wise legislation, should establish a comprehensive public library system.

The Library of Congress is the cornerstone of the country's system of libraries and should therefore be strengthened, but this by itself is not enough; all major research libraries should be recognized as integral parts of this system. Each disseminates information on its holdings, each lends and films copies for the benefit of scholars throughout the United States, and each should seek to avoid needless duplication of the others. Under-nourishment tends to force each library to throw all of its inadequate resources into a losing battle to meet the most urgent demands of its own institution. If libraries were ade-

quately supported, however, further achievements in cooperation and even more effective services could confidently be anticipated. Strength and health will enable American research libraries to work together as they must, if scholarship is to prosper nationally and if the record of civilization is to be preserved for coming generations, not only as a memory of the past but as a base for creative thought in the future.

We emphasize that not only should the Foundation be able to assist research libraries but also it should contribute to the development of public and school libraries, which are of equal importance in the cultural life of our people.

(c) Facilities of Exchange and Publication. The Foundation should be authorized to make grants and contracts for the exchange of scholarly and artistic personnel and information both internally within the United States and with other countries. Conferences and publications should be eligible for support, though it is understood that the Foundation should concentrate its subsidies for publication in university presses or in experimental and scholarly works which under present circumstances cannot be financed.

5. *Organization of the Foundation*

A. The Board. The Board of the National Humanities Foundation should consist of twenty-four members who would be chosen for a term of six years each by the President of the United States, with the advice and consent of the Senate. These persons should be selected for their general cultivation and competence in the humanities as such, in the arts, in education, or in the direction of libraries and organizations concerned with the arts, and they should represent a wide spectrum of American life. Appropriate organizations should be requested to nominate candidates. The terms of the first twenty-four selected should be staggered to permit replacement of one-third of the members every two years.

B. The Director. The Director of the Foundation, who would be a member of the Board *ex officio,* should be ap-

pointed by the President of the United States with the advice and consent of the Senate. The Board should make recommendations to the President, and the President ought not to act until the Board has had an opportunity to do so. Because of the Director's vital role in the conduct of the Foundation, the members of the Commission on the Humanities place the greatest stress upon the need to select for the office of Director a man of the highest distinction in the Foundation's areas of concern. He should serve for a term of six years, unless the President should wish to replace him.

C. Commissions, Committees, and Divisions. The Director, with the approval of the Board, should appoint a staff, and the Board should organize the Foundation into divisions appropriate to its work. At the discretion of the Board, each division might well have an advisory committee composed of eminent persons in the field involved. In addition, there should be regional and national committees charged with judging applications for grants. When necessary, the Board might appoint special commissions to make recommendations upon matters of policy.

6. *General Authority of the Foundation*

The Foundation should be empowered to administer funds through governmental appropriations, through the transfer from other departments of government of funds whose use falls within the scope of the Foundation, and through gifts from private foundations, corporations, and individuals. Such funds should be used by the Foundation in such ways as it sees fit, within the terms of the appropriation, gift, or grant, and under the general provisions establishing the Foundation. It should also be able to contract with profit-making organizations or non-profit-making organizations and to publish or support publication.

APPENDIX A

THE HUMANITIES AND THE SCHOOLS

A Report Submitted to the Commission
by its
Committee on the Schools

John Fischer
President, *Teachers College, Columbia University*

Bartlett H. Hayes, Jr.
Director, *Addison Gallery of American Art* and Chairman of the Art Department, *Phillips Academy*, Andover, Massachusetts

Harold Howe II
Superintendent of Schools, Scarsdale, New York
Chairman

Charles R. Keller
Director, John Hay Fellows Program

Albert R. Kitzhaber
Professor of English and Director, Project English, *University of Oregon*

Alexander Moore
Principal, *Crispus Attucks High School*, Indianapolis, Indiana

Jean Reynolds
Consultant in English, Ann Arbor Public Schools, Ann Arbor, Michigan

THE STUDY OF THE HUMANITIES

THE AREAS of the school curriculum embraced by the following subjects are those we refer to as the humanities: English language and literature, philosophy, modern and classical foreign languages (in their literary and historical aspects as opposed to the narrower concept of communication skills alone), history and the social sciences, the visual arts, music, the performing arts as they are represented in the schools, and those aspects of science and mathematics which widen the understanding of man in relation to his environment as well as to other men.

Certain generalizations can be applied to all of these fields of knowledge and endeavor. One is that they do not, in themselves, usually offer a direct route to a vocation or profession. Although skill and interest in them may enhance vocational opportunities, they are fields of study which hold values for all human beings regardless of their abilities, interests, or means of livelihood. These studies hold such values for all men precisely because they are focused upon universal qualities rather than upon specific and measurable ends.

For example, the knowledge of history brings with it an awareness of the characteristics of an age which then illuminates its literature; experience in more than one language teaches the student that there are many ways of expressing a concept, and that the concept itself is not always absolute but depends on relative situations. Through the humanities men come to know who they are, to understand what has shaped their beliefs, attitudes, and fortunes, and to develop a critical sense which will allow them as individuals to select and preserve the best in the human tradition.

To the frequent charge that the humanities are impractical and that they must give way in our schools to narrow concern with those studies which seem more immediately connected to economic opportunity for the individual or to survival in a world whose instruments of power are based on the specific applications of science, we would assert that the humanities play a uniquely effective role in determining a man's behavior and values. Included in the humanities are those studies that help man to find a purpose, that endow him with the ability to criticize intelligently and therefore to improve his own society, and that establish for the individual his sense of identity with other men both in his own country and in the world at large. Men and women who have a thoughtful appreciation of humane studies understand more fully than others the complexities with which we all live, and they have the potential for dealing with these complexities more rationally and more successfully than people who are unaware of or indifferent to the humanities. Those who understand and appreciate the humanities also lead more rewarding lives both within their own hearts and minds

and in their relations with their neighbors and associates, their communities and their country.

In making these broad claims for humanistic studies we would emphasize that we are not talking solely about the humanities as a collection of studies designed mainly to produce scholars. Rather, we are concerned with every student who attends the public and private elementary and secondary schools of the United States, and with the type of person and citizen he is likely to become after his formal schooling has been completed. Whether a student leaves school after grade 9, after grade 12, after college, or after achieving a doctoral degree, it is important to him and to society that he be allowed to receive, as fully as his own potential permits, the heritage which is his in the humanities. While the schools are not the only agency to accomplish this task, there is no other in America today that bears so heavy a responsibility for it.

THE HUMANITIES IN THE SCHOOLS TODAY

Current attempts to encourage understanding and appreciation of the humanities are noteworthy but inadequate. Without major efforts in all the schools of every state, the status and influence of the humanities in the schools will inevitably decline in the years ahead. In making this statement we do not wish to detract from the worthwhile enterprises afoot in humanistic studies in a variety of schools both public and private, or from the efforts of foundations and the federal and state governments to encourage improved curriculum, better teacher training, and new approaches in the schools to humanistic learning. Such activities as Project English, supported by the U. S. Office of Education, and the John Hay Fellows Program, backed by the Ford Foundation, are evidence of successful approaches to the problem we have raised. But without a more widespread understanding of their value the efforts now under way are unlikely to remedy the problems we see confronting the schools. Lack of properly educated teachers, lack of time, lack of space, and lack of good teaching materials are the principal difficulties to be faced.

Our conclusion is, therefore, that the schools require more than the example of a few islands of excellence if they are to achieve needed progress in the next ten or fifteen years. They require the massive support which can come in our country only through the interest of a national agency with the resources and the leadership to work in all the areas of humanistic learning, in all parts of the country, and at all levels of elementary and secondary education.

The agency we envision should be free from control by any group

that wishes to exploit a narrow special interest; it should have the flexibility to assist both individuals and organizations; it should try to provide suitable opportunities for all our citizens to become acquainted with the humanities; it should be able to relate the improvement of humanistic studies in the schools to the other centers of support for these studies (libraries, museums, and institutions for the performing arts); and it should, as its program expands, command funds from both public and private sources in sufficient amounts to solve a national problem in education fully as large as the problem of education in mathematics and the sciences which has received so much attention in the last six or seven years. But the problem must be solved without sacrificing the educational contributions of science and mathematics. Rather, we should seek ways to establish an interplay between the sciences and the humanities so that they may mutually complement and fortify each other; from such a relationship we may hope for citzens who are educated in the full sense of the term — interested, informed, inquiring, tolerant.

THE SPECIFIC NEEDS OF THE SCHOOLS

We attempt in the remainder of this report to suggest specific activities which a National Foundation for the Humanities should encourage and support so as to improve the teaching of the humanities in the schools. Our suggestions are not exhaustive but do provide useful starting points. We have organized them under four headings:

I. Changes in the Education of Teachers

II. Improvements in Courses of Study in the Schools

III. Needs of the Schools for Materials and Facilities

IV. Relationships Between the Schools and the Colleges

By implication, if not by direct assertion, this listing of the needs of the humanities at the elementary and secondary levels should indicate our beliefs about the current handicaps students encounter in the schools and the shortcomings which need attention.

I. *Changes in the Education of Teachers*

The teachers now in the schools will set the tone and standard of education in the humanities for at least the next ten years. Even though many of them will be replaced gradually during that period by resignation and retirement, teachers coming in will not be able to bring new thinking to bear unless their senior colleagues understand it and sym-

pathize with it. It is important, therefore, both to improve the education of those who will take over in the years ahead and to provide opportunities and incentives for the teachers already in the schools to improve their competence.

Programs for prospective teachers should focus on two major efforts to improve education in the humanities from kindergarten through grade 12: 1) a renewed, more intensive, and more demanding experience in the liberal arts and sciences in the undergraduate years for all prospective teachers; 2) an effort to achieve greater depth of learning and background in the subjects of specialization chosen by those teachers who will work in the humanities when they join the schools.

It is easier to say that these two efforts need to be made than to say how they can be successfully carried out. But here are some suggestions that we think worthy of support:

A. Long-term support for experimental ventures in designing new courses for teachers. Members of college faculties from the liberal arts and from education must be encouraged to co-operate in planning special offerings.

B. Co-operative efforts between school systems or individual schools (public or private) to bring those preparing to teach into closer contact with the actual problems of teaching in the schools. Long-term internship programs with built-in incentives may help to develop a cadre of teachers who take pride in their ability to elicit a response to the humanities from children of all levels of ability. It is a matter of first importance that no segment of society be neglected as further efforts are launched to improve teaching in the humanities.

C. Experiments in adjusting and evaluating teacher certification requirements so as to provide teachers who have greater knowledge of the humanistic subjects.

D. Fellowships for the faculty members who teach teachers so they may reorient their thinking and refresh their subject backgrounds.

E. Fellowships to attract able college graduates to teaching. As a corollary to this kind of effort, assistance must be given those institutions willing to set up new and selective procedures for focusing their teacher-education efforts on undergraduates of great promise.

F. Major support for efforts to awaken in college and university professors in the humanities a renewed sense of responsibility for the education of those who will become teachers in the

schools. These efforts might take the form of special courses for prospective teachers in departments now removed from teacher education. A particular need is for good summer courses in the humanities for teachers. Another is the offering of special courses in the subjects of the humanities for teachers in training at the graduate level. Too frequently the courses for Ph.D. candidates do not serve prospective teachers well.

To improve the competence of teachers now in the schools, the same emphasis is required as in the education of prospective teachers: 1) an effort to bring teachers of the humanities into renewed contact with their subjects; 2) an attempt to advance the effectiveness of the present teaching staff in providing humanistic studies both for successful students and for those with whom the schools are now least successful. Many of these latter children are culturally deprived in their homes and require particular patience and skill on the part of the teacher. Efforts to reach present teachers must be of sufficient scope to serve thousands of teachers in all parts of the country. They involve by far the largest commitment of the proposals we have to recommend.

Among the activities for which we consider support by a National Foundation for the Humanities important are the following:

A. Fellowship programs for individual teachers to bring them into contact with the humanities in depth. Fellowships should be granted for varying periods of time ranging from a single summer to a full year. Existing programs which provide such fellowships need additional support, and new programs should be started. Specific examples of present or recent programs which need to be expanded or duplicated are the following: 1) opportunities offered to English teachers by the College Board Commission on English; 2) the John Hay Fellows Program; 3) the Coe Fellowships; 4) The American Council of Learned Societies summer institute program for secondary-school teachers.

B. Institutes or workshops for groups of teachers engaged in common efforts to develop their background of learning and appreciation and their skills in teaching. These group efforts can take many forms and we cite here only a few examples:

   1) Education in visual and auditory comprehension should be provided for teachers, in order to develop their abilities to discriminate and make value judgments in these areas. At the present time our schools are woefully lacking in teachers with the capacity to approach the visual arts and music in a way to help their pupils develop dis-

crimination, judgment, and taste. Teachers whose knowledge and ability have been increased, as recommended here, can become teachers of teachers in their own schools. (Similar examples of education or re-education could be cited in the other subject fields: history, English, foreign languages, etc.)

2) Opportunities should be offered for teachers to have a broad exposure to the humanities on a cross-disciplinary basis through programs organized to bring them in contact with samples of excellence in literature (including drama), painting, philosophy, and music. Such efforts will bring the individual teacher a new perspective and will help to develop an interrelationship among humanistic studies in the schools. Both of these results will favorably affect the atmosphere of the schools and the effectiveness of teaching and learning.

3) These efforts to expose teachers to all the fields of the humanities should include school administrators as well; for if the values inherent in the humanities are to be fostered in the schools, the administrators, who are the agents of change, must be aware of the need for improvement and of the possibilities.

4) Summer institutes or in-service training programs must be offered in which teachers of the humanities may try to adapt modern means of communication and modern learning theory to the problems of teaching. Such investigations, pressed with vigor and imagination, may offer clues to successful teaching in the humanities.

5) Special support should be granted experienced teachers to undertake training for work with children from culturally deprived backgrounds. Such support should encourage demonstration projects as well as opportunities to teach under special supervision.

C. Arrangements should be made to have outstanding teachers, artists, musicians, and other representatives of the humanities and the arts made available on a regular basis to school systems. Programs which will expose teachers and administrators in the schools to the direct stimulation of such contacts may do as much as anything else to raise their sights in working with the humanities. There are two ways to do this: one is to send the teachers to the source; the other, suggested here, is to bring the source to the school. Both should be tried.

II. *Improvement in Courses of Study in the Schools*

Both educators and the general public are tempted to think that the only way to improve education is to offer new courses of study. Too often such efforts result only in a rearrangement of material and not in any new knowledge or understanding. A course outline or textbook may provide a new treatment but not necessarily a new educational approach. New courses and new subjects in the schools will bring about worthwhile changes only when teachers understand what they are expected to do, and when they are provided with materials in depth, besides outlines and textbooks. This warning is a necessary introduction to the following recommendations for curricular changes in the schools which the National Foundation for the Humanities should foster. (One further qualification is that there can be no single curriculum in the humanities but rather an individual selection and emphasis made by each school.)

A. Every subject field covered by this report needs attention to its content and course organization in the elementary and secondary schools. The specific changes are a matter of extended research and cannot be completely covered here. Nevertheless, two examples may convey the idea: 1) English as taught in today's schools is out of touch with the latest thinking about the analysis of language, it lacks sequential emphasis, and it is confused as to purpose; 2) History tries to cover too much and becomes superficial, it is handicapped by duplication from one year to the next, and it is taught with too little emphasis on understanding and too much upon the regurgitation of facts. Although major efforts have now been launched under various auspices to re-examine the English curriculum and the history and social science curriculum, these areas are so significant to the beliefs, values, and attitudes of the children in our schools that a more comprehensive and systematic attack on their problems is required. If the improvements in these fields of study are to reach more than a scattering of schools, new materials must be written, new visual and auditory presentations must be developed, teachers and administrators must be introduced to them, and centers must be set up to demonstrate improved practice. All of these activities cost money: all could be assisted by the interest of a National Humanities Foundation. Similar observations can be made concerning the visual arts and music both as ends in themselves and as elements in better understanding such areas as history and literature. Foreign language study has received support through the National De-

fense Education Act but probably requires further attention to its literary aspects than that legislation provides.

B. Three considerations need attention as the curriculum in the humanities is re-studied. A continuum or a sequential emphasis should be provided in each discipline or subject so that the young person working in art or history or literature is, according to his ability, continually introduced to new concepts which expand the meaning and significance of all he has learned before. Curriculum planners need to avoid gaps that cause an area of study to become a scattering of islands rather than a continent of meaning and experience; they need also to adjust learning to the developing maturity of children so that experiences in music or art, for example, do not become repetitive and boring.

A second consideration that needs attention is the concept of selection as opposed to that of coverage. Particularly in history and the social sciences, our schools have become so obsessed with covering everything that they run the danger of doing nothing well. External examinations, college requirements, and the ideas of teachers too frequently emphasize the broad coverage of content at the cost of understanding and insight as well as of intellectual challenge. The specialist in curriculum building has an important role to play in discriminating between the trivial and the significant and in using the significant to magnify the students' commitment. A corollary is that it is fully as important for the schools to teach students to continue independently to expand and deepen their understanding of the humanities as it is for the schools to inculcate any particular body of knowledge. Viewed in this light, the function of the school in teaching the humanities becomes one of using well-chosen materials and ideas, appropriate to the student's interest and capability, to so involve his attention that the skills and knowledge he has acquired remain with him through life.

A third consideration is to make evident the relationship of the various fields in the humanities. Students, like teachers, need to sense the common denominators that history and philosophy bring to the discussion of all humanistic studies. Efforts to achieve meaning of this kind through special humanities courses at the upper levels of secondary school need additional trial before they can be fully evaluated; but we see much hope in such enterprises and believe that they deserve support. There is at least the possibility that the secondary schools may, through

interdisciplinary humanities courses in grades 11 and 12, have more success with the concept of "general education" than the colleges have had in the past fifteen years.

C. To accomplish the objectives mentioned in (A) and (B) above, educators need especially the following:
   1. Funds for publications.
   2. Grants to provide the time of experts.
   3. Financing to allow small groups of people in related fields to work together over extended periods of time.
   4. Special staffing in selected schools to try out new materials and courses and to evaluate their success.
   5. Support for demonstration projects which have proved their worth experimentally.
   6. Money for substitute or apprentice teachers to allow the regular staff the time to develop some of these new approaches and to learn the new techniques.

III. *Needs of the Schools for Materials and Facilities*

Learning in the humanities in the elementary and secondary schools requires that the resources available to most teachers and students be improved. A partial listing of priority requirements would include the following:

A. Textbooks are the major source of learning in the humanities in most schools. In other schools they are a significant supplement to learning. A charitable estimate of many texts now in use is that they fail to reflect either the meaning or the spirit of the humanities. Without entering into the reasons for this serious shortcoming in materials, we would assert the need for the support of writing and publishing ventures designed to bring to students in the schools more of the essentials of humanistic learning. Concurrently there is a need for improved materials to be viewed and heard by students via the many electronic devices that are increasingly present in today's classrooms. One of the tragedies of modern education is the emphasis which has been placed on apparatus for seeing and hearing and the lack of concern over the quality of what is seen and heard. This fault must be rectified if modern means of communication are to have their proper place in education.

B. Most school libraries are grossly inadequate. Most elementary schools have no real library services at all. Most secondary-school libraries have weak collections of books, magazines, and reference materials. The paperback revolution must be encour-

aged in the schools, for it offers a partial solution to the problem of providing good printed materials. The school library problem involves, however, more than the simple matter of providing more and better books. It involves the training of librarians, the design and construction of well-planned library spaces, and, most important of all, the establishment of a degree and kind of academic freedom at the elementary and secondary levels analogous to that found in a good university. Periodicals carrying controversial opinions on current issues must not be banned from high-school libraries; current books with language and content typical of this century rather than the nineteenth should be on the shelves as long as they have integrity as books; books with artistic integrity as literature should be widely read in the schools even though they may be controversial because of viewpoints or attitudes expressed in them.

C. Instruction in art and in music requires that students have the opportunity to see and hear great works. These must be made available to the schools. There should also be better contact with museums, art centers, and concert halls. And just as school library design requires re-thinking, the places where students work with art or music materials can help them to develop their powers of discrimination, if they are well planned for the purposes involved. Schools need assistance with planning and building the kinds of spaces which will support the work of teachers and students.

D. The new means of communication, largely provided through modern electronics, must be brought to bear upon problems of teaching and learning in the humanities. It is as important to discover what not to do with these devices as it is to adapt them successfully to daily use in the schools. Most classrooms in the country are twenty years behind what they might be in the power to communicate ideas, if present knowledge about apparatus and techniques were put to use. To reduce this lag schools need help in the form of equipment and training in its use. There are untapped possibilities for more efficient and more meaningful learning inherent in such simple devices as the slide projector, the overhead projector, and the tape recorder.

IV. *Relations Between School and College*

This report has emphasized bringing the humanities to all of the students in the schools. If there is to be any significant change in what the schools do, it will depend in part upon their relationship to the centers

of higher education where all fields of study are kept alive by scholarly research, criticism, and experiment.

A major loss to American elementary and secondary education has been the separation of the teacher in the school from the professor of arts and sciences in the university. There are many reasons for the separation, but this is not the place to explore them. It can be said, however, that in selected subjects bridges have been built from professor to teacher. Distinguished professors of foreign languages have become interested in the problems of the fourth grade; Nobel laureates in physics and chemistry have worked with science teachers from the schools to develop modern curricula; historians and professors of English have in isolated but important instances sat down with school teachers to see how the knowledge and experience of both can be combined for the benefit of elementary- and secondary-school pupils.

We mention these developments because they indicate activities which must be encouraged throughout the humanities. These co-operative efforts have so far been most successful in the sciences and mathematics, where considerations of national defense have brought generous financial support by the federal government. It is time that similar energies be expended for the benefit of the humanities, to gain the richness and variety that their encouragement can bring.

This statement already contains numerous suggestions for fostering co-operation between schools and colleges. We recapitulate some of them here because of our belief in the great importance of this kind of activity:

A. Fellowship programs in the humanities for school teachers.
B. Curriculum-planning groups involving both school and college teachers working in specific subjects.
C. Visiting "professorships" in the schools for authorities in various humanistic fields.
D. Removal of barriers within universities and colleges so that those people preparing to teach have easy access to the best offerings in the humanities.
E. Special courses for teachers in the fields of the humanities in summer schools, offered by authorities from colleges and universities.

A National Foundation for the Humanities which can support efforts of this kind will greatly advance educational quality in the United States. Too frequently this relationship between the school teacher and the university professor of humanistic studies has been characterized by mutual recrimination and lack of co-operation. This pattern must be changed.

Conclusion

This report, brief as it is, cannot presume to offer a comprehensive analysis of the ways by which teaching and learning in the humanities can be improved in the schools of the United States. We hope that it does convey a sense of urgency about the need for improvement. We hope still more that it points some directions which will be helpful to a national agency attempting to embark upon a program of selective assistance to the schools.

Some thoughtful people will fear the dangers of a national effort to support the humanities. They will see in it the threat of an exclusive agent with potential control of taste, values, and interpretation of all that comprises our cultural heritage. While we understand the sources of concern which produce such arguments, we do not believe that the arguments are valid. Furthermore, we see much to be gained in the pursuit of the suggestions in this report without threat of undesirable control. The fundamental protection of our educational system from domination by any central organization lies in the heritage of our national tradition of freedom. A further protection for the schools is found in the variety of independent educational authorities in this country. Starting with the fifty separate states, each with its own system of education, we have some 30,000 independent public-school boards with varying degrees of autonomy. Added to these are the many and varied private institutions, each jealous of its prerogatives and confident of firm support for these in the courts, if they should be challenged.

The task before us in the humanities is no overnight job. For the ills of our schools there is no quick cure. But there is no reason for either dismay or delay. There are practical, immediate, and positive courses before us. This report outlines some of them. Our responsibility to the best in our own tradition and to the world at large demands that we get immediately to the business of improvement in an aspect of our life as a nation which we have too long neglected. The cost of doing otherwise is to be measured in the adverse effect on our national character and our national life. We have the necessary resources, both of wealth and of dedicated people. We should use them to advantage.

APPENDIX B

LIBRARIES FOR THE HUMANITIES

A Report Submitted to the Commission
by its
Committee on Library Needs

Paul H. Buck
Director of the University Library,
Harvard University
Chairman

William S. Dix
Librarian, *Princeton University Library*

Herman H. Fussler
Director, *University of Chicago Library*

Stephen A. McCarthy
Director, *Cornell University Libraries*

Robert Vosper
Librarian, University Library, *University of California at Los Angeles*

Edwin E. Williams
Counselor to the Director, *Harvard University Library*
Secretary

INTRODUCTION

FREELY ranging in a good library, an enquiring mind can seek nourishment in the recorded ideas of men belonging to far-distant times and places; there it can choose among scores of teachers, boldly explore the vast diversity of human thought, and base its own conclusions upon centuries of evidence. Good libraries of many kinds are needed, some to serve and to supplement teaching, some to support advanced research, and many more to help Americans throughout their lives in continuing to learn, in using their leisure intelligently, and in governing themselves.

Political as well as educational leaders have been aware of these needs. "This nation," President Kennedy wrote, "must strive to make its schools and colleges good enough to educate free men who think for themselves in an increasingly complex world. Education of this quality demands strong libraries." Nearly fifty years have passed since President Hoover began work on building up the great specialized research collection at Stanford University that bears his name. As early as 1809 Thomas Jefferson advocated the establishment of a free circulating library in every county.

Libraries preserve more of the recorded memory of mankind than any other institutions, and in every field the scholar depends upon them for information on what other scholars have discovered. This may often be the library's sole function for the scientist who pursues his own investigations in a laboratory, but the humanist, in addition, usually finds in libraries the raw materials with which he works. The library resources at his disposal affect both the direction and the quality of his research. Clearly, therefore, libraries ought to have a particularly important place in any broad program for support of the humanities.

SCHOOL LIBRARIES AND PUBLIC LIBRARIES

College and university libraries for teaching and advanced research will be emphasized here, but strong libraries ought to be provided at all levels. From the elementary grades onward, the library is an essential facility for education in the humanities, and good public library service ought to be available to every citizen of a free country.

There are 10,600,000 students in schools in the United States without a central library of any kind, and many of the libraries that do exist are far from adequate. These grave deficiencies of American school libraries are treated elsewhere in this report; it may be sufficient here to call attention to the most obvious consequences. Unless his school has a good library, the child is not likely to learn how to use libraries or why to use them. If he goes on to college he will be handicapped there. If he is not going to continue his formal education in college, the deficiency will be even more unfortunate, for the use of libraries after he has left school

would help him to educate himself and to enjoy to the limits of his capacity the cultural heritage that humanity has created.

While some of the centralized and co-operative services that will be described here are of interest almost exclusively to research institutions, no library is an isolated unit. All use one or another of the standard systems of classification and subject headings, depend on indexes and bibliographies they do not produce themselves, buy printed cards, and lend books to one another. The possibilities of technology are of interest to all, and all will benefit greatly if a more nearly adequate number of qualified librarians can be recruited and trained.

It is now recognized, moreover, that most communities are too small to provide satisfactory library service by themselves. State-wide plans, such as those recently proposed in New York and Rhode Island, ought to be adopted. In such plans the university research library has its place as a reservoir on which smaller collections should be able to draw for highly specialized materials. At present, of course, every large university library serves the public outside its own institution to a considerable extent, but some such libraries, in order to maintain satisfactory service to their own students and professors, now find it necessary to impose restrictions on outside use. A sound regional system should safeguard the research library from demands that can and should be met by public libraries, and should reimburse it for the services that it can legitimately be called upon to provide to the general public.

Some idea of how much remains to be done in the public library field may be suggested by the fact that 18,000,000 Americans are still without public library service of any kind, and that 110,000,000 others have substandard service. Even so, the situation is better than it was in 1956 when the Library Services Bill was enacted. This authorized federal appropriations of up to $7,500,000 per year to improve rural library services; it has helped to strengthen state library extension agencies, to develop regional library systems and bookmobile services, and to support co-operative and experimental projects. As a result, 36,000,000 inhabitants of rural areas have new or improved library facilities.

This program was extended for five years in 1960, and proved to be so successful that Congress has now amended the Library Services Act in order to provide assistance to public libraries in communities of all kinds, urban as well as rural. Under the extended program, which was described by President Johnson as "an act of national achievement" when he signed the legislation on February 11, 1964, $45,000,000 per year is authorized, of which $20,000,000 is allocated to buildings. No appropriations under this authorization have yet been made, but enactment of this bill is by far the most encouraging development on the

public library scene during recent years, and a strenuous effort must now be made in each state to grasp the opportunities that are at hand for developing genuinely adequate and comprehensive public library services for all Americans.

As some of its proponents observed during the congressional debate on this measure, federal aid to school libraries has not yet been provided. Continued good results from assistance to public libraries should help to convince the Congress that school libraries would also be sound resources in which to invest federal funds and that aid to college and university libraries should not be limited to construction of buildings, as it is under the terms of the Higher Education Facilities Act, which the President signed on December 16, 1963.

REALISTIC ESTIMATES

Libraries are far more than the buildings that house them, and the development of research collections is a very different thing from the construction of buildings; failure to realize this may have unfortunate consequences. Library facilities are essential for all fields of teaching and research, just as classrooms are, but the library needs of some subjects are of a quite different order of magnitude from those of others. It is desirable to emphasize this point at present, because many institutions have recently embarked on work in the sciences more advanced than they had previously undertaken. Knowing what it has spent to provide library resources adequate to support this new advanced work in several scientific subjects, such an institution may be tempted to suppose that research in several humanistic subjects can now be provided for by spending a comparable sum. A single striking comparison may be sufficient to suggest how completely mistaken this supposition would be. The Massachusetts Institute of Technology, which specializes in the pure and applied sciences, has a library of 885,947 volumes on which it spent $697,478 during 1962–63. Harvard University, with programs of research including many within the humanities and social sciences, has a library of 7,073,689 volumes, on which it spent $4,775,402 during the same year — it has eight times as many books and spent seven times as much on its library. Only twenty-two per cent of Harvard's books, it has been estimated, deal with the pure or applied sciences.

It should be kept in mind, therefore, that the extent and cost of library facilities may have little relation to the number of scholars who use them. A specialized graduate program enrolling only a few students may need more books than an entire undergraduate college — there are now more than 380,000 volumes in Harvard's Chinese-Japanese Library alone.

It may also be desirable to warn against underestimating the costs of selection, acquisition, classification, and cataloguing. Good judgment and broad knowledge are required for choosing the right books. A building filled with books, even if they have been well selected, is not a library unless the books have been organized for use, and the work of organization is expensive. Indeed, because books are not interchangeable units like bricks, unit costs of library operations tend to increase rather than decrease as a collection grows. The staff of a large research library must organize books in scores of languages on thousands of topics; even filing the cards is far from a simple operation. Though he knows that it will shock the layman, an honest librarian must admit that the purchase price of many a book is less than the other costs involved in its incorporation into the collection. Because librarians have been reluctant to emphasize this, and because it has usually been much easier to attract money for buying books than for cataloguing them, gifts and grants-in-aid have often left extensive cataloguing arrearages behind them.

Time as well as money is required to build up strong library collections in humanistic fields, and schedules based on experience with the sciences may be as unrealistic as budgets based on such experience. The laboratories needed by scientific research can be constructed quickly, and a large proportion of the books and journals required by the sciences are recent publications that can readily be purchased; hence a university can move into scientific research rapidly if it has the funds. The humanist's laboratory, however, is a great collection of books, which usually must be accumulated over a period of years.

CENTRALIZED SERVICES AND CO-OPERATIVE PROJECTS

Libraries also call for special consideration in a report of this kind because no library in the country is an isolated unit; each co-operates in many ways with other libraries and is dependent on services provided by others. Consequently, while a program for strengthening library resources and improving facilities may well provide for grants-in-aid to individual institutions, it should not be restricted to assistance of this kind, but should take into account a number of projects that will benefit libraries generally. Some of the possibilities may be suggested by a brief account of major co-operative or centralized activities that now knit together the library community.

Each strong library is more than a local institution; it admits visiting scholars when they come to use its books and manuscripts, it lends books to other libraries, and it fills orders for photographic copies of its

holdings. As microphotographic techniques have improved, photo-copying has increased rapidly. Each of the largest research libraries now welcomes hundreds of visiting scholars annually, lends thousands of volumes to other institutions, and reproduces hundreds of thousands of pages photographically.

Each research library disseminates information on its holdings outside its own locality. There are several regional union catalogues, and the National Union Catalog at the Library of Congress, though still far from complete, lists most of the books owned by most of the nation's major research libraries. Tentative plans have been made to reproduce and publish the National Union Catalog in book form in order that each research library may have a copy on its own shelves, and studies are being made of the feasibility of increasing the National Union Catalog's usefulness by transferring it to punched cards or electronic tapes. The serial holdings of major American libraries are recorded in the *Union List of Serials,* which is currently supplemented by *New Serial Titles,* a Library of Congress publication. Many bibliographies record library holdings in special fields, and there are many published directories and surveys of resources. An increasing number of catalogues of notable subject collections have been published recently, and, in California, the catalogues of the two major research libraries of the state university, in Berkeley and Los Angeles, are now appearing in book form.

Every library takes advantage of work done by others in classification and cataloguing. Very few have their own classification systems; nearly all depend on published schedules of either the Dewey or the Library of Congress classifications. The published *Subject Headings* of the Library of Congress are also widely used. In cataloguing, libraries copy or adapt entries they find in printed catalogues and bibliographies; consequently the publication of the National Union Catalog will, in effect, be a great step forward in co-operative cataloguing as well as in dissemination of information on resources. The Library of Congress has been selling printed catalogue cards to other libraries since 1901, and it sold more than 42,000,000 of them during 1962. These printed cards are not all products of its own Processing Department; there is a co-operative project under which seventy-six other libraries supplied copy for printed cards during 1962. Finally, no library can catalogue most of the articles contained in periodicals and other serials; each depends for indexing and abstracting on a multitude of publications issued by governments, learned societies, and commercial firms as well as by other libraries.

Co-operative procedures are also used in acquiring books and periodicals. Libraries exchange publications of their own institutions. As

a means of making their exchange of duplicate holdings more effective and economical, they have established a nonprofit organization, the United States Book Exchange, to maintain a reservoir into which each library can channel publications it does not need and from which it can fill gaps in its own collections. In addition to its domestic services, this reservoir has had an international program under which 2,500,000 items have been supplied to 1800 foreign libraries at a cost to the government's foreign-aid funds of only sixty cents per item; unfortunately this program has been discontinued, at least temporarily, by the Agency for International Development.

Under an amendment to the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, foreign currencies owned by the United States can be used to buy foreign publications and to pay for cataloguing, indexing, abstracting, and related activities; these publications can then be deposited in libraries and research centers in the United States specializing in the areas to which they relate. Thirty libraries have been participating in this "Public Law 480 Program," which is administered by the Library of Congress and began operation in 1962 with comprehensive acquisition of current publications in India, Pakistan, and the United Arab Republic. Selected English-language publications from these countries are now also to be supplied to some three hundred American libraries, and the program is being extended to Burma, Indonesia, and Israel this year. Participating libraries, it should be noted, have paid a nominal sum toward the "hard currency" costs of the project and have bought the catalogue cards that are made available for the publications supplied. Lists have been issued for the information of nonparticipating libraries. A plan of this kind is particularly desirable for countries where the book trade does not yet provide good channels of acquisition and where the languages of publication are familiar to relatively few American order librarians and cataloguers.

Whenever two or more libraries share their holdings by means of lending and photo-copying, and when they facilitate and encourage this interlibrary use by contributing to union catalogues and lists, it can hardly fail to seem wasteful for each to buy and store copies of the same infrequently used books; the prospect of increasing collective resources by agreeing to some plan for specialization in acquisitions is sure to seem attractive. There have been many local arrangements for division of collecting fields, but college and university libraries cannot go far by themselves, and few of the institutions to which they belong have been willing, particularly during a period of enormous growth in higher education, to promise that they will always emphasize certain

fields of teaching and research but never attempt to do very much in certain others.

None the less, under the Farmington Plan, which was inaugurated in 1948, sixty libraries have voluntarily accepted special responsibilities for collecting. For publications originating in Western Europe these responsibilities are by subject; elsewhere, all publications of a country may be allocated to a single library. If the Farmington Plan were extended to all types of publication coming from all countries, and if it were fully effective, it would make sure that at least one copy of each new foreign publication that might reasonably be expected to interest a research worker in the United States would be acquired by an American library, promptly listed in the National Union Catalog, and made available by interlibrary loan or photographic reproduction. This plan has its critics, but it has survived surveys and reappraisals; committees of the Association of Research Libraries, working closely with scholarly organizations in African, Asian, Latin-American, Middle-Eastern, and Slavic studies, are engaged in efforts to extend and improve it.

Farmington Plan responsibilities are positive in nature, and no library has agreed to refrain from purchasing anything. However, since acquisition funds are always limited, when a library's Farmington Plan commitment causes it to spend $1,000 for marginal materials that probably ought to be available somewhere in the country but would not otherwise have been selected for its own collection, it has that much less to spend for books that would have promised to be more useful than these to its own students and faculty. In view of its obligations to its own academic community, therefore, a library can hardly commit any large proportion of its acquisition funds to purchases under a plan for specialization, and this undoubtedly is one reason why the Farmington Plan has not yet been extended to all classes of material or to all countries.

Under a plan for specialization, each participating library adds to its own collections the infrequently used publications in fields assigned to it. As an alternative, a separate institution — a library's library — may be established to house such publications. The major experiment along these lines is the Midwest Inter-Library Center in Chicago, which was opened in 1951. Its twenty members have deposited publications that were worth preserving but were not needed on their own shelves, including many college and university catalogues and reports, dissertations, foreign bank publications, insurance statistics, newspapers, official documents of states and municipalities, and textbooks. Deposits have been consolidated and duplicates eliminated. Relatively little additional material has been deposited during recent years, but an acquisitions program has been developed to bring to the Center materials that ought

to be in the region but need not be represented there by more than one copy. The National Science Foundation has enabled the Center to subscribe for 1200 chemical and biological journals that were not previously available in the Midwest, and there have been co-operative microfilming projects, including one under which 143 foreign newspapers are reproduced currently and positive film copies are available on loan to the subscribing libraries throughout the country.

One question regarding the future of the Midwest Inter-Library Center is whether it is not in fact a national institution. Libraries in all regions of the United States benefit from its resources and, with modern communications, their distance from Chicago makes little difference. If one genuinely comprehensive collection of old textbooks is enough for the nation, the one that has now been assembled in Chicago ought not to be duplicated. A closely related question is why twenty institutions in the Midwest should tax themselves to support a Center that is as useful or almost as useful to other libraries in their own area and elsewhere as it is to them. The Center's building was provided by foundation grants, and the institution costs less than $200,000 per year to operate. Since libraries are co-operative and altruistic, the Center, like the Farmington Plan, can count on its participating institutions to make a limited contribution to the general welfare, but costly programs for extension of its activities are not likely to be approved unless outside funds can be obtained as they were for the National Science Foundation's scientific journals project.

To wonder if the Center in Chicago is really national rather than regional is not to doubt that genuinely local centers may be established. The Hampshire Interlibrary Center at Amherst, Massachusetts, provides a common collection of periodicals for four institutions within a ten-mile radius. At Claremont, California, the Associated Colleges maintain the Honnold Library as a joint research collection. In Arkansas, the Rockefeller Brothers Fund has enabled seven colleges to establish a co-operative library system, and there have been recent proposals for state-wide co-operative plans in New York and Rhode Island. The University of California has a Master Plan for Library Development, under which a New Campuses Program is selecting, ordering, and cataloguing three identical undergraduate collections for the San Diego, Irvine, and Santa Cruz campuses; as has been noted, the catalogues of the research libraries at Berkeley and Los Angeles are being issued in book form, and other efforts are being made to facilitate intercampus use of libraries.

Even the preceding bare outline of existing co-operative projects and centralized services should have suggested something of their value to all libraries serving teaching and research. Clearly the humanities will

benefit substantially if improved techniques of micro-copying can be developed, if the National Union Catalog and many other lists and bibliographies can be perfected and disseminated, if the production and distribution of printed cards can be further extended and speeded up, if co-ordination can produce more effective acquisition procedures, if specialized collections can be built up either by division of responsibility or by interlibrary centers, and if local plans can increase the total of resources available in single states or metropolitan areas. It has been suggested that many co-operative efforts have gone about as far as they can if they must continue to depend for funds on voluntary self-assessment by participating libraries. It is time to move ahead. Research collections, regardless of whether they belong to "private" institutions or to states or municipalities, are clearly national resources and ought to be assisted by the federal government; their efforts toward co-operation are particularly deserving of such assistance.

Let no one suppose, however, that the sharing of resources can make it unnecessary for each college and university to build up a library strong enough to support its own program of teaching and research. Books in a national or regional center that can be borrowed or filmed are immensely valuable in supplementing a good library on a man's own campus, but they can never take its place.

POSSIBILITIES FOR PRESERVATION AND DISSEMINATION

The limitations of co-operation make it clear that many more good libraries must be created for the country's new colleges and for all the universities that are rapidly growing up where only colleges stood before. The achievements of co-operation make it equally clear that, while these new libraries are building, the great existing collections must not be neglected; they serve scholarship everywhere, and research in the humanities would be crippled if they were allowed to deteriorate.

These major existing research libraries are so large that it is increasingly difficult for them to make their holdings readily accessible and to respond effectively to changing needs, yet they must grow even more rapidly than in the past because the world of scholarship is now becoming coextensive with the physical world. Not many years ago, American scholarship was concerned almost exclusively with Western Europe and the United States; today, research deals with every continent, and the presses of every continent are printing more and more. The Harvard University Library, with its 7,100,000 volumes, is reminded of its inadequacies more frequently now than it was sixty years ago when it had only 1,000,000.

Keeping up with the flood of current publication is not enough, however; the great libraries now realize that a large percentage of the volumes on their shelves at present are disintegrating physically at an alarming rate. Most books printed since 1870, when wood-pulp paper became prevalent, have a distinctly limited life expectancy, and some of them are gone already. Much of the content of research libraries will be lost unless a comprehensive program for preservation can be undertaken. With the help of a grant from the Council on Library Resources, the Association of Research Libraries is attempting to determine what ought to be done. Its study has not yet been completed, and this, in any case, is not the place to propose a detailed plan, but the essential points of the situation ought to be stated.

There are always hopes that advances in technology will provide less expensive and more satisfactory methods, but it is possible now, without inventing any new machinery, both to preserve the content of American research collections and to make available to new libraries the materials they need. The obstacles are chiefly financial, and estimates of costs are not possible here, but it seems clear that the cost of a comprehensive project would not be unreasonable when weighed against its value to American teaching and research. These are among the possibilities:

If a book is de-acidified and stored under optimum physical conditions, its life can be greatly prolonged. Hence, a national center might preserve one master copy of each volume in its original form.

If a micro-copy is made, securely stored, and used as a master negative for reproduction only, additional copies – either microform or full-size – can be produced whenever needed for use.

The original filming is the most expensive part of the operation; master films can be copied automatically and relatively cheaply. If each volume is to be filmed only once and wasteful duplication is to be avoided, there must be a central record of master negatives if not a central depository for them.

With an effective system in operation, every book owned by any library will always be "in print" – *i.e.*, a copy will always be supplied in response to an order from any library.

It is enormously costly in both time and money for each new college and university library to enter into competition on the market for second-hand books and to build up, volume by volume, its entire undergraduate or research collection. A national center for preservation and dissemination could be expected to fill an order for an entire collection, and to supply a set of catalogue cards with each volume.

There are not nearly enough original copies in existence of most

of the books that will be needed for new institutions; therefore it is true that, even in the absence of any national system, books will be reprinted or filmed in increasing numbers, some of them commercially and some by individual libraries, to meet the growing demand. This, however, is wasteful and slow. A new college or university needs a satisfactory library the day it opens its doors.

Major existing research libraries would also benefit greatly; the national center would both enable them to add to their holdings more economically than is now possible and insure them against the irreparable losses with which they are now threatened by paper deterioration.

ACCESSIBILITY AND BIBLIOGRAPHICAL CONTROL

The greatest achievement of the American academic library has been its success in making its collections readily accessible to students and faculty, and this has been a contribution to the welfare of the humanist in particular. There are several factors that now threaten to reduce this accessibility. One of them, indeed, is microphotography, which, as has just been suggested, promises to rescue the scholar from other perils. In any case, one cannot browse through microfilms in the stack; they must be read at a machine. More and more books have to be transferred from open shelves to rare-book collections. More and more is printed in periodicals, which cannot be classified as precisely as separate monographs. The cost of space for rapidly growing collections is prompting libraries to store some of their holdings by size in fixed locations.

There have been studies and experiments in the field of inexpensive storage at Chicago, Harvard, and Yale; the subject calls for further investigation. Growth has also led to increasing decentralization of some university libraries, and this, while usually welcomed by men whose interests fall within a traditional subject, may seriously handicap interdisciplinary research. Here, as at many other points, studies of how scholars use libraries could provide a basis for more intelligent planning.

Whatever the future of classified collections on open shelves, the problem of bibliographical control clearly is growing more acute, and no problem is more important, because efficient access to information is absolutely essential to effective research and learning. Large as they are, library catalogues can deal with only a fraction of the problem; as has been noted, they do little or nothing to open up the content of serial publications, in which the results of most research are first reported. As the needs of scholars grow more varied, and as the materials with

which they work continue to grow rapidly in diversity as well as in volume, the difficulties of bibliographical control are multiplied. The National Science Foundation has wisely made a considerable investment in efforts to improve the situation in the sciences, where there is great pressure for speed in indexing, but where the volume of publication is less than in the humanities and its content is relatively more amenable to bibliographical control. Useful existing indexing and abstracting services in the humanities should be fostered and needs should be surveyed.

MACHINERY AND MANPOWER

Traditional methods of making information accessible deserve support, as has just been recommended, but they are only palliatives; it seems inevitable that the situation will deteriorate still further unless means are found to employ the techniques of mechanization and automation. Computers are capable of handling great masses of bibliographical information. Many of their potentialities may first be exploited in the service of scientific bibliography, but it must be hoped that eventually they can manage the flood of information on which humanistic scholarship depends. Research and development funds are needed for investigation of what can be done and how much it will cost. Some library records, such as circulation files and serial receipts, have already been automated with excellent results, and a comprehensive study of possibilities of mechanization at the Library of Congress is now being reviewed. The value to the humanities of really effective bibliographical control would be so great that further efforts along these lines would be justified even if the prospects were much less promising than they are.

Electronic advances cannot be expected to reduce the present shortage of competent librarians; rather, they will demand of librarians new talents in addition to those that traditionally have been desirable. To some extent, of course, librarianship is in competition with humanistic teaching and research for personnel, yet teaching and research in the humanities will suffer if libraries fail to recruit enough good men. There are opportunities for fruitful co-operation between libraries and faculty departments in providing summer work for graduate students, research fellowships, and joint appointments; moreover, the broad opportunities of librarianship as a career should not be overlooked by humanists, particularly those who are excellently qualified for administration but lack a taste or talent for teaching.

A national plan for library education is being drafted by a special commission of the American Library Association, and it is to be hoped that one result, in the long run at least, will be better training than is

now available for what is known in business as "advanced management" personnel. At the same time, it is clear that libraries should not seek to attract only potential administrators and should not reward only administrative abilities and achievements; varied qualifications are needed if librarians are to accomplish all that is required of them, and libraries must recruit and hold men who could expect to be successful elsewhere in the college or university, in government, or in industry.

SUMMARY

The foregoing statement has dealt with what libraries do and with what they ought to be enabled to do. It has suggested the vital importance of school libraries, and has noted highly encouraging recent developments that promise an extension and improvement of public library services. It has emphasized the dangers of underestimating the time and money required to build strong collections for the humanities. It has described centralized services and co-operative projects that deserve support. It has suggested the desirability of a major undertaking designed both to preserve what research libraries now have and to make extensive resources available to new institutions as economically and rapidly as possible. It has called attention to special problems of accessibility and bibliographical control, to opportunities presented by modern technology, and to needs for personnel that must be met if libraries are to respond to the growing demands of society. Many of these matters do not affect the humanities exclusively; library collections cover all subjects, but it is the humanities that ask the most of them, and it is the humanities that have the most to gain from strong and responsive libraries.

SUPPLEMENT

REPORTS TO THE COMMISSION FROM TWENTY-FOUR LEARNED SOCIETIES

	Page
American Society for Aesthetics	51
American Studies Association	57
American Anthropological Association	62
Archaeological Institute of America	71
Society of Architectural Historians	77
Association for Asian Studies	82
Society of Biblical Literature	89
American Dialect Society	91
American Folklore Society	95
Association of American Geographers	100
American Historical Association	108
History of Science Society	123
Modern Language Association of America	129
Association of American Law Schools	146
Linguistic Society of America	152
Metaphysical Society of America	159
American Musicological Society	166
American Numismatic Society	170
American Oriental Society	173
American Philological Association	181
American Philosophical Association	193
American Political Science Association	198
Renaissance Society of America	207
American Sociological Association	214

AT ITS FIRST full meeting, in the spring of 1963, the Commission on the Humanities discussed ways of gathering information and suggestions that would be useful in the preparation of its Report. The Commission decided to turn to the constituent societies of the American Council of Learned Societies and, through them, to call upon the knowledge and imagination of scholars active in the disciplines and fields of study that comprise the humanities. Each society was asked to appoint an *ad hoc* committee of its members to prepare for the Commission a report on its discipline. The Commission, in its request, enumerated some of the topics which it intended to consider and about which it desired further information:

> the present state of scholarship and teaching in the humanistic disciplines; the relations between scholarship in the humanities and the teaching of humanistic subjects at all levels from elementary school through graduate school; the sources and amounts of financial support presently available for research in the humanities and for curriculum development in the humanistic disciplines; the present and potential importance of new techniques for teaching and scholarship in the humanities; relations between the humanities and other areas of scholarship and creativity, notably the social sciences and the creative and performing arts.

Each committee, in short, was asked to report on "the present situation and the present and future needs" of its discipline.*

In due course, twenty-four reports were received; each was duplicated and distributed to the members of the Commission. The information and the suggestions they contained were extremely useful in the deliberations of the Commission and played a major role in shaping its recommendations. The Commission wishes to record here its gratitude to the 176 scholars who participated in the preparation of these reports.

Although the views expressed in these reports were not elicited by a survey of the 80,000 members of the societies that submitted them, it is reasonable to suppose that they represent the thinking of a wide (and distinguished) cross-section of scholars and teachers in the humanities. What is perhaps most striking is the fact that, despite their diversity in style and tone and specific detail, the reports present a remarkably consistent account of the state of the humanities in America today. With no exception, they speak of the vitality and richness of American

*The American Academy of Arts and Sciences and The American Philosophical Society, although members of the ACLS, were not asked to report because they do not represent particular disciplines or fields of study.

scholarship and look forward to even greater achievements in the future. At the same time, however, the reports are unanimous in their conclusion that more can and must be done to strengthen scholarship and, more urgently, teaching in all the humanistic disciplines. Because these statements give so valuable an account of the humanities in America, and because they document and support the recommendation of the Commission, they are included here as a Supplement to the Commission's Report.

THE AMERICAN SOCIETY FOR AESTHETICS

COMMITTEE*

Professor Holcombe M. Austin
Wheaton College

Professor Van Meter Ames
University of Cincinnati

James R. Johnson
Cleveland Museum of Art

Thomas Munro
Cleveland Museum of Art

INTRODUCTORY REMARKS

THERE has been a remarkable growth of interest in the arts in this country since World War I. Unfortunately, this great wave of interest has not been adequately matched by efforts directed toward an understanding of the arts. While art collections and museums have multiplied under both private and public sponsorship, the educational departments of even leading museums are characteristically the least well financed; while even mass-circulation magazines go in more and more for richly colored art reproductions, only a few of the country's newspapers maintain a staff of competent and responsible music, literature, and art critics; while our cities have been spending billions on new buildings and throughways, architectural criticism has been either stifled or kept remote from the general public, and the same can be said for the inquiries which have sought to diagnose the causes of the ugliness of our cities and towns; and, it appears to many observers, the level of taste in the country at large is determined more by fashion and commercial exploitation than by educated judgment.

The New Leisure finds the "quiet American" spending more and more of his time and money on the arts. Yet, troubled by his Puritan and practicalist upbringing, he is at a loss to know what role the arts may rightfully play in the social order, beyond that of private amusements. The "unquiet American," on the other hand, sees the contemporary artist as some kind of public menace to be met with contempt and anger. Surely the blatancy and malapropism of some Americans' talk about art are symptoms of an unexamined life more discordant than they will admit. The "unquiet American" may "know what he

* Report prepared in consultation with: Rudolf Arnheim (Sarah Lawrence College), Monroe Beardsley (Swarthmore College), Bernard C. Heyl (Wellesley College), Helmut Hungerland (California College of the Arts), Leonard B. Meyer (University of Chicago), Julius Portnoy (Brooklyn College), Carroll C. Pratt (Princeton University), Herbert M. Schueller (Wayne State University).

likes," but he is not really very happy with it. As for what he dislikes, the venomous attacks on art which appear, if not signs of a national malaise, are at least evidence of acute misunderstanding.

The point of this report is, then, the need for increased understanding to match the increase in attention to the arts in American life. If we emphasize what aestheticians are doing or might do, it is of course clear that the accomplishment of our goals depends upon common effort by all those concerned for the humanities. On the other hand, we believe that the vigorous revival of aesthetics in recent years is no accident; indeed, this revival is a response to needs not otherwise being served.

I. THE ARTS AND THE AMERICAN CAMPUS

Encouragement of the arts has developed extensively in the last few years on the American campus. Formerly it was felt that the practicing artist or musician or performer was better off outside the academic scheme of things. But with the commercialization of music and the decline of live theater, academic communities have responded by establishing art centers and drama centers or, more modestly, by appointing Composers in Residence, Poets in Residence, and so on. The training of all kinds of artists has attained a new status in the last ten or fifteen years.

In this new situation emphasis falls upon *practice* (in Western universities) or upon *history* (on the Eastern seaboard) with little attention to general theory or philosophical or social significance. What still too often prevails is the thought that aesthetics belongs in the philosophy department, history of art in a history of art department, and so on. On the majority of American campuses the history of the arts, basic theoretical studies, and praxis are in a state of separation if not total divorce.

Despite some success with the art center movement, efforts toward bringing the arts into co-ordinated educational programs have been greatly handicapped by the compartmentalization which is, perhaps, an inherent feature of the American university and college. An educational scheme based on rigid compartmentalization and isolation tends either to trivialize art or to foster chaotic rivalries. Certainly an educational program so organized does not foster a comprehensive understanding of the arts. Quite the contrary. The reaction to rigid compartmentalization, as an unsatisfactory state of affairs, has played a part in the rise of interest in aesthetics, as a body of knowledge and as a mode of inquiry which might bridge some of the chasms that now exist.

II. THE REVIVAL OF AESTHETICS

Forty years ago only a few colleges offered courses in aesthetics. Today nearly every liberal arts program includes such courses. Forty years ago the books on the aesthetics shelf were few, antiquated, and odd. Today they are numerous, contemporary in outlook, and certainly no odder than professors' books are obliged to be. What will impress anyone who will undertake to make the comparison is the fact of the presence in recent aesthetics of greater clarity, greater breadth, and in general, more professional competence. The outlook of aestheticians has changed radically since the days when a "philosophy of beauty" was tacked on as an addendum to a philosophical system. Present-day aestheticians are more empirical. They regard their work as inspired by aims more like those of the natural scientist than like those of the speculative system-maker.

Central to the revival of aesthetics in this country has been the American Society for Aesthetics, organized in 1942 "for the advancement of philosophical and scientific studies of the arts and related fields." The range of purpose is reflected in the following quotation from its public announcement:

> The purpose of the Society is to promote study, research, discussion and publication in aesthetics. The term "aesthetics," in this connection, is understood to include all studies of the arts and related types of experience from a philosophic, scientific, or other theoretical standpoint, including those of psychology, sociology, anthropology, cultural history, art criticism, and education. "The arts" include the visual arts, literature, music and theater arts.

The "across the disciplines" character of the ASA has evidently appealed to many, for it has grown to a membership of almost a thousand, a remarkable number for a learned society which has no element of job-guarantee or union-card reward. The steady development of the ASA *Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism* is further evidence of the revival of aesthetics. The success of the Society and of the *Journal* owes much to the energy and wisdom of Dr. Thomas Munro, who has guided this enterprise for over twenty years. This accomplishment has been without extensive aid from foundations (total aid: $5,000).

The circle of influence of the ASA embraces most of the writers on aesthetics in this country. Its national meetings and the meetings of its Regional Divisions bring together people from many fields both from inside and outside academic walls. It is also important to note that the general journals and reviews of philosophy have been printing many articles on aesthetics. Further, in the more specialized jour-

nals of the arts, such as the *Architectural Record,* the *Music Quarterly,* the *Film Quarterly,* and so on, there appear articles of philosophic intent.

III. INTERNATIONAL INFLUENCES

The American Society for Aesthetics owes much to the example of the German aestheticians, particularly Max Dessoir and his *Zeitschrift Für Asthetik Und Allgemeine Kunstwissenschaft.* Since World War II the influence has been from the United States to other countries. Societies similar to the ASA have been founded in France, Britain, Italy, Poland, and Japan. Quite recently, journals similar to our *Journal* have been started in these countries and there is at least the beginning of a lively interchange of ideas.

IV. REVIEW OF SPECIFIC NEEDS

There is, of course, the general need to carry on and strengthen what has already been accomplished or initiated; but, in order to be more specific, we offer the following list:

1. *Support for Individual Research.* Individuals need time; relief from teaching loads; travel (both in this country and abroad); funds for books, music, photos, microfilms and other instruments of scholarship, and secretarial assistance.

2. *Support for Group Activity.* We need to meet with our fellow inquirers, both for stimulation and for joint research. People from different fields particularly need to come together. As it is now, philosophers tend to meet only philosophers, psychologists only psychologists, and so on. Problems such as city planning, the work of the theater, and art education require a team approach. Aestheticians need to learn more of what is going on in psychology, psychiatry, anthropology, linguistics, communication studies, and others of the newer sciences. In turn, inquirers in these fields would benefit by learning of advances in aesthetics. Contact between aesthetics and the older, more established humanities needs to be maintained and extended.

3. *Publication of Research.* Long delays in publication and difficulty in obtaining support for illustrated books and essays tend to discourage the scholar and to deprive others who are interested in what he is doing. The *Journal* turns away eight or nine articles for every one it publishes. No doubt this makes for high quality of what is published but it does result in discouragements and does place heavy responsibilities upon one set of editors. Fortunately for those doing philosophical aesthetics, a number of new philosophy journals have been started in the last few years, and articles on aesthetics are generally

acceptable to them. In adjacent fields of aesthetics the situation is less favorable.

Publication of short articles is one thing, publication of a book quite another. It is here that there is great need for support in publication, especially for books that do not appeal to a commercial publishing house.

4. *Translations.* We have a great need for translation of work done in aesthetics in foreign countries – from the great German *Zeitschrift Für Asthetik,* edited by Dessoir until the coming of Hitler; from the contemporary Japanese journal *Bigaku;* from the Italian *Rivista di Estetica;* and others. Similarly for books. If we could come more abreast of what has been accomplished abroad, we in this country could save much waste motion. It is our impression that American psychologists, for example, are currently repeating a great deal of research that was done in German aesthetics between the world wars. American investigators should take up where the research broke off in Europe during World War II.

Translation of American books in aesthetics into other languages is also very much in order.

5. *International Co-operation.* Other modes of international exchange besides translations need large-scale support. While American aestheticians have overcome the extreme parochialism of eighteenth- and nineteenth-century writers in this field, there is still provincialism to be overcome. The desire for contact and understanding of other cultures is keen and there is much to be gained by interchange, especially with non-European cultures. (We are reminded of Walter Gropius's remark following his first direct contact with Japanese architecture and aesthetics: "For the first time I felt myself to be among the majority.")

6. *Sharing of Results.* There is much need for basic research in aesthetics, but there is also a need for bringing the benefits of its accomplishment to a wider public. Perhaps we can count on an indirect, a "filtering down," process, but it would seem that we should find more means, and more direct means, for providing public-school teachers, public servants, advertising executives, merchandisers, and other molders of public taste, with a less disordered aesthetic than they now possess. The conditions mentioned on the first page of this "statement" deserve study.

7. *Graduate Students.* The questions of what kind of support and what kind of training are needed for graduate students interested in aesthetics need to be studied. If the need for better co-ordination of the arts in the universities comes to be recognized, we shall need more people adequately prepared in aesthetics.

8. *Appraisal of Aesthetics.* We need a much more thorough assess-

ment of our subject than we have been able to offer in this brief self-appraisal. To what extent can aesthetics be scientific? In what sense is it a humanity? Where have we succeeded? in what ways failed? And how can we best make common cause with our sister disciplines?

THE AMERICAN STUDIES ASSOCIATION

COMMITTEE

Professor Hennig Cohen
University of Pennsylvania

Merrill Hartshorn
National Council for the Social Studies

Professor David M. Potter
Stanford University

Professor William R. Steckel
University of Wyoming

Professor Robert H. Walker
George Washington University
Chairman

INTRODUCTORY

WE ACCEPT as self-evident the need for a national foundation for the humanities and social sciences equipped to support, financially and in other ways, the recommendations which follow. We see the operational value of a national center in the establishment of standards and the indication of lines of development. National agreement on goals, however, should by no means inhibit the initiation of diverse programs by individuals, institutions, state and local boards of education, and organizations of teachers and scholars.

In order to give this report the brevity requested we have cited objectives rather than recommended detailed means for the accomplishment of these objectives.

I. IMPROVING RELATIONS BETWEEN THE HUMANITIES, THE SOCIAL SCIENCES AND THE PERFORMING ARTS

This committee represents a group committed to a belief in the importance of interdisciplinary teaching and scholarship within the humanities (including the fine arts) and the social sciences. All of our observations are colored by a desire to bring conventionally separate approaches into a closer and better-integrated relationship, both as a matter of pedagogic principle and as a recognition of steps necessary for the effective study of the culture of the United States.

All teachers in the humanities and social sciences, we feel, could profitably enrich their courses through the inclusion of materials and concepts drawn from areas related to, but not included in, their own

specialty. Particularly in the secondary schools, co-ordination and correlation should be encouraged between courses in literature and social studies. New avenues of development in the humanities should be encouraged by a closer co-operation between various scholarly and professional organizations, museums, libraries, and foundations. Joint sessions among these groups have proved profitable in the past and should be increasingly so in the future. One tangible result might be co-operatively sponsored publication programs aimed at improving interdisciplinary understanding (such as the one jointly fostered by the Library of Congress, the Harvard University Press, and the American Studies Association) and at providing teaching materials. Forewarned by experience, the committee cautions that experiments in developing interdisciplinary programs and materials will succeed more readily if they begin simply.

The committee believes that interdisciplinary study can be an important educational experience. This method of teaching is standard practice in elementary schools. From this point on, the pull is toward specialization and compartmentalization. Colleges and universities are organized almost universally on a departmental basis, and the curriculum reflects this system. We believe that departmental specialization should be minimized, at least through the secondary level, and that college undergraduates should have the opportunity to elect an interdepartmental major. We have no wish to weaken the departmental basis of higher education; we do not think that an interdepartmental major would be appropriate for all students. But we do feel that every college should offer at least one interdepartmental major in the humanities-social science field, not necessarily in American Studies, and that colleges of education should give prospective teachers the opportunity to choose between preparing to teach a single subject, and preparing to teach in block, core, and problems courses, where more than one subject is involved.

II. RESEARCH AND SCHOLARSHIP

The committee recognizes the disproportionate difficulty in obtaining support for research in the humanities as opposed to the sciences and the teaching of languages. This imbalance should be righted through more numerous grants, prizes, and publication subsidies. Not only is research in the humanities generally undersupported, but there is a special difficulty in finding support for interdisciplinary research, perhaps because the organization of foundations and government agencies tends to reflect the departmental structure of the academic world. Therefore, special attention needs to be given to the evaluation and support of research involving more than one discipline.

Co-operative research and the co-ordination of individual research in the humanities have not been properly provided for. One means toward this end might be the establishment of a center for advanced study in the humanities, parallel to the one in the behavioral sciences which already exists.

III. TEACHING AND CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT

National sponsorship should stimulate the improvement of teaching materials in the humanities and social sciences. Especially when their approach is experimental or interdisciplinary, new materials often fail to overcome the allegiance of publishers to established and traditionally profitable patterns. A national center might enlist the kind of sponsorship which would make evident to textbook publishers the desirability of bringing out such materials. A national center might offer guidance to the curriculum committees of state and local boards of education in the selection of teaching aids appropriate to improved curricula.

Even teachers who have received competent undergraduate training require continuing in-service education. We commend an existing program which brings selected teachers back to universities during the summer for supervised preparation of teaching plans for the coming year, followed by regular meetings throughout the year for the purpose of adapting plans to practice. We feel such activity appropriate for graduate credit. We commend the Department of Health, Education and Welfare for its sponsorship of Project English and Project Social Studies; we recognize a further need for a project which would co-ordinate teaching in these two areas.

We need a series of controlled experiments in the co-ordinated teaching of humanities and social studies, involving the teacher, the community, the college of education, and the college of liberal arts.

Humanities courses and curricula are often neglected because of a failure to educate the student to the general value and particular utility of a liberal education. We have oversold our youth on science and technology at the expense of the humanities and social sciences, and on training at the expense of education. To counteract this we need to put carefully prepared material in the hands of high-school guidance counselors and lower-division college advisors. This material should include information on precisely what careers are available to graduates of humanistic programs at all levels. Perhaps subsidy would enable professional and scholarly societies to offer placement services that extend meaningfully beyond the teaching profession. Certainly college-placement offices should be encouraged to make clear what opportunities exist for the educated as well as the trained.

IV. RELATIONS BETWEEN SCHOLARSHIP AND TEACHING

Not only is more research needed in the humanities, but better methods of keeping abreast of publications are also required. We suggest that the humanities take a cue from the sciences in printing brief abstracts at the heads of published articles; that these abstracts be collected annually; that they be indexed for ready access not only with reference to research fields but also for pedagogical use; that this annual list be circulated as widely as possible, not only to journal subscribers but also to active teachers at all levels. The compilation of abstracts should be accompanied by a clear and convenient form for obtaining low-cost offprints of individual articles, thus obviating the necessity for multiple-journal subscriptions. Electrostatic means of reproduction might answer the demand for large numbers of offprints. The object of this process would be to bring the fruits of research in all fields to bear not only on the problems of further research, but also on the needs of teachers in elementary schools, secondary schools, and colleges.

Special pamphlets and book-length publications are also needed for this same purpose, as exemplified by the American Historical Association's Service Center for Teachers of History series, and by such volumes as the National Council for the Social Studies' *Interpreting and Teaching American History* (edited by William H. Cartwright and Richard L. Watson, 1961). Unprecedented efforts are needed to perform this function in the case of interdisciplinary programs.

On the personal level, we believe that scholars need to be brought into a closer appreciation of the needs and problems of the teacher. We favor programs that would bring the scholar to the teacher, allowing university professors to spend prolonged periods working with teachers and conducting classes at primary and secondary schools.

Research usually involves work in a narrow range, whereas preparation for teaching should include extensive reading in a broad range of subjects and approaches. Often one of these directions is pursued to the unhealthy exclusion of the other; our present system encourages this. We therefore suggest a mid-career grant program which would enable individuals to enjoy a constructive change of direction. Under the terms of such a grant, the published scholar would be able to restore his range of knowledge, and the effective teacher would be able to take up research activity without penalty for lack of productivity during the years he had devoted to acquiring his background for teaching.

We particularly recognize the need for some kind of sabbatical pro-

gram for primary- and secondary-school teachers. The period freed from teaching duties should be spent in a supervised program of reading at an institution of higher learning, but not necessarily in pursuit of an advanced degree. This program should not be designed to meet certification or increment requirements but should allow the teacher to fill in gaps in his knowledge of humanistic learning.

V. MAKING USE OF NEW TECHNIQUES FOR TEACHING AND SCHOLARSHIP

The committee feels that closed-circuit television and recorded lectures have but limited classroom application. We see no reason to encourage the use of these devices in a field properly characterized by experimental and highly individualized teaching.

Much better and wider use could be made of art reproductions, photographs, slides, strip films, motion pictures, and recordings. Encouragement should be given to the preparation of accurate lists of such items, indexed topically, and accompanied by instructions for rental and acquisition. We deplore a tendency to use such materials merely as illustrations of points established from other sources, rather than as keys to cultural understanding and as historical evidence in their own right. Handbooks exemplifying this superior use of pictorial and musical materials could add immeasurably to teaching in American Studies.

We need better information, primarily for research purposes, on the availability of microreproductions of all types.

The committee feels that the humanities lag behind the sciences in the use of new techniques for research, and that this lag should be overcome. All encouragement should be given to the application of modern techniques to scholarship in the humanities: the use of electronic data-processing systems in libraries; the teletype facsimile transmission of rare and locally unavailable items; the computer storage, retrieval, and analysis of bibliographies. Although we cannot give this subject the informed and detailed attention it deserves, we wish to acknowledge the full extent of its challenge.

AMERICAN ANTHROPOLOGICAL ASSOCIATION

This report was drafted by Alexander Spoehr, President-Elect of the American Anthropological Association. It incorporates suggestions by Eric R. Wolf of the University of Michigan and Stephen T. Boggs, Executive Secretary of the Association.

I. INTRODUCTION

As A DISCIPLINE, anthropology coalesced from diverse intellectual interests whose common ground was a concern with the evolution and the comparative study of man and his culture. The historical relation of anthropology to the humanities extends back to humanistic scholars, particularly those with a 19th century classical training, who helped substantially in shaping anthropology as a formal field of teaching and research. In more recent times there has been a distinguished list of anthropologists who have contributed in one form or another to studies which can appropriately be called humanistic. At the same time, scholars from humanistic disciplines such as philosophy, comparative religion, literature, folklore, and art history have continued the convergence of interest between the humanities and anthropology. These historical ties are both numerous and important for the future development of anthropology.

The contemporary relations of anthropology and the humanities can be viewed in two ways. The first lies in the social ties which anthropologists maintain with humanists. Anthropologists and humanists belong to the Linguistic Society of America and the American Folklore Society (because of common subject interests), to the Association for Asian Studies (because of a common regional interest), and to the American Association of Museums (because of a common institutional interest). Anthropologists are also strongly represented in organizations devoted to ethnohistory and ethnomusicology.

The second way in which the relation of anthropology to the humanities can be viewed lies in the logical ties of scholarly interest in problems posed for research. This is reflected in complementary interests in the understanding of man's culture and of those qualities which make up human nature, and which have led to man's highest achievements. Now that anthropologists are no longer so concentrated on the study of non-literate and so-called primitive societies but increasingly include complex societies and civilizations in their purview, while humanists have shown a growing awareness of the value of drawing a wide comparative net in the study of man's work and thought, these comple-

mentary interests should become more mutually fruitful and should be further strengthened.

A balanced view of the relations of anthropology and the humanities, however, must take into account the relations of anthropology to the natural and social sciences. Anthropology has a strong historical root in natural history and in many ways is much closer to the natural sciences than to the humanities. At the same time, in college catalogues anthropology is almost always found under the social sciences. It has for years been represented in the National Research Council, as well as in the Social Science Research Council and the American Council of Learned Societies. This representation accurately reflects the breadth of anthropology's interests in the biological, social, and cultural aspects of man. It even insists that these aspects have to be viewed together.

II. THE INSTITUTIONAL BASIS OF ANTHROPOLOGY IN THE UNITED STATES

In the last two decades there has been a rapid growth in anthropology in American institutions. There are now over one thousand professional Fellows of the American Anthropological Association, and graduate work is now offered in more than sixty universities in the United States and Canada. There is a strong demand for young Ph.D.'s to teach anthropology at both universities and liberal arts colleges – a demand which at present it does not seem possible to fill.

Another institution, the museum, played a leading role in the founding of anthropology in the United States. But the function of museums as employers has not expanded greatly in recent years. The larger natural history museums, as well as university museums of anthropology, have to a large extent stabilized their staffs in the face of financial necessity. This does not mean, however, that the museum field is static.

The growth of anthropology has also given rise to a modest demand for anthropologists in related fields. These include university schools of business administration, public health, and education, as well as a number of government agencies. In this development it has been anthropology's ties with the natural and social sciences, and the practical applications of anthropology, which have been principally exploited.

III. THE COMMUNICATION OF ANTHROPOLOGICAL INFORMATION

More than a dozen established journals published in the United States serve the needs of American anthropologists, including the subfields

into which they divide themselves. The number of established monograph series issued by museums, universities, and professional societies is larger. There are in addition a substantial number of journals and monograph series published abroad. Despite this great number of outlets, however, problems of publication in the field of anthropology have increased in recent years. A very large proportion of the results of research carried on over the past twenty years or more has not been made available to others in usable form. Whatever the ultimate reason for this (and there are several) the flow of information could be greatly improved by selective programs supporting scholarship of all kinds. For the writing up of anthropological findings tends to be viewed as a scholarly activity, rather than a research activity, so far as most funding agencies are concerned. Thus anthropological scholarship, as distinguished from research, tends to be no better supported than other areas of humanistic scholarship.

The flow of new knowledge from research into teaching, on the other hand, is relatively rapid and there do not seem to be major barriers to this type of information flow.

IV. THE TEACHING OF ANTHROPOLOGY

The great increase in the teaching of anthropology in colleges and universities has made anthropologists aware of the need for teaching materials, as well as self-examination of the content and goals of their teaching. A systematic appraisal of the teaching of anthropology, with particular reference to the teaching of undergraduates in the United States, has been published under the auspices of the American Anthropological Association (David G. Mandelbaum, Gabriel W. Lasker, and Ethel M. Albert, editors, *The Teaching of Anthropology* and *Resources for the Teaching of Anthropology;* Berkeley: University of California Press, 1963, 2 vols.) In this appraisal, the relation of anthropology to the humanities is discussed in several places. Leslie emphasizes the need for a holistic approach to the study of human nature in the context of the humanities. Marriott describes the University of Chicago teaching experiments in courses dealing with complex civilizations such as that of India. Mandelbaum believes that it is important to communicate "the development of anthropological thought in the context of the intellectual history of the times and to assess the validity of concepts within the larger corpus of knowledge as well as within the discipline." The relation of anthropology to the humanities is implicit or specifically discussed in other articles as well.

Anthropology does not have an established place in the secondary school curriculum and there is a definite insulation of this curriculum from advances of knowledge to which anthropology has contributed.

Under the sponsorship of the American Anthropological Association, and with funds provided by the National Science Foundation, an Anthropology Curriculum Study Project was instituted in 1962 to work at two basic problems: the identification of those fields of knowledge within anthropology from which significant contributions to secondary education can be drawn, and the development of useful ways of introducing anthropological substance and concept into the high school classroom. This has entailed an analysis of the present content of the secondary curriculum, and the preparation of a series of publications for parts of this curriculum. Two booklets in the series have been published for trial use. They are *The Emergence of Civilization,* which is being tested in world history courses, and *The Idea of Liberty in American Culture,* which is being used in American history courses.

The significance of this project for the present discussion is that the introduction of anthropological subject matter into the secondary curriculum seems most effective when handled in relatively broad contexts or themes, in which a humanistic orientation plays an important role.

V. CURRENT FINANCIAL SUPPORT FOR RESEARCH

Apart from universities, museums, and research institutes employing anthropologists from their own funds, anthropology draws on private foundations (including Ford, Rockefeller, Carnegie, Wenner-Gren, and Guggenheim), on government agencies (principally the National Science Foundation and the National Institutes of Health), and on the national councils (National Research Council, Social Science Research Council, and American Council of Learned Societies) for grants in support of anthropological research. The National Science Foundation and the National Institutes of Health have become increasingly important as sources of research funds. This pattern of support is strongly directed toward the natural science and social science components of anthropological research.

It is true that some of the current projects funded by the National Science Foundation, for example, are of interest to humanists. But a review of current research projects leaves one with the unmistakable impression that there are not many anthropologists devoting themselves to research with a strictly humanistic orientation; that few anthropologists, for example, apply to the American Council of Learned Societies for grants; and that the level of support for anthropological work in fields such as music, art, and literature is low. A comparable situation prevails in the awards of either training or research fellowships to graduate students in anthropology. This means that the present imbalance will extend indefinitely into the future if something is not done about it.

Although the preceding paragraphs have indicated a long-standing relationship between anthropology and the humanities, this relationship does not seem to be very actively prosecuted today on the research frontiers of anthropology. To what degree this is due to the availability of funds, and the consequently greater attractiveness of other interests, is not clear. There does seem to be a bias in the kinds of research projects which commonly win favor in anthropology. Those in which the analysis is qualitative, or historical, often fail to receive support, no matter how rigorous the scholarship may be. It seems likely that the low level of support for the humanities as a whole has limited research in certain fields of anthropology, has affected the methods used, and has restricted recruitment into some fields.

VI. THE NEEDS OF ANTHROPOLOGICAL SCHOLARSHIP WHICH COULD BE MET BY A NATIONAL HUMANITIES FOUNDATION

If humanistic disciplines were strengthened, one could predict a healthy impact on anthropology, in view of the close relations which have obtained between anthropology and the humanities. Linguistics and folklore are two examples. Since their professional organizations are submitting their own reports, no further comment need be made here. For potential impact on anthropology, one can select philosophy and history. There is a powerful current in American philosophy which is integrating anthropological materials into the body of data with which philosophers are concerned. Charles Morris and F. S. C. Northrop may be mentioned as examples in this movement. In the case of history, there is direct relevance to anthropology in the history of social and intellectual thought, conceived as an integrated body of knowledge.

There are other, more particular concerns common to anthropological and humanistic scholarship. One of these is area studies, seen in the framework of the comparative study of contemporary cultures and civilizations. If area studies can be pursued in a more sophisticated manner, anthropology's participation in them would be strengthened by increased support for studies of religion, aesthetics, and value systems. Anthropology can contribute also an understanding of the ways in which culture affects the external relations of particular peoples, and their communication across language barriers and national boundaries. Important too is an understanding of how the social relations among different segments of a society condition the form and content of literature and the arts, at both folk and sophisticated levels. Such areas as these deserve increased support. This is especially so if the recommendation contained in the report *The University and World*

Affairs is to be realized, namely that "all students should get at least an introductory acquaintance with some culture other than their own."

Another concern is the understanding of contemporary culture change. Here again, value systems are crucial for knowledge of such change. Furthermore, such knowledge is not merely of academic interest. The political scientists have pointed out that research in political philosophy is the least well endowed field in political science, yet the need to understand the philosophical presuppositions that underlie political systems and ideologies is an urgent matter with real implications for American relations abroad in a rapidly changing world. In similar vein one may inquire whether religions such as Buddhism in Southeast Asia will become a potent political force in that unsettled area. Several anthropologists have called attention recently to the latent potential for economic development in Buddhism at the village level. The point is that humanistic interests can be fruitfully applied to the study of contemporary culture change: one of anthropology's principal fields of investigation, and one of national significance.

Culture history is another surprisingly relevant, and long established field in anthropology. Thus, Medieval history is emerging as a fresh field in which we can learn much about one "underdeveloped area" that successfully made the transition to urban industrial civilization. Much would be gained if anthropologists could be encouraged and aided to bring to the study of periods of documented history anthropological concepts and problems. Other examples of a similar kind could be mentioned. Thus ethnohistory, which lies in the border area between ethnology and history, has special relevance to all regions where preliterate people have become literate. Hence it is crucial to the study of the Westernization of the modern world. Yet it now receives very modest support.

Primitive art and ethnomusicology deserve more attention and encouragement than they now receive. Primitive art, whether "primitive" or not, has become fashionable with sophisticates. However, scholarly investigations of style and technique, of their transformations through time, or of the artist himself in relation to his media or to his society, have not been given the assistance which such studies deserve. Similarly, ethnomusicology is bringing into music a comparative dimension drawn from the cultures of the world which may in time revolutionize what we listen to.

The preceding remarks have referred to research interests. If these are to develop, provision will have to be made for qualified graduate students to become thoroughly trained in both anthropology and a humanistic subject. This calls for a limited number of fellowships at the graduate level which do not now exist.

Most anthropologists and humanists in the United States are associated with universities and colleges, as we have pointed out. They accordingly tend to think of education in this framework. However, an important educational institution outside this framework is the museum. It is true that there are a sizeable number of university museums. But there are many more, large and small, which are not connected with any university. In the United States today there are more than four thousand museums of art, history and science, many including anthropology, which reach the lives of many millions of people each year. Museums are a powerful educational force, not only in adult education, but in their instructional relations with primary and secondary schools, as well as colleges and universities. It is noteworthy that the United States is one of the few countries in the world which does not have a governmentally supported museum system.

As educational institutions, museums of all types rely primarily on visual means of communication based upon exhibitions. In the last two decades, great advances have been made in exhibit content and techniques. American museums are an educational resource worthy of the careful attention of any national foundation active in the humanities. Museums are also established centers of humanistic and anthropological scholarship. Art history, regional history, the study of primitive art, material culture, and technology — in all areas where collections are important — museum scholarship is to be found. Yet museum research in these fields is often poorly supported.

Finally, American museums have not yet played the international role in underdeveloped areas which they could perform, if given assistance. New museums are being established in these areas, or old ones transformed. They serve to contribute a sense of national identity to their peoples, and can serve, as some do now, to support scholarly research. But they suffer greatly from lack of staff trained in the techniques of museum management. It is a logical international role of American museums to make a coordinated effort to provide such training.

VII. NEEDED DEVELOPMENT OF TOOLS FOR SCHOLARSHIP AND TEACHING

Funds are urgently needed for research and development leading to the wider and more efficient utilization of the following tools.

Computers. As a research device, computers are just beginning to be used in anthropology for the quantification of large masses of data. It is difficult to predict the future uses to which computers will be put, but their importance will almost certainly increase (see Dell Hymes, editor, *The Use of Computers in Anthropology*, 1964).

Tape-recording libraries. Libraries are presently used wherever collections of tapes are necessary for scholarship or teaching. Linguistics, ethnomusicology, and the study of "contemporary" history collected from living informants may be cited as examples. The management, coordination, and expansion of such libraries across the country is in need of development.

Research translations. There are certain languages, of which Japanese, Chinese, and Russian are examples, in which scholarly work is being published and where the language barrier is significant. It would be most desirable to increase support of research translations (including abstracts and bibliographies) and of periodical, critical reviews of the foreign literature for the purpose of selecting works which should be translated in full.

Motion picture films for classroom teaching. There are a considerable number of valuable ethnographic films covering life in various parts of the world, and new ones appear from time to time. An unknown number of anthropologists, moreover, have films which they have taken in all parts of the world. Much of this film, whether assembled or not, requires editing for classroom use. There is also a real need for a country-wide system of procurement, exchange, and use. Films have never been properly exploited in the teaching of anthropology (see Mandelbaum, Lasker, and Albert, *Resources for the Teaching of Anthropology*). The use of such films by museums could greatly expand the public understanding of peoples all over the world.

Museum conservation and restoration laboratories. These are becoming essential tools for museums. Pioneered largely by art museums, such laboratories are being established by other types of large museums. An important task in this connection is the preservation of collections of all kinds under tropical conditions, an extremely difficult problem.

VIII. CONCLUSION

As a member of the American Council of Learned Societies, the American Anthropological Association urges the establishment of a National Humanities Foundation, or a comparable agency. The Association believes that it is entirely appropriate that American national policy be more specifically directed toward the improvement of the quality of our national life, as well as to needs for physical well-being and military defense. In the needed enhancement of our national life, the efforts of a National Humanities Foundation would be both necessary and of inestimable value.

American colleges, universities, and other institutions supporting scholarship and higher education are being called upon to play increasingly active international roles. Greater support for humanistic

scholarship and teaching in these institutions is a requirement if they are to discharge this international responsibility and to contribute their full measure of leadership to the world.

THE ARCHAEOLOGICAL INSTITUTE OF AMERICA

COMMITTEE

Professor Alan Boegehold
Brown University

Professor Cedric G. Boulter
University of Cincinnati
Chairman

Professor Jotham Johnson,
President
Archaeological Institute
(ex officio)

Professor Paul MacKendrick
University of Wisconsin

Professor Robert L. Scranton
University of Chicago

Professor John H. Young
The Johns Hopkins University

THE COMMITTEE appointed to report on the present situation and present and future needs of archaeology starts from the basic premise that the Archaeological Institute of America has traditionally been concerned principally with the archaeology of advanced ancient civilizations, *i.e.*, Greece and Rome, Egypt and Mesopotamia, and the areas in cultural and commercial contact with them. We recognize the importance of archaeology in other areas of the world, and we note the affiliation between the Institute and the School of American Research at Santa Fe. We recall also the fact that the Institute's popular journal, *Archaeology,* is world-wide in its scope. The same is true of its lecture program. We believe, however, that the archaeology of the more primitive peoples, in America and elsewhere, will be covered primarily by the report of our colleagues in the American Anthropological Association. In our own report we discuss the following topics in the order named: education, excavation, publications, museums, new techniques, archaeology and the general public, and relations with other areas of scholarship and creativity.

I. EDUCATION

The committee was unanimous in concluding that the most important needs in our discipline are to be met at the high-school level. It may seem strange that our primary emphasis should be placed here, in view of the fact that archaeology is almost exclusively a subject for graduate study. The fundamental preparation cannot wait, however,

until the student is entering graduate school, nor even until he enters college. Briefly, the health of our discipline depends on the availability of Greek and Latin in the secondary schools. Our greatest single need is for high-school teachers who can teach the classical languages. Funds are required, moreover, to ensure that they are free to teach the two languages full-time, and to guarantee the existence of classes, no matter how small, in Greek and Latin. Unless Greek and Latin are maintained in the secondary schools, our discipline is threatened at its roots. The introduction of Latin in the elementary schools would go a long way toward improving our situation. As a further part of any long-range program, we would recommend the establishment of year-long fellowships for master teachers, on the model of the John Hay fellowships, to enable teachers to renew contacts with scholars and scholarship, and generally to gain fresh inspiration. In conjunction with these fellowships, funds could well be used to provide books, journals, and slides for the high schools, so that when such teachers return to their schools, they will have continuing access to the stimulus of contemporary ideas and scholarship in their field.

So far as college students contemplating a career in archaeology are concerned, we would recommend only that they get the best possible general education, including, as of the first importance, the classical languages. At the graduate level there is urgent need for increased funds for fellowships and scholarships, so that doctoral candidates may proceed to the degree without the present often interminable delays. The doctoral candidate in archaeology, like his colleagues in other areas of the humanities, must normally, because of financial need, interrupt his graduate studies to take a teaching position. The candidate in archaeology is subject also to a special requirement – the need for experience in the field. Hence there are additional costs to be considered, for transportation and maintenance abroad. We regard experience in the field as an indispensable element in the training of an archaeologist. Such training is now feasible at the American School of Classical Studies in Athens and at the American Academy in Rome. There are further possibilities at the American Research Center in Egypt, and at the American Schools of Oriental Research in Jerusalem and Baghdad. All these should be strengthened, and support should be given to the proposed establishment of a comparable American research center in Anatolia. We are not aiming at a large increase in the number of archaeologists. There is room in field archaeology for more professionals, but not for an indefinite expansion of their numbers. Our aim is to attract and encourage the best people. We would propose a pool of funds to provide for fellowships renewable annually (on condition of satisfactory performance) for a period of three or

four years, at the end of which time the candidate should have completed the requirements for the Ph.D.

We hail the Commission's announced intention to consider "the sources and amounts of financial support presently available for curriculum development in the humanistic disciplines." It is our experience that such funds are scant and sporadic. We do, however, see a great deal of room for the development of more imaginative curricula for the teaching of Greek and Latin. We are aware that curriculum development is a subject deserving careful pedagogical inquiry, and that specific proposals are obviously beyond the scope of this report.

It would be useful also to consider what should constitute the ideal program of study for graduate students in archaeology. In this connection it is most desirable from our point of view that adequate courses in ancient history should be more widely available. We would welcome also the greater availability of courses that receive only rare support from American universities – not because they lack value, but because they are extremely specialized – for example, the languages of the ancient Near East.

II. EXCAVATIONS

We estimate that at least $200,000 is now being spent annually on American excavations in the Mediterranean and the Near East. We include only the actual expenses of excavation – the cost of labor, equipment, and supplies – and leave out for the moment the substantial cost of transportation of staff from America to the site. Further, we are considering only excavations of the remains of what we have designated as the advanced civilizations. It is obvious that much more could profitably be spent, but exactly how much more is hard to say. We believe, however, that the figure quoted above could properly be doubled for ordinary operations. There is never enough money available at any one time for the work that needs to be done, and there are always extraordinary needs. The measures proposed for the preservation of the temples at Abu Simbel have failed for lack of funds. To be sure, the sum required was unusually large, and opinion was divided as to the value of the results that could be achieved. There is no question, however, about the major importance of the proposal to complete the American excavations of the Athenian Agora, which have been described as "the exemplary dig of all time," but the present opportunity may well be lost once and for all through lack of the required $4,000,000. The Agora provides a striking example of a situation that occurs repeatedly on a lesser scale: the knowledge of valuable ancient remains is often permanently lost to us for the lack of as little as $5,000.

It should be noted that ours is the only one of the principal Western nations where archaeology is not state-supported. The bulk of the support is provided from private sources, in a manner that is often hit-or-miss, and its continuance is subject to the whim of the donor. There is an obvious need to insure continuity, and to guarantee that an important project, once undertaken, will not be suspended halfway through. At present, too many archaeologists must spend their time and energies raising funds to guarantee the next season, and are forced thereby to postpone their primary obligation, the study and interpretation of the finds themselves.

Two footnotes should be added on excavations. The archaeologist of advanced civilizations is at a disadvantage in comparison with his colleagues in palaeolithic and neolithic archaeology, since the latter have a ready source of support in the National Science Foundation. The NSF, for example, has lately made two grants totaling $110,000 for the study of neolithic remains in Mesopotamia and Macedonia. The second point to be emphasized in this context is the substantial cost of transportation of staff that must be faced by an American expedition operating at a site in the Mediterranean or Near Eastern area.

III. PUBLICATIONS

The importance of publications will be obvious. It might be of interest to cite the practice of the Bollingen Foundation, which, when making grants for excavation, regularly adds an equivalent amount to cover the costs of publication of the finds. In recent years, costs of publication have risen enormously, particularly in the case of archaeological reports, where there are unusual expenses for photographs, drawings, special type-faces, and the like, to say nothing of the problem involved in transporting to America (for study) adequate records of materials that must themselves remain in the country of origin. Additional funds could be put to excellent use also for the support of archaeological journals and monographs, and for the publication of archaeological collections in American museums. This country, for example, has lagged far behind European countries in issuing fascicles of the *Corpus vasorum antiquorum,* the principal reason being lack of funds.

IV. MUSEUMS

Museums in America, apart from the large ones that house the celebrated collections of classical and Near Eastern antiquities, are disinclined to maintain the study collections needed to supplement even elementary college courses in archaeology and ancient art. It is per-

haps not widely appreciated how much room there is in this area for the imaginative display of even simple and modest materials. We cite as an outstanding example the current Junior Museum exhibition, *Archaeology – Exploring the Past,* at the Metropolitan Museum of Art, which has proved an educational instrument of the greatest value, and has attracted numerous visitors of all ages. Another shining example is the exhibition of ancient wine jars in the Stoa of Attalos in Athens, with the accompanying Agora Picture Book, *Amphoras and the Ancient Wine Trade.* Funds could be used to great advantage for the purchase of antiquities to be exhibited in colleges and communities lacking museums. European museums might well be induced to part with some of the duplicates in their storerooms. Even one or two objects can have an enormous effect in creating an informed public interest. Where purchase is not feasible, subsidies could be used with equal advantage to support the cost of loan exhibitions.

V. NEW TECHNIQUES

There is boundless opportunity in archaeology for the application of such recent scientific innovations as radiocarbon dating, archaeometry, and neutron activation studies, to name only a few. Revolutionary results might be obtained in archaeology through a program inviting the collaboration of American physicists, chemists, engineers, and the like. Underwater archaeology demands a whole set of new techniques. Results of great service to scholarship could be achieved through the use of electronic devices for compiling, storing, and making available abstracts of data from archaeological publications.

VI. ARCHAEOLOGY AND THE GENERAL PUBLIC

Consideration must be given to the interpretation and transmission to the general public of the results of archaeological research. The Archaeological Institute of America has devoted much of its energies and resources to this endeavor, principally through its programs of lectures by distinguished archaeologists, presented to some fifty local societies throughout the country, and ordinarily open to the general public. This program, operating on a shoestring, could well be expanded. The Institute's popular quarterly, *Archaeology,* offers, in attractive format and nontechnical language, an authentic and responsible treatment of a broad range of subject matter. On occasion, complimentary copies have been sent to selected high schools. If funds were available, there would be virtue in doing this regularly and on a larger scale. A few archaeological films have been produced under the supervision of the Institute, again for the general public. We think

it would be desirable to explore the potentialities of a larger program to which the Institute might contribute, including not only lectures and publications, but films and radio and television programs, not neglecting the possibility of co-operation with National Educational Television.

VII. RELATIONS WITH OTHER AREAS

On the interest expressed by the Commission in "relations between the humanities and other areas of scholarship and creativity," we would cite our belief in the great value, for example, of arranging for students in archaeology to have some contact with practising artists. Students of ancient art can derive the utmost benefit from seeing the subject of their study through the eyes of the practising sculptor or painter. As to the relation between the humanities and the social sciences, we believe again that the possibilities for co-operation are numerous. It is easy to cite studies that illustrate the interrelation of archaeology with sociology and economics – for example, Rostovtzeff's *Social and Economic History of the Hellenistic World* and Tenney Frank's *Economic History of Rome.* The discoveries in Crete, revealing a whole new civilization, have been a gold mine for anthropologists and art historians alike, and the economic data contained in the inscribed clay tablets of Mesopotamia are practically inexhaustible.

VIII. CONCLUSION

Considering the uses which this report is designed to serve, the committee concluded that a peroration was neither necessary nor desirable. It will be evident that our basic needs are support for education, excavation, and publications. If additional funds become available for these and related objectives we strongly recommend that the expenditure of such funds, at least in large part, be entrusted to existing institutions, believing that more effective results will be achieved by strengthening the facilities and utilizing the experience of active and established institutions than by creating agencies that are wholly new.

THE SOCIETY OF ARCHITECTURAL HISTORIANS

COMMITTEE

Professor J. D. Forbes
University of Virginia

Dr. Richard H. Howland
Smithsonian Institution

INTRODUCTION

THIS report on the needs of architectural history and architectural historians is a summary digest of conferences, conversations, and exchanges of correspondence with more than thirty scholars, architects, editors, and curators actively participating in some phase or phases of architectural history. It seeks to be a fair expression of responsible opinion in the field. More remarkable than the differences among the individuals consulted is their essential agreement on what the needs are. But since there are variations, the composite character of the report must be kept in mind.

Architectural historians have three primary concerns: (a) the physical survival of areas and individual monuments of architectural significance and, especially, of beauty; (b) the examination and analysis of the architectural examples and related documents of all sorts (verbal, pictorial, etc.); (c) the dissemination of the findings of such analysis and the orderly presentation of the story of architectural development.

These three concerns are intertwined and interdependent, and activities and facilities which serve one are quite apt to serve or be served by one or both of the others. Central archives, for example, are essential to all three and are, in turn, dependent upon them. It follows that some overlapping in a statement of needs is inevitable.

In the matter of financing – and not everyone consulted is of the opinion that the subject is germane to the report – there is an almost unanimous agreement that expenses relating to the face of America – the physical appearance of the cities and of the land – should be charges on the federal government. On the other hand, a number of those consulted have strongly expressed the view that the expense of research and publication concerned with knowledge for its own sake are more related to the aims of the foundations – particularly at a time when government debts are mounting.

I. CENTRAL ARCHIVES, REPOSITORIES, AND AGENCIES

The importance of building up concentrations of architectural knowledge and making possible centralized activities of large scope is second only to the problems of the individual student/scholar in the frequency of listing by the consultants.

Five different kinds of architectural-historical centers were suggested:

(a) Archive(s) of photographs of world architecture. Some have suggested the singling out of a given library for a central archive, others favor several centers for convenience and safety. (It has been noted that the existing Fototeca in Rome is in acute financial need and should be helped immediately.)

(b) Archive(s) of architectural drawings. As in the case of the proposed photograph archive, there is a difference of opinion as to whether a vast corpus of material should be assembled in one place or dispersed among a number of institutions. (Attention is called to the existing Avery Archive of Measured Drawings at Columbia University and its financial needs.)

(c) A national museum of American architecture. The specific recommendation was that the Smithsonian Institution be provided with the funds to maintain such a museum and to build up collections of actual parts of buildings, models, photographs, drawings, documents, a bibliographical index, etc.

(d) An institute of American architecture. An alternative to the museum just mentioned, or complement to it, might be a central organization to maintain an inventory-index of buildings across the nation, extant and destroyed. (Note in this connection the current functions of the National Trust for Historic Preservation and the Historic American Buildings Survey, and their financial needs.)

(e) A central office for learned societies. In a somewhat different category of centralization is the suggestion that the several learned societies collaborate for reasons of economy and convenience on the location of their permanent offices.

II. CENTRALLY DIRECTED SURVEYS, COLLECTIONS OF MATERIAL, AND OTHER ACTIVITIES

While most of the specific activities listed in this section are implied in the titles of the central agencies enumerated in Section I above, they were submitted as separate items, usually without reference to agencies or institutions that would undertake the projects:

Architectural surveys of American cities primarily as a basis for

controlling Urban Renewal programs. Such surveys would build up a body of photographs, drawings, and documents.

Architectural surveys of American architecture, both urban and rural, especially by the Historic American Buildings Survey.

Architectural surveys of world architecture.

The assembling of archives (as noted).

Architectural survey of the European origins of buildings in the United States.

Architectural survey and general collaborative re-examination of nineteenth-century United States architecture.

A strengthening of the clearinghouse function of the National Trust for Historic Preservation, for efficient and effective preservation activities by local and regional groups in co-operation with the Trust.

III. DISSEMINATION OF IDEAS, INFORMATION, AND MATERIALS: PUBLICATION AND INSTRUCTION

The needs reflected here are for funds to make available to libraries, colleges and universities, and other agencies materials for use in guiding preservation policy, teaching, and research. Grants for teaching architectural history fall in this section.

Certain existing materials not readily accessible for study and use should be reproduced. Suggested categories include photographs (in archives and elsewhere), architectural drawings, out-of-print treatises and periodicals, documents related to building, and collections of architects' papers.

It has been suggested that major publishing ventures should be undertaken: the results of the surveys listed in Section II, a multivolume encyclopaedia of architects and their works; a series of regional architectural studies for the United States comparable to Pevsner's British counties series; a monthly index of architectural and architectural-historical periodical literature (fields inadequately covered by the *Art Index*).

A number of individuals expressed the view that there should be a subvention for the only publication in the field, the *Journal of the Society of Architectural Historians.*

(The question of subsidizing publication of works on architectural history is covered in the next section of this report.)

In the area of the development of new teaching techniques, some thought that experimentation with the use of motion picture films deserves support. Others have advocated the construction of uniform-scale models of important architectural monuments.

The endowing of professorships in architectural history and the development of curricula, including total-environment course planning, have also been recommended.

IV. THE PROBLEMS OF THE INDIVIDUAL STUDENT AND SCHOLAR

The financial needs of the student/scholar, whether undergraduate or senior professor, loom largest in the thoughts of the consultants on this report.

Scholars need uninterrupted time for research. Particularly difficult is the plight of the teacher at the institution which does not give sabbatical leave; he is often unable to accept research grants because they are too small to support a family. It is suggested that funds be made available for allocation by the universities.

Travel is essential to the study of architectural history. It is obvious that there are limits to the amount that can be learned in this particular discipline from pictures and books. In addition to the need to travel to see the monuments at first hand, there is the need to go to widely separate sources for documents – pending creation of the archives listed in Section I. Too often one cannot ask for microfilm until one learns what is available.

Architectural-historical research and publication are expensive. Like the physical sciences, this field requires apparatus and technical assistance. Photography, professional architectural drafting and rendering, surveying and measurement – all involve heavy outlays in services and equipment. There is also the need for stenographic service.

Publication in this area requires subsidizing because of the high cost of reproducing photographs and the need for extensive illustrating, and the relatively modest demand for published studies.

As in other fields, scholarship grants are essential to ensure a flow of competent students.

V. PRESERVATION AND RESTORATION

Architectural history differs from many other scholarly disciplines in that its primary raw materials are a rapidly diminishing resource. The high toll of architectural monuments from onslaughts carried on under what Lewis Mumford calls "the soiled banner of Progress" is apparent on every hand. Architectural historians are interested in keeping the best of our architectural heritage for aesthetic, historical, and scholarly reasons.

Funds are needed, in the opinion of our consultants, for the following enterprises:

The outright purchase and rehabilitation for use — not as museums — of threatened buildings and areas of architectural importance. The use of a revolving fund has been put forward as the most practical procedure for financing the acquisition, reconditioning, and resale for approved use of such buildings. (The National Trust for Historic Preservation, with its numerous affiliates, might well administer such a program. The National Park Service is equipped to acquire and maintain buildings of historic importance.)

Support for the present activities of the National Trust and its expansion as a general clearinghouse of preservation activity in the United States (cf. Section II, above).

The training of architects and builders in the techniques of preservation and restoration. The United States lags far behind the European countries in its facilities for training in the care of historic buildings. Two approaches have been suggested: (a) To give regular courses in preservation-restoration, like those offered at such English centers as York, at American architectural schools; (b) Short courses and seminars to be offered to professional architects and others at various appropriate localities throughout the country.

Support for a broad program to educate the general public to appreciate the importance and value of preserving the best in the American scene.

THE ASSOCIATION FOR ASIAN STUDIES

Prepared by Professor Arthur F. Wright,
Yale University, in Consultation with

Professor Wm. Theodore de Bary
Columbia University

Professor W. Norman Brown
University of Pennsylvania

Professor John Whitney Hall
Yale University

Professor James R. Hightower
Harvard University

Professor Daniel H. H. Ingalls
Harvard University

Professor Frederick W. Mote
Princeton University

I.

ALTHOUGH many problems of this field are common to all the humanities, we will deal briefly with one or two of these pervasive problems, so that the context of our further remarks may be clear.

The basic problems of the humanities lie in the ethos and traditions of our country, and, secondarily, in the organization of learning which reflects them. It is a truism that we are a nation of activists, problem-solvers, inventors, would-be makers of better mousetraps. Humane learning came to us from the English universities, sheltered for nearly two centuries in the shadow of religion where it was protected to some degree from the pragmatism of the American environment. Since the Civil War that protection has gradually faded, and the humanities in the age of super-science and super-technology have an increasingly difficult struggle for existence. The principal support of the humanities in recent times has been their association with "liberal education," a concept that generations of ardent and eloquent educators have managed to implant and sustain in a few strong institutions against a host of enemies. The argument, at its barest, runs as follows: "liberal education" produces better men – whether as citizens, salesmen, scientists, or engineers – and humanistic studies such as Classics, Literature, and Philosophy are essential to that education. But the case for "liberal education" must be restated and defended in each generation with the public, the government and educational groups.

The organization of learning works to the disadvantage of the humanities in a variety of ways. The boards of regents, the boards of trustees of the private universities and the foundations are composed of men of action drawn from the worlds of business and public affairs. It is a

credit to these men and to their faculty and administrative advisers that substantial support has in fact gone to the humanities. Here again the argument for "liberal education" has been of particular importance. But the balance sheet shows a steadily greater emphasis on the sciences and on those social sciences which have "problem-solving" implications. As this has gone on, the case for "pure science" or "basic scientific research" has been made and sustained, while the case for basic research in the humanities has seldom been stated.

Humanists themselves tend to be poor advocates of their cause. Their discipline fosters subjectivism and individualism; they find it difficult to agree on their credo or even their terms. They are surely right to stand against the rising tide of group and team research, but they sometimes seem to their critics too resistant to that minimum of order that might multiply their effectiveness. In Asian studies, as in other fields, they are seldom interested in problems of organization and promotion. More seriously — and this is of fundamental importance — research in the humanities seems often to ignore a basic principle of all scholarship, namely that research should be cumulative (building on what is known while pushing into the unknown) and related to some specified or specifiable problem or theme of potential human significance. (Hypothesis is the term used in other disciplines.) Humanistic research looks and often is scattershot, antiquarian (the indulgence of a purely private curiosity), and unrelatable to any known problem or theme. These defects — not universal but pervasive — provide critics of the humanities with ample ammunition.

II.

The Asian humanities[1] have developed mainly since World War II. They have managed to grow in the climate of mid-century America, and they have inherited the general problems that beset all the humanities. But let us note some primary differences. The concept of "liberal education" did not automatically provide shelter and assistance to the Asian humanities. Confucius was not Plato! Indeed, conservative advocates of liberal education saw in the Asian humanities a deadly threat — the threat of dilution. Gradually the concept of liberal education is being expanded to include some Asian humanities, but such acceptance is far from an accomplished fact. A corollary to the problem is the relega-

[1] In this paper the term "Asian humanities" refers (a) to South Asia, Southeast Asia, China, Korea, and Japan — civilizations within the scope of the Association for Asian Studies; and (b) to the study in depth of their languages, literatures, art, systems of thought, and cultural life, both past and present; (c) also to the early history of those civilizations, which has tended by accident rather than logic to fall within the humanities.

tion of the Asian humanities to some limbo, known as "Oriental Studies," "non-Western Studies," "exotic languages," or what not.

It was a great deal easier for the social science disciplines to expand and to include Asian data and Asian scholars, because these disciplines were problem-oriented; it was not possible, for example, to maintain for very long that China, India, and Japan had no economies and should not be the concern of economics departments. Given this greater receptivity in the social science fields (though there were and are some remarkable hold-outs), plus the social sciences' claims to "relevance" and promises of ultimate problem-solving, foundations and university trustees invested a great deal of new development funds for Asian studies in these fields. As the newly trained (often half-trained) social science specialists on Asia came together in the postwar area-study programs, they needed people with knowledge of an Asian civilization, command of an Asian language, and the ability to teach it. How could any program of Asian studies proceed without scholars who knew these cultures and societies in depth, knew whence they had come and what values dominated their institutions, their preferences, and their choices? Humanists were found to fill these vital roles, but policy-making, control of funds, access to foundations, and therefore powers of attraction for graduate students, tended to remain with the social scientists. In all too many cases humanists were second-class citizens.

In this rather unhappy polarization, historians – particularly modern historians – assumed their usual mediating role. Historians of Asia, like their colleagues in the humanities, have a lifetime commitment to the study of a civilization; they know (or should know) that language is more than a "tool," that a galaxy of dazzling "models" is no substitute for "feel," empathy, and control of a variety of sources. Yet they are often close enough to the social sciences to be shrewd and useful critics; like all historians, they are on the lookout for new concepts that might help them to order some segment of history. They listen while the humanists yawn. Modern historians emerged in many institutions as the managers of the area programs in Asian studies. And, in the postwar years, graduate students have gravitated to history because (a) it is an amorphous and most accommodating discipline, (b) it permits lifelong study of a single civilization, as the social sciences generally do not, and (c) there are more beginning jobs in Asian history than in either the humanities or the social sciences. But whether the social scientist or the historian directs the program, the humanists remain under disabilities.

We have just noted the growth in college and university posts in Asian history. This has developed alongside the evolution of major "area centers" at the great universities. Presidents and trustees of col-

leges and the smaller universities have become increasingly uneasy in the postwar world at the Europocentrism of their curriculums. The first step in remedying this has often been to appoint a young historian of Asia, for the historian is thought to have some depth of knowledge, yet he can be persuaded to speak on contemporary issues; he is a good man-of-all-work for the beginning phases of attention to Asia in the curriculum. Why is the humanist not as good? Why has this type of job opportunity not opened up for the Asian humanist, thus increasing the attractiveness of humanistic studies in our graduate schools? For one thing, he is not so readily "slotted"; he has no obvious departmental home ("Classics" are Greco-Roman, "Literature" tends to mean English literature, etc.); he is not prepared to teach existing standard courses in the college curriculum. Again – and this may often be to his credit – he is not as ready to become a "generalist" as is the young historian. Again, so much of what he has to say hinges on students' understanding of the language in which Asia's great masterpieces are written. Moreover, he needs at least minimal library materials in Asian languages. The small college has not dared to venture into Asian languages, though there are now encouraging experiments at several places. In the acquisition of new jobs, therefore, the humanists have run a poor third behind history and the social sciences.

The organization of American scholarship and the evolution of Asian studies in the last two decades have generally worked against the humanities. Yet there are strong and visible countercurrents. A generation of gifted translators – some academic, some not – has brought Japanese literature to the American public in a way we could not have imagined a few years ago. (This is not the case with Chinese or Indian literature.) The great Columbia projects and other lesser enterprises have made available in new and readable form more of the basic writings of the Indian, the Chinese, and the Japanese traditions than have ever appeared before. Paperbacks of real or supposed classics of Asia pour from the presses, so that the interested layman needs a Baedeker to work his way through the shelves. And, seeking to capitalize on this apparent upsurge of popular interest, there come the charlatans and the hacks who are encouraged by the cupidity of publishers to get anything into print so long as some advertising copy can be concocted. The amateur "comparativists" – well-intentioned but silly – join the party, and the free association of plausible ideas takes the stage. While the academic Asian humanists tend generally to play third violin on the campuses, the book sales and the burgeoning of popular forums and exhibitions are clear evidence that the field of their concern is enjoying a kind of prosperity.

III.

How are we to explain the contrast between the trade winds in the market place and the doldrums on the campuses? When we winnow out of recent publications the best books in the Asian humanities, we find that their authors generally have benefited from one or another national program of fellowships – programs, however, with limited scope and resources. Or, in some cases, we find that universities – often with foundation grants – have helped to foster the creative work of their humanists. But such help has been meager and sporadic; much more needs to be done.

Here are some preliminary suggestions. The humanist capable of expert translations of Asian classics is not now, but should be, free of the routine language-teaching chores that consume his time. The humanist should enjoy what the social scientist now takes for granted: summer compensation for creative work. More, and more generous, financing of leaves, especially leaves for travel in Asia (of the type now available on a limited scale from the Guggenheim Foundation and the ACLS) should be offered. Humanistic scholars from India, China, and Japan should figure more largely in the various programs which bring Asians to the United States. A journal of Asian literature, amply financed and staffed, should be started with a distinguished academic editorial board (to replace the well-intentioned but amateurish bulletin *Literature East and West*). Humanists concerned with Asia should have a permanent council or committee with funds to encourage translations and critical and historical studies, and to finance conferences and symposia that would foster the development of their field.

Such remedies presuppose a reordering of foundation priorities and would certainly mean herculean efforts on the part of foundation executives and staffs. Everyone knows it is easy to persuade the board to give $950,000 to young economists working over the meager data on China's present economy, difficult to get $120,000 for a seven-year project in the humanities (here pre-modern history) involving all the senior Chinese scholars in the country. But this reordering of priorities is one kind of constructive action that is at least conceivable.

What of the universities and colleges? How can it come about that administrators gain a better understanding of the humanities and reach a better balance between the humanities and the social sciences in their Asian programs? Surely the catchall departments of Oriental Studies ought gradually to be liquidated – departments where the professor of Sanskrit speaks only to the professor of Hebrew and the latter only to God. We need more genuine departments of Chinese-Japanese and of South Asian languages and literatures. This is hardly *the* answer, and

not all such departments are utopias, but the step would be in the right direction. Departments of comparative literature – still few in number – are currently centered on European literature. It should be possible, with the offer of funds for new positions, to encourage them to expand their scope, include one or more fields of Asian literature, and thus provide the Asian humanist with an intellectual home and access to new ideas and methods.

The remedies thus far suggested would solve some problems, but many remain. For example, the Asian humanist requires longer training and a longer period of maturing than the social scientist before he is ready for a college or university post. Here a program of post-doctoral fellowships would be very useful. Better translations and teaching materials will make it possible for the young humanist to take one of the beginning jobs in Asian studies at a small university or college. Possibilities for advanced study and writing in a congenial environment need to be increased. The Council on the Humanities at Princeton has offered valuable senior fellowships to scholars in the humanities, including so far several Asian specialists, which provide a year of full support and an opportunity to discuss their research with interested visitors and members of the Princeton faculty. Such arrangements should be encouraged on other campuses with strong humanistic traditions.

Redressing the prestige balance will be a long and difficult task, but some steps suggest themselves. One might be to establish, throughout the country, at those institutions which could make the best case for them, five to ten professorships in the Asian humanities–chairs fully endowed and with sufficient income to permit salaries up to $25,000 plus research funds. Such chairs could not be filled at once from the available talent, but they would offer an incentive to younger humanists, a focus of ambition, and a reminder on several campuses that notable achievement in these fields can bring recognition. An annual national prize for outstanding achievement in the Asian humanities might be offered.

Many of the suggestions made above would require concerted action on a national basis – action not only to raise funds but to supervise and guide their use. A committee (or council) on the Asian humanities attached to the ACLS might provide for these functions. Such machinery should of course be under the control of the humanists themselves and should operate as unobtrusively as possible.

IV.

The suggestions made above may be summarized as follows: 1) new posts to expand the scope of comparative literature departments; 2) a

new and substantial program of post-doctoral fellowships in the Asian humanities; 3) provision for more opportunities for Asian humanists on several campuses for advanced study and writing; 4) the offer of five to ten prestige professorships in the Asian humanities to those institutions that could make the best case for them; 5) a national achievement prize for contributions to the Asian humanities; 6) a new and well-financed journal of Asian literature and the arts; 7) establishment of a national council or committee for the Asian humanities that would a) guide the developments suggested above; b) promote more and better translations of basic works and better critical-historical studies; c) sponsor such conferences and symposia programs as would advance the Asian humanities.

Such measures would not accomplish the "quick miracle" so dear to American hearts. But they would – if effected concertedly and vigorously – go a long way towards improving the status and the productivity of a group of scholars whose role is critical and vital to any increased national understanding of the civilizations and peoples of Asia.

SOCIETY OF BIBLICAL LITERATURE

COMMITTEE

Professor Herbert G. May
Graduate School of Theology, Oberlin College

Professor Bruce M. Metzger
Princeton Theological Seminary
Chairman

Rabbi Samuel Sandmel
Hebrew Union College—Jewish Institute of Religion, Cincinnati

Professor Frederick V. Winnett
University College, Toronto

I.

THE SOCIETY OF BIBLICAL LITERATURE was founded in 1880 in New York. From the beginning its object was "to stimulate the critical study of the Scriptures by presenting, discussing, and publishing original papers on Biblical topics." From 1882 onwards the *Journal of Biblical Literature* was published, a quarterly journal enjoying international reputation for solid and responsible scholarship. In 1946 the publication of a series of monographs was begun in order to provide an outlet for studies which are too long to be included, even serially, in the *Journal.* By the close of 1963 thirteen volumes were published in the Monograph Series.

As the Society grew in numbers it was found advisable to form sections in the various natural regions of the United States. Today there are seven such regional sections, which hold local meetings in addition to the annual national meetings. Frequently these meetings, both regional and national, are held in conjunction with the annual meetings of other scientific organizations, such as the American Oriental Society and the National Association of Biblical Instructors (recently renamed the American Academy of Religion).

The interests of the Society, far from being sectarian, are broad and inclusive of all scientific study of the Bible. At present the membership of the Society stands close to two thousand, made up of scholars, teachers, and clergy from Protestant, Jewish, Roman Catholic, and Greek Orthodox Churches.

II.

A generously supported National Humanities Foundation would immeasurably strengthen the scientific study of the Bible in America in

many respects. The following are several areas which cry out for such assistance:

1. The current experimentation in the teaching of the Biblical languages, Hebrew and Greek, by means of teaching machines is haphazard and uneconomical of time and money. What is needed is a co-ordinated program sponsored on the national level and involving pilot programs in representative institutions throughout the country.

2. In view of the growth of specialized libraries in the central and western parts of the United States, it is imperative that financial aid be made available to reprint all major reference tools and scientific journals which are now out of print but which are needed to undergird specialized research in the Biblical languages, archaeology, history, and exegesis.

3. In order to stimulate continued growth in professional skills, a broader program of financial assistance is needed to permit Biblical scholars to engage in post-doctoral research in this country and abroad.

4. Owing to the rising costs of printing technical materials involving fonts of type for Hebrew, Greek, Arabic, Coptic, Syriac, and other languages connected with Biblical research, a national subvention, such as is provided by some European countries, is imperative lest first-rate material produced by scholars in the United States go unpublished.

5. In order to stimulate further the exchange of ideas and information in the field of Biblical studies, broadly based programs are needed to provide additional travel grants to enable American scholars to participate still more widely in international congresses of learned societies held here and abroad.

6. The area of Biblical studies in the United States would profit greatly if funds for travel were made available to bring to this country scholars who would give shorter series of lectures than are provided for by the several exchange systems now in effect on a semester or yearly basis.

For these and related reasons the Society of Biblical Literature expresses its hope that the Congress of the United States will see fit to establish a National Foundation for the Humanities and Arts.

THE AMERICAN DIALECT SOCIETY

COMMITTEE

Professor Frederic G. Cassidy
University of Wisconsin

Professor Allan F. Hubbell
New York University

Professor James B. McMillan
University of Alabama

Professor Albert H. Marckwardt
Princeton University

Professor I. Willis Russell
University of Alabama

Professor Francis Lee Utley
Ohio State University

IN THE following report we shall attempt to outline the present situation with respect to scholarship on "the English language in America, together with other languages influencing it or influenced by it." We shall, in addition, indicate the present and future needs in the field as we see them. We speak of the discipline of language study, not as representatives of a particular organization, although the passage quoted earlier in this paragraph is taken from the constitution of the American Dialect Society. We are especially anxious that the name of this organization, which goes back to 1889, should not suggest too stringent a limitation upon our interest and concern.

I. PAST SCHOLARLY ACHIEVEMENT

In 1943 the American Dialect Society published a short symposium entitled *Needed Research in American English.* A review of this monograph in the light of the past twenty years of scholarly activity furnishes grounds for some gratification and cause for considerable dismay. One may derive satisfaction from the amount of individual activity and solid personal accomplishment in each of the major divisions of the field: namely, lexicography, linguistic geography, usage studies, place-name studies, new-word collections, non-English dialects, and proverbial sayings. To cite but a few instances, two major works and several lesser studies on non-English dialects in America have appeared. A number of excellent monographs based upon materials of the *Linguistic Atlas of the United States and Canada* have been prepared. The Society's Committee on New Words has diligently prepared an annual survey of additions to the lexicon, which until recently was published in *The Britannica Book of the Year.* Without question there has been industry and in some instances even brilliance, but chiefly upon an individual basis.

II. NEEDED RESEARCH

What is disappointing is the failure to complete, or in some instances even to embark upon, major projects which were recognized and named as desiderata some twenty years ago, and in some cases long before that. Chief among these is a dictionary of the regional and local speech of the United States, which has in effect been an announced aim of the American Dialect Society since 1896. Of the *Linguistic Atlas of the United States and Canada,* only the maps for New England have been published. Materials for much of the rest of the country have been collected, and the results of the surveys of the East Coast have been presented in some detail in three summary volumes. Nevertheless, the entire project is far from completion, and in a few areas the work has not really begun.

In addition to these two, several other large-scale projects should be undertaken. We need to work with place names on a scale comparable to that of the English Place Name Society. It is time for a resurvey of usage as well as a resurvey of opinion about English usage, comparable to the report which S. A. Leonard undertook for the National Council of Teachers of English more than thirty years ago. A country-wide collection of proverbial sayings and lore is long overdue. Continuing systematic collection of new words, particularly in an age of constant scientific development and extension of knowledge, is a constant need.

III. ASSOCIATED PROBLEMS

a. *Co-operation*

This projection of large-scale endeavors for the future poses a serious problem. For the most part the achievements of the past twenty years have come about as the result of individual enterprise and activity. But by their very nature the projects which have been outlined demand co-operative, if not co-ordinated, effort. This presupposes not only financial support on a generous scale but also time and energy devoted to planning and administration, and an abundant supply of manpower. Much as we may look back with nostalgia to the days when every scholar followed his own interests with little thought of adjusting his pursuits to the work of others, we must recognize that such individualism will not result in the completion of what we consider to be the major tasks confronting us.

b. *Financial Support*

With respect to financial support for these large undertakings, one may view the future with cautious optimism, at least to the degree that

new sources of aid are appearing upon the horizon. A request for governmental support for collecting materials for the Dictionary is about to be made. Possibly two other major projects, among those which have been suggested, could be justified for support in terms of existing governmental sources of aid, but certainly not all of them.

Consequently, we shall require foundation aid if we are to bring all of the large projects to completion. In a certain sense this would seem to be the more desirable solution. The contractual nature of most government assistance is often inimical to the spirit and attitudes which underlie humanistic scholarship. It is a grant, rather than a contract, which is best calculated to promote a spirit of free inquiry and an honest presentation of results.

c. *Archival*

The large-project nature of our thinking poses certain other problems for the discipline. For one thing, it raises an archival question. A dictionary is based upon thousands, indeed millions, of citation slips. A linguistic atlas is developed from field notes, also running into thousands of pages. The same is true of virtually every project we have recognized as important. This fact raises such vexing questions as where the materials are to be stored, the housekeeping expenses connected therewith, responsibility for their maintenance, accessibility to scholars in the field, and the possibilities of duplication. At present we have no solutions to suggest. We are concerned, however, with responsible care and maintenance of collections and availability to those who are capable of using them with profit.

d. *Machine Aids*

Research in language differs from that in some of the other humanistic fields in the extent to which new developments in electronics may render positive assistance. It would be foolish today to attempt almost any kind of linguistic field work without the aid of a tape recorder. Computers are potentially valuable for sorting and storing materials. Various kinds of microphotography and duplication can replicate archives and even serve as a substitute for letterpress publication. All of this constitutes another type of financial need, and creates an area in which a new kind of *expertise* is demanded of the individual scholar.

Nevertheless, the necessity of buying the time of the individual (*i.e.*, recompensing him for freedom from teaching responsibilities) and defraying travel and field expenses is still paramount. Mechanization is by no means a substitute for time and individual effort; it constitutes a way of increasing effectiveness.

e. *Publication*

The situation with respect to publication has its unsatisfactory aspects. Currently there is no shortage of publication outlets for everything of merit we can produce. The difficulty lies primarily in the circumstance that the various publications operate at a loss or are barely able to keep their heads above water financially. It is conceivable that some realignment of function and responsibility might improve the situation, but again this points to a greater degree of planning and coordination than has hitherto characterized our efforts in this sphere.

IV. APPLICATION TO TEACHING

At the present time there is perhaps less cause for concern over the possible impact of the results of research in language upon the teaching of the humanistic subjects, particularly English, than formerly. The current ferment in the area of curriculum development is favorable to the adoption of new concepts and the use of whatever information about language we can make available. The research scholar must, however, assume the responsibility of presenting language concepts and attitudes in cogent and assimilable form and disseminating information about language in such a manner that the task of interpreting it is not placed wholly upon the user. Here again we are moderately optimistic and feel that some sectors of our profession are beginning to realize and to assume their responsibilities.

V. INTERDISCIPLINARY RELATIONSHIPS

We may point with considerable satisfaction to our record with respect to awareness of the working methods of allied disciplines and co-operation with scholars in other fields, notably the social sciences. Possibly our greatest problem here lies in our having engendered suspicions among our literary colleagues that we are mechanistic in our approach and antihumanistic in our seeming neglect of questions of value. It is true that our concern with culture is often anthropological as well as belletristic, and that in some instances we feel that we must, without prejudice, defer value judgments and matters of larger significance until we are in firm possession of objective linguistic fact. Despite these differences in working method, we feel that the atmosphere of co-operation and mutual understanding between scholars in the fields of language and literature is on the way to improvement.

THE AMERICAN FOLKLORE SOCIETY

COMMITTEE

William N. Fenton,
Assistant Commissioner
New York State Museum and Science Service

Professor Wayland D. Hand
University of California (Los Angeles)

Louis C. Jones, Director
New York State Historical Association

Professor MacEdward Leach
University of Pennsylvania

Professor Stith Thompson
Indiana University

I. INTRODUCTION

FOLKLORE as an academic subject is relatively new in the United States, although its serious pursuit is about a century old in certain European countries, notably in Scandinavia. The reasons for this are partly historical and partly an expression of our national character. The older countries of northern Europe, being marginal to the great civilization which is more nearly manifest in their cities, were at once aware of contrasts with the more conservative and persistent folk cultures of their own rural areas, which exhibit striking local diversity. Cultural differences were also marked between classes – the educated elite and the peasants, urban and rural, and between occupational groupings. In America, there is a sharp break between the deep and diverse cultural roots of American Indians and the various colonial cultures of New France, the Atlantic seaboard, and New Spain, and the class differences within each national group.

By the twentieth century scholars became aware of the existence of a native American folk culture and of the survival in our hills and prairies, in our cities, ports, and farms, of older forms transplanted from Europe. It was also apparent that new forms are constantly being created. Collectors of tales and songs in the European tradition met with students of American Indian ethnology, who were recording the oral literature of a completely different tradition, to form the American Folklore Society in 1888. The schizoid nature of the Society's interest has been manifest from the beginning. It has been held together by a common focus on the tale, on the ballad, on the nature of the relationship of myth and ritual, on the nature of custom, and on the process of dissemination or diffusion. Of late years, more of the content of folklore production has been of "American" culture and less of "Indian."

II. RELATIONSHIP TO THE TEACHING OF HUMANISTIC SUBJECTS

Historically, folklore as a university discipline has developed from contributory interest from related departments. In America, it has come from literature departments: English, German, Spanish; and later, from anthropology and history. The problems studied have ranged from collecting and describing to classification, dissemination, and analytical treatment of themes and motifs; they have changed continually, becoming more and more complicated, but they have always related to one central question: how does a folk tradition behave?

An interest in the answer to this question and the need for knowledge which its pursuit implies is basic to broad training in anthropology, history, comparative and specialized literature, religious history, music, and art. It is only in the well-organized curriculum in folklore that such basic training can be had.

Nowhere at present is this ideal fulfilled. The training and scholarship of many workers in the field still remain somewhat nondescript. This arises from the fact that the instruction which most workers in the field have received is generally one-sided, with an emphasis on American folklore only, a decided slant in the direction of anthropology, or orientation in terms of European folklore. With few exceptions, folklorists are culture-bound. It would appear, however, that things are much better than they were, with increasing numbers of graduate students taking work at our main folklore centers in the country.

Indeed, the last twenty-five years have seen a tremendous expansion of both scholarly and popular interest in the field of folklore, particularly of American folklore. Three universities (Pennsylvania, Indiana and U.C.L.A.) now have departments or centers for graduate study and more than three hundred folklore courses are being offered at the undergraduate level. In the fall of 1964 the State University College at Oneonta, N. Y., in collaboration with the New York State Historical Association and its Farmers' Museum, will embark on a folk culture program which will endeavor to encompass the broad field of American folk culture or, as the Europeans say, folk life.

Folklore teaching is bound to be of uneven quality because our research has been concentrated on the song and the tale. But there are many areas of folklore that are generally neglected – the folklore of beliefs, folk custom, the technology of handcrafts, folk architecture, foods, costume, etc. It is encouraging to see a few American folklorists becoming interested in these traditional ethnographic topics. In some of these areas of inquiry only the outdoor (or folk) museums are doing

any research and interpretation whatsoever, whereas in Scandinavia there has been a strong university research tradition for sixty years in co-operation with the museums. Folkloristic and ethnographic studies have gone hand in hand with such institutions as the Nordiska Museum of Stockholm and the National Museum of Denmark.

At the present time the need to get broader training for students and the need to get them into the American folk museums to utilize existing research resources remain unsatisfied. Mere enumeration of courses offered gives no satisfactory picture of what is being taught. It is spotty in content and emphasis. Since the demand exceeds the supply of trained teachers, many courses are offered by persons of indifferent training. And where there are trained folklorists to teach these courses, they are likely to have specialized interests in folk song or folk music, the tale, custom and belief, or folk religion, depending on where they were trained. But specialized training, if rigorous, is not to be deprecated and is an improvement on the former situation when the leaders in folklore research were largely self-taught.

Whatever the quality of teaching or the coverage, students who have taken these courses in the past are now, in response to popular demand, incorporating folklore elements into their teaching of high-school and elementary English and social studies. They are receiving support from a great popularization movement, to be seen in the youthful interest in folk songs, and in such volumes as *Life Magazine's* "Book of American Folklore." While the popularizations are often separated from the genuine folk materials by great distances, they are significant in understanding the tides of American cultural introspection. The popularization derives from the scholarly, although sometimes filtered through many intermediaries.

No single textbook has found wide enough acceptance to leaven the mass in any appreciable way. The concern with folklore, which is reflected in the colleges by the proliferation of folklore courses already mentioned, and by the unrequited demand for qualified teachers of the subject, is also borne out by the appearance of many new books on the subject. In the matter of teaching materials, the field has improved its position. We need to implement the survey of the content of the existing course offerings with the devising of a new curriculum at graded levels from the graduate school downward. This is a task that the Society might well consider as a project to be undertaken with foundation support.

III. RESEARCH AND GRADUATE TRAINING

Training a new generation of folklorists is expensive in both time and money. In the past folklorists have had to depend on grants-in-aid

of research from the ACLS or from university research funds, and a few folklorists have held a Guggenheim Fellowship once or twice during their careers. As compared with the social sciences, and in marked contrast with the natural sciences, the amount of money available for folkloristic research is small or infinitesimal. The same situation holds for graduate training.

Today, when the great majority of graduate students in America are subsidized by graduate fellowships, and the universities are highly competitive between disciplines and between campuses in attempts to attract good students by this means, folklore will not attract and hold the best students without these incentives, nor can it survive and grow without subsidies. Estimating such fellowships at $2000 per man per annum, the amount of fellowship money available as incentive to good graduate students in folklore can be estimated at $50,000 from all sources.

The amount of money available for research and graduate training in folklore does not accord with the popular interest in the subject. A second fact is that the discrepancy between scholarly effort and the popular image will continue to grow unless the first is supported. A systematic survey of teaching of folklore will discover the magnitude and the depth of the remaining need.

IV. NEW TECHNIQUES FOR TEACHING AND SCHOLARSHIP

The invention and widespread use of the magnetic tape recorder has revolutionized the collecting of tales and songs. The movie camera makes folk technology and crafts permanently recordable. The still camera, far better than prose, can record folk art, architecture, tools and implements. More authentic material can be collected in less time in longer runs. It can also be brought into the archive and laboratory and into the classroom. The use of these aids is all too infrequent in this country, largely because of the narrowness of the view of supervising scholars. Compare the paucity of our results with what is being done in the School of Scottish Studies, Edinburgh, and we see how far American folklorists have to travel before they are ready to make the analytical studies of our folk life which are needed.

Colleagues in Ireland and Scandinavia have pioneered in the establishment of paper archives and it may be presumed that they are far ahead of us in techniques of indexing and storing folklore elements for retrieval and scholarly use. But the several archives that now exist in America should be examined with a view to their use; and it may be discovered that a late start has given us some advantages: we do not

have to repeat their errors; and we can borrow techniques of data-processing for storage and retrieval that have been developed recently here. We should learn the extent to which these newer techniques have been adopted and put to use.

V. RELATIONS WITH OTHER AREAS OF SCHOLARSHIP AND CREATIVITY

All of us are agreed that the state of the study of folklore is better than it was and may be on the verge of a boom. Matters are infinitely better than they were ten or twenty years ago, but American folklorists still must compile standard works of reference in many, if not most, of the fields of folklore before we can fully come of age. We estimate that it will take another ten or twenty years for our people to be on a par with their confreres in many countries of Europe. Scholarly interest and participation among anthropologists has declined in contrast with the expanding interest in folklore among undergraduates. However, a few significant articles and books bespeak a renewed interest among anthropologists in employing folkloristic materials as data for the testing of modern ethnological theory.

The museum as a resource for research and as an adjunct to our educational apparatus is another force to be reckoned with and exploited for enhancing the position of folklore in popular estimation. One of the greatest needs is for greater co-operation in research between the universities and the museum collections. As in anthropology, we need to get graduate students to use the museum collections and to find productive research problems that involve both the old collections and making new collections that are adequately documented in the field. The museums need to capture some of the popular interest in folk life and turn it to productive research ends.

Finally, folklore affords unique materials and some novel research techniques for applying the theory of themes and motifs to the analysis and determination of the national spirit by examining our literature and public utterances at successive periods in our national life. Perhaps no scholarly area is better equipped than folklore to explore the underlying drives, enthusiasms, loyalties, prejudices of a people. American folklorists need to broaden the concept of their mission.

ASSOCIATION OF AMERICAN GEOGRAPHERS

COMMITTEE

Professor Andrew H. Clark
University of Wisconsin

Professor George Kish
University of Michigan
Chairman

Professor Fred Kniffen
Louisiana State University

Professor William L. Thomas, Jr.
California State College
(Hayward)

I. THE HUMANISTIC CONCEPT OF GEOGRAPHY

GEOGRAPHY, a long-established discipline, holds an honored place in man's endeavors to know his world. If the humanities are concerned with man in his nonbiological and nonsocietal aspects, that is, with his highly individual actions, yearnings, and aspirations, and if geography is concerned with man's role as an occupier, builder, and modifier of the face of the earth over the whole time span of human existence, then geography is responsible for providing a point of view that is peculiarly its own. As defined by the work of geographers of many generations, such a point of view is essentially a regional synthesis, based on a painstaking and detailed analysis of the factors contributing to the landscape. Geography's task in providing such a synthesis is unique, and so is geography's role as the interpreter of a multidimensional, time-conditioned process creating the physical and cultural landscape of man.

Geography, from the point of view of the humanities, visualizes, evokes, and conveys images of the earth and their interpretation. It does so with the help of the carefully weighed word, the artistically and accurately constructed map, and the well-chosen image. To represent the scene about us has always been a major concern of geography, and it is an easy transition for written and graphic representation of man and earth to pass from the realm of science to that of art. Geography thus is and should be an art as well as a science, and geographers may be artists who are able to convey to laymen as well as to fellow-workers in the field the composite image which is the landscape.

This place for geography was well established in the Greek tradition. Herodotus was as much a geographer as a historian. In our time, the French school of regional studies of the landscape has perhaps come closest to this humanistic ideal of geography.

In the current framework of academic activities there has been a noticeable bias against this humanistic treatment of geography. The scientific or analytic approach, with its emphasis upon quantification, has been thought, justly, more likely to gain support and recognition on the basis of tangible results. There is, therefore, that much more reason to re-emphasize geography's traditional role in providing regional synthesis in literate and artistic form, and an exciting and imaginative introduction to the knowledge of the earth. This in turn requires the encouragement and development of the skills necessary to compose regional studies, as a form of artistic endeavor, for both scholars and the enlightened public.

If we accept these premises as indicating the major aspects of geography's role within the frame of reference of the humanities, and if we assume that geography might command financial support for endeavors in this direction, what specific activities would we like to see encouraged, developed and supported?

II. ACTIVITIES WORTHY OF SUPPORT

In the following brief statement a distinction is drawn between activities at the graduate and young staff-member levels, and those of full-fledged faculty members of academic institutions. The majority of geographers are engaged in the field of teaching and research at the collegiate level. Considerable attention is being paid currently to the development of geography's role in the curriculum of secondary education. It is the feeling of this committee that the reports now becoming rapidly available cover this particular level of geography most adequately. Our concern therefore is primarily with the academic scene. With respect to promising activities at the graduate-student and young staff-member level, we believe that these should be grouped under two headings: institutional and tutorial.

III. GRADUATE AND POST-GRADUATE TRAINING

Summer Institutes

Support for humanistic geographical activities at the institutional level is conceived here as providing organized procedures to introduce graduate students and, in some instances, junior staff members to relevant aspects of geography through fellowship support. There has been ample precedent for this course of action within geography as well as in other disciplines; we have in mind summer institutes of six to eight weeks in duration. It is our hope that such special institutes might be conducted by recognized masters of the art of conveying

geographical observations, organized into regionally based presentations.

First and foremost, such institutes should encourage the development of writing skills among the younger geographers. The committee recognizes that this might not necessarily demand a professional geographer as instructor, but rather a senior figure in the field of creative writing. Academic, governmental, and artistic circles have expressed their concern that young American scholars be provided not only with technical training, but also with the skills needed to present their findings in a manner both informative and widely comprehensible. This committee wishes to express its strong disapproval of the prevailing use of unnecessary technical jargon and its support of a return to the canons of clear exposition and literate expression characteristic of some of the outstanding figures throughout geography's long history.

Over and above these considerations, which have to do with geography's role in relation to other branches of the humanities and to the laity, there is another concern that prompted the committee's emphasis on the written form of presentation. This derives from its belief in the significance of regional geography as a primary component of the activities of geography. While the art of regional presentation has reached great heights in some schools of geography outside the United States, it has not done so here. American geographers have singularly neglected to exploit the rich vein of regional materials. Indeed, the writing of truly great regional monographs on the geography of the several parts of the United States remains to be done. It is our belief that the task would be made easier, and the results more pleasing, more readable, more accurate, and more artistic, with the development of greater skills in the art of presentation by the written word.

A second field of endeavor that could well be the subject of special summer institutes for graduate students and younger staff members is cartography. In the recent past there has been a marked increase in emphasis on both quantitative and qualitative cartography among American geographers. Graduate students are increasingly appreciative of the significance of cartographic skills as one of the two primary means of presenting their findings – the reaffirmation of a truism as old as the field. American geography can now claim a small body of distinguished cartographers whose work is of such character as to qualify them properly to instruct the student and the younger staff geographer. We believe that summer institutes under expert guidance would bring rich rewards in the form of a new excellence of cartographic execution and a renewed awareness of the significance of cartography in geographical investigation and representation.

Much used, but with scant concern for artistic qualities, is another form of graphical representation — photography. Such a summer institute as we have proposed, employing the skills, the experience, and the personality of a few of America's truly great professionals in this field, would do a very great deal, we believe, toward the acquisition by young geographers of this essential art of regional presentation. It would be necessary to emphasize the technical aspects of photography, *i.e.*, the choice of an instrument, the range of available film materials, the development of exposed film, and, perhaps most important, the art of enlarging. Besides this, a second, more subjective goal of such an institute would be long and detailed discussions, combined with field practicum, by eminent photographers of the art of composing a photograph, planning one's photographic activities, and choosing one's objectives. The art of restricting one's objectives, of including within the photograph only the essentials, is not easily achieved. Few indeed are the nonprofessionals who reach that high level. Yet it is not a skill beyond attainment; it can be conveyed by observing a practiced artist. A summer institute dealing with this aspect of geographic presentation might well have salutary results.

Last but not least, there remains one high skill in presentation, which may well be restricted to those possessing at least a modicum of artistic ability, namely, the art of drawing and sketching. Geographers have envied those fortunate few who were able to liberate themselves from the all-inclusive eye of the camera and concentrate on the selective power of the human eye. There is no doubt in our minds that a sketch of a small, significant part of the total landscape may well be worth several score of the best photographs. A geographer able to select in this manner that particular feature of the landscape which he is describing has a distinct advantage over virtually all of his colleagues. It is our belief that under the proper leadership there would be members of our profession who could become proficient in it. We would very strongly support this as one of the chosen activities of the proposed summer institutes.

Tutorials

In addition to the group instruction of the institutes, a second area of training this committee would like to see encouraged might come under the heading of tutorial instruction. It has been pointed out that learning the skill of observation and of recording observations from one who has mastered the art can be a most important step in the training of a geographer. The art of the "traverse" of a landscape, employed in discovery and exploration, is part of these skills. So is the art of

summarizing the sights, the smells, the sounds of a place, and assigning proportionate significance to each one.

We might suggest three specific measures which we feel would contribute to the improvement of the training of geographers in the humanities, and bring about a better understanding of the role of geography as an art among its younger practitioners. The first measure would provide an opportunity for graduate students to join a senior staff member in the field. The association would be for a period of only a week or two; it would provide an opportunity for the student to be introduced informally to the skills of observation, recording, and selection, by a tried practitioner. Those of us who have had the benefit of such training value it highly among the ingredients of our professional education. An opportunity to be in the field with a "senior practitioner" might mean an introduction not only to the skills involved but also to a new and different cultural context. Opportunities for the student working alone in the field have been provided in the last decade, on a modest scale, by field fellowships. What we suggest here, however, is different, in that it would make available to advanced students an opportunity to join a staff member carrying on his own research, and to work with him as a field assistant for short periods of time. Whether such work is done at home or abroad, the art of teaching by example would here find full expression.

A second but equally significant aspect of "tutorial" training would call for closer field supervision by a senior staff member of the doctoral candidate's thesis research. What we suggest here is an opportunity for the staff member directing the thesis to spend a period with the graduate student on his project in the field. This would provide an unequaled opportunity for the student to be made aware, before it is too late, of the possibilities inherent in his chosen project, but more important, to learn from his tutor the manner in which he should collect, record, and organize material.

A third suggestion proposes the establishment of special national chairs in geography. We feel that this proposal may well rank equal in importance with the previous two. The effectiveness of the Sigma Xi National Lectureship and the Phi Beta Kappa National Lectureship have influenced the committee in making this suggestion.

We envisage men of national distinction, recognized for their work in humanistic branches of geography, being appointed to national chairs for a period of at least five years. During their tenure they would be available, for periods ranging from a few weeks to whole terms, for residence on university campuses where geography is carried on as a major teaching and research discipline. We believe it would be possible

thus to develop a nation-wide awareness of the humanistic approach to geography and its respectability, and to provide a lasting stimulus for younger staff members and students to seek out this relatively neglected aspect of the field.

IV. SENIOR GEOGRAPHERS

Fellowships

Financial support for humanistic geography is needed not only for the training of graduate students and younger staff members but also for established geographers. Our feeling is that the first need is for research fellowships. There is a marked bias in favor of the scientific as opposed to humanistic approaches in available research fellowships. We feel that a strong case can be made for a revision of the situation.

We envisage such research fellowships making it possible for staff members to spend an extended period of time – a minimum of one semester and preferably a full year – in some of the great research collections in the United States. A man engaged in writing the history of a particular period of geography or of cartography might well request such support to spend a year at the Library of Congress, at the Newberry Library, at the John Carter Brown Library, or at the library of Harvard University, to name a few. Needless to say, we would strongly support such research fellowships being given also to geographers anxious to spend an extended period of time in the field, at home or abroad.

We feel, however, that we would be remiss in the charge given to us if at this point we did not emphasize the fact that research time in the field or in the library represents only a fraction of the time needed by geographers, as well as by other workers in the humanities, for organizing and presenting the results of their research. It is a well-known fact that the time of the average American university faculty member that he can call his own for research purposes is becoming more and more limited every year. The demands made upon an academician by his department, by his college, by his university, as well as by his profession at the regional, the national, and even the international level, are increasing every year. The first responsibility of a member of a university faculty is, after all, to teach, and we would find little to quarrel with if such demands were made upon members of university and college faculties for the benefit of their students. The fact is, however, that this time is devoted to tasks which in quite a few instances cannot be classified as particularly productive. In order to devote time to the preparation of the results of his research for publication the geographer needs uninterrupted time, not time snatched away from

the many subsidiary activities imposed upon him by his position. We would like to urge, therefore, that serious consideration be given to geographers who, having already benefited from fellowship support for field or library work, find themselves in a position where it becomes virtually impossible for them to devote prolonged periods of time to the preparation of the results of their research.

Conferences

The second activity which seems to be of significance to us in this respect is that of making funds available for "retreats" or "conferences," of a few days' duration, which would make available to geographers, among themselves or in consort with members of other disciplines, an opportunity to chart new paths in teaching, in training, in research policy. There have been quite a few instances of such conferences yielding results far beyond the worth of the relatively modest sums necessary for their support. We wish to urge that a place be reserved, when funds become available, for activities of this kind.

V. FEDERAL SUPPORT FOR HUMANISTIC NEEDS

The committee has discussed at some length the vital problem of sources of support. We have taken into account the organizations which have supported geography to date. We have also considered the fact that there exists, beyond doubt, a degree of bias in favor of the non-humanistic aspects of our field. We have therefore come to the conclusion that federal support, in whatever form available, is likely to be the answer to the needs of humanistic activities in geography.

The first choice of this committee is the amendment of the National Science Foundation Act, enabling it to include humanities among its supported activities. Our reasons include our view that the Foundation has already established procedures of selection and administration, and that it has created a strong working liaison both with other branches of the administration and with Congress. Last but not least, it seems to us that the National Science Foundation is a well-established organization which has fitted into the "federal pattern," and that therefore it would enjoy certain advantages because of its intimate contacts.

Our second choice would be the establishment of a separate National Foundation for the Humanities. It seems to us that a new start, new spirit, and new staff, awake to its responsibilities and aware of the needs of the humanities in the United States, might take advantage of the growing awareness at the national level of the needs of the humanities and the possibilities of supporting them.

In considering the foregoing it becomes evident that an institute for the support of the humanities, in the form proposed by Representative Fogarty, that is, the National Institute of the Arts and the Humanities, located in the United States Office of Education, in the Department of Health, Education and Welfare, is definitely our last choice. We fully agree in this respect with the executive committee of the Council of Graduate Schools, in its vote of April 17, 1962.

CONCLUSION

In voicing the needs and attempting to foresee possible developments, this committee feels that the role of geography in the humanities might well be fruitful beyond all expectations. We feel that geography, rather than purely a science, is very distinctly an art; that its practitioners should be considered artists as well as scientists; and that such an approach is well justified by the position of geography as the meeting place of the arts, of the social sciences, and of the humanities. The role of the geographer in interpreting for man his environment is one that has been fulfilled with considerable credit throughout a history of more than two thousand years. The task of fitting this age-old art into a twentieth-century framework is not an easy one. It demands encouragement and support, particularly for younger men who may well be tempted away by opportunities available elsewhere. Those with their productive years before them must be made aware of the satisfactions coming to the geographer working as an artist. We feel that through the means we have suggested here these satisfactions could be made known to promising young scholars.

THE AMERICAN HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION

COMMITTEE

R. F. Arragon
Woodrow Wilson National Fellowship Foundation

W. Stull Holt,
Executive Secretary
American Historical Association

Professor Wilbur K. Jordan
Harvard University

Professor George W. Pierson
Yale University
Chairman

Professor Boyd C. Shafer
Macalester College

HISTORY AND THE HUMANITIES

I. THE HUMANITIES

IN BROAD summary the humanities may be defined as a particular body of knowledge, a special system of instruction, and a basic attitude toward life.

The particular body of knowledge is that developed by and handed down through the fields of study or subject-matter disciplines which we call language and literature, philosophy, history, and the various branches of the arts. The special system of instruction is that known and practiced now through some two thousand years (with whatever variation of disciplines or change of emphasis) as the liberal arts. The basic attitude which distinguishes these disciplines is one of concern for the individual: for his emotional growth; for his moral, religious, and aesthetic values; and for the goals of his life on earth. These goals of course include his development as a rational being and his responsibilities as a member of the human community.

Looked at in the large, the humanities – as knowledge, as education, and as attitude – have played an immense and almost inexpressible role in the creation of Western culture, in the definition of its values, and in its struggles for intensification and survival.

It goes without saying that not everything that we value or depend on has stemmed from humanist endeavor. The conquest of nature, the mastery of matter, the marked secular bent of European thinking, and the extraordinary development of the natural and physical sciences in the last three centuries – these have added new dimensions to man's concept of civilization, and put in his hand fantastic new powers. In

like fashion, the experimental or quantitative study of men living in groups, through the behavioral sciences, has given us invaluable insights and sharp tools for social improvement. Yet the social theories of these same scientists, the purposes they propose, the history of their efforts, and the assessment of their ultimate meaning for human good or ill, all fall primarily within the intellectual and moral overview of the humanities.

It is hardly too much to say that everything that man has done and everything that has happened to man – his whole past on earth – is of concern. For since time out of mind the humanities have been the preservers, the translators, and the judges of man's labors. It follows that humanist scholars have shared a fearful responsibility. It has been their job to discover and understand what has happened, then to organize "our huge inheritance of experience" so as to make the past available to the present, finally to make the whole of contemporary civilization accessible, too, to men who "necessarily must live in one small corner for one little stretch of time." As has been well said, to work in the humanities has been "to engage in an act of civilization itself."

To work in the humanities has been also to help give civilization its purpose and direction. Today, as one colleague has put it, "a knowledge of science we must have if we are to live; [but] a knowledge of the humanities we must have if we are to live well" – that is, if we are to realize the full purposes and satisfactions of living. For mankind is nothing without individual men. Pleasure and pain, good and evil, truth and beauty can only be perceived, and transmuted into culture, by individual human beings. And not even the most gifted persons can fully realize themselves, or make their contributions to human welfare, unless their imaginations have been stretched by some knowledge of what other men have dreamed or thought or actually accomplished.

In struggling to make a living, we may too readily forget that men cannot live by the machine alone or by the organized group. Science is for man, not vice versa. Ultimately, the welfare state itself exists for its individual citizens. Unfortunately, even the most favored citizens risk becoming subjects instead, pawns rather than masters of the machine, stunted in their personal development, victims finally of aimlessness or despair, if they do not somehow achieve a sense of man's innate worth and of his infinite capacities. Here – it will bear repeating – is where civilization most directly depends upon the humanities. For it is the humanities which have always believed in the individual and cultivated his manifold capacities. By learning they have given him intellectual humility. By the exercise of his emotions they have

contributed to his stability. By their interest in man, rather than matter, they have taught him the excitement that lies in ideas and in people; by literature they have stimulated his vaulting imagination, and by faith released the greatest creative energies we know – the energies of the human spirit.

Not everyone, of course, is able to work successfully in the humanities; nor have all groups in society historically felt called upon to support them. In Greece it was the philosopher-statesmen; in Rome, pre-eminently the poets and lawyers; in the Middle Ages, the religious orders; and in the Italian Renaissance, the city merchants, who recognized the values in literature, philosophy, and history, and encouraged their systematic development through the liberal arts. Later, in northern Europe, it was the leading groups and classes, whether of church or state, of land or of trade, that supported the collegiate way of living and patronized the arts. Whatever the difficulties or vicissitudes, century after century in Europe, as in most of the New World societies which Europe founded, the ablest youth have found their instruction, the citizens their enlargement of horizons, and the wise men their inspirations and solace, in the humanities and the liberal arts.

How is it now with us?

Soberly we must say that in American society, for many generations past, the prevailing concern has been for the conquest of nature, the production of material goods, and the development of a viable system of democratic government. Hence we have stressed, both in our education and in our public support, the sciences, the application of science through engineering, and the application of engineering or quantitative methods to the economic and political problems of a prospering republic. Lately, that predilection or bias in favor of the "practical" arts has been enormously reinforced by the atomic breakthrough, the Communist threat, and the upheaval of the Afro-Asian world. In an age of automation at home and awakening nationalisms abroad, all under the menace of atomic warfare, such subjects as nuclear physics, electronics, and chemical engineering, or such studies as the demography, econometrics, growth economics, or sociology of underdeveloped countries, seem to have such immediate and necessary applications that their encouragement and public support are no longer even debatable. Yet by such one-sided choices we risk becoming in fact – what some European and Asiatic commentators have always accused us of being – an overwhelmingly materialistic society.

By contrast, our humanities, which are concerned for the spirit and potentialities of the individual, which through language and literature make possible effective human communication, and which de-

fine the ends of living and are indispensable to its full enjoyment, have been lightly regarded, or taken for granted, or left to the care of an underprivileged teaching class and the educational efforts (primarily) of our private colleges and universities. Today, more than ever, those concerns which nourish personality, and are at the heart of individual freedom, are being neglected in our free society. Those studies which refine the values and feed the very soul of a culture are increasingly starved of support. Nor is this merely a matter of popular ignorance or Congressional indifference. By national science scholarships for undergraduates, by graduate fellowships and research grants in the "defense" sciences, the ablest young men and women – the potential humanists of the future – are being lured away. Without really intending it, we are on the road toward becoming a dehumanized society.

To make matters more difficult, in a pluralistic and democratic society the humanities seem extraordinarily hard to help, for financial support tends to lead to financial dependence, and financial dependence quickly brings on dependence in matters of action and opinion, too. Yet for the very reason that the humanities are concerned with quality, with values, with emotions, and with the goals of living, *they must remain free.* To control them is to dictate opinion and to subject all men to the tyranny of a controlling authority in the most intimate and sacred concerns of our existence as human beings.

It follows that the humanities are at once the part of our culture most in need of support, yet most dangerous to entrust to the benevolence or direction of any single authority, whether of church or of party or of state. The federal government could perhaps entirely take over the financing of engineering without great damage to society, but it cannot determine what is done in the humanities without irreparable harm to the freedom and moral welfare of its citizens. A government which gives no support at all to humane values may be careless of its own destiny, but that government which gives too much support (and policy direction) may be more dangerous still. Inescapably, we must somehow increase the prestige of the humanities and the flow of funds. At the same time, however grave this need, we must safeguard the independence, the originality, and the freedom of expression of those individuals and those groups and those institutions which are concerned with liberal learning.

In such a dilemma, it seems to us that the champions of the humanities ought to make a stronger case for the humanities before the public and ought to work for much more substantial support. Yet in so doing *we ought to make sure that the support, so far as it comes from the federal government, (1) is limited and indirect; (2) is matched by support from many other sources; and (3) is controlled as to its direction*

and distribution by a mixed body or by several bodies of policy-makers, themselves representative of the humanistic professions and of qualified individuals from private life.

A desirable first step would be the establishment of a National Humanities Foundation, in part resting on and appealing to private support, but comparable in other ways to the National Science Foundation, which is doing so much to invigorate our scientific development. Such a National Humanities Foundation should rely on the experience, the services, and the advice of the American Council of Learned Societies, the Social Science Research Council, and other conference boards devoted to the cause of the arts and of humane learning. It might draw on the counsel and the membership of the established professional societies. And it could create panels of scholars and qualified laymen to design or oversee special projects for the improvement of the humanities and the strengthening of their contributions to American life.

II. HISTORY

In twentieth-century America what is history's importance? In a Western tradition now overlaid by the culture of science and shadowed by the spectre of annihilation, has it anything of special value to say? Let us note first of all, *history's many-sided character.*

1. *History offers us certain original and indispensable ways of looking at human experience,* for it is concerned primarily with TIME. It brings us perception in depth. It weighs the conflict of the generations and the passing of the years. It contrasts what is or what was with what has gone before. It speaks of the rise of civilizations – and of their decline. So history deals with the flow of things and makes plain that nothing ever can stand still. It recognizes the inevitability of CHANGE. To those caught up in the moment, swept along by mass passions, or blinded by the sudden glare of new dangers, it offers the sovereign antidote of PERSPECTIVE. Men have survived troubles before. One of its greatest gifts to individuals and to society is that history puts the temporary present in its place.

Another peculiar quality of history is its acceptance of idiosyncrasy and variation, its recognition that both individuals and events are UNIQUE. However tempting the parallels, it shows us an unrepeatable past and situations which cannot be duplicated. Insisting also on the major role that CHANCE and CONTINGENCY have played in human affairs, it warns us against trusting blindly to repetition. History smiles at our self-confidence and makes plain the hazards of prediction.

Again, history uncovers, beneath the vivid myths of folklore or the stereotypes of some national legend, the unexpected COMPLEXITY of human affairs. However uncomfortable it may make us, we discover that issues were not all black-and-white, or one-sided. From history we learn that things are rarely if ever as simple as they seem.

While all the humanities are concerned with civilization, history has the special duty to act as CARETAKER OF THE PAST. Ideally, our historians should "sift the whole of man's culture again and again, reassessing, reinterpreting, rediscovering, translating into a modern idiom, . . . bringing to the center of the stage that which a past generation has judged irrelevant but which is now again usable, sending into storage that which has become, for the moment, too familiar . . . preserving it for a posterity to which it will once more seem fresh."

2. *History is basically HUMANISTIC.* Its biographical content and attention to personalities, its emphasis on chance and individual choice, its recognition that beliefs and moral values have mattered – these link history with literature and philosophy as a radically humane inquiry. History also particularly responds to a fundamental human urge, the instinct of CURIOSITY. It feeds man's desire to know, and in so doing both instructs and entertains. Because of the sheer chaos of history's materials and the overwhelming magnitude of the assignment, the interpretation of the past has also been, and must largely remain, selective and interpretive, a LITERARY ART.

Again, history takes many of its tools from the other humanities, from the study of the languages and literatures, philosophies and fine arts of the European tradition. In return it contributes to these disciplines its strong sense of time and change, of accident and the precariousness of life, of individual triumphs and disappointments, of cultural influences or inescapable social involvement. Underneath the tangle of past happenings it discovers both patterns and irregularities. By its record of social action it also shapes our understanding of men's behavior and motivations, "our insight into the inner life through its outward expression."

3. *History is also a social study.* It deals with groups and institutions, politics and economics, wars and the balance of power. It borrows the findings and hypotheses of the social sciences for the reinterpretation of the past. In return it contributes to the maturity and sophistication of the social sciences by its emphasis on chance and personality, on human emotions and disorders, on the historic importance of religious beliefs and moral codes, on contrasting purposes in civilization.

With its interest in CAUSE, history also contributes to the understanding of social process. By its concern for the past it gives roots to

our institutions. We may not altogether believe that "those who know no history are doomed to repeat it." But for our social or political planners history provides the indispensable warnings. It reminds us of factors to be taken into account, and suggests possibilities for action. In an international crisis history will not tell us precisely what to do but rather some things we surely ought not to do. Again and again, what we don't know about the traditions and cultures of other peoples has hurt us.

4. *History is a bridge between the other disciplines.* Like philosophy, but in a different way, history takes all knowledge for its province. It not only puts materials of civilization into their social context and time sequence but shows the interrelations of institutions, the relativity of ideas, the interdependence of our disciplines. It thus not only contributes to an understanding of literature, art, religion, and philosophy but also, in the shape of the history of our sciences, makes clear the remarkable scientific component in Western culture, just as by the study of the development of the social sciences it illuminates their growing role in the contemporary world. By its very character history helps bridge "the two cultures."

5. *History can give us personal strength.* As Carl Becker so poignantly wrote, "The value of history is, indeed, not scientific but moral: by liberalizing the mind, by deepening the sympathies, by fortifying the will, it enables us to control, not society, but ourselves – a much more important thing; it prepares us to live more humanely in the present and to meet rather than to foretell the future."

6. *History (and this is most important) has become one of the central disciplines and indispensable experiences of liberal education.* Its attention both to the individual and to society as a whole, its recognition of the many arts and disciplines and professions, its revelation of the vast range of human experience and the extraordinary variety of human institutions, its chronicle of the rise and fall of proud peoples – these make history, with literature, one of the two broadest and most profoundly instructive studies of our time. It is no accident that history and English literature are the two most powerful major studies in many of our leading universities and colleges – and the prime elective studies, too. How else are we to civilize our decision-makers? How better enlarge the horizons of future engineers and industrialists than through the understanding of their own tradition and the study of *other* cultures and times? How more effectively than through history can we bring to our citizens and their chosen leaders that experience of other rulers and crises, and that humility in prediction, without which the highest statesmanship becomes impossible?

7. *Finally, history is a public resource* – a reservoir from which the

layman too can draw wisdom. It helps him defend himself against fanatics and demagogues, against the narrowness of professional specialization, against excessive "presentism" or a shallow preoccupation with the latest discovery or novelty. When a man can know about and think about the past, and becomes aware of alternatives, of the fallibility of human planning, of the danger of oversimplification, of the limitation of dogmas or monistic solutions, then he is a freer man, by so much emancipated from the pressures of fashionable opinion, the tyranny of circumstance, or the false premises of some party line. Through history, also, he becomes better equipped to understand and contribute to civilization. A people without "annals" may be happy, but it can hardly be civilized.

III. THE PUBLIC POSITION OF HISTORY

History can be (and often is) abused. Because history is a selective art, because it is or can be made so persuasive, and because the layman can hardly hope to know more than the general outlines or some dramatic passages out of the past, history can be used to alter men's view of their own origins and destiny. It can be distorted for partisan purposes or colored to serve the interests of jingoism or hero worship. It can be revised to further a crusade, or to disguise a selfish conspiracy. With enough power and desire, not a little "Newthink" can even be imposed. So if we say that without history our citizens would be uneducated, let us not forget that with a history politically controlled we risk entering the nightmare world of *1984.* To allow some president or Congressional committee to censor our past experiences would be to brainwash ourselves. *The control of the past is no less critical than the control of a man's beliefs or of his religion.*

The public support of history? History is very widely but very carelessly maintained. Its formal support comes from its place in the curriculum, from books and articles and the world of commercial publication, from its services to nationalism in many forms, and from all the casual or purposeful human curiosity which leads men to investigate what happened yesterday or years ago. Supreme Courts base their decisions upon it. Politics cannot do without it. No treaties can be ratified without appeals to historic experiences. No sectional rivalries but draw nourishment from their past. No Congressional investigation but depends on history or manufactures its own. For the general public the past has the added attractions of a public domain, better still a vast zoo, in which the largest and fiercest animals, the outrageously spectacular specimens, or the freak monstrosities, rivet the casual visitor's attention (without regard to their evolutionary significance). Meanwhile, history also feeds our curiosity about people, and in the form

of historical biographies wins many prizes or, in the guise of historical novels, a place on the best-seller lists.

Yet, for all this, the sober fact remains that the investigation of history, the writing of history, and the teaching of history are supported *most inadequately by the foundations and hardly at all by any public authorities.* As a profession, history is too little honored and narrowly interpreted, while as a body of knowledge or public resource it is too much taken for granted, or vulgarized, or abused. On the one hand it is too easily corrupted for partisan purposes. On the other it is too commonly regarded as something which is finished, which cannot change, which is dead. First and last, the values of history for our conduct and character are consistently underestimated. There is something obstinately childish in our attitude toward experience. By neglect of the historical dimension we foreshorten our own lives.

IV. THE GENERAL NEEDS OF HISTORY

All things considered, history has been rather uninspired and uninspiring in this country. As modest in their talents as in their public position, our historians too often have shown themselves timid and pedestrian in approach, dull and unimaginative in their writing. Yet these are the vices that stem from public indifference. To realize its higher potentials history needs support, invigoration, new talent and imagination, but not political control. In order to play its role in the education of our people and the maturing of American culture, our profession requires not the forced redirection of its energies, not drastic reforms of its methods or ideas or training, not direct political grants for major policy purposes, not even federal financing for particular worthy projects – but *the recruitment of superior ability and the widest kind of indirect and mixed support.*

In this open society, *ability, freedom,* and *general support* are the key terms. Thus, when the government does help finance history, it should do so in the "non-sensitive" or "instrumental" areas, *i.e.,* primarily by the supply of tools and facilities and general opportunities for training. As with all the humanities, such support should be channeled through some mediating body like a National Humanities Foundation, through our learned associations and professional organizations, or through lay bodies advised by panels of scholars. The particular requirements of history may be quite specific, but the support from tax monies should be broadly conceived, and primarily technical in character.

A major need of the profession, many now feel, is to take in the "new territories." Having confined itself largely to the Western tradi-

tion, history now needs to explore, describe, and teach the histories of the non-Western peoples; also to improve its command of Russia, Eastern Europe, the Middle East and North Africa, and perhaps Latin America. Again, the study of the natural and social sciences by our apprentice historians should be encouraged, and a training period in these sciences should be made available for the better understanding of their character and historic significance. However, it is questionable whether the federal government should be asked to finance, to give direction to, or to choose among such "area" studies any farther than it already does through the N.D.E.A. For the foundations and private philanthropy have perceived the needs, are now helping to carry the responsibility, and should be encouraged to continue. What is to be feared, in the circumstances, is not so much a drying up of public support as too close a control or direction of our colleges and universities. Here, as elsewhere, foundation funds, or any fresh drafts on tax monies, should make available *general opportunities* for training under college and university supervision, should underwrite the required tools and facilities, and should be used to enlarge the research and travel grants already being provided through the A.C.L.S. and the S.S.R.C.

Meanwhile, our historical profession needs very badly to gain a greater mastery of the world's languages, past and present, not only for the understanding of Asia but for the better understanding of the origins and evolution of the European tradition. Studies of the Renaissance and Reformation in this country are greatly handicapped by the fact that so few, even among the abler students, command the necessary languages. The same goes, a fortiori, for the still earlier languages of the Mediterranean world and of our classical traditions. With models already established for the intensive summer study of contemporary European and non-European tongues, in institutes with federal support, it may be suggested that our efforts should be chronologically expanded. Winter or summer, by grants both publicly and privately financed, our students should be afforded the opportunities properly to equip themselves in any language appropriate to their studies. And under a National Humanities Foundation the languages of our European inheritance should be emphasized. Indubitably, it is in these fields that most of the undergraduates – and most of the adult public, too – will be exposed to the study of history and an appreciation of the Western tradition.

Of fundamental importance would be a substantial build-up of libraries and of library collections on the peoples and civilizations of the past. The costs of library building may seem prohibitive to the foundations, but the government could easily afford to assist communities

and even private universities in this fashion, especially as library construction need raise no religious issues and could be done on the basis of matching grants. The separation of church and state must of course be maintained. But the separation of state from laboratory has long since broken down – and the library is the laboratory of history and of all the humanities: the indispensable heart of the modern university. The federal government should be persuaded to donate a few pints of tax blood yearly to keep these hearts pumping – to start up and enlarge these laboratories of civilization.

For the sound growth of history in the United States, students and scholars also need much better collections of public records, and some balance in regional distribution: enterprises in which the federal government might well swing the laboring oar. It has been suggested that the nation as a whole would greatly benefit if libraries of the first order and historical resources comparable to those of Boston, New York, Philadelphia, Washington, Chicago, and San Francisco, could be built up at such regional centers as Chapel Hill or Atlanta, New Orleans, St. Louis, and possibly Denver or Seattle.

Another distinctly "instrumental" need of the historical profession is that of learning to master the exploding documentary universe by archival and bibliographical instruction and by training in the selection and editing of documents. The publication of guides and of reference works serves a like purpose – as does the reproduction and cataloguing of the basic historical materials, *e.g.* public records, newspapers, microfilms, and audio-visual records.

The translation of documents and important works from the more difficult languages would benefit the undergraduates and the lay public (more than our scholars); while the translation of leading works of American historical scholarship into selected foreign languages would help broaden the influence and contacts of our profession.

Perhaps we need also to experiment more imaginatively with the new teaching devices, such as film, radio, and television – and to explore the popularization of history (see Summary, VI). Surely we need to keep studying the role of history in our educational system at all levels. The development of high-school curricula, the collaboration of high-school and college faculties, the role of history in the liberal arts curriculum, the better general education of intending teachers and scholars of history, the improvement of the graduate programs for the Ph.D., and the development of wider opportunities for publication and for post-doctoral study, are all among the important agenda of the historical profession. The problems of writing or of teaching world history are not without challenge. And the study of the theory and history of history merits distinctly more attention than it has been getting.

It hardly needs arguing that, for these and many other purposes, able individuals, either in training to become teachers or when fully employed as historians, should have the opportunity to be freed for reasonable periods from their academic duties by means of fellowships or grants. In this field the A.C.L.S., the S.S.R.C., and a number of foundations have pioneered in an extraordinarily useful way. So what is now needed is perhaps chiefly the enlargement of such opportunities, more particularly for the more "remote" and neglected areas of our own Western tradition.

This brings us finally to the problem of quality and of *talent and prestige.* What the humanities need is better history; what society needs is better historians. We need to attract more men of ability into the profession, and we need therefore to reward ability in history with greater prestige. This suggests that a National Humanities Foundation might well organize, or encourage, the award of honors and prizes. The federal government should avoid making such awards itself. It might rather help support a self-governing foundation with a lay board of trustees for the award of prizes for great historical works and distinguished historical careers, or for contributions of outstanding merit from promising younger scholars.

Paradoxically, the world is now moving so fast that history or the knowable past seems to Americans more than ever irrelevant, out of date and useless – and this just at the moment when an understanding of the varieties and complexities and vicissitudes of human experience, and of the different continents and traditions, is most of all needed. A major effort should therefore be made in the direction of restoring the balance of American life, supporting liberal education, bringing more talent and prestige into the field of history, and finally of increasing the resources, sharpening the tools, and multiplying the materials for the study of the experience of all mankind.

V. SUMMARY AND TABLE OF NEEDS

American civilization is becoming increasingly unbalanced. The humanities – concerned for the individual, his culture, and all his values – have been slighted by the federal government, persistently underestimated by the public. And history has shared in the damaging neglect. Because of the extraordinary insights which history has developed (as noted in the preceding Report), the many-sided study of the past has become one of the indispensable resources for civilized societies. Yet in America history has been too much scorned and thought of as dead, too often simply taken for granted, or too selfishly exploited and abused.

On the record, we feel strongly that for their own growth and welfare the American people ought to give much stronger attention and support both to the humanities in general and to history in particular —yet they should do so in a way or ways to safeguard freedom of opinion and liberty of choice. Because financial help easily leads to influence, or even censorship and control, the financing of history should be mixed and largely voluntary. Government support should be strongly urged, but should be (a) limited and indirect, (b) matched as far as possible by private or foundation grants, (c) controlled and distributed by intermediate bodies of scholars and laymen, such as might be organized under a National Humanities Foundation. Finally, (d) tax monies should be sought primarily for the less "sensitive" areas, *i.e.,* for the tools, equipment, training opportunities, and other instrumental aids which are needed if the old fields of history are to be invigorated or the new mastered.

The areas of needed support for history, the preferred sources of support, and the ways in which financial help can most productively be applied, are summarized in the following Table. (G=government support; P=private support from foundations, business, learned societies, or other philanthropic sources.)

I. *AREAS OF HISTORY*

Certain fields of historical inquiry or instruction or public communication are in need of additional, more substantial, or more immediate help, especially

(a) The *"NEW TERRITORIES":* the exploration, interpretation, and teaching of the histories and civilizations of the peoples of Asia. (Recommended for P) Also the improvement and strengthening of our historical command of Russia, Central Europe, the Middle East and North Africa. (P)

(b) The invigoration and reinterpretation of the history of our Western tradition, with its roots in ancient, classical, Christian, and medieval history. Renewed emphasis on the history of Western Europe and America. A corpus of experience of such fundamental importance as to require and deserve joint support. (A.C.L.S., P and G)

(c) Intellectual history: the history of the natural sciences and the social sciences; the support of the "scientific humanities" or the study and teaching of the historic origins and cultural consequences of science for Western man; the implications of the social sciences, their theories and methods, for the practice and interpretation of modern history. (S.S.R.C. and G)

II. *INSTRUMENTS AND OPPORTUNITIES FOR TRAINING*

(a) *Languages.* Strong government support for the teaching and study of ALL the Languages – with summer, term, or year grants for graduate students in history or other disciplines for the study of appropriate languages, both ancient and modern. (G and P)

(b) *Libraries.* Contributions on a matching basis for the building, enlarging, and strengthening of libraries, in connection with major universities and centers of study. (G and P) Perhaps also by this means the development of new centers of advanced historical study in the South and West. (G and P)

(c) *Documents.* Appropriations for the better collection and regional distribution of public records; also for the reproduction and cataloguing of such basic historical materials as public documents, newspapers, microfilms, audio-visual records, etc. (G and P)

(d) *Guidance.* Support for training programs in bibliography, use of archives, and the editing of documents; funds for the compilation of historical guides and reference works. (G and P)

(e) *Teacher Training.* Opportunities for the training of high-school and secondary-school teachers of history, under the control of the colleges and universities. (G and P)

III. *AIDS FOR RESEARCH, WRITING, AND PUBLICATION IN ALL FIELDS*

(a) *Fellowships.* Enlargement of the excellent work already carried on by the A.C.L.S., the S.S.R.C., the Guggenheim, Ford, and Rockefeller foundations, etc., in making available fellowships for research and writing for both older and younger scholars, *e.g.*, dissertation fellowships, post-doctoral fellowships. The whole problem of protecting graduate students from having to take employment while writing their dissertations needs careful attention. (P)

(b) *Travel Funds.* Further development, under professional advice, of travel grants, cost-of-living grants, conference grants, exchange-of-scholars programs, etc. (P)

(c) *Publication.* Continuation of the Ford subsidies for historical publication by university presses (P); fund for editing of papers of American statesmen (P and G); assistance to historical journals, historical abstracts, provision for short monographs. (P and G)

(d) *Translation* of important works by American historians into selected foreign languages; and translation into English, for the benefit of undergraduates and the lay public, of the most important classics of the more difficult languages. (P and G)

IV. *SUPPORT FOR CONTINUING STUDIES IN THE EDUCATIONAL ROLE OF HISTORY* (all P)

(a) History in the primary and secondary schools and the high-school curriculum. The relation of history to the humanities and to the social studies. The methods of teaching and the ways of learning history.
(b) History in college as a major study, and as one of the key disciplines of a liberal education.
(c) The professional training of historians. The Ph.D. program.
(d) The problem of world history, its writing, and its use as an educational instrument.
(e) The theory and philosophy and history of history.

V. *SUPPORT OF THE ORGANIZED HISTORICAL PROFESSION*

(a) Subventions to the American Historical Association for its periodical publications, for the sponsoring of indexes and guides, for making available to teachers the results of scholarly research, and for the rendering of other public services. (G and P)
(b) Establishment, in consultation with the S.S.R.C. and the A.C.L.S., of a center or centers of historical research, *e.g.*, a center in Washington to provide assistance in research, a place to work, a meeting ground for historians, and perhaps living accommodations for visiting fellows. (G and P)

VI. *STUDIES IN PUBLIC COMMUNICATION*

(a) Ways and means of making history more useful and attractive to the public. (P)
(b) Experimental development and use of films, radio, TV, or other devices. (P)

VII. *PROMOTION OF EXCELLENCE IN HISTORY*

(a) By the annual award of prizes for outstanding contributions to the major fields or the major modes of historical writing. (P)
(b) Substantial cash awards and honors for outstanding historians of genuine achievement and distinction, to recognize the public importance of historical work and to enhance the prestige of the profession. (P and G)

THE HISTORY OF SCIENCE SOCIETY

COMMITTEE

Professor Marshall Clagett
University of Wisconsin

Professor Charles C. Gillispie
Princeton University

Professor C. D. O'Malley
University of California (Los Angeles)

Professor John C. Greene
University of Kansas

Professor Harry Woolf
The Johns Hopkins University

I.

THE History of Science Society heartily endorses the proposal that there be created a National Foundation for the purpose of encouraging and aiding research and teaching in the humanities in a fashion analogous to the support which the National Science Foundation affords the sciences.

II.

It may be that as historians of science we are in a peculiarly favorable position to observe how intimately the health and vigor of scientific culture in this country are related to the activities of the National Science Foundation. It has been our good fortune that in a relatively small way, though one extremely important for us, the history of science together with the philosophy of science has been eligible for support from the National Science Foundation. This support has taken the form mainly of fellowships for graduate study and contracts for sponsored research on appropriate projects of scientific interest. It is primarily in the technical reaches of the history of science that the National Science Foundation is able to give us some support.

The history of science is by no means an exclusively technical subject, however. There are extremely important problems which do not fall within the scope of science. They have to do with the relations of science to the arts, to religion and theology, and to philosophy and general culture. There is beginning to emerge an aspect of the subject which is usually called sociology of science, though sociologists are doing little with it, and which may best be described as concerned with the influence of science in the world. It may very well be that in the

long run these features of the history of science, although less well defined at present than its technical aspect, will be more important to understanding the relation of science to the historical process of the development of Western civilization.

Taking the matter institutionally and personally, we should like to observe that the background of our professional society and of our activities therein has been primarily identified with the humanities. Our society is a constituent member of the American Council of Learned Societies. George Sarton did more than anyone else to arouse awareness of the prospect for the history of science. He did so in a context of humanism and scholarship. Most professional historians of science hold their teaching posts in departments of history in their several institutions. Others are in departments of philosophy. A significant number of us are also associated primarily with libraries and bibliographical concerns. Only a very few of us whose primary academic interest is the history of science are members of science departments in colleges or universities. We have a responsibility toward the sciences and a mission to students of science and to a culture of which the scientific component grows continually in importance and influence. Nevertheless, we consider ourselves humanists and historians, and while not wishing to give up the stimulation and advantage of our association with the sciences, we shall be most securely and appropriately situated by retaining our footing and foundation in the humanities.

III.

It might further be observed that this is a distinction which would have little institutional or practical importance except for the historical course which science has taken in this country as in Great Britain. In that pattern the state has traditionally taken no special responsibility for arts, letters, or the sciences. Only in recent years have the pressing necessities of the sciences made them a public charge. There is nothing intrinsically necessary about this division. In important Continental countries academic bodies comprise the leaders of all learned disciplines. The Continental tradition, which stems from France through the influence first of Louis XIV and later of Napoleon, makes no differentiation between subjects which have a claim upon public support and others which seem voluntary embellishments. In Russia the Academy of Sciences and in France the Centre de la Recherche Scientifique support and sponsor work in the sciences, the social sciences, and the humanities as cultural enterprises all in principle in the public interest. Support by the state for the humanities, in a word, would be a novelty only in the United States. There is no reason to think that they would

not respond to support as readily as the sciences have done in the last few decades.

IV.

With specific relevance to the history of science, we are under great pressure to answer to the expectations held of the subject as one that is in a mediating position between the traditional concerns of the humanities in liberal education and the immense development of scientific and technical education going on everywhere about us. Until about six years ago, the history of science was a rather recondite specialty cultivated by a few highly specialized scholars in no more than two or three important universities in this country. The subject was not regarded as a major branch of historiography, and most persons who cultivated it did so as an avocation. The situation changed quite suddenly with the concentration which has ensued upon scientific education generally. This prosperity is very welcome, but it has struck unevenly, and we fear to miss many opportunities.

Our most pressing requirement is for people and careers. We would estimate that there are approximately forty persons holding posts in American colleges and universities in which their primary and full-time responsibility is to the history of science. This is too few. It is too few to do the scholarship which will make of this subject a branch of historiography of standing equivalent to that of the established branches. It is too few to constitute a varied and vigorous profession in itself. It is too few to establish even its own professional control over the discipline and the subject matter. We depend upon the standing of individual persons in a relatively few hospitable and enlightened institutions. Those of us who are fortunate to be in those institutions, moreover, spread ourselves very thin across the subject as a whole, since most of us have to cover everything from Babylonian astronomy to nuclear physics, as well as discoursing of the influence and the context of all the phases of science in civilization between the beginning and the present.

The intellectual demand for the subject is very great, but it cannot be met except by a quick and multifold expansion of personnel to the point that, considering only the academic scene, every department of history will naturally consider it proper and even necessary to include a historian of science in the faculty as it does a diplomatic historian, an economic historian, a medievalist, and representatives of whatever other specialties are central and indispensable.

To bring this about requires two sets of steps. It requires first that institutions which cannot afford such expansion be given financial assistance which will permit them to augment their commitment to

history so as to include the history of science. It would be improper and unrealistic to expect them to displace some other, perhaps equally important specialty to make way for the history of science. In some instances this will mean establishment of departments of the history of science, an arrangement which obtains in several of the larger universities. All this means, in a word, funds for the development of teaching programs comparable to those which have been granted for scientific education.

In the second place we need persons to take up the opportunities that exist now and to fill the additional posts which certainly ought to be created. This means an immense expansion of graduate study and the provision of very considerable support for scholarships and fellowships. We even need to create the sense, among students of science particularly, that such a career as the history of science exists as a tempting and important possibility. As it is, we are doing as well as can be expected with the support that comes from scientific sources. Without this we would be helpless. We would not wish to say that we are in a vicious circle, but neither have we risen above some critical level of mass in the staffing of our field. It is difficult to encourage institutions to establish posts, because at the present time we cannot tell them that we could recommend qualified and able students to fill any places that might be opened. On the other hand, neither can we in good conscience encourage and persuade students to give up other prospects and go into the history of science by saying that posts and opportunities exist. At the present time they do not exist in any very considerable measure.

In a word, the expansion of the profession to the dimensions of a stable professional state seems to us the most pressing and most general requirement of the history of science.

V.

In addition to the establishment of posts and graduate studies, the other appurtenances of a developing discipline require support. Institutions inaugurating the history of science will need funds to build up their libraries. It must be appreciated that the history of science is a new subject. Provision for it will not naturally have been made even in many old and well-established libraries. Further than that, there is need for the range of fellowships which exists in scientific subjects. Post-doctoral fellowships might be particularly important in the history of science, since we must hope ultimately to attract to our discipline persons who have qualified themselves first of all in some relevant branch of science. Finally, as in any healthy discipline, we urgently

need provision for the support of research, study abroad, and the institution of such conferences and symposia as go with the development of knowledge and the collaboration upon studies.

VI.

As examples of immediate requirements let us mention briefly two major projects for which we are at the present time seeking support. The first of these is the compilation of an index to the fifty-odd volumes of ISIS which have been published since the foundation of that journal in 1913. The index will cover the articles both as to author and subject matter. This will give entrée to the most important papers published in the field since it became recognizable. Even more important than this, however, the index will cover the eighty-seven critical bibliographies which have been published from the beginning in accordance with the design of George Sarton. These bibliographies each contain 1800 to 2000 citations. Preparation of such an index is an immense work which will require years of labor by a professional indexer. We are fortunate to have received initial support which permits us to undertake the work. When it is finished, it will provide a tool which will enable any scholar to find all the literature on any figure in the history of science in the last half-century.

As a second example, the History of Science Society, through the American Council of Learned Societies, is sponsoring the creation of a Dictionary of Scientific Biography. This is to be the major work of reference in the entire field. The purpose is that it should serve the history of science in the way in which the Dictionary of American Biography and the Dictionary of National Biography serve in American and British historiography. Articles will be commissioned from the entire profession in this country and abroad, ranging from graduate students to the leading scholars in the field. We estimate that approximately 2600 articles will be required, of varying lengths, contributed by five or six hundred scholars. The enterprise will take five years, and the budget for preparation of the manuscript alone and for editorial costs and reference amounts to over $400,000. Such a work of reference would properly be a charge upon humanistic scholarship. We hope for support from the National Science Foundation, though if comparable resources existed for humanistic scholarship properly speaking, we might think it more natural to turn to them.

VII.

The matter of support for research in general in the history of science scarcely differs in principle from what might be said of the his-

torical profession generally, and we will limit ourselves therefore to the foregoing remarks as giving a summary of the particular state and needs of our own branch of history.

THE MODERN LANGUAGE ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA

COMMITTEE

Professor C. L. Barber
(English)
Indiana University

Professor Juan Marichal
(Romance Languages)
Harvard University

Professor Marjorie H. Nicolson
Institute for Advanced Study, Princeton
Chairman

Professor Leland Phelps
(German)
Duke University

Professor James Thorpe
(English)
Princeton University

Professor Donald Frame
(French)
Columbia University

Dr. Gordon Ray, President
The John Simon Guggenheim Memorial Foundation

Professor Franklin Reeve
(Russian)
Wesleyan University

I. SCHOLARSHIP

1. *Scholarship in Modern Foreign Languages*

IN MOST of the modern foreign literatures American scholarship of the twentieth century holds a high place in editing, translation, and interpretation. Fifteen years ago an eminent foreign-born comparatist singled out as especially distinguished the work done in this country on Baudelaire, Diderot, Goethe, Lope de Vega, and Petrarch. A longer list might also include, among others, Arthurian Romance, Camus, the *Celestina*, Dante, Gide, Malraux, Proust, Ronsard, Voltaire, and Zola. His summary, which still seems valid today, was this:

> Outside of France today for French letters, outside of Germany for German letters, outside of Spain for Spanish letters, the most abundant and the best work on those foreign literatures is being done in our century in the United States of America.[1]

[1] Henri Peyre, "American Scholarship in the Field of Foreign Literatures," *PMLA*, March 1949, p. 25.

2. *Scholarship in English and American Literature*

A. Particularly during the present century, the work of American scholars and critics has proved outstanding, so far as British literature is concerned. Various American writers are recognized, both at home and abroad, as important critics of and authorities on British literature. American scholars have produced and are producing definitive editions of Chaucer, Shakespeare, Milton, Dryden, Samuel Johnson, Boswell, and Walpole, together with innumerable other contributions to our knowledge and understanding of British literature. In part at least, this is a result of the fact that for several decades English was recognized as a "discipline." American students were trained almost exclusively in British literature, while American letters were less recognized as an essential branch of study than they have now become.

B. There is nothing in the fields of the humanities to correspond to advantages enjoyed by historians in the National Historical Publications Commission, which, since its creation by President Truman in 1950, has served as a planning and screening board. An imposing number of works of historians and statesmen have already been subsidized and are in progress. The Historical Commission now proposes to enlarge its function and to seek substantial funds from the Congress, as well as support from foundations, for all the publishing projects in being and in prospect.

Meanwhile, publication of American men of letters has lagged far behind that of historians and statesmen. "Of all the 'collected' or 'complete' editions of American authors yet published . . . it is generally recognized that only two can stand without major revisions and additions." One is of a major, the other of a minor American poet, Emily Dickinson and Sidney Lanier. Editions of Whitman, Hawthorne, and Melville, which are officially under way, face both scholarly and financial problems. As Gay Wilson Allen, one of the editors of the Whitman edition, says: "It is a million dollar project without a million dollars." The Melville edition has become "a source of profound discouragement for most of the editors."[2]

Definitive editions of major American writers are as eagerly desired abroad as at home. At the recent congress of the Fédération Internationale des Langues et Littératures Modernes, at New York University,

[2] In the case of American literature, we call particular attention to a paper appearing in the current issue of the *PMLA* (Sept. 2, 1963), "Editions of American Writers: A Preliminary Survey," by William M. Gibson and Edwin H. Cady, which will indicate some of the weaknesses of contemporary scholarship in American studies.

one scholar after another expressed gratitude for the generosity of foundations and individuals in America who had supplied him and his colleagues in foreign countries with important secondary materials, but indicated that what was most needed and desired was definitive editions of the authors themselves.

We urge you to consider this project as an example of scholarship which is of manifest importance, which is not making progress, and which could be carried forward under the auspices of a National Humanities Foundation.

3. *Imperative Need for More and Better Translations of Literature in Foreign Languages*

There is urgent need for reliable translations into English of foreign authors, both those who have never been translated and others whose works have been handled inadequately or in a fragmentary manner. Foreign scholars, as well as English-speaking readers, would welcome such editions. We might offer many examples of works in French, Spanish, German, and Italian which are virtually unavailable at the present time, but shall limit this report to commenting upon one important foreign culture, and stress *the comparative inaccessibiliy of much important Russian literature.*

A relatively small group of scholars and teachers have been working in this field with distinction, but knowledge of Russian literature among literate English-speaking people is almost confined to paperback titles now in print, a list shaped by the forces of the commercial market. The major novels and other works of Turgenev, Gogol, Dostoevsky, Tolstoy, and Chekhov are readily available, but many of the translations are inferior and most editions lack notes and adequate introductions. Publishers have tended to re-issue books that have proved marked successes: there are more than half a dozen translations of *Crime and Punishment* readily available, but there is no English edition of Dostoevsky's critical articles, and none of his complete published letters. Writers of outstanding importance – such as Lermontov, Goncharov, Leskov, Tyutchev, Nekrasov, Blok, not to mention eighteenth-century and later authors – have been treated only in a desultory fashion.

Preparation of such translations and editions involves money, time, and consistent planning, with the assistance of the best scholars and translators in the field. Only such an organization as a National Humanities Foundation could provide the resources necessary to carry such an important project to successful completion.

DESIDERATA FOR ADVANCEMENT OF SCHOLARSHIP IN THE FIELDS OF ENGLISH AND MODERN LANGUAGES

1. *Leaves of Absence*

The task of scholars in our fields is to carry on the traditions of humanistic learning. Our "laboratories" are libraries. Those of us who are located at universities with research libraries are fortunate in that we can and do combine research with teaching, so far as time permits. Many of our colleagues, however, are less strategically situated, so that it is practically impossible for them to carry out their plans for scholarship except during vacation periods. Even those of us who have access to good libraries on our own campuses must travel far afield for many materials essential to scholarship – to such repositories as the Huntington and Folger libraries and many other specialized collections of books and manuscripts available in this country. All scholars in English and modern foreign languages must spend some time at the great libraries in England and on the Continent, even today when modern photographic processes have made it possible for the scholar to be supplied with copies of materials he could not order in the past. In addition, as we point out in another connection in this report, all of us who teach English and modern languages need first-hand experience with the culture of the countries whose languages or literatures we teach. For foreign study and research, we are inevitably dependent upon sabbatical or other leaves of absence.

We call your attention at this point to a study made under our auspices: "Aid to Research in Modern Languages and Literatures: Report of the Committee on Research Activities," by Robert S. Fine, published in the May 1963 issue of *PMLA*. The study was intentionally limited to two problems: the extent to which American universities – colleges and universities, public and private – give leaves of absence with or without stipend, and the extent to which these institutions offer grants-in-aid for the assistance of scholars. We quote from the conclusion:

> The report reveals that the great majority of schools allow time off without pay for research purposes, but do not supplement outside grants when such are below the needs of the grantee. . . . The low average figures of persons who actually took leaves without pay suggest that without supplementary school aid in addition to outside grants, most scholars were unable to finance scholarly activities. Apparent also is the fact that the sabbatical leave which is given by 82% of the schools polled does not suffice to answer

the financial needs of those eligible for them. *Together the statistics on leaves and grants-in-aid point to a shortage of funds available within institutions of higher learning for research activities of particular concern to the MLA.*

2. *Bibliographical Aids*

A. Unlike our colleagues in mathematics and some of the sciences, we cannot limit ourselves to the scholarship of very recent times. Among our most necessary tools are bibliographies compiled by scholars in various branches of our discipline. While there are many such bibliographies, they are inevitably scattered in different publications with no master guide. Finding them often occupies as much time as using them. We have reason to be very grateful to those of our colleagues who have spent so much effort on what is inevitably a somewhat thankless task, requiring infinite patience and the expenditure of much time and effort. Yet they would be the first to agree that at present our bibliographical assistance is far from adequate.

The most basic of such tools for research in English and the modern languages is the annual bibliography in *PMLA*, published each May. *The last issue of this bibliography cost the Modern Language Association nearly $30,000 – a heavy weight for one organization to carry in its annual budget.* Financial assistance even to the extent of one half the cost would help immensely. Yet, good as it is, and as nearly complete as the many compilers can make it, it is still inadequate. It is at most a finding list, with no critical appraisal of the quality of the books and articles it lists. We need a systematic arrangement for reviewing all books and articles which purport to be scholarly. If they are worth publishing, they are worth reviewing seriously, conscientiously, rigorously. It is natural that few scholars and critics relish such work as the preparation of bibliographies, yet without them important books and articles will pass unnoticed, since journals intended for the general intelligent reader seldom review "scholarly" books, and almost never "scholarly" articles. The learned journals review many such books, and some articles, yet their reviews are frequently delayed for two or three years.

Highly competent bibliographers and critics could be found who would do the necessary work, which is now a labor of love, without financial returns; but they would require "released time" of one sort or another, which available funds do not cover.

Such bibliographies could be of great value even to many outside the fields of the humanities. They would also save scholars endless hours by giving them not only facts, but also preliminary evaluations of new materials in all the fields concerned. *This is the kind of large-*

scale project which requires co-operation and collaboration on the part of many workers, for which financial aid at this time is almost totally lacking.

B. Among many specific bibliographical proposals that we might make, we single out one of the highest importance to every scholar in the field of English. All scholars concerned with the period of the seventeenth century find invaluable assistance in the *Short-Title Catalogue* (Donald Wing, ed. *Short-title Catalogue of Books Printed in England, Scotland, Ireland, Wales and British America and of English Books Printed in other Countries,* 1641–1700). This has been supplemented by other studies, particularly those of the Huntington Library. There is nothing approaching this for earlier or later periods. If the *STC* could be continued through the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, scholars would have a bibliographical aid of the utmost importance. This could not be done, however, without the kind of financial support at present quite unavailable.

Finally, we observe that the National Science Foundation has granted the MLA Center for Applied Linguistics $170,000 over three years, to strengthen bibliography in linguistics, and the United States Office of Education has granted scholars at the University of Colorado $76,000 over three years, to work towards a computerized bibliography in literature. (American literature will be used in the pilot project.) These are useful short-term expedients, but they do not provide the long-term support for bibliographical indexes and mechanical information retrieval which must come to the humanities as it has already to the sciences.

3. *Libraries*

A. Thanks to microfilm and other modern photographic processes, even small libraries have access to hundreds of volumes which until a few years ago would have been completely inaccessible to them, not only because of the expense involved but also because of the impossibility of obtaining many rare books. In addition to plans now under way to make older books available, there is pressing need for rapid recovery of materials. This is of importance not only to the library; a master-recovery-system would likewise aid the scholar in the collection of information for any type of teaching or research. For example, the contents of all periodicals should be on some sort of electronic recall-system, so as to facilitate their use. The same should apply to dissertations and theses. Only by some such process can the scholar really know what has been done and what is now in process.

B. America is facing another problem in connection with libraries, which, while not peculiar to our discipline, will become more and more

crucial. As the number of college students increases, our graduate schools are being forced to expand to increase the potential number of college teachers who are being and will be required. Under various state legislatures, there is a movement to develop graduate schools rapidly, not only in existent colleges which are speedily developed into universities, but wherever graduate schools can be spawned. Often an institution announces its readiness to accept candidates for the M.A. and Ph.D. before it has either the faculty or the equipment necessary. The first desideratum for a graduate school is its faculty. But the strongest faculty cannot direct graduate work in such fields as ours without books. Libraries are not built or stocked overnight. If graduate education is not to become a travesty, a great deal of financial assistance is needed to help those who do not sufficiently know how to help themselves in this crisis of expanding education.

4. *Institutes and Regional Centers*

Among other possible future developments of scholarship in the fields of English and modern languages, we mention briefly two:

A. *Regional Centers for the Humanities* — We quote from a proposal made by one of our members: "A National Humanities Foundation might sponsor a program for regional centers for the humanities (New England, Middle Atlantic, Southern, Middle Western, Southwestern, Far Western, etc.). Regional allocation of certain kinds of support, by representatives of our profession in collaboration with other concerned groups, under the over-all control of a National Humanities Foundation, could supplement what is done on a national or state basis, avoiding to some extent entanglement in existing educational power structure. This would also be a means for allocating funds equitably on a geographical basis and for exercising control over grants made in these divisions."

B. *Institutes for the Advanced Study of the Humanities* — A National Humanities Foundation might well consider the establishment of other institutes like the Stanford and Wesleyan centers, which might provide locales for research leaves, with opportunities for stimulation and collaboration within and without disciplines. These might be merged with the possible regional centers for the humanities, though drawing their scholars from various parts of the country.

II. TEACHING

Problems of teaching English and modern foreign languages must ultimately include elementary and secondary teaching, as well as undergraduate and graduate instruction. Since James Bryant Conant's

The Education of American Teachers had appeared shortly before our meeting, we made no attempt to discuss in any detail problems of education in the lower schools, with which he is chiefly concerned, but limited ourselves to problems of teaching in undergraduate and graduate colleges.

1. *The Teaching of Modern Foreign Languages*

A. *The Foreign Language Program of MLA* — During the past two decades little less than a revolution has occurred in the teaching of modern foreign languages in America. While many factors and various organizations have been involved, we may rightly emphasize the part played here by the Modern Language Association.[3]

In December 1951 the Modern Language Association reasserted its original policy of including among its official concerns pedagogical matters involving modern languages, which, for various cultural and historical reasons, had been ignored since the nineteen-twenties. College admissions offices, the Foreign Service, graduate departments of arts and sciences had all been aware of the shrinking language competence of college students. What no one knew was the extent. The Foreign Language Program of MLA was launched in 1952 to gather facts and to take whatever measures proved possible to reverse the trend.

A decade later, the FL Program, as it has come to be called, could look back with justifiable gratification, though without complacency, on what had been accomplished. Its fact-finding had made possible a very influential document, *The National Interest and Foreign Languages* by William Riley Parker, now in its third edition. New teaching materials on the elementary, secondary, and college levels had been developed. The proficiencies to be expected of foreign-language teachers had been defined, and means of testing them devised. The most noteworthy accomplishments of that decade were in the area known in Education as K-12. College and university problems had not been neglected, but it seemed that they would best be served by concentrated attention to the broad base on which our whole educational structure rests. During those ten years, a majority of problems in the teaching of foreign languages had been attacked, if not solved.

B. *Problems Involved in the Improvement of Language Teaching* — The fact that students entering college today are much better prepared in modern languages than were students twenty years ago, and that training in languages at the undergraduate level shows similar improve-

[3] We call particular attention to the MacAllister Report, *The Preparation of College Teachers of Modern Foreign Languages* (PMLA, May 1964).

ment, is gratifying, *but this is only a beginning.* From the point of view of the advanced teaching of modern foreign languages and literatures, it raises other problems intimately involved in the advancement of both *teaching* and *scholarship* in these fields. Graduate schools find themselves under the dual pressure of producing *teachers* and of trying to train *scholars.*

a. There is great need for language teachers now, which will continue to increase during the coming years. At present many secondary-school teachers are trained only in teaching a foreign language at a fairly elementary level. As students become increasingly proficient in languages, secondary-school teachers must be trained to teach at a more advanced level. They need to know the literature and the culture of the people whose languages they teach. Undergraduate teachers can begin their training of students at a much more advanced level than in the past. They, also, must be well versed in literature and culture. *Teachers of foreign languages should live and study for some time in the foreign country whose language and culture they are transmitting to another generation. There is need for many more fellowships that will permit them to do so.*

b. Graduate departments of modern foreign languages are facing a serious dilemma. On the one hand, they desire to train *scholars,* but because of the heavy demand, they find themselves primarily training *teachers,* who usually begin to teach far too soon for their own professional development, and find themselves diverted from scholarship in the true sense of the word. Unfortunately, heavy teaching schedules and large amounts of administrative work (grading papers, preparing laboratory exercises, and monitoring laboratory tapes), with little or no correlation between teaching and scholarly research, are results of this increase of interest in modern foreign languages. Only more, and more generous, fellowships will enable our better students to withstand the economic pressures which now force them into teaching at too early a stage in their graduate careers, and will permit them to continue the scholarly careers many of them desire.

As matters stand, at the very time that graduate departments are beginning to receive students far better *equipped* than in the past for true scholarship, they face the fact that because *teachers* are so desperately needed and because of the economic pressure upon the graduate students, the coming period may prove particularly barren in the development of real *scholars* in the modern languages.

2. *The Teaching of English*

In spite of the fact that "English" is supposedly the one subject required in every grade of the lower schools as well as in a majority of

colleges, we can report no such satisfaction in the improvement of the teaching of English as we feel in that of foreign languages. Colleges and universities which can afford to be highly selective may find improvement, but in most collegiate institutions the problem becomes increasingly acute. A majority of college students do not speak, write, or read their own language well. Graduate instructors who direct master's essays and doctoral dissertations are shocked at the extent to which they must become teachers of "hospital" English. Yet we are aware that many of these candidates for higher degrees are already engaged in part-time teaching of freshman English. If they cannot recognize and correct their own egregious errors, what is happening to the end-products of their teaching?

Our committee has no panacea to offer. Whatever the causes, correction must come at the lower levels, since by the time students enter college, any bad habits in speaking, writing, and reading have become so fixed and ingrained that colleges can do little more than stress "remedial" work.[4]

DESIDERATA FOR THE ADVANCEMENT OF TEACHING IN THE FIELDS OF ENGLISH AND MODERN LANGUAGES

1. *Fellowships for Secondary and Elementary Teachers*

If the teaching profession is to maintain and improve its health, serious thought must be given to improving the lot of the elementary- and secondary-school teachers. Along with improvements in salary and working conditions, there must be increased opportunity for them to extend their education in the right way – by sabbaticals, and refreshment in stimulating surroundings – not by "in-service training" provided in the evenings and on Saturdays by schools of education. Unlike college professors, few of our colleagues in the lower schools can look forward to sabbatical terms or other paid leaves of absence, though they need "refresher years" as much as any of us – probably even more so, since their heavy programs of teaching and extracurricular activities do not permit even the semblance of leisure some college teachers enjoy.

We look forward to the day when it will be as normal for the teacher

[4] We call your attention to a recent publication in which the problem is discussed, *The Allerton Park Conference on Research in the Teaching of English.* This is a report of a seminar sponsored by the United States Office of Education in co-operation with the University of Illinois, at which some eighty chairmen or other representatives of college and university departments of English met to consider the program known as "Project English," administered by the United States Office of Education.

in the lower schools to enjoy sabbatical leaves as it now is in many colleges and universities. Such fellowship aid has been given in the past, not for the purpose of completing advanced degrees, which might ultimately lead teachers to leave secondary teaching, but to give opportunity for a change in surroundings, for coming into contact with university students, for reading widely and enriching general backgrounds, in order that the teacher may return refreshed and with new points of view, which result in the stimulation of both their students and their colleagues.

2. *Pre-Doctoral Fellowships*

So far, in spite of the rapid increase in the number of college students, the proportion of teachers to students has not decreased alarmingly; indeed, statistics show that, whatever the situation in an individual institution, the ratio across the nation is not much lower than it was when the mushrooming began. But can we continue to hope for this proportion? Only if graduate education is subsidized to such an extent that we can attract into the teaching profession the number and the quality we need. This cannot be done without fellowship assistance on an unprecedented scale. *Various authorities estimate that such aid must be at the rate of $10,000,000 annually if we are to increase the size of the teaching profession in the humanities at the rate at which students will increase within the next five to ten years.*

3. *Post-Doctoral Fellowships*

A. It is obvious that, as the number of doctoral candidates increases, so inevitably will the number who hold the doctorate. Many of these, as has been suggested, will give most of their time to teaching in their fields. We have already stressed, and now repeat briefly, *the need for both pre-doctoral and post-doctoral fellowships for teachers of modern foreign languages in order that they may live in the country whose language they teach and become more intimately familiar with its culture.* Yet, while nearly all our graduate students will teach, it would prove most unfortunate if the best did not find it possible to continue the *scholarship* in which they have been trained. Generous as are the foundations in this country which offer aid to scholars — more generous than anywhere else in the world — the present number of fellowships for scholars is far from enough. We should like to see, in addition to an over-all increase in the number of fellowships available to scholars of all age-groups, assistance offered specifically to one group of younger scholars:

With the great pressure now being put upon the completion of the Ph.D. as rapidly as possible — three years has come to be considered

the proper time — *it is increasingly important to have available post-doctoral fellowships for a highly selected group of students who are in a position to make immediate scholarly contributions in their various fields.* The experience of the National Science Foundation in this regard is helpful.

B. Even though the older literature of a country remains stable, approaches to the study of that literature vary widely, and interdisciplinary approaches are becoming very important today. The danger of such approaches is their tendency to be superficial. There is probably more nonsense (and non-sense) written today on the "psychological," particularly "psychoanalytical," approach to literature than on any one subject. The interrelations of different fields are important and valid; but writers are often dangerously superficial and facile. *A scholar who seriously intends to work in such interdisciplines needs to prepare himself thoroughly in the other field* (be it psychology, sociology, economics, the history of science, etc., etc.). He must put himself to school to masters in the other discipline, whether in the classroom or the library, with as much seriousness as he brought to his professional training in his original area of specialization. This will sometimes prove a matter not of one year, but of several; but the end-product will be worth the time and effort if our scholars can teach themselves to speak with authority in both fields. Few of them can afford the necessary time without fellowship aid.

C. Group A in this list must inevitably be a large one, and even in Group B applicants would be fairly numerous. *Fellowships are also needed for a small but highly important group of young scholars whose interests and abilities do not lie in the conventional approaches normally emphasized in our graduate education.*

III. SOURCES AND AMOUNTS OF FINANCIAL SUPPORT AVAILABLE FOR RESEARCH IN THE HUMANITIES

We need not dwell upon fellowship aid available in our field, as in others, from such familiar sources as the Guggenheim Foundation, the American Council of Learned Societies, the American Association of University Women, the Danforth Foundation, the Fulbright Scholarships, etc. Valuable as such assistance is, it is far from sufficient for even the needs set forth in this report.

In the pages following and preceding, we mention various contributions to the humanities presently subsidized by the Modern Language Association, and also indicate grants from foundations and the United States Office of Education which have supplemented our insufficient funds for various specific projects. We will not repeat these details.

The fact remains that the amount of aid for the advancement of scholarship in the humanities, in comparison with the sciences or the social sciences, is far short of that needed for important steps in the advancement of learning.

At the moment that this report was being concluded, we received notice of a new program established by a grant from the Ford Foundation, designed to strengthen humanistic research and scholarship in the states of North Carolina, South Carolina, and Virginia, under the auspices of Duke University, the University of North Carolina, and various co-operating liberal arts colleges. According to publicity released by the two universities, "The primary purpose of the new program is the substantial improvement, both in quality and in quantity, of advanced research in the broad area of the humanities . . . in the three-state area." As the announcement indicates, and as we are aware, the action of the Ford Foundation in backing this collective venture represents a departure in the support of humanistic study, since previous grants by the Foundation in the humanities have been nation-wide in scope. "This marks the first attempt to capitalize on the regional strength of universities and colleges in the humanities."

This announcement will be warmly welcomed by all scholars in our field, not only in itself, but also for the hope it brings that such programs will in the future be established at many other centers throughout the United States.

IV. THE PRESENT AND POTENTIAL IMPORTANCE OF NEW TECHNIQUES FOR TEACHING AND SCHOLARSHIP IN THE HUMANITIES

1. *Programmed Learning*

The Modern Language Association has investigated this subject and has sponsored the following studies:

A. "The Teaching Machine and the Teaching of Languages: a Report of Tomorrow," by F. Rand Morton (*PMLA*, September 1960).

B. *Principles and Methods of Teaching a Second Language*, a series of five films: "The Nature of Language and How It is Learned"; "The Sounds of Language"; "The Organization of Language"; "Words and their Meanings"; "Modern Techniques in Language Teaching." These films were prepared with the assistance of a grant of $75,000 from Teaching Film Custodians. The ground broken here has been fertile for other projects of visual aids.

The Office of Education under Title VI has produced a series of language films for classroom use. (Ours are primarily for teachers.) This project was under the direction of Pierre Capretz, and the Modern

Language Association is renting and distributing the film as a service to the profession.

C. On *language and literature teaching by television,* a survey by J. Richard Reid, "An Exploratory Survey of Foreign Language Teaching by Television in the United States," was made under contract with the United States Office of Education. New York University, among others, has long been presenting courses in literature and art over television, which are accepted for credit at various institutions.

2. *Tapes and Records*

For elementary schools the Modern Language Association has produced teachers' guides for French, German, Spanish, Italian, Russian from grades 3–6, all suggesting the use of tapes and records. The use of tapes and records for recording poetry and drama readings has long been familiar. Good recordings of many dramatic productions are available, as are recordings of contemporary poets and other authors. Graduate students, as well as teachers, have found valuable such records as those of Professor Harry Morgan Ayres's readings of Chaucer. The use of tapes and records is being developed markedly at the Poetry Center at San Francisco State College. Some schools and colleges are building up record and tape libraries for the use of students, though, for the most part, individual professors still have to purchase their own equipment.

3. *Kinescopes*

The Commission on English, by aid from CEEB, has developed half a dozen kinescopes by excellent individual teachers for use in secondary schools. These treat various aspects of composition and masterpieces of literature.

4. *Education by Telephone*

We may mention here the project initiated by the Ford Foundation, in which the technique is that of an enlarged conference, whereby a prominent professor of literature sits in his study and by telephone talks with students in Negro universities in the South: a half-hour of lecture or semi-lecture, followed by twenty to thirty minutes of discussion with the students who hold the telephone at the other end.

5. *Microfilm*

So far, it will be noticed, the new techniques are being used for *teaching* rather than for *scholarship.* The Modern Language Association, however, has also participated in a long report, to be published in *PMLA,* September 1964, on the gigantic and complicated problem of photocopying for scholarly uses.

All the work the Modern Language Association has done in this field has been supported by the Rockefeller, Ford, and Carnegie foundations, by the government, and by such organizations as Teaching Film Custodians, after the expenditure of endless time and energy by the central office in negotiating the contracts or requesting the grants. Far greater sums than have as yet been available will be necessary if these and other projects involving new techniques are to be carried as far as their importance seems to warrant.

COMMENT

We have so far limited our remarks on new techniques to factual material, indicating some of the uses made of them in our fields, particularly for teaching. There was division of opinion among the members of our committee about the value of some of the new techniques, particularly so far as *scholarship* is concerned.

"Language laboratories" have undoubtedly proved their importance in the teaching process, though as yet their chief use has been in the more elementary stages of language-training – the pronunciation and comprehension of the spoken language. There is some question among us as to the present and potential value of education by television, though that is the result of insufficient evidence. We have little knowledge of what has actually been accomplished, except from somewhat prejudiced witnesses, in part because the development of such techniques has as yet been chiefly in the hands of technicians rather than educators.

On the question of the value of the new techniques in *scholarship,* again as yet there is insufficient evidence. No scholar will deny for a moment the importance of microfilm, not only for the preservation of books, periodicals, and other documents, which might otherwise be destroyed, but also for making widely available to libraries throughout the world rare publications which many libraries could neither afford nor obtain. Scholars, too, have reason to be grateful for such comparatively inexpensive and rapid techniques of duplication as xerox and other processes. As yet we simply do not have enough evidence about the potentiality of various mechanical processes to speak with authority. Some scholars feel that computers will transform the making of concordances; they have been used with varying success in problems of textual analysis. All these aids and techniques are still new to most of us. The main problem is to permit interested humanists to investigate the potentialities of such tools. This means detailed instruction and study. Only a large-scale program of financial assistance could make such study as rewarding as it might well prove to be.

V. RELATION BETWEEN THE HUMANITIES AND OTHER AREAS OF SCHOLARSHIP AND CREATIVITY

In the preceding pages, we have suggested our response to the first part of the question – interrelationship between the humanities and the social sciences – in recommending the establishment of fellowships for humanists who sincerely desire to combine two or more fields of study, and who, we suggested, should put themselves to school in order to be as competent in the allied field as they presumably are in their chosen branch of the humanities.

So far as the creative arts are concerned, it would be a curious irony if we, who are historians and critics of the art of the past, wished jealously to reserve solely for ourselves all possible aid and not have it extended to practicing artists, some of whose works will be the matter with which our successors will be concerned. Scholars in the humanities teach and study the music, fine art, sculpture, literature of the past. In the particular fields represented by the Modern Language Association, we spend our lives in learning more about the works of poets, dramatists, novelists, essayists. Should we not be the first to urge all possible support to poets, dramatists, novelists, essayists?

The John Simon Guggenheim Memorial Foundation can speak with authority on this matter because of its wide experience with applications from scholars and nonacademic persons. The deed of gift, establishing the Guggenheim Fellowships, stipulated that the funds were to be used "to promote the advancement and diffusion of knowledge and understanding, and the appreciation of beauty by aiding without distinction on account of race, color or creed, *scholars, scientists and artists* of either sex in the prosecution of their labors." Some of us who were closely associated with the Foundation in its early days remember that there was criticism of and question about the advisability of including "artists" among those who might compete for fellowships. The final report of Henry Allen Moe, who has been in charge of the administration of Guggenheim Fellowships since their inception, is illuminating upon this problem. *(John Simon Guggenheim Foundation, 1961 and 1962: Reports of the President and Treasurer.)* In reporting upon the progress of the Foundation in the years 1945–46, Mr. Moe writes (p. xxxviii):

> Those of you who made the original consultations for Senator and Mrs. Guggenheim concerning the Foundation's plans will remember some of the counsels of caution we then received: you must limit your fields, we were advised, otherwise the thing will be unmanageable; and there are some fields, others said, which would not lend themselves to fellowship support. Poetry is one such field,

we were advised, "for if you give a poet money so that he can write poetry, nothing will happen." But Stephen Vincent Benet, the first poet to be awarded a Guggenheim Fellowship, wrote *John Brown's Body;* and no more talk of that sort has been heard since.

Later in the report (pp. lxxv–lxxvii) Mr. Moe quotes statements made by Mrs. Stephen Vincent Benet and Miss Katherine Anne Porter, suggesting the important part in the creative life of a poet and a novelist played by Guggenheim Fellowships. Any scholar who would jealously exclude from fellowship or other assistance practicing artists should read these statements.

Two other sections of Mr. Moe's report suggest the great interest taken in the Guggenheim Foundation by painters, sculptors, and others practicing the fine arts. In 1928 applicants in these fields were invited to send examples of their work, which were shown to the Committee on Selection and the Advisory Committee in the Grand Central Art Galleries. At that time one hundred and sixty canvases (with other sketches, etchings, photographs of sculpture, etc.) were exhibited. In 1962 the number of works submitted by artists had risen to more than ten thousand (p. vi). One other reference made by Mr. Moe suggests the great need of artists for support from foundations. Discussing the number of applications received from nonacademic persons in comparison with those from scholars and scientists, Mr. Moe mentions the fact that in 1932, at the height of the Depression, the percentage of applications from nonacademic persons was sixty-six percent of the total number of applications, the highest it has ever been (pp. viii–ix).

The experience of the Guggenheim Foundation can, of course, be paralleled by that of others who also offer aid to both scholars and practicing artists. As scholars who devote our lives to the study of creative literature, we warmly urge that all possible aid be extended to those who create literature and the other arts.

ASSOCIATION OF AMERICAN LAW SCHOOLS

COMMITTEE

Professor Charles L. Black, Jr.
Yale University

Professor John P. Dawson
Harvard University

Dean Hardy C. Dillard
University of Virginia

Professor Clarence Morris
University of Pennsylvania
Chairman

Professor William F. Young, Jr.
Columbia University

I. INTRODUCTION

LEGAL institutions are developed and used by men with purposes, men guided by ideals and fears; hence, legal institutions are concerned with values underlying law's successes in preventing conflicts and resolving disputes. Attempts at value-free description of law made by social scientists have focused attention on important aspects of law that might otherwise have been overlooked. This "scientific" approach, however, disavowing as it does the evaluation of values, throws little light on what law ought to be and therefore falls short of dealing with what law is becoming. Legal institutions should be studied as part of human activity known by insight and intuition as well as by rigorous scientific investigation. Sensitivity is likely to be developed and supported by broad training in the humanities. Knowledge of the literary and classic concern with the human condition can better furnish the minds of those who deal with the law's ordering of society and resolution of disputes. A humanistic approach should be one aspect of all sound legal instruction and all research and writing on law – even at its most technical levels; such an approach has been exemplified by many of the finest academic jurists of the twentieth century – scholars whose roots are as likely to tap the wisdom of Shakespeare and Herodotus as they are to draw on the writings of Keynes and Freud.

The purposes of law training in this country have, however, been influenced greatly by the fact that our law schools are graduate schools, preceded by at least three and more commonly four years of college education. This arrangement has meant that our law schools, unlike those organized on continental European models, do not undertake as part of their own primary mission broad training in philosophy, history, and other humanistic subjects. Our law schools have concentrated, for the most part, on training directly useful in professional legal work.

Nevertheless, legal educators have become increasingly concerned to see law in a wider perspective, and to graduate educated as well as professionally qualified young lawyers. The subjects brought into this wider focus are often in the social or medical sciences rather than in the humanities; searching legal scholars and teachers have looked to economics, statistics, sociology, psychology, and psychiatry for better understanding. Though these interests have greatly enriched legal education, there are three lines of inquiry already well developed that offer special promise of widened horizons – legal philosophy, legal history, and comparative law. Strengthened programs in these three fields will not only increase opportunities for creative work, but will also help shift the emphasis of research and teaching in the more professional courses.

Legal Philosophy

Of the three subjects, legal philosophy is perhaps taught most widely. A large fraction of our law schools offer legal philosophy courses or seminars. They are usually elective, and while enrollments are not always large, they are substantial and growing. Several good compendia of excerpts from the literature of legal, political, and social philosophy make satisfactory textbooks. The subject got a firm foothold in most of our leading law schools in the first quarter of the century; it has often been required of law post-graduates, training to qualify for law teaching. Some legal philosophy courses have been superb – attracting even international attention. The emphasis and philosophical views of different teachers show much diversity; this is, of course, both inevitable and desirable. Several schools require first-year law students to take orientation courses that are heavily laden with legal philosophy problems; these students are thus interested in jurisprudence early in their studies, and some of them are influenced in their outlook on more technical subjects.

Original writing in legal philosophy has been encouraged by the American Association for Legal and Political Philosophy, whose annual meetings are attended by law teachers, philosophers, and political scientists. The papers presented are augmented and published in annual volumes, entitled *Nomos*. The topics of the first volumes of *Nomos* have been Authority, Community, Responsibility, Liberty, The Public Interest, and Justice. These six concepts enter constantly into the analyses of legal problems, even when problems are at the outset narrowly defined. Awareness of their fundamental and pervasive importance has led teachers of law increasingly to grapple with some of the recurring problems of philosophy and especially of ethical theory, in periodicals circulated among law teachers. It is important that members of other

disciplines concerned with political, social, and ethical theory have turned to law increasingly, through the realization that the legal order raises, constantly and concretely, problems to whose solution they can contribute.

Legal History

In some respects, the teaching of legal history has lost ground in American law schools in the last four decades. Professional courses used to lay considerable stress on history. Especially was this true in procedure and property courses in which the law was especially shaped by historical factors. Modern reforms, however, have swept away many procedural anachronisms. While history is still essential in explaining our property classifications and is still useful in other areas of public and private law, there has been a strong tendency to compress the teaching of historical aspects. The loss involved, though real, need not be greatly deplored, since legal history tended to be too narrowly oriented toward explaining the technicalities of modern law. Most law faculties are conscious of the loss and tend to be uneasy about it. There is a ground swell of tentative moves to fill the gap. A few schools have developed promising first-year required courses in legal history; others have included substantial instruction in legal history in orientation courses or in required reading courses.

The most promising developments, however, are taking place in a few schools where well-qualified instructors are giving advanced courses or seminars which aim to supply a broader view of the processes of historical development. These courses are keeping alive a tradition in legal scholarship that had previously laid great stress on history. Fortunately, several teachers of these courses have collected materials used not only in their own schools, but available to other law schools as well. In advanced seminars students are often supervised in historical research of graduate-school caliber – though usually of only modest scope. Several law faculties are becoming increasingly aware that a legal system with its roots so deep in the past cannot be understood if the past is largely ignored; they are becoming persuaded that restoring the time dimension can illuminate the processes of action and reaction between the legal order and the environment it purports to regulate. As a result there is a revived interest in legal historical research. In earlier times our legal historians did most of their research on our English antecedents. Interest in American legal history is now growing apace. The American Society for Legal History publishes a journal, now in its seventh volume. Law journals and scholarly periodicals of other types have likewise taken to publishing numerous articles concerning or related to American legal history.

Comparative Law

The stirring of interest in comparison of legal systems had begun before the current revival of historical studies. The results at first were modest, since original work required facility in the language and systematics of at least one foreign country, and preferably more than one. In the 1930's a number of law schools organized elective courses in comparative law and encouraged American-trained members of their faculties or employed foreign-trained personnel to develop comparative law teaching materials and engage in research in foreign systems. A few collections of teaching materials have been published.

Comparative law activities greatly expanded after 1950, when leading law schools invested considerable resources in international legal studies. The impulse came in part from the practical need for training lawyers to deal with transactions extending across national boundaries. It also came from a growing belief in the cultural value of knowing about foreign systems, both as a demonstration of the variety existing in our increasingly interconnected world and as a stimulus to improvement of our own law.

When comparative studies are broadly conceived, as many of the current ones are, they at once raise questions that cannot be answered by simple matching of texts. Not only specific solutions but the whole structure of ideas in which they are embedded are products of history and of changing needs and values in the society studied. Inquiry into a foreign system is like projection backward in historical time. The inquirer must seek for underlying causes, for difference in social organization, for the ways in which the legal order responds to demands made on it. This is true even in societies most comparable to our own – the highly industrialized societies of Western Europe. It is still more true where divergence is greater, as with the Communist societies, the Near and Far East, and underdeveloped countries of Africa and Latin America. Our stake in understanding these societies is enormous. They cannot be understood if their law is not conceived as a central instrument. Yet their law cannot be understood if it is viewed in isolation.

II. NEEDS FOR DEVELOPMENT OF THE THREE HUMANISTIC SUBJECTS

Further extension of research on legal philosophy, legal history, and comparative law must depend primarily on the investment of time and thought by individuals. Organized group effort is useful in outlining projects, dividing up topics, discussing methods, and developing enthusiasm. Exchange of ideas through oral and written communication is of the essence. Law schools must be persuaded, however, as many

of them now are, that these humanistic ways of understanding basic legal conceptions will not only contribute to the professional solution of legal problems, but will also promote understanding and consensus on the purposes and values of our society and the relations of our aims to world values. As they become persuaded, the law schools will need not only to release time of their faculty members for training and research, but also to train promising students willing to invest in disciplines that command no premium in the professional market. The demand for talented and well-qualified teachers of these subjects exceeds the supply. Post-graduate study and development of young teachers must await to some extent greater availability of men and money. But fruitful beginnings are already being made in several key schools — beginnings on which a promising future can be built if support is forthcoming. Means should also be developed for acquainting persons trained in related disciplines with those essential elements of legal technique that help to shape and define legal problems. Both groups — those who initially start from and those who later acquire familiarity with lawyers' modes of analysis — should have reasonable assurance of careers with adequate financial support to induce them to make the major investment required.

Accessibility of materials of study should be greatly improved. Bibliographic experts should be employed to develop guides for law-school librarians so that they can invest available funds wisely in materials needed. Law libraries need more funds for improving inadequate collections. Legal historians and comparative lawyers need improved access to original sources through publication, duplication, or facilitated examination at places of deposit. Plans should also be made to develop communication between law teachers and scholars in related disciplines through conferences on subjects of common interest.

Law in Liberal Arts Colleges

It would be a mistake to teach law in the undergraduate curriculum with the methods and objects of professional training. We look with interest, however, on those undergraduate courses that emphasize the philosophical, logical, ethical, or historical appreciation of legal ideas and institutions. In a few schools broadly based liberal arts courses on law are being taught by teachers from the law schools. No doubt this sort of instruction is also given to some extent by philosophers interested in jurisprudence, historians interested in legal institutions, and other humanists.

It is our committee's view that the potentialities of this kind of instruction should be further explored, and that law schools should be

encouraged by financial support to release time of interested law professors and to aid their colleagues in other disciplines to develop instruction in the role of legal institutions in the philosophy and history of world societies.

THE LINGUISTIC SOCIETY OF AMERICA

COMMITTEE

Charles A. Ferguson
Center for Applied Linguistics

Professor Morris Halle
Massachusetts Institute of Technology

Professor Eric P. Hamp
University of Chicago

Professor Archibald A. Hill
University of Texas

Professor Thomas A. Sebeok
Indiana University

Professor William G. Moulton
Princeton University
Chairman

I.

A. *The present state of scholarship in linguistics.*

Scholarship. Linguistic scholarship in the United States is at the moment active, lively, vigorous, with exciting research being carried on in many different areas (notably acoustic phonetics and syntax). There is no longer, as there was two decades ago, any tendency for American linguists to belong to a single school. There are now many schools, each with its passionate adherents; and here as elsewhere there is safety in numbers. We are also far more international in outlook than we were two decades ago; and other nations, in turn, look far more to us for leadership than they ever have before.

Personnel. Though linguistics has had an explosive growth during the past three or four decades, this development was brought about by a surprisingly small number of scholars. As a result, the few score of people in the field who are really active tend to be very much overburdened. And since only a small proportion of these few have much administrative ability, a few people tend to show up again and again on the same national committees. Fortunately, this situation is now slowly improving. Though there is a national Roster of Linguists, maintained by the Center for Applied Linguistics, it is in fact quite impossible to estimate the number of really active scholars; one can only be anecdotal. If one attended a meeting of the Linguistic Society twenty years ago and saw, among the fifty to seventy-five people listening to papers, a person whom one did not know, one was always mildly surprised. Today, at a similar meeting, one does not expect to recognize more than half of the two hundred fifty to three hundred listeners.

Information flow. Though the rest of this report deals only with linguistics in the United States, this topic must be viewed internationally. In many respects the situation is very advantageous: there are relatively few linguistic research workers in the world (probably under five thousand); there is an excellent bibliography (supported by UNESCO and soon to be enlarged and speeded up through NSF aid); and there are in the world hardly more than a dozen leading journals devoted to general linguistics (three of them in the United States: *Language, Word,* and the *International Journal of American Linguistics*). But there are also disadvantages. Because linguistics impinges upon so many other disciplines (anthropology, psychology, philosophy, literature, education, plus dozens of language fields), important articles may appear in hundreds of different journals. The greatest output of published linguistic information is written in English, German, Russian, and French; but substantial quantities of material appear in perhaps thirty other languages, and this causes difficulties even for linguists. A few abstracts of books appear in the *Bulletin de la Société de Linguistique de Paris,* and of books and articles in the *International Journal of American Linguistics* and in *Voprosy Jazykoznanija.* At the moment, the consensus is that a journal of linguistic abstracts is not feasible, except in such subfields of applied linguistics as foreign language teaching (MLAbstracts), English as a foreign language *(English Teaching Abstracts),* and machine translation *(Traduction Automatique).* A series of volumes on the present state of linguistic research in various parts of the world is being published at Indiana University, under the title *Current Trends in Linguistics;* volume I, on the U.S.S.R. and Eastern Europe, is an outstanding achievement. Information flow in linguistics is currently being investigated by an international Committee on Linguistic Information and a report is expected shortly.

B. *The present state of teaching in linguistics.*

In a word, chaotic. Thirty years ago linguistics (largely philology) was taught at only a handful of graduate schools. Today, a recent survey (*University Resources in the United States for Linguistics and the Teaching of English as a Foreign Language,* Washington, D.C., Center for Applied Linguistics, 1963) shows that, in the United States and Puerto Rico, a B.A. major in linguistics is offered at thirteen institutions, an M.A. in linguistics at twenty-four, and a Ph.D. in linguistics at twenty-three. Several other institutions offer degrees which, as thirty years ago, combine linguistics with some other discipline; and the number of institutions which offer courses of a more or less linguistic nature is totally unknown. Because the Linguistic Society has never concerned itself with anything but a journal and semiannual meetings,

there is no national consensus as to what a B.A., M.A., or Ph.D. in linguistics should consist of; and no one knows what is included in the programs listed above. Where the institutions themselves are of high quality, it may be assumed that the courses and degrees in linguistics are also of high quality; but one hears again and again of courses at lesser-known institutions which strike one as travesties on linguistics.

Amidst this chaotic gloom there is one shining light: the Linguistic Institute which, since 1928, has been offered every summer (except for 1932–35) under the auspices of the Linguistic Society and a co-operating university. These annual Linguistic Institutes have had a triple function: they have served as a rallying point and discussion center for the many scholars who would otherwise be isolated from colleagues in linguistics; they have functioned as a center where leaders of the profession could pay systematic attention to the needs and wants of students; and they have provided a much needed supplement to the necessarily limited offerings of the few graduate programs in linguistics throughout the country. It is safe to say that, if the leading linguists in the country were asked to name the one institution which has contributed most to the profession, they would unanimously name the annual summer Linguistic Institute.

II. RELATIONS BETWEEN SCHOLARSHIP AND TEACHING AT ALL LEVELS

Within the field of linguistics itself, the findings of research flow quickly into teaching. Hence there is in this small field no cultural lag such as that which has characterized mathematics and the natural sciences until recently. Scholars hear of new developments at the semi-annual meetings of the Linguistic Society; if they miss them there, they soon read about them in journals and books; it therefore does not take long before new developments are discussed in graduate courses and even in the better undergraduate programs. (This rapid flow of information has often led outsiders to believe that linguists are forever changing their minds, and that their findings are therefore ephemeral and can safely be ignored. It has also meant that textbooks and other teaching materials rapidly go out of date.)

When one leaves the small field of linguistics, the picture changes drastically. Until quite recently, the only academic field which was in any way influenced by the swift developments in linguistics was anthropology. Other academic disciplines – including, curiously enough, English and the foreign languages – were affected only to a minute degree; and the schools and the general public were not affected at all. But within the past two decades some rapid changes have been taking

place. Around 1940 the findings of linguistics first began to be applied systematically to foreign-language teaching, notably in the wartime language programs. Because the teaching of English as a second language was a field with no strong traditions of its own, it accepted the theoretical findings of linguistics quickly and extensively, and has continued to do so ever since. Other language-teaching fields, with their older and stronger traditions, were slower to react. Those with the weakest traditions (Japanese, Chinese, Arabic, etc.) were quickest to make use of applied linguistics; those with stronger traditions (French, German, Spanish, etc.) did not begin to do so until around the mid-fifties; and the languages with the oldest teaching traditions (Latin, Greek, and English) have scarcely begun to do so even today.

Modern foreign-language instruction is often cited as a shining example of the way in which linguistics can be applied to practical purposes. At the moment, applied linguistics has assumed the status of a fad in the most up-to-date foreign-language instruction: any self-respecting methods course must at least make a bow in the direction of linguistics. Yet a word of caution needs to be added. Though applied linguistics has probably made valuable contributions in emphasizing the spoken language and in teaching phonology, it has contributed very little to the teaching of grammar. The reason is not hard to find: linguistics has not yet developed any generally accepted theory of grammar. In effect, the demands upon applied linguistics have outrun the achievements of linguistic theory.

The findings of linguistics have also begun to spread recently into other academic disciplines, notably psychology and philosophy, and to a very small extent into literary criticism. At a more elementary level, a start has been made at applying linguistics to the teaching of reading and spelling and to the so-called language arts – though here often with the mistaken notion that linguistics could solve composition problems which are really matters of content, argument, rhetoric, punctuation, and the like. And more and more, as time goes on, linguistics is exerting at least a modest influence, in a few quarters, on the teaching of English in the colleges and even in the schools. At the risk of again outrunning theory, the time has perhaps come when the entire role of linguistics in American education should be cautiously surveyed. A series of talks and panel discussions on this topic – "Language in American Education" – is planned for the 1964 Linguistic Institute at Indiana University; and a large foundation is contemplating a major investigation of this same matter.

A final word should be added on the impact which the recent advances in linguistics have had upon the general public. Results to date: essentially zero. Largely because of the furor over the third edition of

Webster's New International Dictionary, a fair portion of highly educated laymen see in linguistics the great enemy of all they hold dear. They are perhaps balanced by the number of PTA members who have received a vague impression that linguistics can somehow make foreign language teaching more efficient. One reason that the general public has either no impression or a false impression of linguistics is that there have been hardly any recent popular presentations of it. There are a few – very few – good textbooks; but most of the popular books dealing with language have had little or nothing to do with linguistics.

III. FINANCIAL SUPPORT AVAILABLE TO LINGUISTICS

In regard to financial support for linguistic research, the situation is comparable to that prevailing in the physical sciences before World War II. Considerable funds are available for research that is demonstrably related to the teaching of a foreign language, to the teaching of English to foreigners, to machine translation, or to the improvement of military communication; but there are few funds available for "pure" research – on the linguistic structure of a poetic text, on Indo-European ablaut, or even on basic problems of syntax. The results are predictable. On the one hand, the linguist is tempted into subterfuge – dressing up a problem of basic research to make it look like applied research. Or on the other hand, he is tempted into applied research for which he is not really ready because the basic research which must lie behind it has not yet been done.

The classic example of this linguist's dilemma is machine translation, into which vast sums of money have been poured during the past decade. One member of this committee has described the situation as follows: "It [machine translation] has drawn many capable people into activities of very dubious value. And while there is little reason to worry over the wasted money, there is much reason to deplore the loss of talent to this economically dubious enterprise. A great deal more and better research could have been done if even a fraction of the funds now spent on M.T. had been allocated directly to fundamental research on linguistics." Even in fields less spectacular than M.T. the results of this emphasis on applied research can be unfortunate. Out of sheer idealism, a scholar may offer to write, under government contract, a grammar of some relatively exotic language about which there is in this country little or no public knowledge. But he may then find that, in order to meet the two-year deadline which he has optimistically promised, he must produce a shoddy piece of work.

The temptations of this sort are certainly far greater in linguistics

than in any other branch of the humanities; they are perhaps equal to those in the social sciences, though probably not yet as great as those in the natural sciences. They include not only machine translation and work on military communication, but also teaching English to foreigners (especially under the Fulbright program) and teaching in NDEA foreign-language institutes. It is of course entirely proper that some linguists should engage in some of these activities some of the time. But at the moment so many linguists are engaging in them that it has become far too difficult to staff the annual summer Linguistic Institutes — which are, or ought to be, of more central interest to the profession as a whole. Linguists, like their colleagues in the social and natural sciences, will have to learn to live with these temptations; they have not as yet entirely succeeded in doing this.

The linguist — or his student — who wishes to do pure research can sometimes find sources of financial support which are not normally available to other scholars in the humanities: the National Science Foundation, the National Institutes of Health, the National Institutes of Mental Health, the U. S. Army Signal Corps, the Air Force Office of Scientific Research, the Office of Naval Research, and (via the NDEA) the U. S. Office of Education. But such support is normally available only for very specialized types of research, not for those central areas from which true growth is most likely to come; and in any case it tempts the researcher into applied research, as noted above. The linguist who wants honestly and openly to do pure research can turn only to those sources of financial support which are open to all scholars in the humanities — primarily the foundations. Similarly, his students can apply only for the same fellowships as others: those of the Woodrow Wilson Foundation, the Danforth Foundation, and the like. Perhaps because linguistics is so new and has grown so fast, there are almost no funds which have been made available *specifically* for linguistic study and research. The two notable exceptions are: the summer study aids which the ACLS, with foundation support, has for many years granted to selected students attending the Linguistic Institute and similar institutions; and the terminal doctoral fellowships which the Ford Foundation granted through the ACLS during 1962–63 and 1963–64.

IV. NEW TECHNIQUES FOR TEACHING AND SCHOLARSHIP

The one new teaching device which has affected linguistics thus far is programmed learning: a programmed text to teach phonetics and phonemics became available in the spring of 1963. Reactions to it have been mixed. There is certainly no reason to believe that programmed learning will play more than a minor role in the teaching of linguistics.

A new research device which became available to linguistics at the end of World War II was the sound spectrograph; and this led in turn to the development of the pattern playback. These two devices and related instruments produced something rather close to a revolution in acoustic phonetics. Suffice it to say that our knowledge of this field is far greater than anyone would have dared to predict two decades ago.

A more recent research device which has come to be used in linguistics is the computer. At the moment it is probably fair to say that relatively few linguists have worked as yet with computers, and that not even these few are able to foresee very clearly the uses to which the computer can be put. But sustained efforts are being made. A seminar on the use of the computer in linguistic research was held at the Rand Corporation in the summer of 1963; a similar seminar will be held at the 1964 Linguistic Institute at Indiana University. Further, two books which deal more or less directly with this topic have been published: Paul R. Garvin, ed., *Natural Language and the Computer* (McGraw-Hill, 1963); and Dell Hymes, ed., *The Use of Computers in Anthropology* (Mouton, 1964).

V. SUMMARY OF NEEDS

As a conclusion to this report, we summarize the present and future needs of linguistics as we see them at the moment:

1. Needs which must be met from within the profession:
   a. A larger number of basic textbooks.
   b. Respectable popular books about linguistics.
   c. Better knowledge of the linguistics programs now offered.
2. Needs for which outside help is required:
   a. First and foremost, funds to support basic research.
   b. Continued financial support for the international Linguistic Bibliography.
   c. Financial support to insure the continuation of the annual summer Linguistic Institute.
   d. Financial support for students of linguistics – primarily to produce a larger supply of trained linguists in the country and thus to relieve the present burdens of the active few.
   e. A general survey of the present and potential role of linguistics in American education: linguistics in relation to anthropology, psychology, philosophy, foreign-language teaching, the teaching of English as a second language, the teaching of English in schools and colleges, the teaching of reading, etc.

THE METAPHYSICAL SOCIETY OF AMERICA

COMMITTEE

Professor Peter A. Bertocci
Boston University

Professor Roderick Chisholm
Brown University

Professor Ellen Haring
Wellesley College

Father Robert Johann
Yale University

Professor William L. Reese
University of Delaware

Professor Paul Weiss
Yale University

INTRODUCTION

IT IS the purpose of The Metaphysical Society of America to foster, in whatever manner this may be currently possible, an approach to philosophy in the grand manner; that is, speculative and synoptic philosophy and ontology. This purpose, applied to the contemporary scene, provides us with the following relevant commitments: (1) to explore, across all sectional lines, the similarities and differences among all groups of philosophers in American life; (2) to seek that synoptic vision of the whole of things which will include the insights of all separate disciplines and their interrelations. These commitments have an obvious cultural aspect; and it is this aspect which is central in the following report.

In considering the problems which face our particular area of the humanities in the last half of the twentieth century, it has been remarkable how many times the committee found its discussion returning to the strategic role a National Humanities Foundation could play in the resolution, obviation, or reduction in scale of these problems. This recurrence will be obvious in the paragraphs which follow; they stand in some measure as an evidence and argument in favor of such an agency. The argument of relevance might proceed as follows: It has been appropriate for the various branches of the humanities to develop in partial isolation from each other in American society, but in the present age the problems of our disciplines are common, and where the causes are common joint decisions are indicated. One indication of the mutual relevance of the disciplines of the humanities to each other may be discerned in the fact that, while in the discussions which follow we have largely limited our consideration to the philosophic enterprise, the problems we cite and the solutions we offer have applicability to other humanistic disciplines.

I. THE TEACHING OF PHILOSOPHY

In philosophy, as in other fields, the demand for qualified teachers and stronger departmental programs is increasing rapidly, even while advances in philosophy are altering the appropriate content of many of the areas of philosophy. This leads to a number of problems with respect to the teaching of philosophy.

(A) The increased demand for qualified teachers of philosophy combined with the slightness of the program of graduate subsidies in philosophy generally, as compared, *e.g.*, to physics, has led an ever larger number of graduate students in philosophy to interrupt their graduate studies in order to accept teaching positions. Such interruptions often become permanent, as experience shows. If we are to retain the present educational levels of our teaching faculties in philosophy, while meeting the increasing demand for qualified scholars, it will be necessary to find some means to decelerate the premature movement into teaching, and to support a return to graduate studies on the part of those whose programs have been interrupted. This might be accomplished by (1) loans without interest, especially in the last two years of the doctoral program; (2) a forgiveness feature canceling a significant fraction of the loan upon completion of the Ph.D. degree, and a like fraction for each year of college teaching; (3) scholarships with a limitation on the number of hours of outside work which can be done while holding the scholarship; (4) a program of information encouraging teachers with interrupted programs to utilize the above-mentioned loan, scholarship, and forgiveness features, with dependency allowances to make possible their return to graduate school and completion of their professional training.

Inasmuch as this problem concerns many areas of the humanities, it would be well if a study in the humanities generally could be made. Such a study, and implementation of any subsequent program of loans and scholarships, would be an appropriate function for a National Humanities Foundation.

(B) Among the philosophy teachers in those sections of the country somewhat remote from larger educational centers, and among teachers whose attention has been held by administrative and curricular matters, the more recent developments in philosophy may have passed without notice. It would be very beneficial if a system of post-doctoral seminars were established in various parts of the country, the total number of members in a single seminar being limited to twenty-five, adequately staffed, and designed for six weeks' study and discussion of selected areas within philosophy.

(C) The library facilities of many of the smaller colleges are not

adequate for either students or staff; the problem is more acute in the case of those newly established departments of philosophy which are now beginning to appear across the country, especially in former teachers' colleges newly oriented to the concept of the liberal arts. To meet these problems we suggest that (1) a study should be made of the increasing difficulties lying in the way of rendering the interlibrary loan program more efficient; (2) a study should be made of the possibility of expanding the use of microfilm techniques, and other means of duplicating library materials to make them available at low cost; (3) it might be considered whether or not subsidies would be appropriate to help certain colleges, particularly those with new departments of philosophy, to reach relatively quickly a more adequate philosophy collection.

(D) The unevenness of strength in departments of philosophy across the country has led us to speculate upon the possibility of utilizing the organized lecture series as a means of bringing greater strength and greater diversity of point of view, especially to the smaller institutions. Although the ordinary lecture series may fail to have much effect, it seemed to our committee that a lecture series, organized under the direction of the Department of Philosophy, perhaps as a course for majors, with appropriate readings prior to the lecturer's appearance on campus and further discussions and readings after his departure, could do much to sharpen the perceptions of the students within that department and end the sense of isolation in which the members of small departments labor. If such a program were to be made available across the country, a subsidy of considerable size would obviously be necessary.

II. PUBLICATION

The increase in the number of philosophers has led to an explosive production of articles, essays, monographs, and anthologies; and while there has been a numerical increase in the more thoroughgoing book-length scholarly studies, this represents a proportional decrease in the number of such studies. This situation leads us to the following suggestions.

(A) Because of the publication explosion it becomes increasingly important that abstracts of articles be published and made available to the community of philosophers in some systematic manner. The simplest organization of such a project would be to arrange a set of agreements between the various American journals of philosophy and the American Philosophical Association providing that: (1) one of the conditions for accepting an article for publication would be the provi-

sion by the author of a brief abstract of the article in question; (2) at the time of an article's appearance, it would be the responsibility of the journal in which the article appears to send the abstract of the article to the Abstracts Publications Committee of the American Philosophical Association; (3) annually, or semi-annually, an issue of abstracts would appear, and be made available to libraries and individual philosophers. In the latter case, either an additional subscription could be required or the publication could be provided as part of the service to its members of the American Philosophical Association.

Even though such a publishing project might well become financially self-sufficient in a matter of years, an initial subsidy would be necessary. The most attractive, and perhaps the most practical, means of initiating such a project would be through the agency of a Humanities Foundation with seed-money to foster the project in its early years, and with interest in its development.

(B) Because the relative decline of the serious and creative book-length manuscript, directed to one's professional peers, is due – at least in part – to the marketing principles of commercial publishers, as well as to an apparent inability on the part of the university presses to keep pace with the academic growth of the country, two suggestions require study: (1) Is it feasible to encourage the commercial presses to publish a greater number of the commercially less viable manuscripts on the same grounds on which public-service programs are expected to occupy a certain proportion of the schedule in the offerings of commercial radio and television? If this is not possible, such ventures might be made more palatable by a program of subsidies supporting publication of the scholarly manuscript. (2) Since the university presses exist in order to make possible publication of such scholarly work, it is possible that the present capacities of these presses might be expanded, and their prospective growth rates sharply increased. It might be important to initiate a study designed to discover whether or not financial support of such increase is warranted.

Because these questions pertain to philosophy, and yet extend beyond it, applying to all of the humanities, and to them in a special sense, consideration of such questions and the working out of an answer to the indicated problem would be a most appropriate function for a National Humanities Foundation.

III. INTERNATIONAL CONTACT

If philosophers are to fulfill their expected function in society it is important that they remain in touch with each other across national boundaries, and preferably with a lapse of time sufficiently small to allow productive interchange to occur. Such interchange does occur

regularly between American and British philosophers, to a much slighter extent between American philosophers and those on the European continent, and scarcely at all between American philosophers and those in Asian countries. This is regrettable, and leads us to a number of suggestions.

(A) Our first group of suggestions concerns a program in support of the translation of philosophical articles and books: (1) We propose that a committee of American philosophical societies select each year those articles in the various American philosophical journals which they deem most significant, and that these be made available to a program of translation into the major languages of the world. We propose that a similar commission be set up in each other major country to provide a similar group of articles for translation. (2) We propose that a committee of the Fédération Internationale des Sociétés de Philosophie be commissioned to select the significant volumes in philosophy published in all languages; and that these be made available to the program of translation. (3) We further propose that one function of the prospective Humanities Foundation be to implement this program of translations. It is our belief that such a program of translations would be of benefit in other major disciplines as well; and that this program would in itself tend to create bridges between these disciplines, while also encouraging the development within each discipline of scholars with the linguistic facility necessary for the task in question.

(B) Our second group of suggestions concerns the international exchange of professors. We heartily commend existing programs which lead to international contact among members of the humanities' disciplines, including international congresses, and hope that these programs can be expanded even further. Our comments in this area are only two in number: (1) It would be very helpful to the staffs of American colleges and universities were it possible to discover from some central agency the names of foreign scholars interested in coming to America, and available in the coming year. This agency could also provide information concerning, for example, the ability of the individual in question to lecture in English. (2) It would be of advantage, too, if there were some central place where all foreign scholars currently in this country might register, in order that colleges and universities wishing to invite foreign scholars might gain knowledge of their presence.

IV. RESEARCH GRANTS IN THE HUMANITIES

To the extent that we are something more than a society of scientists and technologists, it is important that the vast imbalance between the amounts of money expended in support of scientific and humanistic

research be corrected. Such corrective action suggests the desirability of a foundation similar to the National Science Foundation, yet oriented toward the difference between scientific and humanistic or scholarly research.

Indeed, one of the strongest arguments in favor of a National Humanities Foundation might well be that through such an agency it would be possible to keep the distinction between scholarly research and scientific research somewhat more clear. However teamlike scientific research may become, humanistic research remains an individual matter, and the effective conditions of such research are the provision of time, and books. The fact that for the past several decades in this country the model of all research has been scientific has led many of the larger foundations unwittingly to require humanists to submit proposals which have about them a "scientific" aura. In the attempt to qualify for grants, some humanistic scholars, perhaps many, have been led to distort the projects with which they wish to deal. In relation to this problem we have two suggestions: (1) A program of grants like those of the National Science Foundation should be instituted, but one staffed by humanists who realize that quantitative results are not the purpose of research in the humanities. Furthermore, it should be recognized that the lack of specificity which would invalidate a proposal for a scientific research contract might be exactly appropriate in application for a grant in the humanities. (2) It seems to us that one of the strengths of the research contracts awarded by such agencies as the National Science Foundation is that the research is usually done on campus, and the professor is available to his graduate and undergraduate students, although with released time for research. Grants in the humanities have tended to remove the scholar from his campus. We suggest that a lesson be taken from the scientists in this respect, and that a program of Humanities On-Campus Fellowships be instituted, which would provide the scholar with an appropriate amount of released time for several years, even while he continues to be able to teach, imparting the results of his research through appropriate course work.

V. PHILOSOPHY AND CULTURE

In addition to college and graduate training in philosophy, and research, we are concerned over the role of philosophy in the general culture of our time.

(A) Because there are philosophical areas, such as the social sciences and philosophy, widely recognized as appropriate for high-school teaching, and because courses in philosophy appear more and more in high-school curricula, and in programs of adult education, and because

these programs are often under the direction of individuals not competently grounded in the discipline and literature of philosophy, it is important that the question of the nature of a suitable high-school curriculum in philosophy, and suitable training for the teachers of whatever philosophy may be offered, be made the object of a special study; and that the problem of the preparation of suitable texts and other materials be considered. These questions should be considered in connection with a committee from the general area of secondary education.

(B) It is our feeling that in educational television, and in the area of public-service, or cultural, programs, there should be a philosophical component; the nature of this component, and the means whereby the contribution of philosophy can be best made to the country, whether through courses or in other types of program, needs to be considered. Indeed, it is our feeling that the cultural interests of North America would be well served by the establishment of a national cultural television network drawing together the educational channels now in operation, and making it more attractive for those not operative to become so; and that this network should make available to our people the best productions of our Western culture, including, of course, our philosophies.

(C) The question concerning the appropriate philosophical component in educational television, and in programs of adult education, raises issues which also concern other humanities areas. These problems would, therefore, be the reasonable subject of study by a humanities commission, in consultation with a committee drawn from the philosophical societies of America.

THE AMERICAN MUSICOLOGICAL SOCIETY

COMMITTEE

Nathan Broder, President
American Musicological Society

Professor Donald Grout
Cornell University

Professor Paul Henry Lang
Columbia University

Professor Gustave Reese
New York University
Chairman

Professor Oliver Strunk
Princeton University

I. THE PRESENT SITUATION

THE current state of musicology in this country may be said to be flourishing. Indeed, the needs of the discipline are to a considerable extent an outgrowth of its vitality. It was only in 1930 that the first academic appointment was made in the United States specifically recognizing musicology as a field of study in its own right; thirty-three years later, all the major American universities and many of the smaller ones offer work in musicology in their graduate schools. Partly as a result of this, Americans have been producing a generous quantity of scholarly articles, books, and editions of high quality. Periodicals such as the *Journal of the American Musicological Society,* the *Musical Quarterly,* and *Ethnomusicology* provide outlets for at least the smaller contributions. The American Musicological Society, founded in 1934, has a membership of more than fifteen hundred, organized into thirteen chapters in various parts of the country. It is fair to say that in current productivity and quality, American musicology stands second only to that of Germany, if second to that of any country. American scholars are frequently invited to contribute to major foreign projects, such as the great German encyclopedia *Die Musik in Geschichte und Gegenwart,* which is still in process. The fact that the International Musicological Society held its 1961 congress in the United States is also recognition of the distinguished position achieved by American musicology.

II. THE FUTURE NEEDS

That the favorable situation has created needs has already been mentioned. The Society hopes that steps may be taken to meet those needs

through the help of a National Humanities Foundation, in which the American Council of Learned Societies and its constituent members would play an important advisory role. Federal support, through such a foundation, would help to combat the imbalance between the humanities and the sciences that exists at our universities and elsewhere. While private foundations have given most valuable help to the humanities, their support has not been of such a nature as to allow for long-range planning. The American Council of Learned Societies would make an excellent advisor to a National Humanities Foundation, since it could provide an ideal clearinghouse for consideration of the wishes and needs of scholarly organizations in the various humanistic disciplines, and since, moreover, it would be equipped to guard against confusion between activities in the humanistic field and those more properly belonging to the field of the performing arts.

A serious need of musicology in this country is a constructive, long-range plan for publication under the auspices of the American Musicological Society. As has been stated earlier, the existing periodicals provide outlets for the publication of shorter contributions. But the situation is by no means so favorable with regard to books, monographs, and editions. The following, quoted from the recently published book, *Musicology*,[1] is relevant:

> The limited communication that publication difficulties have imposed upon American musicology weakens its international impact and makes an appraisal of its total contribution in recent times tentative. A truly comprehensive critical survey of American achievements in this field would take into consideration the many unpublished dissertations . . . .

While certain American publishers have included works on musicology in their catalogues, these works are almost entirely of the textbook type. There is much excellent material contained, for example, in dissertations, which should be made more readily available. The American Musicological Society has tried to provide an outlet for some of it, but has been handicapped by lack of funds. The American Institute of Musicology, actually a one-man organization, has been engaged in the publication of a fairly large number of scholarly editions, but these have been confined mostly to fifteenth-century music.

The Society also urges support for the establishment of an American musicological center abroad, comparable to the Music-historical Division of the German Historical Institute in Rome, founded in 1958. Such a center, developed and directed by a small resident staff including at least one professional scholar, with a library, a film archive, and an index of sources at its disposal, could make itself enormously useful

[1] By Frank Ll. Harrison, Mantle Hood, and Claude V. Palisca, p. 149.

to the many musicologists from this country who visit Europe every year, and could at the same time answer inquiries and carry out commissions for those who remain at home. Ideally, its budget should include funds for publication, so that the center might contribute in its own way to the realization of the long-range publication plan already recommended.

Support is urged, in addition, for visiting professorships in musicology, to be filled by European scholars invited by American universities for one or two terms, the program to be administered by the American Council of Learned Societies, the applications and nominations to come from the universities interested. Similar professorships have found support in other fields, but they are practically unknown in the field of musicology because of lack of funds.

There is a serious lack in the means of setting up large-scale projects that require the collaboration of scholars in various parts of the country. There are whole areas in music history that remain partly in the dark because the source materials are fragmented and need to be put together before they can be properly studied. Thus, most of the polyphonic music of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries exists only in the form of part-books, which have to be transcribed and put together into scores in order to be read and analyzed. Similarly, great quantities of eighteenth-century symphonies remain unknown because they are available only in instrumental parts, not in score. To be sure, scores are constantly being made, but this is laborious work, and individual scholars can make only a small dent in the total task. For example, of some ten thousand eighteenth-century symphonies available in parts, only two or three hundred have been scored.

Support is urged for the recommendations bearing on music teaching in the elementary and secondary schools put forward in the report by Claude Palisca on the Seminar on Music Education held at Yale University between June 17 and 28, 1963 (U.S. Office of Education, Co-operative Research Project G-013). The recommendations resulted from twelve days of discussion by thirty-one musicians, composers, scholars, and teachers. General agreement was expressed on the need for a thorough revision of the content, organization, and materials of pre-college music education. Musical instruction, it was emphasized, should concentrate upon developing the innate musical capabilities of individual pupils rather than upon accessory goals such as community relations and immediate social and recreational values. The repertory needs to be extended in all directions — chronologically, geographically, ethnically — and improved in artistic value and authenticity. There should be a balance, which does not exist today, of performing, creative activities, and the study of music as a literature.

Each of these should be guided by teachers who are sufficiently trained in these areas by college instructors who, in turn, are steeped in their subjects as well as in the process of education. The participants in the conference urged a large-scale program of research and development of materials and audio-visual aids, and of various schemes for bringing the schools into closer contact with the world of professional music-making.

If American musicology is provided with the various types of assistance recommended in this report, it will be still better equipped than it now is to represent American culture favorably on the international scene.

THE AMERICAN NUMISMATIC SOCIETY

COMMITTEE

Harald Ingholt
Yale University

Samuel R. Milbank
President, *American Numismatic Society*

George C. Miles
Chief Curator, *American Numismatic Society*

Sawyer McA. Mosser
Secretary, *American Numismatic Society*

IN RESPONSE to the request of the Commission on the Humanities for a statement with regard to the present status and anticipated future needs of the various humanistic disciplines in the United States, a committee composed of Council and staff members of the American Numismatic Society has prepared the following brief report on scholarship and teaching in the field of numismatics. It should perhaps be emphasized that the term numismatics is here used in its strict sense as the scholarly discipline of the history of coinage since its inception in the seventh century B. C. and not in the popular modern sense of "coin collecting." In the former strict sense numismatics is closely connected with virtually all the other humanistic disciplines.

I. THE PRESENT STATE OF SCHOLARSHIP AND TEACHING

a) American scholarship in numismatics ranks with the best in the world and some of it is a good deal better than the best in many European countries. Limitations on scholarly production, however, are imposed by lack of adequate funds for research and publication, and by inadequate teaching facilities (see below). The most important center of scholarly numismatic publication is the American Numismatic Society.

b) Some American universities include courses in numismatics in their curricula. The writers of this report have not made a thorough survey of curricula to determine how many universities offer courses in numismatics, but they are aware of the existence of such courses at Yale, Princeton, Cornell, The University of Minnesota, Washington University (St. Louis), Columbia (a seminar in Greek numismatics planned for next year), and the

American Numismatic Society. The Summer Seminar for selected graduate students at this latter institution, which has been held annually for the past twelve years, is the most important single scholarly endeavor in this country in the field of numismatics. Some 134 students have attended this seminar since its inception, and as a result a number of "graduates" of this course now occupying teaching positions in universities throughout the country are aware of the importance of this discipline and are indoctrinating their students and faculties in the value and usefulness of the discipline in humanistic studies. Some of these students have made important contributions to scholarly numismatic literature.

II. THE RELATIONS BETWEEN SCHOLARSHIP IN NUMISMATICS AND THE TEACHING OF HUMANISTIC SUBJECTS

a) While numismatics is a specialized discipline to which original contributions can be made only by specialized scholars, basic teaching at the college level for the purpose of elucidating and supplementing the study of history, art, archaeology, economics, etc., can be handled by non-specialists who have had such training as they receive in university courses in numismatics or at the seminar of the American Numismatic Society. The value of numismatics as an ancillary discipline is increasingly being recognized, especially in the fields of classics, mediaeval studies, the history of fine arts and economic history.

b) Some enterprising teachers of Latin and of classical civilization and mythology at the secondary school level make use of coins in their teaching, but much wider use of numismatics at this level would be profitable, especially through such media as loan collections of coins, photographs, slides, etc. Such teaching aids by and large do not exist, nor is there any organization for the dissemination of such material.

III. FINANCIAL SUPPORT PRESENTLY AVAILABLE

So far as the writers of this report are aware, there is at present no financial support specifically for these purposes in colleges and universities. The only institution in the country which devotes any appreciable funds to research and publication in numismatics is again the American Numismatic Society, and its funds derive almost exclusively from the Society's own endowment.

IV. THE PRESENT AND POTENTIAL IMPORTANCE OF NEW TECHNIQUES FOR TEACHING AND SCHOLARSHIP IN NUMISMATICS

Numismatists and scholars in humanistic fields which numismatics serves recognize the fact that the use of scientific disciplines (physical, chemical, mechanical, microscopic, etc.), especially with reference to economic history and the history of technology, has been very limited. Certain institutions abroad and conservation centers such as that at the Institute of Fine Arts of New York University have recently been devoting attention and limited funds to the potential benefits of closer collaboration between humanistic scholarship and the physical sciences in this regard.

It is doubtless evident from the above observations that the institution best fitted to act as the coordinator of any efforts to promote research and teaching in the discipline of numismatics in this country is the American Numismatic Society.

THE AMERICAN ORIENTAL SOCIETY

COMMITTEE

Professor Ernest Bender
University of Pennsylvania

Professor Wm. Theodore de Bary
Columbia University
Chairman

Professor Richard Frye
Harvard University

Professor Theodore H. Gaster
Dropsie College

Professor James B. Pritchard
University of Pennsylvania

THIS report consists of three sections prepared by committee members representing the Middle East, South Asia, and the Far East respectively. Each outlines accomplishments in these fields during the past two decades and particular problems or subjects in serious need of attention. In recommending future steps to be taken, however, certain needs of Asian studies as a whole stand out. These are listed in the conclusion.

I. THE NEAR EAST

(RICHARD FRYE)

The Near East, in the context of the Commission on the Humanities, is overwhelmingly ancient and mediaeval, since the contemporary scene is more than adequately represented by those involved in the social sciences. This is not to say that art, music, and literature in the modern Near East should not be the concern of scholars engaged in humanistic studies relating to that geographical area, but in the framework of the ACLS, with attention directed to the third word, "learned," the past is primarily our concern.

In considering needs and plans for this Near Eastern field, we cannot be concerned with particular institutions or universities, but rather with general and national needs and exigencies. Rather than direct our concerns to minutiae of specific projects, we may sum up the overriding requirements of the ancient field of Near Eastern Studies in one word, "archaeology," while the needs of the mediaeval area can be expressed by the word "institutes."

Since World War II, American archaeologists in the Near East have suffered from lack of funds to carry out proper and exhaustive excavations of sites. Too often, sporadic, one-season digs have failed of any purpose, though chance finds have sometimes more than justified even one summer of excavation. By archaeology in the Near East we do not mean just the enriching of museums with art objects, but the complete apparatus of scholars studying all aspects of an excavation. An ideal example of the kind of excavations and the type of studies needed in the Near East is Dura Europos, excavated over a period of years by Yale University. The results of those excavations have enormously enriched our knowledge, and work on the results continues to this day. The various objects and inscriptions still to be recovered from the soil of the Near East should provoke the support of all groups interested in this area.

Perhaps more than help to archaeology, *permanent* American academic institutes in Egypt, Turkey, Iran, and possibly elsewhere, are badly needed. Great sums of money are available for students to travel in the Near East, but there are no centers for scholars to work in the field. Frequently, grant-holders who come to the Near East spend much of their time and money in the search for housing and in trying to obtain official permission to travel, photograph, or study objects or archives. We can utilize the experiences of the French, Germans, British, and others, while not slavishly copying them, in establishing our scholarly institutes in the Near East.

Such institutes should have adequate living quarters and a reference library (as a minimum) with places to work. Transportation should be available for archaeologists or those scholars needing to travel in the area. The further requirements of such an institute – an information section, classes in the local language, and the like – would be open to discussion and negotiation. The principal requirement of an American center in the Near East would be continuity of personnel. A director should manage the institute, helped by a committee or board, and responsible students should be appointed to fellowships of at least two or three years, so that they might reap full benefit of a stay at a center.

Needless to say, there are many questions or problems rising in connection with both *archaeology* and *institutes*, not the least of which is the matter of publications. But the double primary need of the Near Eastern field can be well and succinctly stated in the words "archaeology and institutes," and they should provide guide lines for further activity in this area.

Important New Developments in Near Eastern Studies Since World War II

It is, of course, impossible to list all of the many developments and achievements in the field of Near Eastern Studies since 1945. Much has been accomplished, but much more remains to be done, for new discoveries not only answer some old questions but usually open new vistas with hosts of new questions and problems. A rapid survey of chief developments in the Near Eastern field reveals that most of them are the result of archaeology and new finds. Difficulties of research and publication continue to plague scholars in this field, but none the less much has been accomplished. An incomplete list of the most significant developments follows:

1. The discovery of and work on the Dead Sea Scrolls.
2. The discovery of and work on papyri from Egypt (Gnostic Manichaean and Christian in Greek or Coptic).
3. The recovery of a new language and culture of the Kushans in Afghanistan by French archaeologists.
4. Publication of the prewar Persepolis excavations.
5. Decipherment and publication of Cretan scripts (Linear A and B), and resultant increase of knowledge of Greek-Near Eastern relations.
6. Opening of the Ottoman and other archives.
7. Cataloguing of Islamic manuscript collections in the Near East.
8. Excavations and salvage operations in Upper Egypt in preparation for the construction of the Aswan dam.
9. Publication of the Chicago Assyrian Dictionary.

II. SOUTH ASIA

(Ernest Bender)

The term "South Asian Studies" has been applied in recent years to the area comprising present-day India, Pakistan, Ceylon, Afghanistan, Nepal, Bhutan, Sikkim, and Southern Tibet. It can be considered, therefore, to cover for the most part in this report the area to which was applied the older term "India" (or "Indian").

Of the overall needs for post-doctoral, graduate, and undergraduate training in this area, the following are of immediate importance:

1. An introductory textbook for the study of the Sanskrit language. At present there is no adequate textbook in English.
2. A revision and supplementation of M. B. Emeneau's *A Union List of Printed Indic Texts and Translations in American Libraries,* American Oriental Society, 1935.

3. A revision and supplementation of H. I. Poleman's *Census of Indic Manuscripts in the United States and Canada,* American Oriental Society, 1938.
4. A revision of W. D. Whitney's *The Roots, Verb-Forms and Primary Derivatives of the Sanskrit Language,* reprinted by the American Oriental Society, 1945.
5. A representative collection on microfilm of manuscripts available only in South Asian collections, *i.e.,* composed in Sanskrit, Pali, Prakrit, the early stages of the modern Indo-Aryan vernaculars, Dravidian, Sinhalese, etc. (On several occasions in the recent past students have encountered difficulties in acquiring manuscripts necessary for their work in this country. The Indian institutions where these manuscripts were lodged were not able to provide copies.)
6. As editor for India and South Asia of the *Journal of the American Oriental Society* I am often made aware of the difficulties encountered by authors regarding the payment of the costs of printing plates for articles, especially those whose subjects embrace art and archaeology. The JAOS, not being geared to meet this expense, is forced to ask authors to do so. Such being the case, I am prevented from inviting scholars of art and archaeology (especially Indians, for whom this expense would be impossible) to contribute articles. A possible answer to this problem would be the establishment of an agency to which authors could make application for the subsidizing of the printing of plates of papers accepted for publication — or, preferably, arrangements could be made directly between the agency and the journals encountering these costs.

There are not many continuing projects of research in depth by Americans in connection with South Asia. Those which do exist are in the realm of the preparation of language instructional materials and in linguistic research connected with South Asia, financed under the NDEA. The desire to organize and pursue long-range projects exists and should be fulfilled. Such projects include, but are not limited to, archaeological exploration and the study of the history of South Asian art, South Asian fiction and literature; an encyclopaedia of Indian philosophy; the study of South Asian music, drama, and dance. Two things are needed: one is the financing, the other an organization to take over the general operation of such projects. The latter must, of course, be strictly scholarly in the aims and methods devoted to research. Such an institution exists in India in the American Institute for Indian Studies, which has been organized by American scholars and operated by American scholars with the aid of PL 480 funds. A similar institute could be organized in Pakistan. Humanistic research needs in Ceylon

and Nepal could possibly be handled by the Institute in India by special arrangements. For Afghanistan a separate institute might be needed. Funds could be found by drawing upon PL 480. The important thing to emphasize is that all this should be under the direction of American scholars. They would work in co-operation with scholars in the South Asian countries involved.

Serious consideration must be given at this time to an adequate introduction of South Asian subjects (including languages) into the primary and secondary schools. The Asia Society has made available a "Teacher's Packet on South Asia." It includes reading materials, selected visual aids, maps, a bibliography of books on Asia for children, and a *Guide,* intended for classroom use by the teacher, which describes the contents of the packet and gives supplementary materials and sources. I recommend:

1. The establishment of scholarships or fellowships, to be made available to primary- and secondary-school teachers, to attend summer institutes devoted to South Asian Studies, or to enable them to take leave to attend the regular sessions of such institutes.
2. The provision of the necessary library materials (including visual aids).
3. As an intermediate stage or for areas where teachers with inclinations for South Asian subjects are few, provisions for properly accredited lecturers who can circulate among several schools. In such cases, the library materials can be devised to be kept in vehicles on the plan of the circulating libraries which are in use in many areas of this country. Arrangements can be considered to bring to this country English-speaking teachers from South Asian countries. Perhaps this can be carried out on an "exchange-of-teachers" basis.
4. This is the time to give serious thought to the introduction of the teaching of modern South Asian languages – perhaps also Sanskrit – into the secondary schools. At first the classes could be offered to linguistically talented students (in a limited number of schools) who would be willing to participate in these courses outside the regular curriculum. I have in mind something like the way in which the study of Russian was introduced into several Philadelphia schools. In one instance, as it was described to me, the class was held on Saturday mornings. On entering college the graduates were able to proceed immediately into the second-year Russian course.

III. THE FAR EAST

(WM. THEODORE DE BARY)

Humanistic studies of the Far East area have developed considerably from very small beginnings after World War II. The most significant advances have not been through striking new discoveries but rather through the opening up of large areas for teaching and research which previously were not represented or covered by American scholarship. In other words, the accomplishment has been made primarily by a larger number of individual scholars working in the field, each making his own contribution to the over-all advancement of studies in the Chinese and Japanese humanities. To list these contributions would be to compile a bibliography, which is not our purpose here. But the fundamental importance of these individual efforts should be kept in mind when considering the progress made through group projects with organizational backing. These latter, which lend themselves more readily to summary listing, may be taken as an index of the general growth in Far Eastern Studies in the last two decades.

1. The compilation of *Eminent Chinese of the Ch'ing Dynasty,* a monumental reference work in Chinese history, under the editorship of Arthur Hummel and with the sponsorship of the Library of Congress, the ACLS, and the Rockefeller Foundation.
2. The translation of the *History of the Former Han Dynasty* by Homer H. Dubs, with ACLS sponsorship.
3. The series of Conferences on Chinese Thought, sponsored by the Association for Asian Studies, the ACLS, and the Rockefeller Foundation, and under the general direction of Arthur Wright. These have resulted in the publication of five volumes of essays and research papers on different aspects of Chinese, and especially Confucian, thought.
4. A similar series of Conferences on Modern Japan, sponsored by a committee of the Association for Asian Studies under the chairmanship of John Hall, which has included studies from both the humanities and social sciences on nineteenth-century Japan and the process of modernization.
5. The series of monographic studies and reference works in Chinese and Japanese history and literature sponsored by the Harvard-Yenching Institute, and a similar series by the University of Michigan.
6. The monograph series of the Association for Asian Studies, emphasizing particularly Asian history.
7. The series of translations from the Chinese Dynastic histories sponsored by the University of California, Berkeley.

8. The series of publications sponsored by the Committee on Oriental Studies, Columbia University, under the chairmanship of Wm. Theodore de Bary, for use in general education on the undergraduate level. These include source-books in the Japanese, Chinese, and Indian Traditions; translations from the Oriental classics; bibliographical and discussion guides to the Oriental classics; introductory surveys of Oriental literature; and a series entitled "Problems in Asian Civilizations."
9. The Ming Biographical History Project of the Association for Asian Studies, recently set up with the support of the ACLS and the Ford Foundation, to compile a comprehensive history of the Ming similar to the above-mentioned *Eminent Chinese of the Ch'ing Period.*

Notwithstanding the above-mentioned projects (which are illustrative and by no means exhaustive), some areas of East Asian studies in the humanities remain almost totally undeveloped in the United States. These include:

1. Korean history, literature, and thought.
2. Vietnamese history, literature, and thought.

Other fields in which somewhat more work has been done but which are still largely neglected or seriously undermanned are:

3. Chinese and Japanese archaeology.
4. Chinese and Japanese music and fine arts.
5. Chinese and Japanese religion and thought.

Although relatively greater progress has been made in Chinese history and literature, there are still major universities in the United States unable to fill positions in these fields because of the unavailability of competent, trained scholars. In general, it is safe to say that none even of the major universities considers itself fully staffed to do an adequate job of teaching in the East Asian humanities, and in some fields the number of specialists is so few that there is an insufficiency of basic texts and readings with which to conduct even survey — much less specialized — courses.

Two things seem to be required. One is special funds to be devoted to the development of research and teaching in neglected areas mentioned above, under the sponsorship of existing scholarly societies. Second is implementation of the over-all recommendations for the promotion of the Asian humanities, which follow. These would benefit all areas of Asian studies equally, and help to raise the general level of humanistic studies on Asia more nearly to that of the Western humanities.

IV. GENERAL RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE COMMITTEE

1. The establishment of professorships in both graduate schools and liberal arts colleges, which would constitute the essential basis for the expansion of teaching, training, and research in the Asian humanities.
2. The establishment of a Council for the Asian Humanities to sponsor translation, research, and scholarly conferences in neglected fields. Such a council should serve as the planner, co-ordinator, and financial backer of both individual and collective scholarly projects.
3. The establishment of a program of research and travel grants on the post-doctoral level, to aid professors in returning to the field for "refreshening," especially after years of service in teaching. Since travel to Asia is expensive, scholars in this field cannot so readily spend their summers there as scholars in traditional Western subjects spend theirs in Europe. Without special funds it is impossible for most of them to return to the field to conduct research, to maintain scholarly contacts, and to keep up fluency in the spoken language of their area. A limited number of grants of this type have been available in recent years, but many of the funds devoted to the Asian field specify that the research proposed must have some modern, usually "social science," relevance, and this puts scholars in the humanities at a great disadvantage.
4. Subsidies to support publication, extending the programs listed above and providing new outlets for publication in neglected fields. A scholarly periodical on Oriental literature is badly needed to take over the job which the mimeographed *Literature East and West* has struggled to perform in the past several years without adequate resources.
5. Although a few libraries at major universities, as well as the Library of Congress, have built up Asian collections, there is a massive need for funds for library acquisitions and cataloguing, and a further need for additional working collections at other universities and colleges.
6. To help in overcoming the neglect of Asian humanities on the high-school and college level, grants should be made available to high-school and college teachers to study, do research, and serve internships in the larger centers of Asian studies. Funds should likewise be made available to support visiting professorships or lectureships so that smaller institutions may have an opportunity to hear from distinguished scholars from the large centers.

THE AMERICAN PHILOLOGICAL ASSOCIATION

The report of the American Philological Association was not prepared by a special committee. The time factor and other considerations made it advisable for the President of the Association to draft a preliminary form of statement to be submitted for comment and emendation to a representative selection of the Association's members at various levels and in various branches of Classical Studies other than Classical Archaeology. Expressions of general approval or specific suggestions for improvement were returned by about fifty colleagues; the editor expresses gratitude to them all. Insofar as suggestions were received in time, and were relevant to the main purpose of the Commission, and did not overload the principal points with confusing detail or apparent contradictions, they have been incorporated and have greatly enhanced the value of the report. However, while the revised form now seems to be a reasonable reply to the Commission's request for information, it should be strongly emphasized that almost any classicist could legitimately and strongly disagree with one or another of the individual statements, ideas, phrases or emphases herein, as some have done; that the report is not the product of vis-à-vis consultation; and that it is not an official paper of the American Philological Association.

H.C.

INTRODUCTION

For purposes of this report, Classical Studies means, briefly, the study of the Greek and Latin languages and literatures and of several branches (history, philosophy, palaeography, papyrology, etc.) depending upon written remains. The recovery and interpretation of the *material* remains of antiquity are covered in the report of The Archaeological Institute of America.

I. CLASSICAL STUDIES AND TEACHERS OF CLASSICS

The indispensable foundation for Classical Studies is a knowledge of the Greek or Latin language or, far preferably, of both. Hence the languages, though susceptible of study for their own sake and as ends in themselves, are usually treated as introductory to the reading of authors' texts.

The literatures in turn fall into a preliminary phase of elementary and routine translation (which is regrettably often treated for its own sake and as an end in itself), and a more advanced phase of interpretation, involving response to qualities of literary style, sublime expression, and emotions (much of which is intangible), and involving consideration of human life and the goals of living, with a moral-political orientation which includes a complete world extending from Mycenaean times to the fall of Rome. None of these elements necessarily excludes the others, but many students in the American educational system never master even the most elementary technique of translating Caesar, Cicero, or Vergil; and many of those who do so nevertheless fail to penetrate to the deeper significance of these authors – to say nothing of authors more "advanced."

Since Classics, like other literary subjects, deals in large measure with intangibles, many of the results of studying Classics are intangible. The classicist's closest approach to tangibility lies in the area of Greek and Roman archaeology; the classical archaeologist can display or photographically reproduce his raw material, some of which is genuinely beautiful, and all of which is by definition at least "thousands of years old." Popular mass media are glad to publicize this kind of exotic visual material, but the scholar of ancient literature has a far less ready market for the concepts and ideas which comprise his stock in trade.

Classics further contrasts with many other disciplines in requiring a teacher. Some subject matters can be cultivated as hobbies and even as professions by anyone with curiosity, a general background, and an ability to read intelligently. Still other professional fields which have been elevated to academic status are really learned only on the job, with little or no formal instruction. But Classics, like mathematics and some other disciplines, requires vis-à-vis teaching by a qualified instructor capable of presenting new material clearly, probing the weak spots in the students' understanding, and clearing up difficulties accurately and unhesitatingly. Classicists are not self-taught. The essential give-and-take between student and teacher thus not merely excludes effective instruction in elementary Latin from the closed-circuit expository treatment successfully applied to certain other subjects, but also necessitates smaller instructional sections than some public-school systems consider the minimum. (Parenthetically, be it noted that a large part of the elementary-Latin teacher's inescapable liturgy regrettably consists of inculcating basic English grammar.) If smaller sections cost more money, this is the price of teaching superior students. The conclusion, supported also below, is obvious: more teachers of high-school Latin are needed.

Ph.D.'s in Classics command a minimum of two ancient languages and three modern – the latter not merely as a formal requirement to be passed and forgotten, but as a tool for facile day-to-day use – and an extensive range of ancient and modern literature as well as ancient and modern cultural civilization. In addition, most professors of Classics have their own specialized interests in some field such as those already noted, or in particular authors, individual periods of cultural or literary history, private life, specialized archaeology of a chosen area or period, and a myriad of other specialties. Many of these fields can be cultivated best, or only, in Europe or other classical lands; thus the classicist is, and must be, more widely traveled in the pursuit of his profession than is his colleague in, for instance, American history. "Classics is more truly an international and co-operative field of study over its whole extent than most others in the humanities."

Though it is no longer news, it deserves emphasis that many contemporary American classical scholars are internationally recognized leaders in their profession. This means that first-rate graduate work in Classics is now available in a number of American universities, and adequate graduate work in others; it is no longer fashionable for American doctoral candidates to migrate to Europe for training. (Admittedly, some of this eminence of American institutions results from professorial immigration from Europe; nevertheless, the large majority of American professors are now American-trained and are evolving an American approach to their discipline.) Another factor contributing to American leadership in Classics is the funds occasionally available for the accumulation of good working libraries – the classicist's indispensable research tool – for research travel, and, to a lesser degree, for publication. Classicists share with other scholars access to foundation grants, Fulbright grants, etc., which were unknown a generation ago and which are still rare in other countries. Nor should the importance of the peculiarly American sabbatical leave be overlooked. There may be enough universities now offering graduate work in Classics to meet predictable needs; what is needed is an up-grading and diversification of personnel and a considerable extension of library holdings to take some of the load from the more famous and traditional "best," without loss of instructional quality; and in turn there should be a heavier load of graduate students in order to meet the predictable need for college teachers.

Several disciplines once associated with Classics, *e.g.*, linguistics and modern languages, have developed into independent disciplines, and even within the classical field itself there is a visible tendency toward specialization. Yet Classical Studies remain comparatively unified; *most* classicists can still at least understand what *most* other classicists

talk about even though they may not feel personal involvement therein. This "universality of interest" among classicists is the last vestige of the unity of the humanistic tradition, and it should not fall victim to modern trends toward specialization in the degree characterizing some other disciplines, *e.g.*, mathematics, modern languages, history.

But at the same time, the place of the old is being taken by new discoveries, new points of view, and new areas of classical scholarship, to which Americans, if not always the originators, are at least important and vigorous contributors. Among these new areas are Mycenaean linguistic and historical studies, studies in literary structure, the development of oral (non-literary) epic, archaeological discoveries, new approaches to translation, a continuing succession of *indices verborum* and other aids born of the computer age, and new approaches to the teaching of elementary Latin and Greek. Obviously, it cannot be foreseen what novelties the future will produce, but it can be confidently assumed that Americans will continue to provide refutation of the venerable canard that "after two thousand years there is nothing more to be done in Classics." One American scholar comments, "My junior colleagues are fond of saying that we have only begun to understand antiquity."

II. STUDENT REGISTRATIONS

Reliable and up-to-date and comprehensive statistics are not available, but we believe the following statements to be true and relevant:

(1) A very large number of children throughout the country study some Latin in school, but

(2) the overwhelming majority of them drop it at the end of two years, frequently because no more is available in the school concerned, or even permitted in conjunction with a modern language, and

(3) a large proportion of the survivors into third-year Latin do not take four years of it, frequently for the same reasons; and further

(4) only a small proportion of those presenting four years of Latin for entrance to college continue it as undergraduate students, and even fewer become Classics majors. However,

(5) a certain proportion of those presenting only two or three years of Latin for entrance resume it as undergraduates, and a certain small, but intellectually significant, number begin the study of Latin in college. In the Middle Atlantic states in 1961 "forty-eight per cent of the colleges reported an increase in Latin at a rate higher than the increase in total college enrollments and thirty-nine per cent of these colleges show the same kind of increase in Greek." (Statistics for the foregoing and for "other signs of growth and life" in *Classical World* 55, no. 4, 1962, p. 116.)

No single explanation of the foregoing paragraphs (1)–(4) is valid, but we would note (1) a dearth of secondary-Latin teachers, which often makes it impossible to present any Latin at all, or only a skeleton curriculum, in high school; (2) the narrow and insufficient preparation in their field and in their concept of it, under which many Latin teachers labor; (3) a tendency to draw the superior Latin teachers into other literary or historical fields; (4) the advice of guidance counselors, parents, and other well-wishers to the effect that "You've had enough Latin," "All you can do with Latin is teach it," and the like; and (5) the frequently unrewarding character of the Latin texts read at elementary levels.

The case as regards Greek is quite different. With the exception of a handful of private or church schools, pre-college Greek is not taught. Though the success of these schools in promoting Greek is notable, their example has not been followed by other private schools or by public-school systems – doubtless in part because teachers of Greek are unavailable. For practical purposes Greek is, regrettably, a wholly collegiate subject in the United States.

In explanation of paragraph (5) above, the current tendency on the part of graduate schools, especially in some departments such as English, Romance Languages, History, etc., to require a reading knowledge of Latin or Greek for admission has created a demand which has an upward bearing upon undergraduate registrations in Classics.

Further, undergraduate registrations are likewise supported by students who have made the acquaintance of antiquity, frequently during their freshman or sophomore years, through such courses as Classical Civilization, Classical Literature in Translation, and Archaeology, which present a comprehensive or a romantic background that motivates the pedestrian preparatory exercise of learning paradigms.

It is also probable that Classics benefits, along with other humanities, from an undergraduate revolt against the materialistic approach and claims of economics, push-button sputnik subjects, and certain other disciplines which, rightly or wrongly, are sometimes considered to make exaggerated claims or actually to be leading toward a general self-destruction of civilization.

Classics likewise benefits from the interest in "Greeks and Romans," "mythology," and other elementary subjects presented in secondary or even in primary school, from the modern lay-scholarly discovery of Plato and other Greek writers, and from increased opportunities for travel. Most Classics professors have noted a permeation of classical culture and interest into the circumambient world (an example is the availability of classics in paperback new translations), even though these may not directly affect registrations in classes.

Finally, it is an observed fact doubtless influenced by the foregoing considerations that Ph.D.'s in Classics are likely to be more fully prepared in Greek than in Latin; it is currently easier to fill positions with well-prepared young Hellenists than with Latinists.

III. THE CURRICULUM

The traditional Latin curriculum consisting of elementary forms and composition, leading into Caesar, Cicero, and Vergil, in that order, is followed in college by such standard authors as Horace, Livy, Catullus, more Cicero and Vergil, Pliny, Tacitus, Petronius, Juvenal, and others – rarely Seneca, despite his alleged significance in the study of Elizabethan drama. This last points to an unfortunate situation: although Classics can be properly described as basic to many other disciplines, the Classics Department rarely regards itself as serving the needs of other departments, and other departments rarely call upon Classics to contribute to their curricula. Occasional courses in "Latin and Greek for Science Majors" or in New Testament Greek for pre-theologians, are the exception rather than the rule. Closer relations between classicists and their colleagues in other fields deserve cultivation.

The chief weakness of the classical curriculum, however, lies at its high-school beginning. Caesar's *Gallic Wars* and Xenophon's *Anabasis* were once presumed to be good virile stuff for vigorous American striplings. Whether Caesar's Latin was ever as enthralling as hoped is questionable; but there can be no doubt that the politics, the geography, and even the military descriptions are over the heads and apart from the interests of teen-agers (most of whom perhaps are now girls!) as well as, perhaps, their instructors. Even without the barrier of language this material is not entrancing to this age-group. Much the same can be said of Cicero's orations. Attempts to make these classics more interesting by omitting the "duller" parts and stringing excerpts together is one method of meeting the situation; it is also applied by some editors of Vergil, with the added purpose of securing greater over-all coverage than is possible in a year's reading of the *Aeneid.* This curriculum has persisted for several reasons – the resistance to change on the part of secondary-Latin teachers, the requirements of examining bodies, the availability of texts. Attempts to alter the situation have not been greeted with enthusiasm.

Courses of collegiate Beginning Latin or Beginning Greek do not labor under the same incubus of requirements and professorial inertia. The college can set its own standards and reading list, and it has the advantage of dealing with a more mature and better-motivated type of student. One can make a defensible case that students commencing

Latin in college, per thousand, get much more out of their study than those commencing in ninth grade.

A limiting factor in the collegiate Latin and Greek curriculum is the paucity of available texts. The A.P.A. is undertaking to meet this situation through the efforts of a Committee on College Textbooks, which has arranged for the reprinting of many old texts now out of print, and will arrange for the production of new annotated texts. For instance, even if one wished to read Seneca, it is impossible to buy the basic text from any American book stock; the only accessible book is a worn and interlineated copy from the library. One correspondent estimates that "the Textbook Committee alone could use annually the income from $500,000."

A novelty of recent years has been the extension of the reading lists and the enrichment of the preparatory curriculum through the introduction of "advanced placement." Opinions vary on its efficacy as applied to Latin, but few college professors would maintain that it has significantly raised the quality of college performance.

IV. STATUS AND ORGANIZATION OF CLASSICS DEPARTMENTS

Classicists often complain of their place in the American educational scene, and it is probably true that this is lower than it once was. Competition of other subjects reflecting the growth of knowledge, philosophies of education, the power of authoritative educational bodies, and other factors, have combined to cause this. But actually there are numerically, and perhaps proportionally, more students studying Latin at the lowest levels than ever before. In some areas of the United States more study Latin than all other foreign languages combined. And there are certain indications that the Classics departments of colleges and universities are currently held in higher regard among their colleagues than at other times within recent years. It is in any case notable that administrators of liberal arts and of graduate schools are frequently classicists, because their training seems to give them the right background for certain types of executive service.

A further phenomenon leading to increased prestige is the success of numerous courses in Classical Civilization, which have lifted the Classics departments out of the reputation of teaching only a few stray strange characters. Either because of imaginative and exciting teaching, or because of requirements in humanities, or for other reasons, some Classics departments have burgeoned through teaching their material in the vernacular, and have thereby become locally "important." This is a peculiarly American contribution to the perpetuation

of the classical tradition; European students either study antiquity in its own languages or not at all. (Note, however, that instructors in this expanding area must themselves be as thoroughly trained and as productively active classicists as if they were teaching in the ancient languages.)

Most work in Classics at the liberal arts and graduate levels is administered by a Classics Department which maintains as rounded a balance as possible between Greek and Latin language and literature and certain related studies, which may include ancient history, archaeology, the Classical Civilization courses already mentioned, and others. Only a few institutions retain for local reasons the older organization in separate Greek and Latin departments.

However, a number of institutions, including some rather well-known universities and a number of the newly founded or reorganized institutions, either present no ancient languages at all or else include them in a Foreign Languages Department or elsewhere. The instructors may be on part-time or temporary appointment, or may be admittedly unprepared to teach the subject. This downgrading of Classics is of course neither a credit to the institutions concerned, nor an encouragement to students with classical interests. Each institution will continue to regard the matter through its own eyes, but the situation calls for correction.

V. SCHOLARSHIP AND POPULARIZATION

Too often the American high-school teacher in any field is not considered a learned person by himself, his employers, or the public. He makes few if any claims to more than minimum scholarship, and he is hardly encouraged to extend his learning in his field. Hence, the question of scholarship does not enter the lower ranges of classical instruction. On the other hand, popularization through gay illustrations in textbooks, the traditional Roman banquets, the National Anthem in Latin text, and other means is widely accepted. The college and university professor has little sympathy with this approach to the subject, and in general he does not mingle with his high-school colleagues because he is simply on a different "wave length." But while this situation is regrettable, it is remediable and by no means desperate, as is shown by current activity in other disciplines faced with comparable problems.

Most classical scholars are so insulated from the public that they cannot present their professional material in an interesting way outside the classroom, even though an audience is prepared to be interested, and many of them openly scorn the rare admitted scholar who has the knack of doing so. The presentation of antiquity to the public

has hence been largely abandoned, by the classicists themselves, to treatment at the hands of novelists, dramatists, script-writers, and others whose claims to scholarship are various and whose products fluctuate with their capacities for reading up on the subject they propose to treat. Some of these treatments are excellent; others are outrageous. But the public ordinarily cannot distinguish relative merits, and in any case, is generally exposed to sensational and journalistic treatments of antiquity rather than to any deeper message.

VI. IMPROVEMENTS WITHIN POSSIBLE RANGE

While the study of Greek and Latin is in an encouraging state as compared with that of the recent past, and while certain elements among American classicists are showing considerable awareness of possible advances, and initiative in making them, there remains much to be done. Most of the following suggestions require some degree of financial support, and several of them require it in substantial amount.

(1) It has lately been proposed, with some hope of realization, that all American national and regional classical organizations, and perhaps those of more local scope, should join in an over-all federation of the Classical Associations of the United States of America. Whether through the channels of this proposed federation or otherwise, there is need for an office and staff to promote the welfare of the profession in ways somewhat similar to those already adopted by numerous other (mostly non-humanistic) learned societies and governmental agencies. No such office currently exists; the nearest thing to it is the Service Bureau of the American Classical League, of which the functions are quite different. Its activities would be defined by its director but would include some of the following, as hinted in the foregoing factual review:

a. The creation of closer contacts between the university and the high-school teachers. To do this would mean (1) arranging physical contacts, lectures, institutes, work-shops, refresher courses, conferences, etc., (2) persuading both the professors and the high-school teachers that their mutual contribution to this activity is essential professional communication, and (3) actually even instructing some professors how to talk to school teachers, as well as vice versa.

b. The promotion of comparable contact between professors and high-school students. It could be done; it would be valuable; many professors would be quite willing to undertake it as a professional responsibility with little or no compensation; many professors are even gifted at talking to teen-agers. But any such contact is now haphazard; no one knows where or how to begin.

c. "We should produce authoritative pamphlets for high-school teachers, as the American Historical Association does."

d. To persuade school districts in which Latin is not offered of the advantages of teaching the subject.

e. The exertion of pressure upon state colleges, Offices of Education, teachers' associations, and other groups, to offer more Latin as preparation not only for Latin teachers but for teachers in many other fields.

f. A general reconsideration and probable overhauling of the elementary Latin curriculum. Attempts to re-evaluate it in recent years have, for different reasons, not made headway.

g. Secondary, but only secondary, attention should be given to the promotion of Greek in the elementary curriculum. Greek is, in many ways, substantially easier to learn than Latin; it is the language of those who built the best buildings, sculptured the best statues, and wrote the best literature that the world has known; the privilege of stepping from an elementary chrestomathy into the *Iliad* or *Odyssey,* the world's oldest textbooks and the unsurpassed masterpieces of epic, is unmatched in the study of any other foreign language (*cf.* the second- and third-rate classics read in the first two years of modern language study); the most widely read book in the world, the New Testament, is in fact a Greek book which repays reading in the words of those who wrote it. But we must begin with what we have – in the high schools, this is Latin.

h. This office should extend its attention to the laity with such scatter-procedures as the promotion of films, of acting versions of ancient drama of all kinds, and of educational radio and TV; by facilitation, if not outright subsidy, of semipopular publications, etc. For although everyone is well disposed toward the "humanities," the publicizing of the relative worth and value of the Classics within the humanities is left entirely to the classicists. One of our most distinguished classical elder statesmen remarked that "what American classics needs is a good public relations man."

i. In short, such an office should do any and all the things which professors would recognize as worthwhile to do if they knew the ropes and were not so bogged down by academic responsibilities that they cannot explore and capitalize upon the specific needs and opportunities.

(2) Cultivation of audio-visual aids to teaching requires some further research as applied to Classics. There are many such aids available commercially already; research among teachers, professors, and

technicians would doubtless define the needs more sharply and would produce more and better results.

(3) Undergraduate instruction in Classics would be aided by the opportunity to travel abroad, or to spend one's junior year at an institution comparable to the American School in Athens or the American Academy in Rome, but organized for the undergraduate level. There is no substitute for studying on the spot, as of course is well recognized by faculties of modern languages.

(4) A committee of the American Historical Association, plus two members appointed by the A.P.A., is currently exploring the question of the availability and adequate training of ancient historians. This touches the graduate level of training and involves a variety of considerations inherent in interdisciplinary collaboration of any kind. It also emphasizes the need for classically trained personnel outside the strictly literary field, and especially the necessity for trained personnel to administer the courses in Classical Civilization, for whom the minimum preparation is a doctorate in Classics or Classical Archaeology or Classics-plus-History.

(5) Reference has already been made to the need for a wider range of classical textbooks at the college and university level.

(6) While it may be that there are too many books in existence already, it should be borne in mind that book and periodical publications in Classics are not of ephemeral value, in contrast to scientific books, which, as is boasted, are out of date in ten years at most. Despite support and encouragement from such sources as the Institute for Advanced Study, Dumbarton Oaks, the Center for Hellenic Studies, the institutes at the University of Wisconsin and Wesleyan University (Conn.), various better-known and less-known foundations, and the like, and despite the optimistic tone of a foregoing paragraph regarding graduate study in the United States, few would maintain that there are sufficient funds and opportunities for research in the various classical fields, and all would agree that there are insufficient funds for publication, which is especially expensive because of the frequent necessity for Greek type, for illustrations of objects, etc.

(7) There are also insufficient funds available for travel and study in the interests of curricular development by secondary-school and college teachers of Classics. If every such classicist could get to the classical world from time to time, his teaching would greatly improve. A good deal of travel is now masked as research, but the people not engaged in research are among those who would most profit from the travel.

(8) More graduate fellowships in Classics are needed. The chairman of a distinguished graduate department of Classics says, "We are

not turning out our share of good Ph.D.'s because we cannot get them here to start with."

(9) The same commentator notes the need for "more exchanges of foreign, especially European, and American scholars and teachers at all levels. Except for the Ivy League schools and the Sather Lectures, a grossly insufficient number of people are crossing the ocean to learn each other's ways."

THE AMERICAN PHILOSOPHICAL ASSOCIATION

COMMITTEE

Professor Roderick M. Chisholm
Brown University

Professor Robert Turnbull
University of Iowa

Professor Maurice Mandelbaum
The Johns Hopkins University

Professor Gregory Vlastos
Princeton University

Professor Morton G. White
Harvard University

THE following account of the needs of philosophy, considered as one of the humanistic disciplines, has been prepared in answer to questions submitted by the Commission on the Humanities to the Chairman of the Board of Officers of the American Philosophical Association. The authors were asked by the Chairman of the Board to prepare this report. The report has not been submitted to the members of the Association and we do not presume to be speaking for them.

We report only upon the needs of the discipline and do not touch upon the question whether these needs might better be met by public or by private financial support.

We discuss (I) the problems which philosophy shares with the humanistic disciplines generally and (II) the problems which seem to be unique to philosophy.

I.

One of the most urgent problems for the humanistic disciplines results from the fact that teaching demands have increased to such a point that there are not enough teachers and those who are teaching in these areas are unable properly to pursue their own studies and creative work. There is every indication that these teaching demands will increase enormously in the years immediately to come. The result is: (1) the quality of humanistic teaching is now in serious danger of deteriorating; (2) qualified teachers are attracted to other endeavors; and (3) the progress of research and creative work within the humanistic disciplines falls far behind that of the sciences.

The level of support that is needed should be at least comparable to that which the National Science Foundation provides for the sciences.

One unfortunate indication of the potential deterioration in humanistic teaching is the fact that, in the larger universities, more and more use is being made of graduate students in the teaching of the larger humanistic courses.

Funds are needed to enable universities to add to their staffs of humanistic teachers; to add to the number and to the size of post-doctoral fellowships for such teachers; to add to the number and to the size of pre-doctoral fellowships for graduate students; and possibly to make available loans for students at low rates of interest.

The following considerations point to a need for a systematic program of post-doctoral fellowships:

(1) It is essential to the success of humanistic teaching that the teacher be able periodically to renew his perspective upon his subject.

(2) It is essential to the progress of the humanistic disciplines that the qualified specialist be given the opportunity to carry out his researches and creative work.

(3) At the present time, most fellowships are available only to scholars who have made some reputation in their fields. There is need also to make them available to the occasional younger man of promise who has just completed an outstanding Ph.D. dissertation and who may now be better prepared than he ever will be again to make an important contribution to his subject. The distinction, made by the National Science Foundation, between the (immediate) "post-doctoral" and "senior post-doctoral" fellowships is useful in this connection.

(4) Many scholars, both younger and older, need to be given the opportunity to study and confer with specialists in their fields.

(5) There is continued need to enable certain scholars to study abroad and to bring qualified foreign scholars to the United States in order to teach and in order to be available to other humanistic scholars in this country. In this connection, there is also need for a clearinghouse to enable both educational institutions and scholars to co-ordinate their programs.

(6) There is now no systematic fellowship program designed to fulfill these needs. Such fellowships as are available to humanistic scholars have decreased considerably in their relative size; it is much more difficult than it was in former years for a senior scholar to match his sabbatical salary with a stipend equalling half of his normal annual salary.

Other funds are needed in order to improve the library facilities that are now available for most humanistic scholars, and to reproduce by photographic or other means books and journals that are otherwise unavailable. (It is now more difficult for scholars at smaller institutions to obtain material by interlibrary loan from libraries of larger institu-

tions – partly because of the increasing demand for the material at its home institution, partly because of the deterioration of paper.)

A systematic program of pre-doctoral fellowships is needed in order to counteract (1) the increasing cost, to the student, of graduate education, and (2) the present tendency of potential humanistic teachers and scholars to turn to fields of endeavor that are more lucrative than the humanities.

Present fellowship programs tend to overlook the needs of (a) first-year graduate students and (b) students who are eligible to accept attractive teaching positions but who have not yet completed their dissertations; hence there is a need for introductory fellowships and for dissertation fellowships.

II.

Philosophy, as one of the humanistic disciplines, is faced with the problems of the humanistic disciplines in general and also with certain peculiar problems of its own.

The need for teachers of philosophy is complicated by two considerations which do not apply to the humanistic disciplines generally.

(a) The relative emphasis upon philosophy in American education has increased sharply since World War II. Colleges previously without separate departments of philosophy have instituted such departments. Teachers of philosophy have been called upon to contribute to programs of general humanistic instruction falling outside of the curricula of departments of philosophy. The philosophy of education has become an essential part of the offering of schools of education. (The tendency of the earlier "normal schools" to transform themselves into liberal arts colleges accounts for some, but only for some, of the increase in the number of departments of philosophy.) Philosophy is receiving more and more emphasis in secondary-school education; prior to World War II it was not taught in secondary schools at all. This new emphasis is manifested in the introduction of courses in logic, in the philosophy of communism and dialectical materialism, and in the philosophy of American democracy.

(b) As a result of this new stress upon philosophy, the subject is being taught in many institutions by people who have had little or no professional training in philosophy. (In his recent report on *The Education of American Teachers,* Dr. Conant notes that instruction of philosophy in colleges of education is at best "pathetic.")

The limitations of our present system of post-doctoral fellowships for the humanistic studies in general also affect philosophy. The following considerations apply to philosophy in particular.

(1) Private and public support of research and creative work in

philosophy tends to stress the contributions which philosophy can make to certain interdisciplinary endeavors. In consequence, philosophy of science, philosophy of language, philosophy of law, philosophy of religion, philosophy of education, and the like, have received considerably more support than have the basic disciplines within philosophy, viz., metaphysics, epistemology, logic, and ethics. Philosophy is an autonomous discipline and is not to be construed as being essentially an auxiliary to other disciplines of knowledge.

(2) But philosophy does have an interdisciplinary and auxiliary function. The result is that many philosophers need to inform themselves in other areas. The philosopher of language, in order to do his work, may need to study philology, linguistics, or certain particular languages. Analogously for those working in other branch disciplines of philosophy: philosophy of art, philosophy of science, philosophy of law, philosophy of religion, philosophy of mind, etc.

(3) The nature of philosophy is problematic, but most philosophers agree that a significant part of the creative work that is done in philosophy results from "dialogue." The nature of co-operative work in philosophy, however, is generally misconceived in at least two respects.

(a) It is widely thought that the best way to produce fruitful co-operative results is to bring together a group of experts under one roof for a certain period of time, and that this group may be selected, on the basis of achievement and reputation, by persons outside of the group, *e.g.*, the trustees of a foundation. Actually, such co-operative work is not likely to produce significant results unless those who are co-operating share a certain common background, interest, and general point of view. Instead of being invited merely to work with other distinguished philosophers, distinguished philosophers should also be invited to select those with whom they believe they can most profitably work. There are many subsets of philosophers who agree that the most profitable dialogue in which any of them can engage is with each other.

(b) It should not be expected that the most likely result of co-operation among, say, seven different philosophers will be a single joint work; a much more likely result would be seven individual works, each of them much better as a result of the co-operative work than it otherwise would have been.

This need for the opportunity for co-operative work might best be fulfilled by a number of philosophical institutes which would be co-operative bodies but possibly without having a definite location. There are areas in the country where the presence of such an institute for a few months or a year might serve to arouse interest in philosophy and to stimulate research.

(4) There is less of a dichotomy between teaching and scholarship in philosophy than in many other areas. The teacher of philosophy is not likely to be successful unless he also "practices" his subject. And the needs of the "practitioner" are not likely to be satisfied unless he has the opportunity of teaching his subject to qualified students.

Even were this not the case, active and mature scholars are likely to be engaged in teaching large groups of undergraduates, since philosophy differs from many other disciplines in that the teaching of introductory courses is usually most effectively done by senior members of the department.

(5) It has been demonstrated that professional needs of many teachers of philosophy, who have not had the opportunity themselves to do a significant amount of research or creative work in their field, may be met by summer institutes of philosophy. Such institutes would also serve the needs of those teaching philosophy in secondary schools and in adult education courses. The ideal arrangement might be a five-year cycle of such institutes, in as many different universities as would serve as hosts, concerned each year with a different set of topics. These institutes would need to be financed at least to the extent of being able to offer salary for five or six teachers, and subsistence grants for, say, one hundred people, the latter to be professional teachers of philosophy.

(6) Philosophical instruction could be improved at smaller institutions if they were able to institute courses of study in which distinguished philosophers would participate for a period of a week or more at a time. The distinguished philosopher, instead of appearing for a one-night stand, would assign reading prior to his appearance on the campus, thus enabling the students there to put him to better use. This kind of program would work best if there were a national coordinating agency.

AMERICAN POLITICAL SCIENCE ASSOCIATION

COMMITTEE

Professor Herbert Deane
Columbia University

Professor John H. Hallowell
Duke University
Chairman

Professor H. Malcolm Macdonald
University of Texas

Professor Frederick M. Watkins
Yale University

Professor Sheldon Wolin
University of California (Berkeley)

I. INTRODUCTION

THERE is probably no human activity of more vital concern in the modern world than that of political decision-making. For upon the kinds of political decisions that are made depends not only the peace of the world but the quality of that peace – not only is life itself at stake but the conditions necessary for a good life. The humanities have long sought to identify and nourish the ingredients of a good life as they have focused their attention upon the question: What does it mean to be a man? That question, whether consciously articulated or not, lies at the heart of politics, for it is one of the primary functions of politics to help to bring into being a good life for man in society. The question, What constitutes a good life in society, will necessarily lead to some consideration of what is good for man. Not all men agree in their conception of that good and hence a large part of politics is concerned with the attempt to reconcile rival claims, interests, and philosophies of life. But political science shares with the humanities a common interest in common questions: What does it mean to be a man? What social conditions can best promote human welfare?

As an autonomous academic discipline political science is relatively new, but as a systematic inquiry into the nature of things political it is as old as Plato and Aristotle. Aristotle described political science as a "master science," since it is by means of the political process that decisions are made as to how the "lesser" sciences are to be used. In an age of technological achievement far beyond anything Aristotle dreamed

of, his designation of politics as a "master science" has become perhaps even more relevant. Whether or not man is to remain the master of the machine, whether technological achievements and potentialities are to be used to enhance human life or to make the world unfit for human habitation – such decisions will ultimately be made through the political process. Indeed, by extending or withholding support of humanistic endeavors government can in large measure determine the kinds of opportunity available in society for the fulfillment of human purpose.

It has become apparent that governments can do much to stimulate scientific and technological advancement, and under the motivation of national defense and the threat of communism throughout the world the United States government has already appropriately encouraged the training of future scientists and engineers and encouraged scientists to probe the frontiers of outer space. In its legitimate concern for such advancement of knowledge and technology it should not neglect the cultivation of those ingredients of the good life that identify the kind of civilization we all want to defend. It is not only our physical existence that is at stake but a kind of life. Physical defense alone is inadequate. We must cultivate through both private and public agencies those ingredients of a good social life which make it worth defending.

Ever since the first inquiries into the nature of politics, political scientists have been concerned to identify the conditions necessary for a good life in society. They have not always agreed, but their disagreements have served to stimulate the inquiry and to perpetuate it down to the present day. Traditionally, political scientists have sought to understand and articulate the meaning of such concepts as justice, authority, order, liberty, community, consent, law, and sovereignty. They have traced the origin and development of constitutional government and of representative institutions. Through a comparative study of political systems, political scientists have sought to understand the way in which legislative, executive, and judicial functions are performed in various national and cultural contexts. They have sought to isolate what is universal in such experience and what is particular. Through the study of international law and relations they have sought to subject the complexity and ambiguities of international relations to some kind of rational understanding. They have sought to identify the causes of war and the best means of promoting peace. They have examined the governmental institutions and legal systems of all existing governments. More recently, political scientists have sought to look behind the formal governmental institutions to examine in greater detail than ever before the nature of the political process itself. They have focused attention upon the decision-making process, the role of elites and of minority groups, and the

voting behavior of citizens of many countries. They have been concerned throughout to discover the ways in which men have sought perennially to reconcile the claims of power and of justice, the claims of liberty and of order. Whether politics is in the last analysis a science or an art has been a subject of debate among students of politics ever since the beginning of the study, and it continues today. Whether politics can be studied with complete objectivity is another subject of debate, as is the question whether the methods of the natural sciences can completely comprehend the subject matter that we call "political." But the writings of political scientists have demonstrated that the study of politics need not be narrowly partisan and may, indeed, be useful to all partisans. Whether the knowledge uncovered by political scientists is to be called "scientific" is a debatable point, but that some knowledge of the political process can be distinguished from mere opinion has been amply demonstrated. The political scientist stands between science and the humanities, and while this stance often causes tensions within the discipline itself, it also enables the political scientist, particularly when he is sympathetic toward the humanities, to play an important role in mediating between the two.

The American Political Science Association has demonstrated through a number of activities in recent years that it can be of service to both Republicans and Democrats. With the aid of a Ford Foundation grant the Association recently established a fellowship program for congressional staff employees who wished to undertake research projects related to their professional responsibilities and goals. Four award-winners were selected for 1963–64 by a bipartisan House-Senate advisory committee. This program was established in consultation with the leadership of both parties in both houses of Congress. The Association has also been conducting a Congressional Fellowship Program under which younger political scientists have been afforded an opportunity to work on the staff of individual congressmen. Requests from congressional offices for Fellows have far exceeded the number available for assignment. With the collaboration of the United States Civil Service Commission the Association has sponsored a seminar on legislative operations for federal executives. It has also sponsored a seminar for freshman congressmen conducted by senior members of both houses and by a number of political scientists. Congressional reaction to this program has been highly favorable and future seminars of the same kind are being planned.

As a member of the American Council of Learned Societies, the American Political Science Association joins with other constituent members of that Council in urging the establishment of a National Humanities Foundation. As one of the disciplines that would expect to

receive support from such a foundation we should like to indicate in more specific detail some of the needs of our profession which might be met in part by it. Some of our needs are now met by private organizations such as the Ford Foundation, the Social Science Research Council, the Rockefeller Foundation, and others, but despite generous private support of our activities there is need for additional assistance. Some areas of study in political science and some methods of pursuing that study are more generously endowed than others. It is in the interest of balanced support that we urge the establishment of a National Humanities Foundation. It is now somewhat easier for political scientists who are concerned with the use of quantitative methods to secure financial support for their research activities than it is for those among us whose interest in politics is more philosophically and normatively oriented. This is not to disparage the work of those who are endeavoring to make the study of politics more scientific; rather, it is a plea for the support of those areas of political research and training which are most directly related to the concerns shared by the humanities.

II. THE TRAINING OF POLITICAL SCIENTISTS

The number of students studying political science in our colleges and universities increases at an even greater rate than the increase in our student population. The demand for qualified teachers of political science is greater than the present supply. In 1962 a Committee on Standards of Instruction appointed by the American Political Science Association reported that of 786 institutions offering courses under the heading of political science only 466 had a separate department of political science. Of these 786 colleges and universities, in 564 instances (or 72 per cent of the total) political science was being offered by three or fewer persons. In the 297 separate departments of political science having three or fewer instructors, the total number of persons teaching was 412. Of these, only 236 held the Ph.D. degree and 138 held the Master's degree. The proportion of individuals with the doctorate was 57 per cent. The committee concluded that "quite a large number of persons are teaching political science who have not had any educational preparation in political science."

We can meet the demand for qualified teachers of political science only by encouraging able students to pursue graduate study in this field. To that end we need help in providing adequate fellowships for graduate study. There appear to be more qualified students desiring and able to do graduate work than there are fellowships available for their support. We need fellowships that are not earmarked for a special purpose but are for general training in political science.

It has become increasingly difficult for graduate students to finance the dissertation year. Though normally aided for three years out of regular fellowship funds, it is the rare student who completes his dissertation during that period of time. Frequently the graduate student, out of financial necessity, takes a teaching position before he completes the dissertation, and many of those never find the time or the energy to complete the work for the doctorate. The need for financial support for the dissertation year is acute.

There are many areas of inquiry in political science in which it is not only desirable but necessary for the student to conduct his research in foreign countries or in places far distant from his home university. One can hardly do research on some aspect of the political process in an African nation, in Latin America, or Asia, without going to that part of the world. Even the student of political philosophy, whose work may be done entirely in libraries, may very well need to use materials in libraries far distant from his own university. One of our greatest needs is for fellowships which permit this kind of travel and adequately provide for it. In many cases the quality of the finished product will be directly related to the availability of a fellowship of this kind. Some few fellowships of this kind are now provided by private foundations, but the competition for them is extremely keen and many able students with very good projects are necessarily eliminated.

As the research interests of the political scientist legitimately turn to the underdeveloped areas of the world he often finds his linguistic skills inadequate for his task. Younger political scientists who are attracted to research problems in such areas particularly need language training. It is not possible for political science departments to supply that kind of training. Universities need help in financing the teaching of languages for which the demand may be slight in comparison with other fields of learning but for which the need, where it exists, is great. We are constantly told that the world is shrinking. If we are to communicate with and understand peoples of the world with whom we have had only a slight acquaintance before, it is essential that scholars begin now to learn their languages. And it is not only instruction in the more "exotic" languages that we need, but also instruction in the more usual foreign languages. It is surprising how many graduate students enter graduate school with little or no training in modern European languages. One possible way to meet this need for further language training might be to provide summer fellowships for the special purpose of learning a needed language. This would enable a student to secure training in languages not taught at the institution in which he is regularly enrolled, and to devote several weeks of intensive study to this one subject.

It is sometimes supposed that the training of political scientists stops at that point when the graduate student completes his work or takes a teaching position. This may very well be true of those who fail to complete their graduate work and go prematurely into teaching. The American Political Science Association has sought to meet the need of such persons in part by sponsoring regional seminars led by leading political scientists and government officials. These seminars have been financed by a private foundation, but they could be expanded in scope, duration, and frequency if more money were available for that purpose. Those who have participated in the regional seminars have been enthusiastic in their appreciation of the opportunity. "In the past ten years of teaching," one participant reported, "no conference or symposium has brought me as much concentrated intellectual stimulation." And another said, "The chance to meet with colleagues to discuss political science was alone worth the trip. It is sometimes hard to realize how limited such opportunities are for those teaching in the smaller colleges."

III. THE TEACHING OF GOVERNMENT IN SECONDARY SCHOOLS

Since its founding in 1903, the American Political Science Association has displayed a continuing interest in promoting effective teaching of government in secondary schools. The records of the Association disclose the existence of numerous committees which have been directly concerned with this problem for many decades. One of the most recent committees appointed to deal with the problem recommended the establishment of summer seminars for high-school teachers, and the granting of fellowships to enable high-school teachers to work for advanced degrees in the field of political science. It also suggested the preparation of a pamphlet series in various fields of political science to stimulate thinking among high-school teachers of government about most recent developments. Several pamphlets have already been prepared for distribution, including one entitled *An Annotated Bibliography on Communism.* Since a number of states have either established required courses on communism and Marxism or are actively considering their establishment, the need for professional guidance in this area of concern is great. Political scientists can be of great help to secondary-school teachers who are planning such courses. With the aid of private funds, a few universities have been holding summer seminars on communism especially designed for high-school teachers of social studies. This sort of activity could be expanded and improved if additional financial resources were available.

IV. SUPPORT FOR RESEARCH

It is easier to secure financial help for research in some areas of political science than in others. The availability of money for certain kinds of research does have the effect frequently of directing research efforts along some lines of inquiry rather than others. The need for financial assistance is particularly acute in the field of political philosophy. The Rockefeller Foundation supported a few post-doctoral fellowships in this field for a few years, but that program has been discontinued. A current program administered by the Social Science Research Council will be discontinued after this year for lack of funds. It was probably the hope of the Rockefeller Foundation, in initially supporting such research, that, if attention were called to the need of studying problems in political philosophy, other and more permanent forms of financial support might be attracted to this area of inquiry. The competition for these fellowships was keen, and more significant studies were proposed than there was money available to support.

It is possible that some persons may believe that philosophical investigations do not have the same practical urgency or relevance as some other kinds of inquiry. Genuine scholarship, however, is rarely advanced when practical considerations are employed as normative standards of relevance. It is well understood that the freedom and opportunity to engage in "pure science" keeps the technological sciences alive and growing. The same kind of understanding is necessary if research in the humanities is to flourish. It would be difficult to justify the immediate practical relevance of a study, let us say, of the meaning of law in the thought of Marsilius of Padua, but such a study in conjunction with related studies would, indeed, be necessary if we are to come to some understanding of the meaning of the "rule of law" in general. Studies which probe into the medieval roots of constitutional government may seem at first glance to have little practical relevance, but it is through such studies that light can be shed on the meaning of constitutional government itself. An understanding of the past is essential to an understanding of the present and may be useful in charting our course in the future. One obstacle to effective teaching and research in the field of medieval political theory is the lack of translations of medieval political texts and the fact that many of the original texts are available only in European libraries. Those concerned with teaching and research in the field of political philosophy have often concentrated their attention upon classical, medieval, and Renaissance political thought, and that concentration of interest has been a desirable emphasis, for it is sometimes assumed by other political scientists that politics is an activity that began in the twentieth century or even after World War II. If we

are to understand the nature of the political process in its entirety, it is essential that we bring some historical perspective to bear upon our present political concerns. Political philosophers study the past, not merely for the light that it sheds upon present dilemmas, but also because it helps us to learn who we are, where we have come from, what choices have brought us to our present circumstances. The study of the past is an important means of discovering our own identities and that of the civilization of which we are a part.

But not all students and teachers of political philosophy have concentrated their attention upon the past; many are actively engaged in analyzing contemporary political ideologies. The need to understand Marxist-Leninist thought and the philosophy underlying modern democratic institutions is obvious. It is essential, of course, that we understand how contemporary governmental institutions do in fact work, and the informal political process that lies behind institutional frameworks. It is equally essential that we bring some philosophical perspective to bear upon those institutions and political practices. We probably cannot resolve the question whether men are in fact largely motivated by ideas or whether the ideas are expressions of environmental influences, but in the light of competing ideologies in the contemporary world it is apparent that it is not wholly irrelevant to speak of "the battle for men's minds." It is one of the tasks of the political philosopher to bring to light the philosophical presuppositions that underlie political systems and practices – in the words of one philosopher-historian, to "bring belief to a self-consciousness of itself." Such an understanding of ourselves and of others is essential if the so-called battle for men's minds is to be a genuine encounter. Research in political philosophy is the least well-endowed field of research in political science, but the questions to which it seeks answers are of ultimate concern. A National Humanities Foundation might well provide assistance for research in this field and help to correct an imbalance in the current availability of research funds.

But there are other areas of political science which might also legitimately request support from a National Humanities Foundation. There are problems encountered in the study of public law, comparative government, public administration, and international relations which are closely related to the concerns of the humanities. The criterion for support of such projects by a National Humanities Foundation might be whether the research project was normatively oriented. The tools employed might be empirical, but if the empirical data were subjected to normative judgment the research project might be said to qualify for such assistance.

It may be thought by some that the government cannot legitimately support normatively oriented research, but every activity undertaken by the government has normative implications. Welfare and social security legislation, the regulation of business practices, civil rights legislation, and even tax legislation certainly imply and implement normative judgments. It is in the very nature of government to make such judgments and to incorporate them in legislation. In assisting research the important consideration is that no one normative judgment should be controlling and that freedom to investigate problems from competing normative perspectives should be encouraged. To this end it is essential that a National Humanities Foundation be administered by scholars and that assistance be extended to research by a panel of professional persons drawn from outside the ranks of government personnel. The various learned societies could well provide such a foundation with a list of qualified persons. Private foundations often call upon persons not associated with the foundation to help in the administration of their research funds; in principle it is possible for a government foundation to act in the same way. It is essential to distinguish between government support for scholarly research, and government control; the one does not necessarily, and should not, imply the other. We would urge that adequate safeguards be provided to assure that a National Humanities Foundation would be independent of partisan political pressures and that the ultimate responsibility for its functioning would be lodged in an independent body of scholars.

We urge the government to consider, in addition to its legitimate concern for national defense, what it might do to help promote those cultural and intellectual endeavors which make that defense in the last analysis most meaningful. We believe that the establishment of a National Humanities Foundation would greatly encourage the cultivation of that kind of intellectual activity in which we can take legitimate national pride.

THE RENAISSANCE SOCIETY OF AMERICA

COMMITTEE*

Professor Josephine Waters Bennett
Hunter College
Chairman

W. G. Constable
Museum of Fine Arts, Boston

Professor Paul O. Kristeller
Columbia University

Professor George B. Parks
Queens College

Professor Gustave Reese
New York University

I.

SINCE THIS SOCIETY is interdisciplinary, some areas of your inquiry, concerned with teaching and teaching techniques, can be answered only in the most general terms. We do not aim at establishing a new teaching field, but at broadening and deepening the learning of our members who are engaged in teaching in one of the many already established disciplines of the field of the humanities. Our undertaking is the intensive study of a single period in history from every angle. We therefore promote interdepartmental exchanges of ideas and techniques—through our publications, through regional meetings and the meetings of our national Council, in which Canadian scholarship is also represented, and through the international organizations in which we have representation.

We now support two publications: a quarterly of *Renaissance News* and an annual volume of *Studies in the Renaissance.* Both are mailed to all members. The Casa Italiana of Columbia University gives us office space without charge. After ten years of effort we now have barely enough in the publication fund to publish one volume in what we hope will be a series of edited texts of significant Renaissance works. These are mostly in Latin, but works in other languages are not excluded. Each volume will be provided with either a translation or a full summary in English.

*The report drafted by the Committee was discussed and revised by the entire Executive Board of the Renaissance Society. The members, in addition to those listed above, are: Curt F. Bühler (The Pierpont Morgan Library), Elizabeth Story Donno (Columbia University), Charles Garside, Jr. (Yale University), Felix Gilbert (Institute for Advanced Study), Rensselaer W. Lee (Princeton University), William Nelson (Columbia University), John H. Randall (Columbia University), Helen E. Sandison (Vassar College), and M. A. Shaaber (University of Pennsylvania).

The Society, in its first year (1954), published on twenty-nine rolls of microfilm M.E. Cosenza's *Biographical and Bibliographical Dictionary of the Italian Humanists and of the World of Classical Scholarship in Italy 1300–1800.* This lifetime's accumulation of notes was reproduced at the expense of a private patron and advertised and distributed by the Society at cost. It sold well enough to interest a commercial publisher, who took it over and published it in book form. The Society has also acted as banker for successive gifts toward the collection and publication of the letters of Lorenzo de' Medici, sponsored by the Istituto Nazionale di Studi sul Rinascimento of Florence and the Warburg Institute. Our endorsement has helped to make possible the publication of P.O. Kristeller's *Iter Italicum,* a finding-list of uncatalogued or incompletely catalogued manuscripts in European and American libraries — a massive work now being printed in four volumes. This is a piece of primary research upon which all future editors of Renaissance works will build, yet it had to go to the Warburg Institute to find a sponsor, and to the Bollingen Foundation for a substantial subsidy. The Society makes what use it can of the prestige of a membership of over two thousand scholars, many of them at the top of their professions (plus about six hundred library members), but it lacks funds for the promotion of large co-operative projects of basic research (bibliographies, edited texts, etc.) badly needed in our field.

The Society has organized an International Federation of Renaissance Societies and Institutes, with member organizations in Holland, Italy, France, Switzerland, West Germany, and Colombia. This Federation, organized with six members in 1958, has now grown to over twice that number. We have, therefore, the organizational machinery for the promotion of Renaissance scholarship on a regional, national, and international scale; but without funds very little can be accomplished. Out of dues and small gifts from members we can scarcely pay for minimal secretarial services. The Director serves on a voluntary basis, and the members of the Executive Board pay their own expenses to attend meetings, as do also the representatives of regional conferences and of various disciplines who make up our governing body.

The understanding of human activities and institutions which have created our civilization is certainly necessary to the understanding and preservation of that civilization. Democracy rests on a base of mutual understanding, and trust arising from that understanding. This trust is the result of common experience over a considerable period of time. The humanities, as they embrace all fields of human history, require continuing research if civilization is to be preserved and enriched. Just as in science, each major advance calls for reconsideration of our generalizations. For example, the relatively new development of eco-

nomic history has affected art history. Discoveries in archaeology throw new light on classical and Biblical texts. Unitive study of the Middle Ages has been under way since the nineteenth century and has produced many important discoveries, but study of the Renaissance is still in its infancy. Much of the material for such study is unpublished, and so largely unavailable. And yet the Renaissance has had a decisive influence on the modern world. Extensive and co-ordinated work is needed. The Renaissance Society now has the machinery for planning and promoting such work, but with such small means very little can be accomplished.

II.

We feel very strongly that federal support for the humanities is needed, and that the establishment of a National Humanities Foundation would be the most practical means of giving a permanent organization to this support. The main reasons are:

a) Such support exists for the sciences, and its absence for the humanities creates an imbalance at the universities and in other connections, as has been noticed by many recent critics, including university presidents. The imbalance even affects the recruiting of talented young people into the humanities.

b) There is foreign precedent for such a move. The main research organizations in several European countries (France, West Germany, Spain, and others) include, as a matter of course, the historical disciplines along with the natural sciences. On the other hand, in such English-speaking countries as Britain and Canada, where loss of the root meaning of *scio* in *science* has created a separation of the humanities from science, separate organizations in support of the humanities have been created recently.

c) This country possesses few institutions, comparable to the Academies of Science in Europe, that are taking care of scholarly projects. The American Philosophical Society is the only one that functions in the same way, and its operations are not large enough for present needs. The American Academy of Arts and Sciences is primarily concerned with the sciences but also contributes to a limited extent to research in the humanities. Other academies are either of a local character (Connecticut, Michigan) or limited in subject matter (Mediaeval Academy of America).

d) Private foundations have done a good deal for humanistic scholarship, but do not provide sufficiently extended support for long-range planning.

e) The American Council of Learned Societies would be ideally equipped to serve the function we advocate, if it had adequate funds

for support of the humanities on a national scale. However, at present it is unable to support certain very necessary activities, such as publication, because the foundations upon which it is dependent refuse to make grants for this purpose.

However, if and when a National Humanities Foundation is established, it is obvious that the ACLS and its constituent societies should have a decisive managerial role in it. What is needed is an organization comparable to the French Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique, or the German Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft (in their humanistic sections), where all legitimate branches of humanistic scholarship would find their proper share of support. The merits of every program and project would be judged by the organizations, and by committees of experts, in the appropriate fields.

The humanities should have either a separate foundation or, if a foundation including the social sciences and the creative and performing arts is created, a distinct division within that foundation to make sure that the humanistic disciplines receive their proper share of support.

III.

Among the many areas and levels of training where support for our branch of the humanities is needed are the following:

1. *Teaching.* We welcome all efforts to improve the equipment of students in languages (including English) and in history and geography. The Modern Language Association's foreign-language project has helped to improve instruction in foreign languages in the schools. The concept of area studies has done much to encourage college foreign-language study, except for the languages of western Europe, with which we are most concerned. We should like to see intensive courses, especially in Latin and Italian, available in colleges and graduate schools.

Books for course study of Renaissance subjects are scarce or not available. Although publication of paperback editions has filled some gaps, a great many remain. There are several translations of Machiavelli's *The Prince* in print, but few of most other Italian Renaissance books, no translation of Tasso's critical writings, no copies at all in most libraries of dozens of other significant English and Continental works. The result is that courses are distorted to fit available materials and students and teachers are hampered and frustrated.

Just as the National Science Foundation has done much to improve the teaching of the sciences at all levels, so a humanities foundation could strengthen teaching in our field. Increasing emphasis on subject-matter courses should help to lessen the gap in the preparation of teachers between high schools and colleges.

2. *Research and Publication.* Research in the humanities, while it aims at increasing the sum of human knowledge, also makes available to students the materials needed to increase *their* knowledge. It provides self-education for the teacher-researcher and, at the same time, materials for the education of future scholars, so that, instead of taking the researcher out of teaching (as much scientific research does), it improves his competence as a teacher and enlarges the size of his audience. Through his publications, he may even continue to teach long after he is dead.

We probably should not quarrel with the fact that scholars are not paid for doing research in the humanities as they are in the sciences. We are paid for teaching and librarianship (the library is the humanist's laboratory), and some of us write or compile textbooks for profit. Research, however, is done in recreation time or on leave, although graduate schools consider it part of the service which a professor renders to his university. Leave with half-pay is now usual every seventh year, but the scholar cannot afford to take a sabbatical year unless he also has a fellowship, and the best of these (most range from $3,500 to $7,000) do not fully replace the half-pay sacrificed, nor do they provide adequately for necessary travel. We need not dwell upon the grant to a science colleague of $30,000 plus costly equipment, as compared with a maximum of $2,000 for an ACLS grant-in-aid.

Scholarly articles can usually find a publisher (through the self-help of learned society journals). Book publication, however, is difficult, unless the work is of a general nature and can command an audience large enough to pay for the cost of production. For this reason many scholars, discouraged by the prospect of never finding a publisher, report their findings piecemeal in short papers, and never undertake the larger (and more significant) synthesis which it would require a book to develop.

3. *Co-operative scholarship.* What is most difficult now is the carrying on of co-operative scholarly projects in the humanities. Here we are entirely dependent upon the interests of private patrons and private foundations. The result is adequate provision for editing the works of Thomas More, but no American funds for an edition of the enormously more influential and significant works of Erasmus. (With the encouragement of the Society that work has now been undertaken by the Dutch Academy of Sciences.) While lack of financial support hampers and stifles individual research, it positively strangles co-operative scholarship. The managing committee of such a project pays its own carfare to necessary meetings, and types its own letters; the contributors type their own copy; the editors canvass the foundations for subsidy (the Milton Variorum is said to have tried four hundred in vain), and may

gain a cautious interest from a university press; but even if a publisher is found, he discreetly ignores hints about the cost of typing the final copy. "Operation Shoestring" is the proper name for co-operative scholarship in Renaissance studies. A member of this board is concerned with three such enterprises, all sponsored by a committee or a section of a professional society. Two sponsors semi-promise publication, one even semi-promised the typing of final copy; but the editors and contributors type their own letters and pay their own carfare, as usual — except for one who luckily has a lead into the National Science Foundation, and gets typing and plane fare at will. He should be editor-in-chief, of course.

However, what is really unfortunate is that the contributors have only their spare, or leisure, time to give to research. Result: the American Bibliography of French Literature is still unfinished after twenty-five years, whereas the Cambridge Bibliography of English Literature, which had a paid editor and which paid contributors, came out in ten years and produced a supplement sixteen years later.

The Renaissance Society needs funds for promotion of co-operative research. We have in hand a catalogue of Latin authors of the Renaissance. Housed in shoe boxes in a private office, it is being worked on in leisure time by a distingushed scholar whose time is valuable because his *mind* is valuable — yet he does his own typing and much work a filing clerk could do. We have just published as a sample for correction in various great libraries, and for evaluation, the letter *A*. When the rest of the alphabet will be done, even in this preliminary form, depends on what help can be secured. Another project for which funds are needed is the publication of Lorenzo de' Medici's letters. The preliminary checklist is in process of publication, but the editing is still to be done. Italy will do the publication. The Society has about $5,000 given to it specifically for this project. It will take several scholars several years to do the editing, and this sum is perhaps enough to compensate one competent scholar for three months' work. The letters are of much interest not only for economic history, but also for literary and art history, the history of communication and travel, of the transmission of ideas, etc. A dictionary of Renaissance Latin is urgently needed as a tool, but to produce one would require co-operative organization, and therefore funds.

4. *Libraries.* Renaissance scholars, especially in the English field, are fortunate in having such special libraries as Folger, Huntington, and Newberry, and such great libraries as Harvard and those of the New York area to use, but these libraries will be wholly inadequate for the teachers now being trained to meet the needs of the exploding college population. The New York Public Library is now being destroyed

because it lacks funds for the care, repair, and duplication of its books. University libraries generally need funds for the purchase and housing of the multiple copies of important books which they should provide, so that it will not be necessary to present a class of fifty or even a hundred with a reading-list of books of which the library has only one copy. America possesses no really great library of Renaissance books in foreign languages. For those the scholar must go abroad. I Tatti, the Harvard center in Florence, is hospitable, but lacks funds for fellowships.

We need one or more American centers, or institutes, where Renaissance scholars can work together and help each other. This need is especially urgent in our field because it is cross-disciplinary. A similar center abroad would be most useful, and would do much to increase national prestige abroad.

5. *The Society.* The Renaissance Society of America needs funds for publication and for the subsidy of publication because a.) the existence of such funds would enormously encourage scholars to produce suitable books; b.) research in the humanities is a broadening and self-educating process which makes the scholar more valuable as a teacher; c.) publication is the means by which the scholar educates his colleagues, his students – and other people's students.

The Society needs also, and urgently, funds for meetings: executive sessions; planning conferences; and learned conferences for exchange of ideas, information, and techniques among leaders of the various disciplines.

IV.

The Renaissance was the great age of the spread of education. It emphasized history, ethics, literature, and scholarship. America desperately needs a re-emphasis on these subjects today. Interest in the Renaissance has already been exploited by popular publications. The beauty of its pictures and architecture and music has a perennial popular appeal. What is needed is a better understanding of the forces and especially the ideas which produced this great flowering of human creativity, which produced also sweeping reforms in religion and the reunion of Christian with classical ethics.

AMERICAN SOCIOLOGICAL ASSOCIATION

COMMITTEE

Professor Lewis A. Coser
Brandeis University

Professor Llewellyn Gross
State University of New York (Buffalo)

Professor William L. Kolb
Carleton College

Professor Robert A. Nisbet,
University of California (Riverside)
Chairman

Professor Charles Tilly
Joint Center for Urban Studies of Harvard and M.I.T.

Professor Robert N. Wilson
University of North Carolina

I.

WHAT is the present situation of sociology in its relation to the humanities, and what are the present and future needs of sociology with respect to this relationship? That is the question, in its two parts, that this brief report will consider. Let us turn first to the present situation, asking, What is the relation between sociologists and humanists?

Do sociology and the humanities have any present working affinity? Probably the truest answer is, very little. But it would be negligent to leave it at that. After all, the members of this committee have shown by teaching and published work their own engagement in matters of history, philosophy, literature, and the arts. One would have no difficulty in thinking of at least a score of individuals of stature in American sociology whose research interests are of humanistic character. The insights or materials of art, literature, music, literary criticism, religion, language, philosophy, and history are all to be seen in their works.

There is also the nature of some of sociology's profoundest problems – problems of individuality, moral consensus, conflict, alienation, and status. All of these are obviously related to man's hope and man's fate – both enduring quests of the humanist. Leaving aside current methodologies and types of data employed, sociology's major interests go back directly to the works of a small group of European scholars in the nineteenth century – to Alexis de Tocqueville, Max Weber, Georg Simmel, Emile Durkheim, to limit ourselves here to the titans. One and all, these men were humanists as well as scientists, a fact betokened by the very chairs that three of them held at one time or other in Euro-

pean universities – chairs of philosophy and history. There is, as several students have had no difficulty in showing, a close relation indeed between the central themes of sociology, in its main tradition, and the themes of those literary and philosophical works of the nineteenth century which, by common assent, ushered in the twentieth century's special intellectual focus on man's nature and destiny.

Despite the significance of the works and orientations noted above, the truth is that the great, even overwhelming, majority of sociologists in the United States today show no evidence in their works of either interest in or affinity with the humanities. In this respect they are, of course, precisely like the overwhelming majority of *all* scientists – social, biological, and physical. That science and art have, or may have, common roots of imagination and creation is beside the point here. What is to the point is that as many humanists as scientists deny or disregard this truth and suggest, by their scholarship and teaching curricula, that it is of little importance. Rare indeed are the ventures in which humanists and social scientists collaborate. This is the case with works of scholarship, courses in undergraduate and graduate schools, and also the various institutes and centers which are established by universities and foundations. It is hard enough, apparently, for social scientists by themselves, or humanists by themselves, to join knowledge and effort. On the evidence, it would seem hopelessly utopian to ask humanists and social scientists to come together for teaching and scholarship.

But not quite hopeless. For, again on the evidence, this collaboration is not only possible but can be superlatively successful. What is needed is knowledge, based on the successful examples of collaboration we can lay hand on, and on the scholarly works in existence that, if suitably studied, might be of value to those individuals, a few of whom exist on every faculty, who would relish the opportunity to try something new and exciting.

In the field of sociology there are unmistakable evidences at the present time of a waning of certain types of work, chiefly survey, that for long virtually epitomized the field. More heartening is the equally unmistakable, if still slow, rise to the fore of historical analysis. History, within sociology, may again have something of the majesty that it had in Max Weber's day.

There is also philosophy. The central problems of sociology derive in considerable part from philosophy, and it is to philosophy that we find ourselves, as sociologists, returning increasingly for clarification of problems of both method and substance. It would appear that a slowly rising number of philosophers are beginning to forsake the strict linguistic analysis that has so largely characterized the field for

a generation, and to return for inspiration to historic problems of the humanities and the social sciences. For sociology, philosophy is not merely important, it is crucial.

II.

What is to be done? We suggested above, as one small but important approach, the study of known examples of successful collaboration. To this might be added inquiry into a few of the more notable *failures* along this line, for to those who seek there is often as much to be learned from mishap as from success. A few studies of this type could be of extraordinary value.

Collaboration should not, of course, be restricted to teaching ventures, important and even primary though these may be. There are works of scholarship, imaginative writing, colloquia; these also call for union of humanist and social scientist. What we need badly is knowledge, elementary knowledge, of how creative members of diverse fields can work together in ways that *unite* on a given theme, not merely juxtapose.

Collaboration is difficult, given the stereotypes in both professional and popular mind that do so much to isolate the humanities and sociology from one another. So many fruitless, even pathetic efforts at this type of collaboration come to mind that we tend unconsciously to resist. Inevitably one thinks of the legendary article on Chinese metaphysics done by the man who, in preparation, read first a history of China and then a history of metaphysics. Beyond any doubt, collaborative ventures between the humanities and the social sciences have too often ended up like that.

There are many prejudices to overcome, many understandings to reach, many techniques to experiment with, for collaboration to go beyond the few examples of success, examples which now have to depend upon qualities of intellectual brilliance and personal intimacy that are not likely to occur very often in any setting. But at least there are examples to go on, which could be made the subject of discreet and tactful study in the expectation that what is learned about them might be communicated, at least in part, to others who are interested or whose interest might be aroused.

There are other possibilities. For example, there is the Institute for the Social Study of the Arts now being formed at C.C.N.Y. Here, it is hoped, humanists, social scientists, and artists will be brought together on certain specific problems, *e.g.*, the artist's role, the nature of the audience, and so on. Institutes and centers would appear to have value, especially where they revolve about problems that command respect on both sides and that are, by their nature, not merely amenable to,

but actually require, insights and techniques from both areas. The history of field-synthesis (bio-physics, bio-chemistry, for example) suggests that problems are the essence of the matter —rather than conferences concerned with working out joint curricula in advance of research on problems.

There is finally the indispensable subsidization of humanistic research. On one aspect of this matter there is no difference of view among members of the committee: present funds need to be significantly augmented both for the *encouragement* of humanistic studies and for the financing of research already in mind. The all-too-familiar disproportion between funds for science and funds for humanistic research is sufficient reinforcement of this view, even allowing for the inevitably greater costs of Big Research in the sciences (social and natural).

What about present policies of fund-granting agencies — for example, organizations like the SSRC and ACLS? Are requests by sociologists for funds to support works of predominantly humanistic character — historical, philosophical, interpretative — given a reception that would imply willingness to grant if funds were available? On this matter there is some difference of view, perhaps in part the result of varying personal experience. The experience of some has been favorable with both the granting organizations named above, the experiences of others unfavorable. As to NIH and NSF, the words of one member are doubtless definitive: "It would require an unusual ability at grantsmanship to so word an application . . . as to hide that it really was concerned with humanistic problems." And another member, referring to all present granting agencies, public and private, writes: "By and large, a sociologist must steal the time for activities of this sort, as if they were underground (like smuggling) or entirely gratuitous (like love) . . . The chief difficulty seems to be that granting agencies themselves reflect precisely the split between the humanities and the social sciences to which our committee is addressed. Not falling clearly on either side, a request for funds for an interdisciplinary activity is doomed to fall between the stools." On balance, it is difficult to assess the relative degree of responsibility for this between the manifestly limited funds of such organizations as SSRC and ACLS and orientation of policy, for the latter has grown up, after all, within the context of the former.

Greatly increased financial support is plainly required if present work is to be supported and, most important, if a creative release is to be effected in the form of stimulating others to leave work whose conventionality or repetitiveness now bores or limits them and to enter peripheral areas for which their talents clearly are intended. This is the heart of the matter.

There are many ways of starting the process: substantial prizes; fellowships and lectureships; financial guarantees of publication for works that have merit but no predictable breadth of appeal; released time from regular teaching in order to experiment with joint-teaching ventures; special, hand-picked conferences that are small enough to permit genuine intellectual activity, prolonged enough to allow for results; and so on.

Finally, should we think in terms of a large, NSF-type of foundation for the humanities? Yes, if this is the only means of channeling federal funds for research in the humanities. But, given the familiar problems of organizational ethos and management, it may be doubted whether sociologists and political scientists would encounter any greater hospitality for their humanistic projects than they do in existing organizations.

In summary: there is profound need for encouragement of humanistic work within the field of sociology and for enterprises in which sociologists and humanists collaborate: in research, teaching, and colloquia. There are many ways of accomplishing both, a few of which we have noted. While funds are indeed required in far greater than present abundance, boldness of reason and imagination alone will determine whether the funds stimulate or suffocate, result in new insights or merely shore up present prejudices and discontents.

INDEX OF NEEDS AND PROPOSALS
CONTAINED IN THE REPORTS OF THE 24 LEARNED SOCIETIES

ABBREVIATIONS: American Society for Aesthetics — *Aesth.;* American Studies Association — *Amer.;* American Anthropological Association — *Anthro.;* Archaeological Institute of America — *Archaeol.;* Society of Architectural Historians — *Architect.;* Association for Asian Studies — *Asian;* Society of Biblical Literature — *Bib. Lit.;* American Dialect Society — *Dialect;* American Folklore Society — *Folklore;* Association of American Geographers — *Geog.;* American Historical Association — *History;* History of Science Society — *Hist. Sci.;* Modern Language Association of America — *MLA;* Association of American Law Schools — *Law;* Linguistic Society of America — *Linguist.;* Metaphysical Society of America — *Meta.;* American Musicological Society — *Music.;* American Oriental Society — *Orient.;* American Philological Association — *Classics;* American Philosophical Association — *Philos.;* American Political Science Association — *Pol. Sci.;* Renaissance Society of America — *Ren.;* American Sociological Association — *Sociol.*

ARCHAEOLOGICAL EXCAVATIONS,
support for, (*Archaeol.*) 73, (*Orient.*) 173-174, 176

ARCHITECTURAL MONUMENTS,
preservation of, (*Architect.*) 80-81

ARCHIVES,
need for, (*Dialect*) 93, (*Folklore*) 98-99, (*History*) 121
of architectural drawings, (*Architect.*) 78
of architectural photographs, (*Architect.*) 78
of folklore, (*Folklore*) 98-99

ATLAS,
linguistic, of U.S. and Canada, (*Dialect*) 92

AUDIO-VISUAL AIDS TO TEACHING,
(*Anthro.*) 69, (*Architect.*) 79, (*History*) 118, (*MLA*) 141-142, (*Music.*) 169, (*Classics*) 190-191

BIBLIOGRAPHICAL AIDS,
general, (*Bib. Lit.*) 90, (*History*) 118, 121, 122, (*Law*) 150, (*Orient.*) 175-176, (*Philos.*) 194-195
abstracts, (*Amer.*) 60, (*Archaeol.*) 75, (*History*) 121, (*Meta.*) 161-162
catalogue of Indic texts, (*Orient.*) 176
catalogue of Latin authors of the Renaissance, (*Ren.*) 212
critical bibliographies, (*Hist. Sci.*) 127, (*MLA*) 133, (*Ren.*) 208, 212
dictionary of regional and local speech of U.S., (*Dialect*) 92
index to ISIS, (*Hist. Sci.*) 127
indexes, (*MLA*) 134
mechanical information retrieval, (*Archaeol.*) 75, (*Dialect*) 93, (*Folklore*) 98-99, (*MLA*) 134
Short-Title Catalogue, (*MLA*) 134

CARTOGRAPHY,
training in, (*Geog.*) 102

COMPUTERS,
(*Anthro.*) 68, (*Dialect*) 93, (*Linguist.*) 158

CONFERENCES AND SYMPOSIA,
(*Asian*) 86

COUNCIL FOR THE ASIAN HUMANITIES,
establishment of, (*Orient.*) 180

CREATIVE ARTS,
co-operation with archaeology, (*Archaeol.*) 76
fellowship support, (*MLA*) 144-145

CURRICULUM (SCHOOLS),
surveys, (*Folklore*) 97

CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT (SCHOOLS),
(*Archaeol.*) 73, (*Architect.*) 80, (*Folklore*) 97, (*History*) 118, 122, (*Meta.*) 164-165, (*Music.*) 168-169, (*Classics*) 186, (*Pol. Sci.*) 203

DATA PROCESSING
(*Amer.*) 61, (*Anthro.*) 68, (*Folklore*) 98-99
DICTIONARY OF SCIENTIFIC BIOGRAPHY,
(*Hist. Sci.*) 127
DOCTORAL DISSERTATIONS,
supervision of, (*Geog.*) 104
DRAWING, TRAINING IN,
(*Geog.*) 103
ENCYCLOPAEDIA OF INDIAN PHILOSOPHY,
(*Orient.*) 176
EXPOSITION, TRAINING IN,
(*Geog.*) 102
FELLOWSHIPS,
for elementary- and secondary-school teachers, (*Archaeol.*) 72, (*MLA*) 138, 139, (*Classics*) 191
graduate, (*Anthro.*) 67, (*Archaeol.*) 72-73, (*Architect.*) 80, (*Folklore*) 98, (*Geog.*) 101, (*History*) 119, 121, (*Hist. Sci.*) 126, (*MLA*) 137, 139, (*Linguist.*) 158, (*Meta.*) 160, (*Classics*) 191-192, (*Philos.*) 194, (*Pol. Sci.*) 201
graduate, dissertation, (*Philos.*) 195, (*Pol. Sci.*) 201
graduate, first-year, (*Philos.*) 195
graduate, travelling, (*Pol. Sci.*) 201
post-doctoral, research, (*Amer.*) 60, (*Architect.*) 80, (*Asian*) 87, (*Bib. Lit.*) 90, (*Dialect*) 93, (*History*) 119, 121, (*Hist. Sci.*) 126, (*MLA*) 137, 139-140, (*Linguist.*) 158, (*Orient.*) 180, (*Philos.*) 194, (*Pol. Sci.*) 204, (*Ren.*) 211, (*Sociol.*) 217-218
post-doctoral, study, (*Philos.*) 196
post-doctoral, on-campus, (*Meta.*) 164
visiting senior, (*Asian*) 87
FIELD WORK,
for graduate students, (*Archaeol.*) 72, (*Geog.*) 104
FILMS,
language teaching, (*MLA*) 141
FOREIGN SCHOLARS IN THE U.S.,
registry of, (*Meta.*) 163
INFORMATION,
on careers in the humanities, (*Amer.*) 59
INSTITUTES,
for advanced study, (*Amer.*) 59, (*History*) 121, (*MLA*) 135, (*Philos.*) 196, (*Ren.*) 213, (*Sociol.*) 216-217
summer, for graduate study, (*Geog.*) 101-102, 103 [see also TEACHERS, summer institutes for]
INTERDISCIPLINARY COURSES,
(*Amer.*) 58, (*Architect.*) 80, (*Sociol.*) 215-216
INTERDISCIPLINARY RESEARCH,
support for, (*Amer.*) 58, (*Dialect*) 94, (*Sociol.*) 216-217
INTERDISCIPLINARY TRAINING OF SCHOLARS,
(*Geog.*) 102-103, (*History*) 117, 120, (*MLA*) 140, (*Law*) 150-151, (*Classics*) 191
INTERNATIONAL EXCHANGE,
of lecturers, (*Bib. Lit.*) 90
of scholars, (*Aesth.*) 55, (*Asian*) 86, (*History*) 121, (*Meta.*) 162-163, (*Classics*) 192, (*Philos.*) 194
KINESCOPES,
(*MLA*), 142
LANGUAGE,
collection of new words, (*Dialect*) 92
English usage, survey, (*Dialect*) 92
introductory Sanskrit textbook, (*Orient.*) 175
LANGUAGE TEACHING,
machines, (*Bib. Lit.*) 90
LANGUAGE TRAINING,
for graduate students, (*Pol. Sci.*) 202, (*Ren.*) 210
LANGUAGES, TEACHING OF,
Greek, (*Bib. Lit.*) 90, (*Classics*) 190
Hebrew, (*Bib. Lit.*) 90
Italian, (*Ren.*) 210
Latin, (*Classics*) 190, (*Ren.*) 210
general support for, (*History*) 117, 121, (*MLA*) 136-137, (*Ren.*) 210
in schools, classical, (*Archaeol.*) 72
South Asian, (*Orient.*) 177
LEARNED SOCIETIES,
support for, (*Architect.*) 78, (*Asian*) 87-88, (*Ren.*) 208-209, 212-213
LECTURE SERIES,
(*Meta.*) 161, (*Sociol.*) 218

LECTURERS,
visiting, for schools, (*Orient.*) 177
LIBRARIES,
Asian materials, (*Orient.*) 180
electronic cataloguing, (*MLA*) 134
general support, (*Philos.*) 194, (*Ren.*) 212-213
for graduate study, (*MLA*) 135
historical books and documents, (*History*) 117-118, 121
history of science materials, (*Hist. Sci.*) 126
interlibrary loan program, (*Meta.*) 161
philosophical collections, (*Meta.*) 161
tape-recording, (*Anthro.*) 69
LOANS,
for graduate study, (*Meta.*) 160, (*Philos.*) 194
MEETINGS,
support for scholarly, (*Aesth.*) 54, (*Geog.*) 106
MICROFILM,
copying of scholarly and teaching materials, (*Amer.*) 61, (*Architect.*) 80, (*Dialect*) 93, (*History*) 118, 121, (*MLA*) 134, 142, 143, (*Meta.*) 161, (*Orient.*) 176
MUSEUMS,
archaeological, (*Archaeol.*) 74-75
of American architecture, (*Architect.*) 78
of folklore, (*Folklore*) 99
training in management of, (*Anthro.*) 68
NEW TECHNIQUES,
application to scholarship, (*Amer.*) 61, (*Archaeol.*) 75, (*Folklore*) 98, (*History*) 118, 121, (*MLA*) 142, 143
PHOTOGRAPHY, TRAINING IN, (*Geog.*) 102
PLACE NAMES,
survey of U.S. (*Dialect*) 92
POPULARIZATION OF SCHOLARLY WORK,
(*Aesth.*) 55, (*Archaeol.*) 75-76, (*Architect.*) 81, (*Folklore*) 99, (*History*) 118, 122, (*Linguist.*) 158, (*Meta.*) 164-165, (*Classics*) 190
PRIZES,
endowment of, (*Asian*) 87, 88, (*History*) 119, 122, (*Sociol.*) 218
PROFESSORSHIPS,
endowment of, (*Architect.*) 80, (*Asian*) 87, 88, (*Geog.*) 104-105, (*Hist. Sci.*) 125-126, (*Orient.*) 180
visiting, (*Meta.*) 163, (*Philos.*) 197
visiting, for foreign scholars, (*Meta.*) 163, (*Music*) 169
PROGRAMMED LEARNING (*MLA*) 141-142
PROVERBS, COLLECTION OF (*Dialect*) 92
PUBLICATION,
general support for, (*Amer.*) 58, (*Archaeol.*) 74, (*Dialect*) 94, (*History*) 121, (*Meta.*) 162, (*Music.*) 167, (*Orient.*) 175-176, 180, (*Classics*) 191, (*Ren.*) 211, (*Sociol.*) 218
American authors, (*MLA*) 130
archaeological reports, (*Archaeol.*) 74
architectural photographs, (*Architect.*) 79
architectural studies, (*Architect.*) 79
architectural surveys, (*Architect.*) 78-79
journals, (*Aesth.*) 54-55, (*Archaeol.*) 74, (*Architect.*) 79, (*Asian*) 86, 88, (*Bib. Lit.*) 90, (*History*) 121, (*Orient.*) 176, 180
papers of American statesmen, (*History*) 121
scholarly books, (*Aesth.*) 55, (*Architect.*) 79, (*Bib. Lit.*) 90
REGIONAL PRESENTATION, GEOGRAPHICAL, (*Geog.*) 101, 102
REGIONAL SEMINARS, (*Pol. Sci.*) 203
RESEARCH,
co-operative projects, (*Amer.*) 59, (*Music.*) 168, (*Orient.*) 176, (*Philos.*) 196, (*Ren.*) 208, 211
RESEARCH CENTERS,
overseas, (*Archaeol.*) 72, (*Music.*) 167, (*Orient.*) 174, 176-177, (*Ren.*) 213
U.S. national, (*History*) 122
U.S. regional, (*History*) 118, (*MLA*) 135

SABBATICAL LEAVES,
for primary- and secondary-school teachers, (*Amer.*) 60-61 (*MLA*) 138-139 [for professors — see, FELLOWSHIPS]

SCHOLARLY ARTICLES,
low-cost reprints, (*Amer.*) 60

SCHOLARLY TECHNIQUES, TRAINING IN,
(*Geog.*) 102-103, (*History*) 118

SCHOOLS,
improvement of relations with universities, (*Amer.*) 60, (*Archaeol.*) 72, (*History*) 118, 121, (*Classics*) 189-190

SEMINARS, POST-DOCTORAL
(*Meta.*) 160

SURVEYS,
architectural, of U.S. cities, (*Architect.*) 78-79
of world architecture, (*Architect.*) 79

TAPES AND RECORDS,
for field work, (*Dialect*) 93, (*Folklore*) 98
for language teaching, (*MLA*) 142

TEACHERS,
publication of guides for, (*Amer.*) 60, (*Classics*) 189-190
summer institutes for, (*Amer.*) 59, (*Orient.*) 177, 180, (*Classics*) 189, (*Philos.*) 197, (*Pol. Sci.*) 203
travel, (*Classics*) 191

TEACHING MATERIALS,

SCHOOLS,
improvement of, (*Amer.*) 59, 61, (*Asian*) 87, (*Orient.*) 177, (*Classics*) 186-187

TELEVISION, EDUCATIONAL,
(*MLA*) 142, (*Meta.*) 165, (*Classics*) 190

TRANSLATIONS, NEED FOR,
(*Aesth.*) 55, (*Anthro.*) 69, (*History*) 118, 121, (*MLA*) 131, (*Meta.*) 163, (*Orient.*) 180, (Pol. *Sci.*) 204-205, (*Ren.*) 210

TRANSLATORS, SUPPORT FOR,
(*Asian*) 86

TRAVEL,
for research, (*Aesth.*) 54, (*Architect.*) 80, (*Asian*) 86, (*History*) 121, (*MLA*) 132-133, (*Orient.*) 180
for undergraduates, (*Classics*) 191
to international congresses, (*Bib. Lit.*) 90

TUTORIAL TRAINING,
for graduate students, (*Geog.*) 103-104