



A Report  
to  
The Congress of the United States  
on  
*The State of the Humanities*  
and  
The Reauthorization  
of  
The National Endowment for the Humanities  
by  
The American Council of Learned Societies  
1985

Copies may be obtained for \$7.00 from

THE AMERICAN COUNCIL OF LEARNED SOCIETIES  
228 East 45th Street, New York, N.Y. 10017

Library of Congress Catalog Card Number 85-71938  
Contents not copyright

## CONTENTS

---

	Page
Introduction	v
THE REPORTS OF THE LEARNED SOCIETIES	
American Academy of Religion	1
American Anthropological Association	17
American Antiquarian Society	26
American Association for the Advancement of Slavic Studies	36
American Dialect Society	41
American Folklore Society	48
American Historical Association	63
American Numismatic Society	69
American Philological Association	74
American Philosophical Association	82
American Political Science Association	88
American Society for Aesthetics	107
American Society for Eighteenth-Century Studies	113
American Sociological Association	121
American Studies Association	127
Association for Asian Studies	133
Association of American Geographers	143
Bibliographical Society of America	154
College Art Association of America	161
History of Science Society	169
Linguistic Society of America	174
Medieval Academy of America	185
Modern Language Association of America	195
Organization of American Historians	211
Renaissance Society of America	218
Society for the History of Technology	223
Society of Architectural Historians	230
Society of Biblical Literature	239





## INTRODUCTION

In 1963, the American Council of Learned Societies, with the Council of Graduate Schools in the United States and the United Chapters of Phi Beta Kappa, created "The Commission on the Humanities." The Chairman of the Commission was Barnaby C. Keeney, then President of Brown University. The members, twenty in all, were a remarkable cross-section of intellectual, academic, and business leaders in the United States. In 1964, the Commission issued its *Report*. Its main recommendation was that the federal government should create a "foundation" in support of the Humanities. The Congress of the United States received the *Report* favorably and acted upon it quickly. In 1965, legislation created the National Endowment for the Humanities (and its counterpart, the National Endowment for the Arts). In 1985, the National Endowment for the Humanities, as it must be every five years, is before the Congress for legislative re-authorization to continue its programs of support for the humanities.

Twenty years ago, the question was whether the federal government of the United States of America should directly support the arts and the humanities. With the creation of the two Endowments, the answer was a resounding yes, an answer agreed with by Presidents Johnson, Nixon, Ford, Carter, and Reagan and by unwavering bi-partisan support in both houses of the Congress ever since.

It would be anomalous had it been otherwise. Business is allowed by law to make gifts that advance the general social good, not just the economic self-interest of the corporation, and it would be curious if a government for the people had come to a different conclusion. The federal government had contributed in many ways to the advancement of humanistic learning and scholarship before, but with the creation of the Endowment, it made a strong institutional and symbolic statement of agreement with the sentiment, to use the words of the 1964 *Report of the Commission on the Humanities*, that "a government which gives no support at all to humane values is careless of its own destiny."

Further, a "partnership" between the public and the private sector is native to the American grain. When the United States made the great transformation from an agrarian and mercantile economy to an industrial economy of self-sustaining growth, the government was an active partner with private interests, not just in building roads and canals and, later, railroads, but in a host of nascent industrial enterprises. The vehicle for government support was the states and cities but, nevertheless, the United States invested a greater amount of social capital than ever before known in Western history in economic development. As the economy expanded, so did governmental participation, directly in the

creation of a national communications network and of land grant colleges and universities, and indirectly in taxing and tariff policies. The tradition persists down to the development of satellite communications in our own time.

In short, the concept of a partnership between the public and the private sectors, between the government and for-profit as well as not-for-profit corporations, is traditional in the history of American society. Unlike command economies, however, the tradition in the United States has been pragmatic and, in the best sense, opportunistic, ungoverned by an inflexible philosophy of the role of the state or a sharp distinction between the public and the private realm. From the beginning, the United States has been a mixed-economy.

Twenty years later, the question is no longer singular, whether the National Endowment for the Humanities should exist, but a series of related questions about its existence. How well has NEH discharged its responsibilities under the mandate given it by the Congress of the United States? What effect has the presence of NEH had upon the humanities in the United States? What changes, intellectually and institutionally, have taken place in the humanities over the last twenty years which might affect the direction of the National Endowment for the Humanities over the next twenty years?

The world of the humanities is as pluralistic as the nation itself. The National Endowment for the Humanities serves a large and varied constituency: elementary and secondary schools; colleges and universities; the media, both print and electronic; libraries and museums; community groups and individual teachers and scholars. The American Council of Learned Societies is involved in many areas of humanistic learning, but in this *Report to the Congress* speaks mainly for the professional, scholarly associations whose more than 250,000 members comprise, literally, the population of the world of humanistic learning and scholarship in the United States. Individual reports from twenty-eight learned societies provide the particulars which give substance to this *Report to the Congress . . . by the American Council of Learned Societies*.

From the perspective of the learned societies, the National Endowment for the Humanities has done its work ably and served the humanities well. The fields of knowledge defined in the legislative mandate to the Endowment as comprising the humanities have been enlarged and enriched by its presence. Changes in leadership of the Endowment have shifted emphases in direction from time to time, but over twenty years the great success of the NEH has been to attract and to maintain a superior professional staff committed to the life of learning, courteous to its constituents, and competent in its duties.

Recognition of the importance of the National Endowment for the Humanities recurs throughout the individual reports of the learned societies. More important is the testimony it is improbable that support would have come from other sources. Such basic and essential tools of scholarship as catalogues of manuscript holdings, the creation of bibliographic and reference works, linguistic atlases and dictionaries, the publication of annotated lists of medieval and Renaissance Latin translations, support for centers for the study of paleography essential for medieval studies: one could extend the list, but these are examples of support for the basics of research that scholars understand and appreciate which may seem esoteric, if not unimportant, to others. They do not possess the glamor or promise the immediate utility which readily attracts support. They are simply the basics for advanced learning in a civilized society.

Beyond its direct grants, the National Endowment for the Humanities has had an even greater effect. Through matching grants, it has had a multiplier effect in two ways. First, it has caused the world of learning and scholarship to take action on its own behalf, to organize itself to seek private support to meet the requirements of NEH matching and challenge grants. The leverage of federal dollars has generated double the amount in private dollars. Second, the matching and challenge grants themselves provide a sanction for the worth of scholarship. The peer review system and the professional assessment of proposals through the National Endowment for the Humanities assure private donors of the worth of the work they are asked to support.

Yet, if one stands back and looks at the entire world of humanistic learning and scholarship, the National Endowment for the Humanities plays a small role. Support for research and scholarship in the humanities and for the libraries and materials which make them possible comes overwhelmingly from the colleges and universities and the private foundations of the United States. Within that context, the money appropriated for the National Endowment for the Humanities is miniscule, as it also is within the context of the total federal budget. But the National Endowment for the Humanities is important because, as the single federal agency dedicated to the humanities, it makes a strong symbolic statement. It says a resounding yes to the question whether humanistic learning and scholarship is important to American culture and to the American people.

Looking backward twenty years, one may see that the establishment of the National Endowment for the Humanities was an effect, not a cause of social and intellectual change in the world of learning and scholarship. The year 1965 was at the crest of the remarkable expansion of higher education which began with the G.I. Bill after World War II.

No study has yet done justice to the democratization of higher education by the G.I. Bill, although because the beneficiaries were nearly all men it had a negative effect for women. Before World War II, only about 14% of high school graduates went on to further education in any form. By 1965, nearly 70% were. The greater number were entering the junior and community colleges which developed to meet new social expectations about education. Yet, more than 25% of high school graduates completed four-year college programs for the A.B. degree. The expansion of post-secondary education was further fueled by demography, the “baby-boom” of the postwar years. Not only was a higher percentage of the age-cohort proceeding on to further education, the cohort itself was greater.

Graduate education expanded to meet the growing demand for faculty. In the field of history, more Ph.D.’s were granted in the ten years of the 60s than since the first Ph.D. was awarded in 1882 when university graduate education first appeared in the United States. The same heady rate of growth was true for other disciplines. The numbers are well-known. There is no need to multiply examples.

All this has changed utterly. One need only compare the optimism and self-confidence of the 1964 *Report of the Commission on the Humanities* with the troubled tone of nearly all the reports of the learned societies in 1985. A demographic down-turn has sharply reduced the population bound for college and university education and an aging faculty, occupying tenured positions, have together practically shut the door of opportunity for new Ph.D.’s until the late 1990s.

The bitter irony is that, as job opportunities have narrowed, intellectual horizons have widened. As the philosophers put it, after reviewing the bleak opportunities for employment in the academy, “Facts such as these might suggest a climate of doom and foreboding. Yet no such climate prevails. Philosophy remains a vigorous discipline in which conceptual advances and innovative methods continue to spring up.” The statement of the Modern Language Association finds the same distinction between the conditions of the profession and the intellectual work which goes on in it: “Although in most respects the situation of American scholarship and teaching has improved in the last twenty years . . . the extraordinary difference in tone between the 1964 [Report and the present] stems from circumstances outside the profession.”

Whatever the social and economic structure of the “institution” of higher learning, the activity of learning and scholarship in the humanities is vigorous, various, and lively. Two general themes characterize the assessments of the state of the humanities in the twenty-eight individual statements in this *Report*. First, there is a heightened

concern with the very meaning of a “field” of study, a discipline, usually concluding in a broader and more generous sense of one’s subject and a more inclusive sense of what materials and techniques are appropriate to it. Second, there is a pervasive movement toward interdisciplinary work and a major re-assessment of the relation between the humanities and the social sciences.

For the first, the subject matter of a field or discipline, the American Academy of Religion contrasts an earlier and narrower view of religion with the work which characterizes the study of religion today:

[Religious Studies] take as studied an interest in contemporary Brooklyn Hassidic Judaism as in the problems of the early Diaspora, in the wisdom of the Black Elk of the Oglala Sioux as in the revivalism of Southern Baptists, in the pure land Buddhism of Japan as in the covenantal theology of Jonathan Edwards. It would search out the religious resonances of the poetry of Wallace Stevens as carefully as that of Dante, discuss the civil religion of America as painstakingly as that of the Roman *Pax Aeterna*, compare the kinship systems of South American tribes and the prestige systems of modern corporations, and enter upon the complex ethics of medical practices in relation to the terminally ill.

The Organization of American Historians testifies to the same sense of a richer view of the meaning of history: “sweeping changes . . . occurred in the subject matter of the discipline as historians broadened their interests significantly.” Likewise, students of literature: “Intellectually,” observes the Modern Language Association, “the field has grown more and more attractive, as the traditional canon has been enlarged and revised.”

The enlargement of the sense of what is the subject matter of a particular discipline extends also to methods of study and critical perspectives on one’s subject. Political philosophers not only reassessed “the traditional canon of classic texts—to ask whence the tradition comes, what has been left out, and how better canons might be created.” At the same time, they became more self-conscious about the meaning of meaning, and more critical of the place of theory in the study of texts:

As movements such as existentialism, neomarxism, phenomenology, structuralism, deconstructivism, and bioethics have left imprints on the humanities, they have also influenced political science, as have evolutionism, political economy, sociobiology, and cognitive science. As a result, political science serves as an important crossroads for virtually all inquiry in the social sciences and humanities. Thus the

discipline helps to create lasting patterns of conversation and cooperation that enliven investigations throughout the academy.

As the definition of fields of study come under scrutiny, as materials appropriate to a subject become more inclusive, as methodologies become more various, there has developed an inevitable interest in interdisciplinary work, especially among contiguous disciplines, as the statement of the political scientists suggests. The classicists, for example, see a "need for people who can transcend the boundaries of their own specialty and communicate with scholars in other fields" and look for "ways to encourage and support wide-ranging and boundary-crossing enterprises." The Society of Biblical Literature recognizes that its own "self-advancement" depends upon "inter-related disciplines" because its subject is not a "book," called the Bible. Geography, which one suspects most citizens would consider a science, argues that "Geography examines and interprets the relationship between man as an occupier and shaper of the earth's surface . . . this relationship extends from social thought and collective action to individual perception and behavior."

The meaning of a discipline, a field of study, is at issue in nearly every one of the separate and individual statements of the several learned societies. No one of the reports of the individual societies concerns itself with the subject of the state of the humanities generally. That very fact, as one reads all the individual reports, means there is a seismic shift taking place in the world of humanistic knowledge, a shift put most directly by the American Society for Eighteenth-Century Studies:

In the late twentieth century, when there is greater recognition that disciplinary boundaries are not self-evident but indeed are constituted by culture, language and history, the lack of disciplinary boundaries in the eighteenth century takes on renewed interest and significance. Indeed, this may be an unprecedented time for the re-evaluation of the nature of interdisciplinary and transdisciplinary studies; and societies such as [the American Society for Eighteenth-Century Studies] may well lead the way in determining what, how, and by whose authority certain kinds of knowledge are constituted as a discipline, or as strategies for approaching disciplines.

There is, to put it shortly, a sense of ferment about the subject matter, the meaning of tradition, the authority of the canon of texts and problems, about the very meaning of a discipline. All of these issues are alive in the work of the several learned societies in the world of humanistic learning and scholarship. Whatever the social condition of the institution of higher learning, these are heady times intellectually.

Inevitably, the sense of openness and variety generates its opposite, a quest for order and a desire for unity. Along with the intellectual excitement of re-thinking one's identity, there appears as a *leitmotif* an anxiety about identity itself. The American Academy of Religion, having celebrated the rich diversity of the meaning of religious studies, puts as its first priority "working toward the creation of a common universe of discourse that, without diluting or lessening real differences, will enable scholars . . . to engage each other in scholarly conversation and debate." Similarly, the American Historical Association, having described with pride the rich variety of contemporary American historical scholarship, concludes that "historians also ought to pay more attention than they have paid of late to synthesis and interpretation."

Again, one may multiply examples from individual assessments by the several learned societies, but it is obvious that much like the inclusion of new social groups in the democratization of higher education in the United States, there has been an intellectual inclusiveness in scholarly work which calls into question what one does as an historian, or literary critic, or political philosopher. The variety and sense of boundlessness, invigorating as it is, generates in its turn a desire for intellectual control. The question which pervades the world of learning and scholarship is how to achieve an order of generalization and interpretation which does not do violence to the variety of experience and the plurality of perspectives which characterizes nearly every field of scholarship over the last twenty years.

If the National Endowment for the Humanities intends to serve the humanities, even more, if it aspires to speak for and to lead the humanities, it must be careful not to confuse the straitened economic circumstances of the world of the humanities with the lively and vigorous intellectual life of humanistic learning and scholarship. It should not impose a limited and restrictive definition of the humanities upon reality in order to create a spurious version of the order and coherence which the best minds in humanistic learning and scholarship are struggling to achieve.

The same issue, in different form, appears in the distinction between the humanities and the social sciences which has troubled the Endowment from its beginning. The legislative language which created the Endowment refers to the study of:

language, both modern and classical; linguistics; literature; history; jurisprudence; philosophy; archaeology; comparative religion; ethics; the history, criticism, and theory of the arts; *those aspects of the social sciences which have humanistic content and employ humanistic methods*. . . (emphasis added).



The self-existence of intellectual disciplines such as “history” or “literature” is what is intellectually at issue in the humanities today. Much more is at issue in the language which tries to draw a line between the humanities and the social sciences. The tripartite division of knowledge into the sciences, the social sciences, and the humanities is an American phenomenon of the twentieth century. It is unknown in Europe and the rest of the world and is a manifestation of the specialization and departmentalization of knowledge in the bureaucratization of the American university.

Yet, it is true that after the Second World War and especially in the 50s, the social sciences modelled themselves after the positivistic, quantitative, and objective methods of the natural sciences, and insisted on the distinction between the social sciences and the humanities. For example, in the 1964 *Report of the Commission on the Humanities*, scholars reporting for the American Sociological Association wrote that, despite some exceptions and despite their own muted hopes for possible change, “the truth is that the great, even overwhelming, majority of sociologists 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.”

To compare the 1964 *Report of the Commission on the Humanities* with the present *Report to the Congress . . . by the American Council of Learned Societies* is to measure a truly significant change in intellectual life in the United States. Some examples:

*Anthropology*: “Today, many anthropologists would . . . stress the intellectual benefit of the creative tension between rigorous science and unabashed humanism *within the single discipline* of anthropology.” (emphasis added)

*Political Science*: “. . . most social scientists now concede that normative assumptions underlie most, if not all, scientific analyses, a concession that requires philosophical inquiry into values . . . . Every field in political science is becoming a complicated conversation among scientific and humanistic approaches, to the benefit of both.”

*Sociology*: “More and more, humanists understand texts as specific types of social action, and sociologists conceive of social action as texts, so the necessary interplay among the two “camps” becomes all but inevitable. . . . It is clear that the enmity or mutual misunderstanding that blocked dialogue between humanists and sociologists has been in large measure overcome.”

Retrospectively, one may understand the language in the mandate to

the National Endowment for the Humanities because that was the language humanists and social scientists were themselves using. But in 1965 it was already coming to pass. It was coming to pass because "the scholarly world turned increasingly toward a mode of understanding that could be characterized as 'interpretive.' Instead of attempting to formulate general laws of behavior, social scientists began to concentrate on the ways in which people make and communicate meaning. Anthropologists, sociologists, and even legal scholars drew new energy from the kinds of analysis that seems peculiar to the humanities: the study of symbols." (American Society for Eighteenth-Century Studies)

The point is not that the Congress should re-write the mandate which governs the National Endowment for the Humanities. Only some utopian bureaucrat would suggest that. The point is that the National Endowment for the Humanities may no longer make simple determinations about the humanities on the basis of the name of the discipline or by the division of knowledge into the categories of the humanities and the social sciences. That may make the administration of grants more difficult but it will make the work of the administration more interesting, simply because it will involve the administration in that which is most lively and interesting in the intellectual work of humanistic learning and scholarship in 1985.

The meaning of a discipline, the emphasis on interdisciplinary scholarship, the convergence of the social sciences and the humanities: these are issues which engage the minds and imaginations of scholars and give energy and urgency to their work. They leave untouched, however, the relation between the humanities and society. As Dr. Richard Lyman, President of the Rockefeller Foundation, put it, "Merely blurring the genres, or finding oneself in collaboration with the neighboring disciplines, does not automatically bring the humanities . . . into effective contact with the rest of the world and its pressing problems."

The implicit question, what value do the humanities have for society, and especially American democratic society, is important. Scholars recognize that it is. As the Society of Biblical Literature reports, "Our task with others in the humanities is to secure the bond between the nation's health and the role of the humanities."

The line of filiation between the humanist in the library and the "health" of the general society is long and difficult to draw. Some will argue it should not be drawn. There are other forces at work in American society, economic, political, social, which have a much more direct bearing on the social good than humanistic learning and scholarship. One must be modest. Yet, there are connections, particular and general, between humanistic learning and the achievement of a decent and humane society.

The particular connections are made in the several reports of the learned societies. For example:

*The Modern Language Association of America:* "We have no more timely task than to induce society to foster basic literacy, foreign language competence, informed sensitivity to other civilizations and customs, and widespread access to instructive and illuminating literature."

*The American Historical Association:* "New historical sensibilities which survive . . . professional scrutiny must in turn be fitted into our inherited concepts of the value and the meaning of the past. . . . Only then will the dual goals of historical study be attainable: the nourishment of social cohesion through the maintenance of a shared past, whose lineaments conform to the most rigorous test of truthfulness. . . . Upon this foundation, and this foundation only, can good citizenship in a democracy rest. Persons ignorant of their country's history and traditions are not likely to be able to make intelligent political decisions. Persons ignorant of other cultures and traditions may fall prey to prejudice, narrow nationalism, and xenophobia. A nation as powerful as the United States must have citizens who are well-informed about their own and other people's history if they are to be good citizens in a world which desperately needs enlightened leadership."

*The American Philosophical Association:* Important "to democratic society is the search for a standard of justice and fairness by which societal institutions and policies may be judged. The contribution which political and moral philosophy have made to this task in the past decade is particularly striking. . . . Philosophical inquiry into the nature of a just state, the standard for fair distribution of societal benefits and costs, and the nature of the cognitive and normative bonds which create a community form an essential background for the work of the legislator, judge, or civil administrator."

The particular ways in which humanistic learning bears upon the social good are important. One need only imagine an individual who, through some trauma, had suffered a loss of memory, or the capacity for self-expression, or the ability to offer reasons for his or her actions. One would recognize a drastically diminished human being, human only in some biological or physical sense. One may say the same of society, dangerous as it is to make the analogy with a single self. A society which does not nourish, does not cherish, such things as history, language, philosophy is a decerebrated society, not capable of what it might yet become, a society not yet fully human.

Beneath the particulars, however, there is a more fundamental rela-

tion between humanistic learning and society, especially a democratic society. Beyond practical consequences for the social good, humanistic learning is implicated in the essential question what it means to be human. It explores how people over time and in different cultures have answered that question in different ways and through different forms of expression so that finally we may confront the same essential question in our daily lives, in our own time and place.

What it means to be human has no single answer. Different thinkers at one moment in time and different cultures widely separated in time or space will give different answers. But one thing humans have in common is the inevitable urge to create ordered representations, in words and in images, of what it means to be human, to make sense of life and experience, to understand what it means to be a self in the society in which one lives, what ethics are required, and what standards of justice are legitimate. The restless drive and deep desire to have satisfying answers to such questions defines the human condition. That is what humanistic learning is about.

If that is true, then, beyond practical consequences for the social good, humanistic learning bears an essential relation to society, especially a democratic society. If humanistic learning is implicated, finally, in what it means to be human, then it can not be the province of a few, a class, however learned that privileged class may pride itself upon being. If humanistic learning is the growth of self-consciousness, a heightened awareness of the possibilities of life, if humanistic learning is, in short, an enlargement of human power, then that enlargement must entail the increase in the power of every individual in society. In a democratic culture, humanistic learning must, perforce, rest on the belief that more than a select few can see and imagine and act as do the best few.

Learning is involved in how to live a life, not how to make a living. Humanistic learning is involved in those fundamental questions of what life is all about. So humanistic learning is deeply political, not political in the foolish sense that people called "humanists" have practical answers to concrete social issues, but political in the sense that humanistic learning is centered on the individual who has important questions about self and society. To learn some of the answers to those questions means the fullest and richest and most imaginative development of every single self—at least, in a democratic culture.

That is why it is appropriate for the government of the United States of America to support the humanities, and that is why the National Endowment for the Humanities should be supported, supported even more greatly, and re-authorized by the Congress of the United States.

John William Ward, President

The American Council of Learned Societies



## THE REPORTS OF THE LEARNED SOCIETIES



# AMERICAN ACADEMY OF RELIGION

---

President: Ray L. Hart, University of Montana  
Delegate to the ACLS: Ray L. Hart  
ACLS Conference of Secretaries: James B. Wiggins, Syracuse  
University, Executive Director and Treasurer

---

## COMMITTEE

John Dillenberger, Graduate Theological Union  
Ray L. Hart  
Charles H. Long, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, and  
Duke University  
Wendy Doniger O'Flaherty, University of Chicago  
Schubert M. Ogden, Southern Methodist University  
James B. Wiggins

## OUTLINE

1. The present situation and its historical background
  - 1.1 A historical note
  - 1.2 The growth and redirection of undergraduate religious studies, 1950–1970
2. AAR, the representative/comprehensive learned society in the field
3. The research and publications orientation of the field
4. The present and future needs of the field
  - 4.1 Forum and administrative unit for assessing needs
  - 4.2 First steps toward meeting the need of field development
    - 4.2.1 Expansion of AAR staff
    - 4.2.2 Inventory and census of the field
  - 4.3 National and regional connections in the field
  - 4.4 “Program” development
    - 4.4.1 Endowed plenary lectureship at annual meeting
  - 4.5 Research and Publications Programs
    - 4.5.1 Separation of research and publications
    - 4.5.2 Revolving publications fund
  - 4.6 Education: the loci of the study of religion
  - 4.7 Relationships with international counterpart learned societies



The report of the American Academy of Religion, pertinent to the re-authorization by Congress of the National Endowment for the Humanities, attempts to speak to “the present situation and the present and future needs of the discipline.” We stipulate only that we shall speak of our “field,” rather than our “discipline.” It is a matter of currently ongoing scholarly debate, both inside and outside religious studies, whether religious studies is a “discipline.” We concur in the view that religious studies is first and foremost a subject matter, a field, that is studied within a broad spectrum of humanistic, and some social scientific, disciplines and methodologies. While religious studies is an integral field in higher education in the United States and Canada, having in most successful instances its own academic structure, in its contemporary and viable near-future forms it makes no claim on disciplinary uniqueness.

Moreover, since religious studies in its contemporary academic form is a comparatively recent entrant on the American college/university scene, having emerged to its present vitality only after WW II, our report will be prefaced by an extensive historical note. But our history as a field bears decisively on the intelligibility and pressure of our present and near-future needs, and cannot for that reason be omitted. It is a melancholy and an ironic fact in academia that religion, oldest and most universal of human phenomena, comparable in these respects only with languages, should require such elaborate context setting.

#### 1. The growth of religious studies as an academic field.

1.1 A historical note. In the decades following World War II the academic study of religion in American higher education has developed at an exceptionally rapid pace. This pace accelerated in the 1960s, especially in the public sector. In the same period the field was marked, qualitatively, by great ferment, vitality and creativity. In order to understand the present situation a review may prove useful.

The oldest universities in Europe, and in America as well, were founded on and centered in the study of religion. For the most part that meant at Bologna, Paris, Oxford and Cambridge the study of Christian theology; as it meant at Harvard, Yale and Princeton what we would now call WASP (White Anglo-Saxon Protestant) theology. Although the earliest colleges in the United States were constituted primarily to educate clergy (and civil magistrates), they were not what later came to be called seminaries. The study of theology was an intrinsic part of a classical education, in which every student was immersed, irrespective of vocational aspiration. Indeed the theological scholar often was the humanist par excellence, the teacher of Greek and Latin, history, letters, and philosophy, as well as theology.

The second half of the nineteenth century brought far-reaching

changes. Colleges in the United States began to veer in the direction of the university, especially under the influence of the discrimination of disciplines and specializations of subject matter fostered in Germany. Coincident with the founding of public, land-grant universities, and for complex social reasons as well as educational ones, the study of theology came to be largely segregated in divinity schools or seminaries, some remaining related to colleges and universities, others becoming independent of them altogether. Although the study of religion continued integrally in many sectarian and nonsectarian private colleges and universities, for the most part for roughly a century the academic study of religion proceeded in some isolation from the mainstream of American higher education. It should be remembered that in the same period emigration from Europe was most intense, and that the immigrants of this period brought to America great numbers of people with religious traditions (notably Roman Catholicism and Judaism) that had not been present in substantial quantity previously. Schools fostering the study of these religious traditions sprang up, and for the first time the pluralistic study of religious traditions, though largely isolated from each other, came to characterize the larger scene.

World War II with its technological demands figured in the emergence of the multiversity; hordes of returning GI's swelled enrollments. Not a few of these young men, deeply troubled by the moral ambiguities of the war and its aftermath in their own existence, and aroused by their contact for the first time with people of alien religious traditions in foreign lands, turned to a serious study of religion on their return. At the same time theologians of distinction had emerged from the previous pattern in Europe (Rudolph Bultmann, Karl Barth, Karl Rahner, Martin Buber, Gershom Scholem) and America (Paul Tillich, Reinhold Niebuhr, H. Richard Niebuhr) to serve as their mentors. It was these graduate students of the late '40s and '50s who sparked the enormous renaissance of religious studies in the recent past.

The college that was departed by the study of theology in the late nineteenth century was not the multiversity to which religious studies returned in the 1960s. In the century of "meantime," "natural philosophy" had proliferated into psychology and all the several physical sciences; sociology and political science had become established as disciplines. The sciences had usurped classics in hegemony. One could not assume that students were prepared, linguistically and otherwise, to take up with ancient texts.

If religious studies reentered a university vastly different from the college it departed in the nineteenth century, it is also the case that the multiversity of the 1960s received the return of a study of religion that was vastly different from nineteenth century WASP theology. It was a

study deeply concerned to recover the repressed in American religious history: the unique religious vision of Blacks, of American Indians, of Chicanos, of American Orientals. It could take as studied an interest in contemporary Brooklyn Hasidic Judaism as in the problems of the early Diaspora, in the wisdom of the Black Elk of the Oglala Sioux as in the revivalism of Southern Baptists, in the Pure Land Buddhism of Japan as in the covenantal theology of Jonathan Edwards. It would search out the religious resonances of the poetry of Wallace Stevens as carefully as that of Dante, discuss the civil religion of America as painstakingly as that of Roman *Pax Aeterna*, compare the kinship systems of South American tribes and the prestige systems of modern corporations, and enter upon the complex ethics of medical practices in relation to the terminally ill.

Religious studies had taken a quantum leap; the multiversity had taken a quantum leap; each was, historically, in a new situation. Religious studies as an academic field required massive reconception: it could not return to the halcyon humanistic days of the colonial college or to the cultural isolation of the independent seminary. Clearly it had to construe itself in the new humanistic context. Thus a premium was placed on fundamental research and thinking during this period of most explosive quantitative growth.

To this end nothing was more important than the emergence of a learned society in the field which would not merely reflect but guide and goad the field, a society that would attract the principal scholars to positions of leadership and create formal structures for the emergence and communication of fundamental research and thinking. We shall speak momentarily of the role of the American Academy of Religion in this respect. But first we may comment on the quantitative growth of the field, and make some observations that have more to do with teaching than with research in religious studies but which have bearing finally on research parameters.

1.2 The growth and redirection of undergraduate religious studies, 1950–1970. Unfortunately, we do not possess reliable data for the period since 1970. This is the more regrettable since, as everyone knows, the picture in higher education, particularly in the humanities, was altered critically during the '70s. The following data are drawn from the study sponsored by the ACLS and conducted by Claude Welch, *Graduate Education in Religion* (Missoula, Montana: University of Montana Press, 1971), and a companion volume by the same author, *Religion in the Undergraduate Curriculum* (Washington, D.C.: Association of American Colleges, 1972). (One of the acute needs of the field, to be expanded below, is a major updating of reliable data—an updating of the “Welch” reports.)

## AMERICAN ACADEMY OF RELIGION

1.2.1 In 1970, from a total of 1,311 accredited four-year institutions of higher learning in the United States and Canada, 873 had organized programs or departments of religion.

1.2.2 In 1970, 30% of the public institutions had some formal program of academic religion studies. Over 50% of these were developed since 1963. (These percentages do not include junior colleges. Of 311 junior colleges queried, 137 reported special programs in religious studies; only 65 reported no course offerings.)

1.2.3 A striking correlation has been shown to exist between the academic quality of an institution and the presence of a program or department of religious studies: the higher the quality of the institution at large, the greater the likelihood of there being a program in religious studies.

1.2.4 In public institutions for the period under review, enrollments in undergraduate religion courses increased at a dramatically higher rate than the total undergraduate population. In 25 public institutions between 1964 and 1969 the total undergraduate population increased 55% while religious studies course enrollments increased 150%. In long-established programs the proportion of students enrolled in religion courses to total undergraduate population tends to be higher (at Iowa and Western Michigan, 10% and 9% respectively) than in recently established programs (in 13 public institutions with programs established since 1964, the average in 1969 was 3.9% of total undergraduate population enrolled in religious studies courses). "It is noteworthy that the major expansion of religious studies in public institutions has coincided with a decline in institutional religion." (*Graduate Education in Religion*, p. 179)

1.2.5 "Although undergraduate religion programs have not infrequently been started as interdepartmental courses of study supervised by interdepartmental committees, they have regularly moved to the status of distinct administrative budgetary units. This is to speak . . . only of administrative structure, not of curricular. It does not at all reflect the extent to which a student's academic program may involve cross-disciplinary work or formal joint majors between religion and other departments. . . . Educational programs and patterns grow in colleges and universities only if they are tended and that requires their being given an organizing center, structure, a budget, some appointive control, and so forth. This is plainly the case with respect to programs of religious studies. Those that have been organized simply as interdepartmental or interdisciplinary structures have regularly failed to prosper." (*Religion in the Undergraduate Curriculum*, pp. 62-63).

1.2.6 The dramatic redirection of undergraduate religious studies in recent years has required a substantial redistribution of faculty re-

sources. In many cases, the present specializations of faculty are different from their areas of graduate training. Faculty have had to retrain themselves in order to meet pluralistic and diverse undergraduate interests.

1.2.7 Several new trends or directions in undergraduate religious studies are apparent.

1.2.7.1 With respect to goals, undergraduate programs show an all but universal (certainly in public institutions) trend toward an inclusive view of religious phenomena. They are thus pluralistic in faculty and subject matter. In public institutions they have no intent to prepare students for clerical or other religious vocations, and eschew advocacy. On the other hand, they do not draw back from the study of commitment and value.

1.2.7.2 The great majority of undergraduate programs presently still have a massive bias in favor of the study of western traditions, and there is an equally massive concentration of faculty resources in such traditions. But there are clear indications that this concentration has been strongly qualified in recent, and will be more so in coming years. There is a growing emphasis upon the history of religions (particularly for Oriental religions—Hinduism, Buddhism, Islam, Taoism, etc.—and primitive religions) among the desired areas of expansion in undergraduate programs.

1.2.7.3 Another “outward” trend in religious studies has been toward interdepartmental and interdisciplinary studies in both the humanities and the social sciences (especially with anthropology, sociology, and psychology). As noted earlier, these “inter” ventures have usually been successful only when religious studies has had its own organizational center.

1.2.7.4 In undergraduate studies, the very concept of “religion” is undergoing expansion. “There are strong tendencies toward the expansion of work in phenomenological and comparative studies, to complement (and to some extent to replace) the traditional concentrations on religious ideas and scriptures and on the religious traditions *per se*. . . . More broadly . . . [this] means concern with the many expressions of both overt and covert religious phenomena and impulses in all aspects of culture: the ‘civil religion in America’; . . . the myth and folklore of popular culture; the religious dimensions of the new youth subcultures; the manifestation of the holy and the sacred in the theatre, in art, and in literature . . . ; the religious themes of alienation and reconciliation in the work of presumably antireligious thinkers . . . ; the quasi or *de facto* religious phenomena in the political and social realm.” (*Graduate Education in Religion*, p. 196)

1.2.7.5 Finally, the conception of the “major” in religious studies at

the undergraduate level is undergoing expansion. In respect of the content of the major, there is a tendency toward consensus as to constituent elements. "First, some area of concentration in the field is essential—and the range of possibilities for such specialization must be broadened to include the Eastern religious traditions, primitive religions, and the more comprehensive understanding of religious phenomena. . . . Second, a responsible pattern of study cannot be limited simply to one religious tradition, but must include serious attention to two or more, preferably from diverse cultural traditions. Third, there must be serious and extensive attention to the questions of general theory and method in the interpretation of religion, including historical, philosophical, literary, phenomenological, psychological, and sociological perspectives and styles of approach." (*Graduate Education in Religion*, pp. 198–99)

The above noted trends of the '60s continued into the '70s, but under far less auspicious circumstances, those of the university in fiscal shock and declining enrollments, particularly in the humanities. Nonetheless, departments started or substantially augmented in the '60s continued to consolidate strength in the '70s: in 1973 Virginia had 18 faculty, Indiana 13, Florida State 15, UC/Santa Barbara 13, Tennessee 11, Temple 24, North Carolina/Chapel Hill 14, Rutgers 10. The inauguration of new departments in the '70s did not halt (e.g., Colorado, Arizona, UNC/Greensboro, UNC/Charlotte, UC/San Diego), but the pace has become slower and is largely restricted to the public sector of higher education. Unquestionably, religious studies has taken its lumps along with the other humanistic fields in terms of enrollments, but there is no hard evidence that it has suffered any more than other liberal arts areas in this respect.

2. The American Academy of Religion, the representative/comprehensive learned society in the field.

2.1 In 1984 the American Academy of Religion celebrated its 75th Anniversary; through its predecessor organizations, it dates back to 1909. Its name was changed in 1963 from the National Association of Biblical Instructors, and with the change in name went an incipient change in reality, a change we believe now largely to be consummated. There can be little doubt that the NABI had been not a learned society in the true sense but a professional organization of faculty primarily preoccupied with pedagogical concerns. Behind the change in name to the American Academy of Religion lay the resolution to bring the field to research maturity through the agency of a learned society in the accepted sense. Hereafter we shall detail steps that have been taken to make good on this resolution, and those that remain.

2.2 Representative/comprehensive learned society. The AAR is the

most, indeed the only, representative and comprehensive membership-based learned society in the field of religious studies in the U.S. and Canada. Religious studies embraces a plethora of subfields. These subfields are rendered subfields by a variety of considerations: through the use of methodologies and linguistic skills of allied humanistic and social scientific disciplines, through concentration on texts that are studied as well as by other disciplines, or on geographical areas engaging other fields, *etc.* Many of these subfields in religious studies have their own learned societies; they are typically relatively small, and meet annually in conjunction with societies “outside” the field (*e.g.*, American Society of Church History meets with American Historical Association); or they may be organized along confessional lines (*e.g.*, Catholic Biblical Association). AAR is the only umbrella learned society in the field, affording structures in its annual meeting and publication programs for the production and communication of research in *all* subfields. (The Council on the Study of Religion is no exception, since as a council of societies it is not a membership-based organization.) Thus only in AAR have the subfields a forum for research at once hewing to subfield specificity and within the context of the field at large.

2.3 The growth of AAR. The growth of AAR has largely paralleled the explosive growth of the field since WW II, although the Academy has continued to grow during the tapering off of the mid-’70s. In 1950 there were 824 members; in 1955, 975; in 1965, 2539; in 1975, 3826; as of this writing, 4119.

3. The research and publications orientation of the field. It is our impression that the evidence of AAR’s leadership role over the past two decades in the orientation of the field toward research and scholarly publication was a principal factor in the admission of AAR to the American Council of Learned Societies in 1979. This orientation was accomplished largely in the traditional way of learned societies, through the annual meeting and through the attention of senior officers and commitment of budget to the work of the Research and Publications Committee.

3.1 Budgetary allocations. As in most organizations, so in AAR; where the money (derived from member dues) goes reveals the real commitments. The 1983–84 budget of AAR was approximately \$208,000; of this roughly 54%, \$114,000, was committed to research and publications programs. We shall speak below of Scholars Press, but should note here that our publications efforts have been substantially forwarded by both private (Exxon Education Foundation, Henry Luce Foundation, the Lilly Endowment) and public (NEH) funds.

3.2 The annual meeting. In 1957 NABI (immediate predecessor of

AAR) held its annual meeting over a 24-hour period; sixteen papers were read, all in plenary sessions, only one of which was not in the Biblical field. At the 1984 annual meeting, extending over four days about 425 papers were scheduled in a vast array of subfields under diverse program units.

What has intervened to account for the difference, apart from the sheer growth of the field itself, is a radical reconception of the structure of the annual meeting, a reconception put into effect with the 1974 annual meeting. Essentially, the new structure allows for and encourages program unit flexibility commensurate with the reconception of the field that has been underway during the past two decades. Previously there had been only "discipline" sections. Under the new structure program units are expanded to include sections, groups, seminars, consultations, and the research of affiliated organizations. These program units permit the presentation of research in several stages of "maturity," from fledgling exploration to polished completion, from circulated preprint to organized research publication. At the 1984 Annual Meeting there were eleven (11) sections, fourteen (14) groups, one (1) seminar, fourteen (14) consultations, and four (4) sessions of affiliated organizations.

Program units are regularly reviewed by ranking scholars in the field; none are presumed to have permanence; all must justify continuation. Proposals emerge continually from the membership for the creation of new subject matter units and are evaluated on their merits by appropriate scholars.

3.3 Publications. Vastly aiding the fresh orientation of the field of religious studies to research and publications was the emergence of Scholars Press, the founding sponsors of which were AAR and the Society of Biblical Literature (SBL). Sponsored as well by twelve (12) other humanistic learned societies, SP publishes scholarly journals and monographs in the humanities and contiguous social sciences. It was the first such enterprise to employ the latest technology in composition, and specialize in the technical monograph having a limited but vitally interested audience. Thus it has filled a lacuna between commercial and university presses, making possible the publication of rigorously juried mss that otherwise might not have been published. Through its sponsoring learned societies and their memberships, SP has had access to its "natural markets."

Founded on a shoestring out of the coffers of AAR and SBL, SP has launched an effort to regularize its financial base. In this effort it has been greatly aided by a grant of \$300,000 from NEH, matched by three (3) dollars for each NEH dollar by AAR, SBL, and other sponsors, and



grants from several private foundations and individuals. Further regularization of support for SP remains one of the needs of our field, as it is of the humanities at large.

In the past two decades the Academy's publication efforts have been concentrated upon its official periodical organ, the *Journal of the American Academy of Religion*, and the launching or revivification of several scholarly monograph series.

In addition to members, who receive it with payment of dues, *JAAR* goes to approximately one thousand (1,000) institutional subscribers in this country and abroad, for a total circulation of roughly five thousand two hundred (5,200). *JAAR* is now widely accepted as the scholarly journal of record for the field of religious studies at large in the U.S. and Canada. It is the only learned journal in the U.S. which aspires to comprehensive coverage of the field as an integral subject matter area with all its subfields, while holding those subfields to the ideal of a common universe of humanistic discourse.

Currently, AAR publishes three continuing series of scholarly monographs. In the Academy Series, four or five nationally juried Ph.D. dissertations are published annually. The Studies Series presents the best in contemporary scholarship from younger scholars. The Classics Series makes available sources and resources for the study of religion that have gone out of print (sometimes involving new translations).

In summary, we believe that AAR in the past two decades has made good on its resolution not only to reflect but to direct the growth of the field of religious studies; that it, as no other learned society in the field, is both comprehensive and member-based; that it has shouldered the responsibility to make the field research and publications oriented, and has afforded the mechanisms for the discharge of this responsibility, primarily through the reconstitution of its annual meeting structures and its research and publications programs; that through it and SBL the field of religious studies is fairly and responsibly represented to the councils and counsels of public and private humanistic support agencies.

But much remains to be done, and to the immediate task ahead and its discernible parts we now turn.

#### 4. The present and future needs of the field.

Quite apart from the present report pertinent to the reauthorization of NEH, but quite as happily coincident with it, a Task Force was commissioned by the AAR during this its 75th Anniversary year to set an agenda for the field for the coming decade. The present report draws heavily and in detail upon the conclusions of the work of that Task Force, which comprised six senior scholars in the field (three current, three former officers of the Academy). The Task Force asked itself three simple but

fundamental questions. What has AAR been doing, want to do better, and might it do and be obliged to do in the near future for the academic study of religion? What structures of governance will be required to meet these needs? What resources and materials will be required and how might they be secured? A greatly foreshortened summary of response to these questions may be presented first, with specifically envisaged steps to follow.

*What do we want to do?* There are two overriding considerations, each of which reflects “failings” of the field and of AAR as its self-assumed guide and goad. (1) One major respect in which the overall founding aspiration for AAR has been fallen short of, and on which its full membership needs to expend concerted effort, is in working toward the creation of a common universe of discourse that, without diluting or lessening real differences, will enable scholars whose approaches to the study of religion and whose subject matter fields are widely diverse genuinely to engage each other in scholarly conversation and debate. It is obligatory upon those in the field in ways specified below to foster the development of such a common discourse, both among the technical subspecializations of religious studies as such, and between such subspecialites and humanists/social scientists at large. (2) While the AAR has been and must continue to be centrally focused as a *learned* society, it has neglected and must make good on its obligations as a *professional association* of scholars at work in the study of religion. In respect of both (1) and (2), the encompassing challenge is to foster and support scholarly communication and professional development. In responding to this challenge, the most far reaching conceptual change for the AAR itself will entail its understanding of itself henceforth as a single entity, acting with and for the field, that comes to expression now in national, now in regional policies, structures, and programs.

*What governance structures will be required?* We find the governance structures of AAR, acting with and for the field, to be fundamentally adequate to meet envisaged needs. Some governance bodies and offices require to be revisioned and revitalized; some new ones need to be added for the launching of unprecedented programs. Such alterations are possible within present flexibility.

*What resources are required and how shall they be secured?* By and large scholars in the field of religious studies have not concerned themselves actively in the development of resources for the field nationally or at large, *i.e.*, beyond the claims of their own institutions. The development of a keener sense of responsibility for and leadership in such matters is perhaps the most challenging development task before us in the next decade. More religion scholars accepting more responsibility for the development requirements of the field is the *sine qua non* for

meeting the needs detailed below. To guide and goad this acceptance, AAR will require (1) a long-range planning and development program, (2) an expansion of its national office staff to assist in its implementation, and (3) a major inventory and census of the field in the U.S. and Canada to provide the data base from which a development program can be reliably launched.

What follows is a detailed series of reflections, proposals, and recommendations in respect of needs for the field.

4.1 A forum/administrative unit for assessing needs. A clear and present need is a permanent forum/administrative unit whose sole responsibility is the regular and continuing determination of the needs of the field at large, the assessment of their priority, and the supervision of garnering resources to meet them. The AAR shall establish a (new) standing Committee on Long Range Planning and Development, a majority of whose membership shall comprise distinguished members at large.

4.2 First steps toward meeting the need of field development. Two steps need to be taken immediately to launch a development program for the field.

4.2.1 Expansion of AAR staff. AAR needs to expand the staff of its national office, both to free the Executive Director to devote a major proportion of his/her time to field development and to assist him/her in that enterprise. Specifically, we need a full-time Executive Associate and a full-time secretary to support the work of the Executive Director and his/her Administrative Assistant (the last two comprising the present national staff), and the new Executive Associate. In support of this staff expansion for the first two years, AAR has applied to and received assurances of support from The Lilly Endowment (in the amount of \$90,550). In *indirect* support of meeting this need, AAR will apply to NEH for a Challenge Grant on a three-for-one matching basis. One of the primary uses of this challenge grant would be to provide permanently committed revolving funds to support the publication programs of the AAR, thus releasing funds from AAR's operating budget that can then be utilized to support the staff of the AAR national office on a continuing basis.

4.2.2 Inventory and census of the field. There is an acute need for a complete inventory and census of personnel and programs in religious studies in North America, which inventory/census will provide the basis for assessing and meeting the needs of the field. The last reliable set of data is now hopelessly out of date, dating back to the so-called "Welch" reports of 1971 and 1972 (and based on research in the late Sixties). A new Welch-type study is a clarion need of the field, should be conducted jointly by AAR and SBL under ACLS sponsorship (as were the Welch

reports), and support of it will be sought in a consortium of private and public agencies. To this end, AAR plans to apply for a grant from the NEH Office of Programs and Planning.

4.3. National and regional connections in the field. It is the judgment of AAR that one of the most basic needs of the field is to strengthen links between the national and regional levels of its life and work. While ideas for strengthening such links, and specifically projects to that end, should emanate from both levels (and steps are being taken to insure contributions from regional organizations), the national leadership proposes to make available a variety of programs that hold this policy in view:

- regularly maintaining a panel of Academy lecturers, any of whom would be available to lecture at regional meetings;
- regularly maintaining a panel of Academy symposiasts, any of whom would be available to participate in symposia at regional meetings;
- regularly organizing an Academy symposium, all of whose members would be available to conduct their discussion at regional meetings;
- regularly sponsoring summer seminars conducted by distinguished senior scholars in the several regions; and;
- regularly sponsoring programs planning leadership seminars for all persons having program planning responsibilities at both national and regional levels.

It goes without saying that financial resources will be required to implement any or all of these programs aimed at achieving this policy. Such resources will require a reallocation of the Academy's available funds and the seeking of new external funding. In respect of the latter, we anticipate close working relationships with NEH, in particular its Summer Seminar program, and through consortia of its State Councils in support of regional programs.

4.4 "Program" development. In the past "program" in AAR has referred all but exclusively to the program of the annual meeting. It is clear that the strengthening of links between the national and regional levels referred to under 4.3 above will require a substantial expansion of the reference of "program," as will a development program, an educational program, a research program, and a professional development program.

4.4.1 Endowed plenary lectureship. These remarks notwithstanding, one central feature of the program of the annual national meeting is in need of substantial shoring up. The Academy needs a "capstone" forum

at its annual meeting for the presentation of truly distinguished work by an individual scholar in the study of religion, a forum that, from its inception, would arouse a climate of highest expectations. To this end, AAR has under study the securing of an endowment, largely from private sources, for the Plenary Lectures at the annual meeting. The model for these lectures would be an American equivalent of the Gifford lectures in England, except that they will attach, not to a local institution of higher learning but rather, to the Academy and will reflect and serve the field at large. The lectures will be drawn from a major book that normally will be published through Scholars Press, and will stand in a continuing AAR monograph series.

4.5 Research and Publications programs. AAR judges its publications program in the past two decades to be among its stellar achievements. That notwithstanding, we believe the structure of the Research and Publications Committee to be inadequately geared for the tasks immediately ahead. Specifically, the committee presently does not and cannot, given its work load, accord sufficient attention to generating, enabling, and monitoring major research projects. And conceptually, the conjoining of publications with research is flawed in implying that publication is the only legitimate outcome of research. We concur that all AAR publications should be based on appropriate research, but not that all research is most effectively embodied in publication.

4.5.1 The "separation" of research and publications. Accordingly, we shall separate the two "functions" procedurally, assigning publications to the committee as presently constituted, and assigning responsibility for the research program of AAR to a new standing committee created for that purpose. This will permit the Publications Committee to devote its attention even more aggressively to scholarly publishing, the monitoring of quality, and the fine-tuning of technique. And it will give to the Research Committee great latitude and range. Research must be conceived with sufficient breadth so as to include not only those kinds of projects that serve the field in its professional and educational association aspects. Research works commissioned in the 75th Anniversary Publications Series illustrate one kind; the inventory and census of the field discussed in 4.2.2 above is another. The range of the Research Committee's work will include but not be limited to curricular patterns and needs at all levels of higher education, nationally and regionally; secondary education needs should be assayed, particularly with regional differences highlighted and accommodated; research regarding pedagogy in the field is needed; research in alternative (to teaching) careers should be undertaken, and as a corollary, research is needed as to what is to be learned regarding graduate education in religion from those who

having participated in it have found careers outside educational institutions. Beyond these professional association parameters, the AAR as a learned society should be fostering research in neglected areas. As an example, the effects of religious pluralism upon religious traditions should be undertaken in regional areas where pluralism is a fact of life, e.g., the Bay Area, where Asians, Blacks and Caucasians exist in equal or nearly equal proportions, or the Southwest, where Hispanics and Caucasians interact. Regional research projects in such settings would make obvious sense.

4.5.2 Revolving publications fund. To place a permanent foundation under AAR's already strong commitment to scholarly publications in religious studies, it needs to establish a revolving, permanent book publication fund in an amount sufficient to provide subsidies annually to permit the publication of up to two times the average number of volumes published in each of the preceding four years. Such a fund will require generous support from both public and private agencies. Its successful implementation will permit AAR to reallocate operating funds to meet other needs detailed in this report.

4.6 Education: the loci of the study of religion. Insofar as AAR in the recent past has devoted itself to "education," and that it has done only weakly, it has done so only at the undergraduate college/university level. We cannot delay any longer meeting our responsibilities to the subject matter and the larger culture in respect of the study of religion at *all* levels of education. Accordingly we will establish a new standing Committee on Education and the Study of Religion. While the largest purview of the Committee will be the impact of the proper study of religion upon the culture at large, it will be specifically directed to the three principal levels of education: secondary, undergraduate (community college, college, university), graduate. The Committee will have both a research and a "practical" mission. It should determine what is the case at all levels, assay and set norms for what ought to be the case at all levels, and develop programs and structures for implementing its findings and recommendations. We have referred (4.2.2) to the need for a comprehensive survey and census of the field in North America, a reference in that context to higher education. We need a like survey, conducted probably at the level of regions, of secondary education and the study of religion (curricula that have been developed for "religion and literature," "religion and the social sciences," and the like; state teacher accreditation procedures where they exist; *etc.*).

4.7 Relationships with international counterpart learned societies. It is our impression that religious studies lags other major humanistic disciplines/fields in co-operative relationships with counterpart learned societies in countries outside North America. It is important to our

society, and we believe theirs, to rectify this lack. Several factors stand in the way of such relationships for our field, owing principally to radically different relationships between the study of religion and cultures at large in other countries. In many if not most other countries, the religiously pluralistic context of the U.S. and Canada does not obtain; the presence of the state, directly or indirectly, as a factor in advocacy, is also pertinent in some other countries. In some countries, learned societies are organized strictly along confessional lines, in others according to strict subspecializations. There are long-established learned societies in Europe devoted to Old and New Testament studies, but no existing umbrella organization for the study of religion as such. There are fledgling efforts in this direction in England, inspired in part by the model of AAR, as there are in Australia. AAR has sufficient members in other countries to serve as some leaven.

We feel obliged to establish working relationships with existing learned societies in other countries, whether or not they are our exact counterparts. Moreover, without imperial intent, we need to make our expertise in convention planning and publications programs available to them, and in other areas as well. It is well past the time when we should be developing the field internationally without neglecting the home fires.

Initial steps toward this end are being taken in the current year. With support from The Henry Luce Foundation, we brought to the 75th Anniversary annual meeting a significant number of international scholars to present their appraisal of American scholarship in their several subfields, and to seek their counsel on the development of working relationships with scholars of religion in their countries. From this initial consultation we expect an agenda for international scholarly cooperation to be formed in the field of religious studies.

In the 75th year of AAR's repurchase on existence, its leadership raised from private sources approximately \$175,000 for envisaging and putting in place the machinery to make good on the needs envisaged in this report, the first such effort toward long-range development in our history. We have taken note of the crucial role of the NEH in our development thus far, and of our hopes for continued involvement in the future. It is unthinkable that a public agency which has so abundantly enriched American cultural life as the NEH has should not be reauthorized by the Congress.

# AMERICAN ANTHROPOLOGICAL ASSOCIATION

---

President: Nancy Oestreich Lurie, Milwaukee Public Museum  
Delegate to the ACLS: Jerome S. Handler, Southern Illinois  
University

ACLS Conference of Secretaries: Edward J. Lehman, Executive  
Director and Secretary-Treasurer

---

## COMMITTEE

Nancy Oestreich Lurie, Chair  
June Helm, University of Iowa  
Sidney W. Mintz, The Johns Hopkins University  
Eric R. Wolf, Herbert H. Lehman College, CUNY

## ANTHROPOLOGY AND THE HUMANITIES

The 1964 statement of the American Anthropological Association prepared for the Commission on the Humanities noted that in addition to funding from universities and research centers, support for anthropological research was available from private foundations, government agencies and national councils. Since its founding in 1965, the National Endowment for the Humanities has become a significant governmental source of support for anthropology. Its programs of interest to anthropologists are regularly noted in the AAA *Anthropology Newsletter* together with programs of agencies which were already mainstays of the discipline in 1964.

NEH has continuously lived up to its high promise of two decades ago, developing and adapting programs to accommodate a broad and changing range of humanistic concerns. Virtually all the areas of need set forth in the 1964 AAA statement are addressed in NEH's now nearly thirty programs. NEH also supports anthropological endeavors not even anticipated in 1964. The very fact of NEH has helped stimulate anthropological innovation, notably in enlarging the public outreach of anthropology. Experience with NEH programs and procedures, and changes on the anthropological scene over the last twenty years now suggest some new directions for NEH support of anthropological proj-



## AMERICAN ANTHROPOLOGICAL ASSOCIATION

ects and new opportunities for other disciplines to utilize anthropological contributions.

Although some anthropologists today are inclined to prefer gender-neutral language in describing their discipline, the fundamental nature and scope of anthropology have not changed since the 1964 statement was written. It remains concerned with "the evolution and the comparative study of man and his culture," its breadth and interests continue to span "the biological, social and cultural aspects of man," and it still "insists that these aspects be viewed together."

The 1964 statement readily acknowledged the natural affinity of anthropology to the humanistic disciplines in regard to shared topical concerns of folklore, languages and linguistics, prehistory, ethnomusicology and related fields and in regard to shared commitments to the history and qualities of the world's societies, but the statement repeatedly distinguished between the science of anthropology and the humanities. Today, many anthropologists would not insist on this distinction but stress the intellectual benefit of the creative tension between rigorous science and unabashed humanism within the single discipline of anthropology. Evidence of humanistic interests is seen in the founding of the Society for Humanistic Anthropology in 1977 (now a Section of AAA) and it is only one of a number of anthropological organizations in the AAA with humanistic concerns.

As hoped in 1964, NEH today supports projects—public media productions, films, museum exhibits, classroom presentations and various public programs which draw upon systematic cross-cultural and biological data from anthropology to lend greater depth of humanistic understanding of the human species' capabilities and place in the natural order of the world. It also provides direct support to many anthropological projects but its humanistic boundaries could be legitimately enlarged to support more anthropological projects.

## THE AMERICAN ANTHROPOLOGICAL ASSOCIATION

Although anthropology has retained its basic character since 1964, the Association which provided the 1964 statement has undergone great change with a reorganized governing structure put into place in 1984. It is designed to maintain unity of the discipline and better coordinate the activities of anthropologists whose ranks have increased greatly. The number of Fellows in the AAA has grown from about 1,000 in 1964 to more than 2,500 today; comparable increases in other membership categories bring the current total membership to nearly 9,000.

## AMERICAN ANTHROPOLOGICAL ASSOCIATION

Not only are there many more anthropologists but their scholarly and professional activities have multiplied and diversified enormously over the last twenty years. The reorganized AAA is now composed of Divisions representing the discipline as a whole and the major sub-disciplines of Ethnology, Archaeology, Linguistics, Biological Anthropology, and Practicing Anthropology; Sections representing topical emphases such as education and world areas; and Branches representing regional anthropological organizations. These units have autonomy of title, officers, publications and other activities but are incorporated under AAA and elect representatives to the governing board. The AAA membership consists of all the members of the constituent units who will continue to elect the AAA president at large; previously, all officers were elected at large. The new By Laws provide for incorporation of additional units as anthropological interests continue to multiply and diversify.

Among other advantages, reorganization will make the Association more effective in its clearing-house functions in identifying groups and individuals with special expertise of interest to agencies such as NEH. The units also could conceivably generate projects which would be appropriate for support from NEH, a possibility of special significance in view of the large number of anthropologists today who are not associated with academic institutions to sponsor and administer grants, discussed below.

## ANTHROPOLOGICAL EMPLOYMENT

The profession of anthropology has changed markedly over the last two decades. In 1964 the discipline had experienced about twenty years of very rapid growth, including the development of more than 60 departments offering graduate programs. As the boom in college enrollments leveled off and in some areas actually declined in the 1970s, anthropology, like many disciplines, was seriously affected. Today, some anthropology departments face the possibility of being terminated. The 1964 opinion—"at present it does not seem possible to fill" the great demand for young Ph.D.'s to teach anthropology in universities and liberal arts colleges—strikes an ironic note in 1984. According to the Conference Board Report on 1982 Doctorate Recipients, anthropology had the highest unemployment of new doctorates (40.5%) of all major fields (compared to 12% in 1972). In the Report, anthropology and sociology are listed together and the percentage of unemployed doctoral recipients has dropped to 30.3%, but it cannot be

determined how much of this improvement relates specifically to anthropology.

The 1964 statement betrays a certain complacency that anthropologists could and should expect traditional academic employment, and takes only passing, almost disdainful, note of the rise of "a modest demand" for anthropologists in schools of business administration, public health and education, and in a number of government agencies which "exploited" anthropology's ties to the natural and behavioral sciences and the practical applications of anthropology.

Although academe remains the primary locus of anthropological employment, according to the Reports there has been a sharp decline from a high of 73% in academic employment in 1968 to only 28% in 1982. Meanwhile, increasing numbers of anthropologists are finding employment in public and private organizations engaged in community assistance and development programs in this country and abroad, nonprofit and profit-making research/analysis firms, and in an expanding range of government agencies, including NEH. A relatively new and growing phenomenon is self-employment. Anthropologists working as individuals or heading small firms employing research staffs contract their services as consultants and researchers to business, industry and government. To cite only a few examples, such employment entails work for law firms engaged in litigation on North American Indian treaty and land issues, studies of labor-management relations, and preparation of archeological surveys and community studies for historical and social impact statements which are required in advance of proposed construction involving federal funding.

Indicative of the AAA's concern for the employment needs of anthropologists are its publications, *Getting a Job Outside the Academy* (Special Publication No. 14, 1982) and the *Directory of Practicing Anthropologists 1982* to help locate and identify the specialties of anthropologists not included in the AAA annual *Guide to Departments of Anthropology*. The *Guide*, in addition to listing academic departments, includes museums and research centers employing anthropologists.

Of special interest is the fact that the presence of new employment opportunities for anthropologists is prompting some graduate students to prepare themselves from the outset for non-academic careers. The practical applications of anthropology take many forms, some of which have humanistic implications and uses such as film making and writing, technical advising to film makers and playwrights, administration of humanities programs and centers, cultural affairs posts, bi-lingual education and the like. Anthropologists in non-traditional employment should certainly be counted within the profession as able to generate projects qualifying for NEH support.

## ANTHROPOLOGY AND MUSEUMS

Museums were mentioned in the 1964 statement, but large natural history museums with anthropology departments and university anthropology museums were considered "stabilized" as to staff size "in the face of financial necessity." Museums at that time did not enjoy the affluence of universities as centers of intellectual activity, and museum-based research was poorly funded. The statement suggested that the proposed federal agency could help remedy the problem, at least in regard to anthropological research in museums which intersected with the humanities. This and much more came to pass as the museum scene took on new vitality in the 1970s and NEH was available to nurture it.

The overproductions of Ph.D.s, not only in anthropology but the natural sciences and history generally, afforded museums the opportunity to fill curatorial openings with highly qualified young Ph.D.s as older (often minimally or self-trained) curators retired. As noted, museums had drifted out of the anthropological mainstream in 1964. Museum employment was not considered particularly attractive. When anthropologists (and others) began to rediscover museums out of economic necessity, they realized that they had more time to devote to research than teaching positions would allow. Anthropologists also found themselves on the cutting edge of new research interests in the discipline at large where there is renewed appreciation of material culture to test theoretical questions and enrich substantive knowledge of now greatly changed cultures. The creation of NEH has been of enormous benefit for museum-based research with humanities content for both museum and academic anthropologists.

Although the description of staff needs of established museums still tends to hold true, over the last twenty years there has been an astonishing proliferation of small museums dedicated to regional, ethnic, historical, and topical concerns. According to a survey conducted in 1978 by the Institute of Museum Services and the National Center for Educational Statistics, there was only one congressional district in the entire country lacking some kind of museum. Universities responded to the need for museum professionals with new programs, variously called museum studies and museology. A large number of these programs are centered in anthropology departments. Most of the new museums, in the tradition of well established museums, rely heavily on volunteers but usually have at least one paid supervisory position. The boards of these museums seek academically qualified personnel in order to compete for federal funding of their programs, particularly from NEH as well as NEA. Anthropology, with its holistic

bio-cultural approach, its concern with material culture and its historical dimension, is excellent preparation for positions in such small museums. While statistics are not available at this time, anthropologists with museological training are finding employment in museums of many kinds.

NEH not only regularly funds research in museums as envisioned in the 1964 statement but also funds anthropological exhibit production in museums. Whatever their scientific content, exhibits are by nature humanistic in promoting thoughtful, informed views on the part of the general public regarding culture, prehistory, and even ecology and evolution.

The writers of the 1964 statement correctly anticipated that what eventuated at NEH would result in the anthropological enrichment of humanities teaching in primary and secondary school curricula and higher education. They did not anticipate the marvelous opportunity NEH affords in stimulating appreciation of human cultural diversity and disseminating anthropological concepts to the general public through permanent and temporary museum exhibits and museum programs. School groups have long received special instructional attention from museums but today many programs of a humanistic nature include anthropological content and are designed for the elderly, handicapped, ethnic groups, families and adult individuals with particular interests. The public value of these programs is beyond calculation and could not be undertaken without NEH through direct grants and re-grants from state humanities committees.

## NEH, ANTHROPOLOGY, AND THE FUTURE

As noted near the outset, virtually all the needs expressed in 1964 are potentially fundable by NEH but sometimes projects which would seem to qualify are turned away, not for lack of merit but for apparent lack of humanistic relevance. Perhaps the 1964 insistence on the distinction between anthropology and the humanities created constraints which continue in NEH funding decisions even now that anthropology has moved in the direction of being as firmly based in the humanities as in the sciences.

Anthropology, for example, is the only discipline among the social sciences that has a traditional investment in linguistics as one of its major components. Certainly in recent years anthropological linguists have addressed strongly humanistic concerns in ethnopoetics, sociolinguistics, semiotics, and the nature of discourse, as well as continuing research in the production of speech, bi-lingualism, and other topics requiring formidable technology and quantitative analyses. Linguistics

is defined unequivocally by NEH as one of the humanities, yet NEH panels sometimes must be reminded that they do not need to determine whether a proposal in linguistics is "humanistic." (It is of interest to note in this connection that a mere twenty years ago only three of twenty-four learned societies in ACLS mentioned the potential of computers in their reports to the Commission on the Humanities: the American Dialect Society, the Linguistic Society of America, and the AAA).

Archeology also is a major component of anthropology and also is defined by NEH as a humanistic discipline. It undeniably has benefitted greatly from NEH support, but there are problems in getting some kinds of support. Classical archeology has long been of interest to the private sector and enjoys patrons willing and able to supply required matching funds. Plain dirt archeology in the Americas, particularly North America, is not so blessed although it contributes mightily to our understanding of our national prehistoric heritage. While such archeological projects have great in-kind resources for matching funds, directors of these projects often are hard put to raise required cash matches and must piece together contributions from many sources, thereby spending a great deal of time and energy which might be better devoted to the work of the projects themselves. The important point is that archeological sites in this country are under terrible threat by the proliferation of shopping centers, urban expansion, and other private sector construction. Anything which delays getting on with the business of retrieving data often means the data will be beyond retrieval.

A more liberal view by NEH of in-kind matches also would be of great benefit in the specialized area of underwater archeology where the archeologist is not confronted with commercial indifference to the fate of historically significant artifacts (to say nothing of their stratigraphic context) but competition for them from professional salvage operators able to attract investors in treasure hunts.

Further recommendations concern the need for greater support through existing funding categories or creation of new ones to encourage more anthropologists to undertake work of a humanistic nature. Translations, noted in the 1964 statement, are supported but there should be more emphasis on translating important books and monographs, particularly from Russian, Chinese, Japanese, and Arabic, along with the present translations of periodicals, articles, abstracts, and bibliographies.

As world or global history becomes increasingly important in secondary and college level curricula, indeed even mandated in some school systems, anthropology has a natural role in contributing to the enrichment of these courses to enable students to know and understand

cultures other than their own. There is need for more encouragement of anthropologists to concentrate on areal studies which have tended to be neglected in recent years in favor of theoretical concentrations.

Related to the need for substantive data to enlarge our understanding of the world's peoples is the need for support of the collection, translation, and annotation of life histories. This endeavor stemming from ethnological field research provides humanistic insights beyond the category of "oral history."

The 1964 statement called for support of publications; NEH funds presses to publish important works which would not otherwise be published and also funds the preparation of basic reference works. There is, however, a continuing need to make certain kinds of information simply accessible where microform would do as well as conventional publication, for example, museum records (including photographs as well as accession/catalog data) and primary documentation still only in manuscript form in linguistics, ethnology, and archaeology.

The 1964 statement made an interesting distinction between research and scholarship, seeing the latter as in need of special support for people to engage in contemplative assessment of the results of research. NEH has various stipend and fellowship programs which approach but do not quite meet this need in special cases. Anthropologists generally obtain a great deal of information in the field which does not get included in their published works but could be of use to others if organized, indexed, annotated, and placed in an appropriate depository. It is generally conceded that this should be done but too often people cannot afford to devote a block of time to this effort. And people die. Notes are lost or end up in archives in far less useful form than would be the case if the scholars who collected them had prepared them for archival deposition. Support for senior anthropologists for this purpose would contribute to the anthropological data base and could even lead to new interpretive scholarship from the experienced field worker enabled to review a lifetime of work in the field.

In view of the renewed interest in material culture, NEH could perform a signal service in expanding support in its Research Resources/Preservation Grants to encourage anthropologists who are not museum oriented to systematically document and donate to museums the many objects brought back from the field which now languish in attics or serve as home or office decor. Artifacts are jeopardized by lack of controlled environmental conditions museums provide. Frequently, items which were commonplace only a few years ago and collected casually in the course of field work are no longer made and could be of great significance in building anthropological study collections. They are of special interest because they could be provided with

the kind of precise and complete documentation so necessary to current research concerns. Documentation stored only in collectors' heads should be recorded in permanent form.

Biological anthropology, the most obviously scientific of the major components of the discipline, also has its humanistic aspects needing support. Again, a program of NEH comes close, Basic Research/Humanities, Science and Technology, but is not quite on the mark to develop publications, programs and exhibits which could simply inform the public on evolution, exponential population growth, heredity and related subjects to enlarge understanding of the human species as inescapably part of the natural world. Responsible popularization of complex information so that it is clearly understandable and compellingly interesting is, in itself, a humanistic enterprise.

The final section of this statement should be seen as an effort to guide, not criticize, NEH in carrying out its mandate. Indeed, it is hard to imagine life as an anthropologist today without NEH.



# AMERICAN ANTIQUARIAN SOCIETY

---

President: John Jeppson, 2nd, American Antiquarian Society  
Delegate to the ACLS: G. Thomas Tanselle, John Simon  
Guggenheim Memorial Foundation  
ACLS Conference of Secretaries: John B. Hench, Associate  
Director for Research and Publication

---

## COMMITTEE

Ross W. Beales, Jr., College of the Holy Cross, Chair  
Nancy H. Burkett, American Antiquarian Society  
Mary Maples Dunn, Bryn Mawr College  
John B. Hench  
Marcus A. McCorison, American Antiquarian Society  
Robert Middlekauff, The Huntington Library  
G. Thomas Tanselle

The printed word is at the heart of Western culture, and in the preservation and study of that culture research libraries play an indispensable role. The American Antiquarian Society (AAS) is one of two members of the American Council of Learned Societies that support independent research libraries. While the following report necessarily focuses upon and reflects the experience and views of AAS, we hope that many of our perspectives and priorities will address areas of concern shared by other independent research libraries which are also committed to the preservation of the printed word.

## “ONE OF OUR NATIONAL TREASURES”

The American Antiquarian Society is a learned society which was founded in 1812 in Worcester, Massachusetts. The Society maintains a research library of American history and culture in order to collect, preserve, and make available for study the printed record of the United States. It is the third oldest historical society in this country and the first to be national rather than regional in its purpose and in the scope of its collections.

With holdings numbering close to three million books, pamphlets,

broad­sides, manuscripts, prints, maps, and newspapers, this library preserves the largest single collection of printed source material relating to the history, literature, and culture of the first 250 years of what is now the United States. It specializes in the American period to 1877, and holds two-thirds of the total pieces known to have been printed in this country between 1640 and 1821, as well as the most useful source materials and reference works printed since that period. Its files of eighteenth- and nineteenth-century newspapers, numbering two million issues, are the finest anywhere.

The American Antiquarian Society has long been a distinctly, and perhaps uniquely, interdisciplinary institution. Because of the richness of its collections, AAS has an international constituency of scholars whose research interests embrace such diverse fields as anthropology, art, communications, history, journalism, literature, philosophy, religious studies and theology. In addition, because of its status as an independently governed and supported research library, AAS is free from the constraints of ties to, and dependence on, specific disciplines or control by other institutions such as universities.

AAS's collections serve a world-wide community of students, teachers, historians, bibliographers, genealogists, and authors whose research directly affects the quality of education through textbooks, biographies, historical novels, newspapers, periodicals, plays, operas, films, and libraries.

A research library differs from all others in that its collections are usually rare, often unique, and their preservation is a constant concern. School, college, and public libraries, designed to fit student curricula and general adult needs, provide printed materials which are meant to be worn out and replaced. The entire AAS research library is a rare book collection acquired over a period of 172 years at great effort and cost. Its holdings are not to be worn out and discarded but preserved for research and study.

The Society has a staff of fifty-one. In addition to the function of curatorship and assistance for others, the staff is itself productive of scholarship. A few examples of staff work produced at AAS are a history of printing in America; a history and bibliography of American newspapers; the standard work on Paul Revere's engravings; completion of Sabin's dictionary of books relating to America as well as Evans's *American Bibliography*; a twenty-volume dictionary catalogue of the Society's pre-1821 holdings, family genealogies, and first editions of American literature; a four-volume catalogue of the manuscript collections; and editorship of the Society's *Proceedings*, published semiannually.

The late Allan Nevins, author and historian, called AAS "one of our

national treasures.” Dr. Willard Thorp of Princeton University once observed that “if the American Antiquarian Society had not come into existence, our knowledge of the origins of this nation would for a long time have been composed of myths and legends. In a sense, the American Antiquarian Society gave us our past.” In 1968, because of its collections and architectural beauty, Antiquarian Hall, the AAS library building, was designated a National Historic Landmark by the Secretary of the Interior.

## AAS COLLECTIONS

On the library’s twenty miles of bookshelves are preeminent collections of pre-1877 American printed materials ranging from sets of encyclopedias to miniature books for children, from city directories to sheet music, and including all imaginable forms of printed ephemera from advertising trade cards and almanacs to bookplates and paper currency.

The Society also holds an important body of material in the field of early religious history and literature, including the most extensive collection of the writings of the Mather family, their manuscripts, private library, and family portraits.

The Society’s manuscript collection, numbering tens of thousands of unpublished documents, is housed in the Kresge Manuscript Room. Its 2,215 running feet of shelving contain diaries, account books, family letters, and business records, as well as the Society’s own archives. A grant from the National Endowment for the Humanities made possible the cataloguing of this collection, thus making this great resource fully available for the first time.

The graphic arts collections, which date from the founding of the Society when Isaiah Thomas donated his personal collection of graphic arts, contain maps, broadsides, prints, and eighteenth-century engravings. This department frequently provides illustrative material for printers, publishers, and broadcasters for use in textbooks, monographs, journals, and television documentaries.

The Society is the nation’s chief repository of early American newspapers. More than two million issues published in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries in every section of the United States, Canada, and the West Indies are held on seven miles of shelving in climate-controlled stacks.

## AAS PROGRAMS

In addition to maintaining its research library, the Society is also engaged in a number of library-based programs of great value to the

world of scholarship. Because of these programs, the Society now serves thousands of scholars, whereas a decade or two ago it could serve only hundreds.

*Fellowships:* In order to make its collections more readily available to scholars, AAS administrators a program of one- to twelve-month fellowships for visiting researchers. Last year, eighteen scholars from the United States and abroad were selected as AAS fellows.

*Publications:* A primary responsibility of AAS is to make the resources under its care available for study, not only in its readings room, but also through a publications program. The Society's semiannual journal, the *Proceedings*, was first issued in 1813. Among recent book titles are *The National Index of American Imprints through 1800: The Short-Title Evans*; *A Calendar of American Poetry in Colonial Newspapers through 1765*; *A Bibliography of American Cookery Books, 1742-1860*; *A Bibliography of American Children's Books Printed Prior to 1821*; *The Angel of Bethesda* (the first complete publication of Cotton Mather's treatise on medicine); *A Descriptive Checklist of Book Catalogues Separately Printed in America, 1693-1800*; *The Press and the American Revolution*; *Printing and Society in Early America*; and *Seven Essays on Early American Bookbinding*. Since AAS has made bibliography and printing history its focus over the years, these and other publications, no less than its holdings, have been central in many fields of scholarship, for bibliography and printing history intersect with all fields.

One of the most far-reaching contributions to scholarly work in American history has been the Society's participation with the Readex Microprint Corporation in a project to edit and film at AAS nearly all the non-serial material published in this country from 1639 to 1820. This series, entitled *Early American Imprints*, contains the full text of over 90,000 books, pamphlets, almanacs, and broadsides. These microform reproductions are available for purchase by any library or individual. In a similar manner, work continues on the AAS-Readex *Early American Newspapers* series, which is reproducing in microform all American newspapers issued before 1821. Another recent collaborative project with Readex has resulted in the microfilm publication of eight manuscript diaries of New England women, 1772-1914, from the AAS. These micropublishing projects not only serve to distribute texts beyond the walls of the AAS library, but are also a means of preserving texts from the ravages of time and use.

*Cataloguing and Bibliographical Research:* Several cataloguing projects of incalculable promise to early American studies are under way at the Society. The North American Imprints Program (NAIP), funded in part by NEH, is a long-term undertaking to construct detailed biblio-

graphical records of all North American imprints, whether held at AAS or elsewhere, first through 1800, but eventually through 1876. While strengthening the Society, this program will also contribute to an extraordinary degree to the advancement of scholarship all over the United States. A catalogue of American engravings on copper and steel made by Americans to 1821 is nearing completion after many years of research. Another project (also supported by NEH), to catalogue the Society's collection of newspapers through 1876 in a nationally accessible computer data base, has been in operation at AAS since 1982.

The Society is an owner/member of the Research Libraries Group, Inc., and a participant in RLG's computerized cataloguing system, RLIN. The Society also is a participant in the CONSER program through OCLC, Inc., another national computerized bibliographical utility.

*Conservation:* The first in-house bindery at the Society was established in 1912. Since that time the department has become a fully equipped restoration workshop directed by skilled professionals, whose duties in addition to the restoration of printed and manuscript materials include the monitoring of climate-control and fumigation programs.

*The History of the Book in American Culture:* The Society's Program in the History of the Book in American Culture is composed of a number of scholarly activities, including a series of annual lectures, workshops and seminars, conferences, publications, and residential fellowships. The program focuses the Society's strength of collections and varied research and publication activities on an emerging field of scholarship. The study of printing and the distribution of printed material in America has always been at the heart of AAS's work—who printed what and where; how printed works got into the hands of readers; how books, pamphlets, newspapers, and graphic arts materials influenced American culture. Now scholars from a variety of academic disciplines are beginning to deal with broad questions of the role of printed material in American social, economic, and cultural life. This program follows from the traditional interests of AAS and at the same time is likely to break new ground in providing an institutional forum for combining different approaches to the history of the book. The American Antiquarian Society is the best place for these studies to take place.

## AAS AND THE NATIONAL ENDOWMENT FOR THE HUMANITIES

Since the early 1970s, the American Antiquarian Society has received a number of grants which have been crucial in the development of its role as a major independent research library. Grants from the National

Endowment for the Humanities have made possible the arrangement and description of AAS collections (manuscripts; nineteenth-century pamphlets; pre-1801 imprints; broadsides through 1830; engravings through 1820; early American newspapers); the creation of research tools (through indexes and catalogues of manuscripts and engravings); the growth of AAS's financial resources (through challenge and special-incentive grants); academic and scholarly programs (under the program of fellowships and through research conferences); and public programs (the production of a film on nineteenth-century American lithography; preparation of an American Bicentennial exhibit, "Wellsprings of a Nation"; and sponsorship of public lectures).

These grants have been key factors in the expansion of the Society's role in its various areas of activity. The grants for arrangement and cataloguing of collections have resulted in AAS's ability to bring under control large quantities of important research materials. In most cases, it has also meant that these materials have been catalogued in machine-readable form, thus providing the means by which AAS has taken a lead nationally in the computerized cataloguing of research materials. The grants for academic or scholarly programs have allowed AAS, on the one hand, to expand considerably the level of its fellowship support, and, on the other hand, to begin the development of an important new research center at AAS, the Program in the History of the Book in American Culture. The grants for public programs have enabled AAS to mount a modest but imaginative series of undertakings to benefit a general rather than scholarly audience. The challenge and special-incentive grants, finally, have been key elements in the Society's fund-raising efforts in recent years.

Taken together, NEH grants have greatly expanded the Society's services to its various clienteles. Moreover, the impressive list of grants that AAS has received from NEH in itself suggests the interdisciplinary nature of the institution; and the momentum of AAS activity, which the NEH has helped to bring about, depends on the continued presence of the NEH. That momentum, in turn, is helping to produce greater interdisciplinary communication, which is surely one of the most important needs in the world of scholarship.

In virtually all instances, the Endowment, through its support of specific projects and more generally through the challenge and special-incentive grants, has permitted the Society to do things that it could not otherwise have done with its own resources alone. At the same time, these grants have enabled the Society to do what it has wished to do: AAS has not applied for NEH grants simply because they are available; rather, AAS has applied for grants when they could advance goals that the Society has set in order to help promote scholarship.

Wherever possible, AAS has tried to formulate grants to complement one another or to build on previous accomplishments. In other words, AAS has worked from its strengths in applying for federal funding. In making grants to the AAS, the NEH has recognized that the AAS has been faithful to its own character and mission.

Another way of looking at the impact of NEH grants on AAS is to look at their effect on staff development. In the dozen years that the Society has been administering NEH grants, some forty individuals have been employed by AAS with salaries paid all or in part by federal funds. At present, approximately twelve of fifty-one AAS staff employees are funded entirely or in part by NEH grants. These grants have been a major factor in recruiting enthusiastic, talented, and energetic professionals for the AAS staff.

Members of the AAS staff have not only successfully completed the specific projects which the NEH has funded, but they have contributed to the development of new procedures. In addition, AAS staff members have been called upon to advise other institutions which are developing similar programs, and those staff members who have left AAS for other positions have carried with them, and contributed to, an expanding nation-wide expertise.

AAS has been quite successful in keeping many of these people on the staff after completion of a grant—either through their moving to another grant-funded project or through their employment on salaries derived from general operating funds. Some of these individuals have moved well up through the ranks. For example, the current assistant librarian, head of cataloguing services, and keeper of manuscripts were all employed early in their AAS careers under NEH grants. These individuals have proved valuable to the Society beyond the specific duties they have performed. The former curator of manuscripts (now at the New York Public Library), who originally came to AAS under its first NEH grant, was, for example, an asset to the Society for much more than simply his direction of that manuscript cataloguing project. As a scholar in his own right, and as an individual with a broad range of interests and contacts, he was sensitive to many issues in the humanities and effectively contributed to the Society's seminars, to the development of its education programs, and to discussions among staff members and with visiting scholars.

AAS staff members over the years have developed very good working relationships with staff members at NEH. Almost without exception, the NEH staff has been extremely helpful, sympathetic, cooperative, and remarkably free from bureaucratic mentalities. Working with those staff members has enabled AAS to have an influence on the development of various policies nationally through its suggestions concerning the defi-

dition and implementation of national standards for processing collections and for recording and making bibliographical data accessible to other libraries and to individual readers. In addition, AAS has been able to learn firsthand and early about other developments that affect the Society's interests.

AAS has also participated in and encouraged developments at the forefront of advances in bibliographical expertise through the encouragement of the use of computer technology; by facilitating the sharing of resources and insistence on national professional standards; and by encouraging other institutions to follow AAS's pioneering work under NEH grants. AAS, as well as other libraries, has benefited from an element of coordination from the NEH's staff, which has emphasized the importance of uniform and highly professional bibliographical standards for the activities of its multiple constituencies.

In all of the NEH's grants, the Society's ability to do what it does best has been greatly enhanced—to create bibliographical tools for an international community of scholars who study American history, literature, and culture; to prepare finding aids to make the AAS's uniquely rich collections accessible; and to provide opportunities for scholars to use AAS resources in their expansion of knowledge about early America. While these activities lack both glamour and visibility in the eyes of the public, they have a long-term, cumulative influence on the preservation, dissemination, and scholarly study of the printed record which forms the basis for understanding our nation's past.

## THE NEH AND AMERICAN SCHOLARSHIP

In 1984 the rationale for the important place of the humanities in American life and for a federal role in fostering excellence in the humanities remains as persuasive and urgent as in 1964, when the American Council of Learned Societies, the Council of Graduate Schools in the United States, and the United Chapters of Phi Beta Kappa co-sponsored the Commission on the Humanities. The eloquence of the *Report of the Commission on the Humanities*, which led to the establishment of the National Endowment for the Humanities, need not be echoed in this report.

In assessing the future directions which the NEH might take, it is important to emphasize both the strengths of the NEH and areas where change might be encouraged. The NEH has been notably successful in the range and quality of the programs which it has supported; in the diversity of the constituencies which it has served; in its efforts to encourage, without dictating, the highest standards of excellence; in the quality, professionalism, and effectiveness of its staff; and in its inde-



pendence in formulating and administering highly successful programs that have benefited an enormous variety of individuals and institutions.

From the perspective of the American Antiquarian Society, the NEH has succeeded in encouraging and assisting the important work which lies at the heart of every great research library: to arrange and make available for use the raw materials of scholarship; to create tools for scholarly research; and to encourage and support scholarship based on those materials and tools. The NEH has been receptive to the needs of independent research libraries at a time when it was not always easy for such institutions, without university connections and disciplinary bases, to obtain a hearing for their needs.

In looking to the future, we would encourage the following:

- (1) That the NEH continue and expand its support for the development of programs with an interdisciplinary and inter-institutional emphasis. In this, the NEH can support both traditional and innovative approaches to curatorship and scholarship, seeking and fostering approaches which promise to be exemplary and therefore useful to institutions beyond the recipients of particular grants. In an era of expanding technological resources such as computer data bases, which are expensive and increasingly indispensable, it is important also to emphasize inter-institutional collaboration. Collaboration such as in NAIP can avoid unnecessary duplication and expense and also take advantage of the resources of more than a single institution.
- (2) That the NEH, through its General Programs grant category (and possibly through special chairman's grants), be more receptive to grant proposals which lack a single categorical emphasis but rather seek to combine elements from different program categories into large projects. While there has been a willingness to transcend divisional lines, because of its divisional structure the NEH has not always been as receptive to multi-faceted proposals as it might be.
- (3) That the NEH continually review its policies with respect to gifts and matching grants. Requirements for matching grants have imposed a special burden on independent libraries, as the number of potential donors to independent research libraries is very small, and requirements to raise matching funds are time-consuming, double the work for a library's small development staff, and dry up funding for other, equally necessary elements of the library's life—*e.g.*, endowment or annual fund campaigns. In the case of massive projects requiring multi-year or multi-grant funding, requirements for gifts or matching funds can dry up sources of funding for subsequent years of a project.

AMERICAN ANTIQUARIAN SOCIETY

(4) That the Congress of the United States consider larger, rather than smaller appropriations for NEH. Far from encouraging support of marginal projects, larger budgets for the NEH would serve to provide adequate funding for worthwhile proposals and would give much-needed support to the humanities in an era in which the professions, science, and technology are dominant.

# AMERICAN ASSOCIATION FOR THE ADVANCEMENT OF SLAVIC STUDIES

---

President: Alexander Dallin, Stanford University  
Delegate to the ACLS: Abbott Gleason, Brown University  
ACLS Conference of Secretaries: Dorothy Atkinson, Stanford  
University, Executive Director

---

## COMMITTEE

Abbott Gleason, Chair  
Dorothy Atkinson  
David Bethea, University of Wisconsin  
Ralph Fisher, University of Illinois  
Daniel Matuszewski, International Research and Exchanges  
Board  
Dean Worth, University of California, Los Angeles

## NEEDS OF THE HUMANITIES IN THE SLAVIC FIELD

*The Report of the Commission on the Humanities*, which recommended in 1964 the creation of what became the National Endowment for the Humanities, presented the humanities in the United States as somewhat beleaguered. American practicality, scientism and present-mindedness were frequently evoked. The times, too, seemed inimical to the humanities: the scientific and military competition with the Soviet Union, the end of the colonial era and the proliferation of new states and nationalisms, and the rapidity of developments in many sciences seemed to make the American romance with pure and especially applied science both more necessary and more all-encompassing than ever. The humanities, or at least many humanistic areas, seemed fussy and antiquarian or in some cases reduced to a decorative and graceful position of secondary importance.

American attitudes change more slowly than we are accustomed to admit, and the world of 1964, although different in important ways, has by no means changed out of all recognition. Perhaps that is why much of the lamentation and exhortation from that earlier report seems perfectly

up-to-date, as if it had been written yesterday instead of twenty years ago.

In one important respect, however, the situation of the humanities *has* changed—at least the position of the humanities in the United States. The National Endowment for the Humanities has been in business now for close to two decades. It has been of very substantial assistance to humanists in the Slavic field, and no report of this kind ought to neglect to express our heartfelt thanks at the outset before proceeding to make some suggestions for the future, trying to blend statesmanship and self-interest into a plausible package.

Virtually every American scholar in a Slavic field must be aware of the absolutely vital assistance which the Endowment has rendered with respect to support for individual research and scholarship, including funding for translations, an extremely significant aspect of our efforts to make non-specialists aware of the cultural treasures of Russia and Eastern Europe. A somewhat more specialized group knows how much the Endowment has done to support our libraries and to fund conferences and workshops on Slavic themes of all kinds. Perhaps equally important has been the Endowment's sustained and unwavering support for the International Research and Exchanges Board (IREX). No history of our field(s) over the last twenty years can fail to put regular exchanges with the Soviet Union at the heart of the story, and IREX has had a deeply affirmative effect not only on the quality of our scholarly effort, but on our more general knowledge of how the Soviet system works. Changing political attitudes have sometimes caused supporters of the exchanges great anxiety, making the Endowment's constancy all the important and welcome. For all these things and more, scholars in this area are greatly indebted to NEH.

Perhaps a deep student of public funding for the humanities in the United States would conclude that such funding has always been dogged by political issues, but we in the Slavic field are at least especially aware of the fact. A broad interest in Russia and the Slavic world generally was in part *created* by the political issues that emerged at the end of the Second World War. The field has alternated since then between feast and famine, in a way which has disconcerted both supporters and critics, if not always in the same ways. We seem now to be entering into another period of feast, but as always, there is some danger that only the most politically and even policy-relevant work will be generously supported. We know that the Endowment will continue to support deeper—and to many of us more important—cultural studies, as it has in the past. Our entire committee expressed strong support for the Endowment's grant-giving policies, but there was some feeling that the Endowment ought to consider raising the grant ceiling of \$25,000, a

rather low figure particularly for our most senior scholars. The new summer travel grants were welcomed by the committee as well, but here too several members felt that a ceiling of \$500 was too low.

In terms of new ideas and suggestions for additional activity, the possibilities turned up by our committee can be conveniently divided into four categories: (a) student support; (b) outreach and new methods of dissemination; (c) support for faculty teaching and research; and (d) support for the important task of integrating talented émigrés into the American academic community.

As far as graduate students are concerned, several committee members suggested that more graduate and post-doctoral fellowships are needed for students in the humanities. If Kremlinological and policy-relevant disciplines are able to support graduate study much more lavishly than language and literature departments, a critical imbalance could gradually develop. An interesting—and to our way of thinking ominous—tendency perceptible among most language departments at a university is for students now to be flocking to language courses, but not to continue in literature, which many students seem to find esoteric and impractical. Perhaps the Endowment should keep an eye on this tendency. In addition, further support is needed for the graduate training of specialists on the history, culture and language of the minority nationalities of the Soviet Union especially the Central Asian ones. Our expertise is very limited in this area, and the relationship of these minorities to the dominant Russians is of growing importance to the United States.

As far as outreach is concerned, members of our committee had a number of useful suggestions. Several stressed the necessity of providing more interesting and diverse material for secondary schools: better and more vivid treatment of Slavic history and culture in the form of texts, as well as films and cassettes. Support was also expressed for trying to encourage the study of Russian in secondary schools, but another member of the committee cautioned that in his experience it was quite easy to generate support for this during periods when we are especially “conscious” of the Soviet Union, but keeping Russian language going during more humdrum periods has not been easy in the past. Particularly (but not exclusively) in connection with outreach to the schools, one member of the committee suggested the creation of what he dubbed National Language and Area Centers, patterned on the Department of Education centers and perhaps linked with them.

Several committee members felt that the Endowment ought to work actively to promote more and better media coverage of the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe. Perhaps in the near future we can expect more public affairs programming on military and political issues, but we are

less likely to get historical and cultural programs unless organizations like NEH are willing to encourage it and fund it. One member of the committee suggested that this kind of programming could be made available to schools and colleges via computer. Since such a program seems technically feasible, it should surely be studied. Perhaps local media could also be encouraged to use more nearby academic talent in the exposition and discussion of cultural questions. Another member of the committee suggested that state humanities commissions be encouraged to sponsor—in addition to purely local projects—some public discussion, through lectures, panels or workshops, of Soviet or East European cultural topics. Several members of the committee stressed how desirable it is that public libraries acquire new kinds of materials—videotapes and cassettes—as well as more alluring books dealing with the Soviet and East European field. Finally, there is a clear need for more high-quality popular publications in the Soviet field; the Endowment could surely help stimulate their appearance.

Turning to support for scholarly research and teaching, several members of the committee who have been intimately associated with the development and maintenance of major libraries suggested that additional help is needed in this area. Substantially more funding for selected regional library centers is clearly desirable, both for new acquisitions and to microfilm the thousands of historically significant items currently mouldering inexorably away. Another interesting suggestion was for the creation of regional faculty exchange networks. Such a device would enable faculty members at smaller or more beleaguered institutions to invite major scholars from regional universities to give a seminar or even a lecture course at their institution.

The program of summer seminars which the Endowment has run over the last decade or so has clearly been a success, judging not only by the praise which they have received from members of the committee and their consultants, but also by some of the spinoff suggestions which have been made. Several people suggested that summer workshops on “critical issues” in the humanities deserve encouragement and support. These would presumably be larger and more diffuse than the current summer seminars, and not under the supervision of a single individual. It was also suggested that advanced graduate students and young faculty (and perhaps not-so-young faculty as well) would profit from a summer language institute, where they could study not merely the Russian language, as is possible in a number of first-rate summer programs, but do so in courses where they could work substantively on Russian literature, architecture, music or history at the same time. New forms of summer study is clearly a topic of interest to scholars and students in the Slavic field.

Our final area is an extremely complex one in which our humanists face a problem really unique to our area. As a result of the emigration from the U.S.S.R. in the course of the 1970s, the United States has a large number of new citizens, some with major academic talents, from the Soviet Union. Unfortunately, this emigration took place just as the glut on the academic market in the United States was entering its worst phase. One result was that the already difficult business of integrating the academically oriented portion of this population into our educational structure was made even more difficult. Even in cases where jobs existed for which émigré humanists from the Soviet Union were amply qualified in some ways, their command of English and their understanding of their new milieu was sometimes so deficient that they could not be hired. We recognize that the magnitude of this problem is daunting to any coalition of individuals and organizations, but it might be possible for the Endowment to make available selected fellowships which would bring such people into a university (or college, or school) setting for several years, as they learned its functioning from within and how to command its language. Even a modest number of such retraining fellowships could do enormous good in individual cases and perhaps raise the morale in the émigré community here, which is lower than is commonly realized.

We hope that the level of specificity in this report is not disconcertingly great. Our tendency is to understand our needs concretely, but out of our laundry lists we must abstract coherent categories. Perhaps the ones in this report—student and training needs; scholarly needs; problems in outreach and dissemination; and the desirability of helping the talented but confused and demoralized community of émigré humanists—will help.

# AMERICAN DIALECT SOCIETY

---

President: Thomas L. Clark, University of Nevada, Las Vegas  
Delegate to the ACLS: John Algeo, University of Georgia  
ACLS Conference of Secretaries: Allan Metcalf, MacMurray  
College, Executive Secretary

---

## COMMITTEE

John Algéo  
Frederic G. Cassidy, University of Wisconsin, Madison  
Thomas L. Clark  
Jurgen Eichhoff, University of Wisconsin, Madison  
Kelsie B. Harder, State University of New York College at  
Potsdam  
William A. Kretzschmar, Jr., University of Wisconsin,  
Whitewater  
Raven I. McDavid, Jr., University of Chicago  
I. Willis Russell, University of Alabama

## I. HISTORICAL PERSPECTIVE

The first axiom of language study is that living languages change. Tracing the changes and sharing information about them with other scholars, teachers, and the general public has long been a major function of the American Dialect Society. The Society, continuing its role as one of the oldest learned societies in the Americas, also continues the tradition of reporting at regular intervals on the state of language study in North America.

The following remarks are based on the third twenty-year report on needed research in American English made to the Society's members in 1983, earlier reports having been made in 1943 and 1963. During the past forty years, members of the Society have devoted their scholarship chiefly to linguistic geography (including social dialectology), regional speech and localisms, usage, new words, proverbs, and non-English dialects. Primary concerns with place names and lexicography have been assumed by newer learned societies such as the American Name Society (whose principal research project is the Place Name Survey of



the United States and Canada) and the Dictionary Society of North America. In keeping with developments in technology and changes in language and society, a new category was included in the 1983 report: computer concerns. In the 1963 report, computers were mentioned briefly as “potentially valuable for sorting and storing materials.” But computers have become important in language study and their uses will continue to grow. Already computers have redirected our study of lexicon and syntax, and they promise to reshape many of the ways we keep track of language change. The other subjects of concern have also shifted focus considerably over the years.

The Society has a responsibility to continue investigating language change, but a parallel responsibility requires us to share the findings with educators and the general public. Publications of the Society make the results of investigations known to the scholarly community, especially through its journal, *American Speech*, and its monograph series, *Publication of the American Dialect Society*.

To fulfill the responsibility of communicating with educators and the public, members of the Society need to continue their individual and collective connections with such organizations as the Modern Language Association of America, the National Council of Teachers of English, the Linguistic Society of America, the Center for Applied Linguistics, the American Name Society, the Dictionary Society of North America, and university and commercial publishers. Joint meetings with other scholarly organizations have been fruitful for inter- and intra-disciplinary cooperation. It would be useful to inaugurate ties with such other organizations as the American Folklore Society, the Organization of American Historians, the Popular Culture Association, and the American Antiquarian Society.

At the same time, the Society has an important responsibility to translate the sometimes arcane findings of research into material usable by teachers and news reporters and understandable by Americans generally.

## II. NEEDED RESEARCH

### a. *Linguistic Geography*

The Linguistic Atlas of the United States and Canada, originally sponsored by the American Council of Learned Societies, is a series of autonomous regional projects. Two of these have been completed: the *Linguistic Atlas of New England* (1939–43) and *The Linguistic Atlas of the Upper Midwest* (1973–76). Work is at various stages on a number of other projects.

The *Linguistic Atlas of the Gulf States* is proceeding smoothly with major financial support from the National Endowment for the Humanities, but requires continued support for its completion. Two older projects require attention, the *Linguistic Atlas of the Middle and South Atlantic States* and the *Linguistic Atlas of the North Central States*. The most pressing needs for the former are to find a permanent editorial site, to complete the overdue Handbook, and to prepare the data for publication in a form conveniently usable by scholars; the need for the latter is to continue the activities currently under way to prepare manuscripts for publication. Both of these projects have also benefitted from the Endowment and need continued support. Other projects are smaller in scope or less advanced and therefore are less pressing, but will require attention eventually.

The most pressing overall needs are (1) to preserve and make available for easy consultation information that has been collected over the past forty years and (2) to improve cooperation between scholars working in different regions and between linguistic geographers and sociolinguists.

### b. *Regional Speech and Localisms*

Regional speech and localisms as an area of research would seem to overlap the preceding; in practice, however, whereas the former is concerned with the Linguistic Atlas projects, this area is devoted to the production of a dialect dictionary, which has been the principal aim of the American Dialect Society since the early years of its existence. The publication of that dictionary is at last within sight and will bring to scholars and to the American people the fullest record we have ever had, or are likely to have for some time in the future, of the diversity in the speechways of our fellow citizens.

The *Dictionary of American Regional English* is now being edited at the University of Wisconsin, Madison, for publication by the Belknap Press of Harvard University. Active work on the dictionary, generously supported by agencies like the National Endowment for the Humanities, has been in progress for nearly twenty years and is currently expected to result in a five-volume dictionary, whose first volume is in production.

The highest priority in needed research for the American Dialect Society is the completion of its dictionary, *DARE*, preferably by the centennial of the Society in 1989. If that completion is to be realized, the editorial work on the dictionary must have continued support—private and public from the Endowment. Thereafter, the collections on which the dictionary is based should be archived and catalogued for future

scholarly use, since the dictionary will by no means have exhausted them.

### c. *Usage*

At the present time, there is a lack of concerted and coordinated usage study within the American Dialect Society, although steps to organize such study have recently been taken by the Usage Committee. The principal needs for usage study envisioned by members of the Society are the following:

1. Communication of the rationale and results of usage study to teachers and the public by such means as an annual study of a controversial item of usage and a "usage watch" to monitor the mass media and respond to inaccurate or irresponsible statements and to publicize reliable information on matters of current interest.

2. Establishment of a Survey of American English Usage with components such as the following: (a) a central file for usage data, especially such data as cannot easily be searched for by computer programs; (b) a corpus of texts (written and spoken) as a basis for analysis and statistical studies; (c) a series of elicitation experiments to generate data for usage questions for which a corpus of limited size cannot supply enough examples; (d) a series of acceptability measurements to assess attitudes towards disputed usage.

3. Studies of the characteristics that distinguish various kinds of language (e.g., speech versus writing, consultative versus informal styles, narration versus conversation, male versus female speechways, child versus adult language, native English versus English as a second language).

4. A study of variable items, with attention to (a) their actual current use, (b) their acceptability as evidenced by reactions to them, and (c) their earlier history and use.

5. The systematic utilization of existent data sources, such as the Brown corpus and the files of *DARE* and the Linguistic Atlases, for evidence on usage questions.

6. An annotated and critical bibliography of usage study, directed toward students.

7. An annual bibliography on usage, including scholarly studies, popular treatments, and a report of usage research in progress and needed.

### d. *New Words*

Research into neologisms and neosemanticisms within the American Dialect Society is carried on chiefly by the New Words Committee and is reported by "Among the New Words" in *American Speech*.

The main needs in neology studies are the following:

1. To apply computer technology more efficiently to the identification of citations for new words.
2. To computerize the existing files of the New Words Committee.
3. To organize a central file of citations, especially drawing from sources not readily available for computer searches.

### *e. Proverbs and Proverbial Sayings*

Margaret M. Bryant's collection of proverbs is now being categorized and computerized. The main needs in this area are the following:

1. The establishment of a center for proverb research, with a central collection of materials and a director of research and publication.
2. The preparation of a dictionary of American proverbs, on historical principles.
3. Studies of the proverbial lore of ethnic minorities and regional communities in the United States and Canada.
4. Field research on the survival and creation of proverbs in both rural and urban societies.
5. Studies of proverbs with regard to their genres (e.g., the Wellerism), media (e.g., bumper-stickers or T-shirt inscriptions), sources (e.g., political speeches or comic books), and uses (e.g., psychological testing).

### *f. Non-English Dialects*

Because of the influence of languages other than English on American speechways and because of the political and educational prominence of bilingualism today, the study of non-English dialects has a special importance and topicality. Yet that study is at present not being pursued with full vigor. Desiderata are the following:

1. To clarify and standardize the metalanguage used in discussing non-English dialects, including clarification of the concept 'non-English dialect' itself.
2. To clarify the relationship between linguistic geography and sociolinguistics with respect to non-English dialects.
3. To study non-English dialects as a laboratory for competing linguistic systems with their social implications, for example, to discover the extent to which national, social, and religious values are protected by the use of a non-English dialect.
4. To produce a comprehensive description and history of each of the non-English immigrant languages on this continent.
5. To preserve information about the immigrant languages that are on

the brink of extinction in the United States and to record the process of "gerontification" in those languages that are becoming extinct.

### *g. Computer Needs*

Computer technology has burst upon the world of dialect study comparatively recently but with a vigor no one could have predicted. Our greatest current needs are to understand just how deeply our methods and expectations have been and will be altered by the computer, and to manage carefully the transition between our former successes and our new possibilities.

We need to encourage the development of hardware features that will allow us to take best advantage of each sort of equipment. General desiderata include communication and greater flexibility for data entry and representation. We need easy means of transporting information from one machine to another, whether from portable to personal to mainframe computers, or from one manufacturer's unit to another's.

Dialect research requires unusual flexibility in symbols to be entered, to represent information in various typestyles and especially to encode data in phonetic characters. There is a pressing need for the development of computer techniques for handling finely graded phonetics to make possible more rapid production of publishable copy for linguistic atlases. We should also take an interest in the efforts of international standards committees to make sure that our concerns receive due representation; and until the industry accepts general standards, we should attempt to cooperate among ourselves to make our data and programs as transportable as possible.

There is a large and growing collection of computer-readable language data bases of various kinds. It would be of significant importance to language study to make such materials easy of access and responsive to search not only for one-word items but for constructions and collocations. The development of such means of access is complicated by the fact that many of the data bases are proprietary, profit-aimed enterprises.

The Society might itself sponsor or encourage another body such as ERIC to create a clearinghouse for the software its members develop for their projects. Grant-funding is needed for the creation of generic programs for entering and analyzing checklist or worksheet data, for encoding and analyzing sentences from free speech samples for syntactic research, and for plotting simple maps from a database. The development of general programs for computer-assisted instruction in linguistics also deserves attention.

The Society could include information for computer users in its publi-

cations, including notices of relevant new technical or software developments, and could through a standing committee monitor its members' use of computers to facilitate cooperation and to represent their interests. The Society should also solicit funding for a computer archive of American English data, an archive that would obviate the need to publish large masses of data and would be available via telephone lines to interested scholars.

### III. SUPPORT FOR RESEARCH, TEACHING, AND COMMUNICATION

Three activities relevant to the American Dialect Society are research into the problems of its discipline, teaching the methods and results of that research to students and thereby training new scholars, and communicating the knowledge accumulated to the general public in a suitable form. All three of these activities require support, of which the following are significant kinds:

1. Released faculty time for data gathering and analysis, research-tool preparation (such as linguistic atlases and dictionaries, especially the *Dictionary of American Regional English*), and translating the results of research into a form appropriate for dissemination to the American public.

2. Graduate student support to train future workers in the field and to assist with the research activities of the discipline.

3. Central archives where data can be stored and made accessible to scholars for their continued use.

4. Publication of research tools.

5. Development of computer technology appropriate for studying and communicating about language variation.

The most significant work of the Society, such as the *Dictionary of American Regional English* and the various Linguistic Atlas projects, has been made possible only through the support of the National Endowment for the Humanities. If the significant work of studying, teaching, and communicating to the public about the language of Americans is to continue with the same vigor as heretofore, continued support from the Endowment is indispensable.

# AMERICAN FOLKLORE SOCIETY

---

President: Bruce Jackson, State University of New York, Buffalo  
Delegate to the ACLS: W. Edson Richmond, Indiana University  
ACLS Conference of Secretaries: John Charles Camp, Maryland  
State Arts Council, Secretary-Treasurer

Excerpt from *Folklore/Folklife*, edited by Bruce Jackson, Judith McCulloh, and Marta Weigle, reprinted with the permission of the American Folklore Society

Addendum written by: W. Edson Richmond

The professional and academic discipline of folklore and folklife began in the late eighteenth century with the publication of Bishop Thomas Percy's *Reliques of Ancient English Poetry*. The discipline developed in the nineteenth century, when it was principally influenced by the German Grimm brothers and their research into language, legends, and tales, by Scandinavian scholars of epic and peasant culture, and by the British philologists and anthropologists with their comparative and evolutionary studies. Like their European counterparts, early American folklorists organized local societies for the discussion and publication of folklore and folklife studies. The American Folklore Society (AFS), founded in 1888, continues as the only national professional and scholarly organization of folklorists in this country. It sponsors an annual meeting, issues a quarterly *Journal of American Folklore* and various other publications, and serves as a clearinghouse and forum for a diverse membership.

The 104 individuals who responded to William Wells Newell's 1887 invitation to join an association dedicated to the preservation and study of folklore native to and found in America share with today's professional and amateur folklorists an interest in people and their beliefs, thoughts, artistic creations, celebrations, and daily round of work, play, and talk. Changing technologies—the development of image- and sound-recording equipment—and changing paradigms of research and analysis have refined but not radically altered folklorists' fundamental tasks: to collect, preserve, study, analyze, and present expressive traditions in societies throughout the world.

Nineteenth-century American folklorists worked with a public awareness largely influenced by the popularity of Indian culture reported in works like Henry Rowe Schoolcraft's *Algic Researches* (1839) and George Catlin's *The Manners, Customs, and Conditions of*

*the North American Indians* (1841). Interest grew, too, in slave culture and the Afro-American inheritance as popular periodicals and Joel Chandler Harris's Uncle Remus books presented lore to the general public. The American folklorists also had a scholarly precedent for their society. The Folk-Lore Society founded in Great Britain in 1878 fostered strong ties to American folklore research. Indeed, a president of the Folk-Lore Society, Andrew Lang, noted that the best edition of British ballads was put together by an American, Francis James Child, and the "most interesting" collection of Irish tales was done by another American, Jeremiah Curtin. From the British society, Americans took models for a journal and organization, and a fair share of theoretical approaches.

The American Folk-Lore Society (the hyphen was dropped in the 1930s) was officially established in Cambridge, Massachusetts, in 1888 and held its first annual meeting in Philadelphia in 1889. Among the early members were men of letters (Samuel Clemens, Henry Wadsworth Longfellow, Joel Chandler Harris, and James Russell Lowell), historians (Francis Parkman and John Fiske), comparatist scholars (T. F. Crane, George Lyman Kittredge, and Francis James Child—the Society's first president), and anthropologists (Franz Boas, John Wesley Powell, and James Mooney). Many of the early members had prominent positions in universities and museums: Child was at Harvard, T. F. Crane was acting president of Cornell, Daniel Brinton was at the University of Pennsylvania, Franz Boas was then at Clark University, Frederic Ward Putnam was director of the Peabody Museum, Stewart Culin was director of the University of Pennsylvania Museum, Otis Mason was at the Smithsonian Institution, and J. Owen Dorsey was with the Bureau of American Ethnology. Other members (as now) were congressmen, physicians, lawyers, curators, philanthropists, teachers, and business men and women.

The young society grew rapidly. By 1893, the group claimed five hundred members, exceeding that of any similar organization in Europe. Local associations had been formed in Boston, Louisiana, Missouri, New York, and Chicago.

One of the chief motivations of the Society's founders was to publish its members' theories and collections. The first issue of the *Journal of American Folklore* appeared in April, 1888. (In 1988 the American Folklore society plans to publish a 100-year analytical index to this quarterly publication.) Along with evolutionism and the doctrine of survivals were popular theories of the psychic unity of mankind as expressed by important scholars such as Daniel J. Brinton. Eventually, the *Journal* reflected the pre-eminence of diffusionism and Boas's historical anthropology. Boas exerted even more influence on the Society



when he became the *Journal's* editor after 1916. A second trend was the increase in research on European and European-American groups.

They began publishing books in 1894; by 1984 more than one hundred publications of the American Folklore Society had appeared. Earlier volumes tended to be collections of field texts such as Alcée Fortier, *Louisiana Folk-Tales* (1895); Washington Matthews, *Navajo Legends* (1897); Eleanor Hague, *Spanish-American Folk Songs* (1917); and Elsie Clews Parsons, *Folk-Lore of the Sea Islands, South Carolina* (1923). (Parsons underwrote the printing costs for sixteen AFS volumes between 1918 and 1943, as well as much of the field research upon which those studies were based.) Later volumes have included more theoretical and analytical work. Among these interpretive studies are Katherine Spencer, *Mythology and Values: An Analysis of Navajo Chantway Myths* (1957); Bill C. Malone, *Country Music, U.S.A.* (1968); Américo Paredes and Ellen J. Stekert, eds., *The Urban Experience and Folk Tradition* (1971), and David J. Hufford, *The Terror That Comes in the Night: An Experience-Centered Study of Supernatural Assault Traditions* (1982).

Ruth Benedict, one of Boas's students, replaced him as *Journal* editor, and the anthropological emphasis lingered through the 1930s. This domination was broken when literary scholars Stith Thompson, Archer Taylor, and Louise Pound took on important roles as presidents of the Society, thus ushering in a literary approach to folklore studies. But a critical ambivalence remained central to the Society: for years the annual meetings were held alternatively with the American Anthropological Association and the Modern Language Association. Not until the great expansion of folklore studies in American higher education in the 1960s did the Society begin holding its meetings independently of any larger organizations.

The *Journal of American Folklore* now contains scholarly articles, reviews of books, records, and films, and notes and queries. The *Journal* provides a vital portrait of the development and range of folklore studies in America over the past century. The Society's *Newsletter*, a bimonthly that began publication in 1972, informs members of Executive Board activities, matters relating to the Society's annual meetings, recent publications, grant opportunities, pending legislation, employment opportunities, and other issues and events of current interest.

Many of today's American Folklore Society members work in universities, colleges, secondary schools, museums, federal and state government, media organizations, consulting firms, and other organizations. About one-third of the present members do not work in folklore-connected jobs at all. They belong to the Society and take part

in its activities for the same reason as the founding members: simply because the materials and processes of folklore interest them.

The American Folklore Society will celebrate its centennial in 1988 and 1989. The organization is using this occasion to take stock of its functions, to redefine its mission, to examine its past, to reaffirm its continuing relationships with other scholarly organizations and with government agencies here and abroad, and to clarify its relationships with other modern disciplines. The two annual meetings bracketing the centennial year will take place in Boston and Philadelphia, the sites of the Society's organizing and first annual meetings. A wide range of publications, conferences, collaborative projects with government and private cultural agencies, and other activities are being developed by the nine working committees of the Centennial Coordinating Council, established by the Executive Board in 1983.

## FOLKLORE IN EDUCATION

Folklore courses have been taught in American universities at undergraduate and graduate levels since the late nineteenth century. Genre courses, primarily the tale and ballad, were common in literature and anthropology programs. Early folklore Ph.D. dissertations include "Japanese Folk-Lore" (1893, Boston University), "The Folk-Lore of May-Day in France" (1895, Johns Hopkins), "The Sources of Spenser's Classical Mythology" (1896, Yale), "'The Wife of Bath's Tale': A Study of Its Sources and the Tales Related to Them" (1889, Harvard), "Decorative Symbolism of the Arapaho" (1901, Columbia), and "Ballad and Epic: A Study in the Development of the Narrative Art" (1903, Harvard).

The broad range of subjects treated in recent dissertations and theses reflects the widening theoretical base of American folklore studies. These studies have focused on such topics as American foodways, American coal-mining songs on records, modern Cheyenne narrative, black folklore from the Mississippi Delta, narrative rhetorical devices of persuasion within Philadelphia's Greek community, oral poetics and traditions of verbal art in Africa, Navajo children's narratives as symbolic forms in a changing culture, an interpretive history of Texas-Mexican *conjunto* music, quilting and the pattern of relationships in community life, speech play and verbal art of Chicano children, the use and meaning of song within a Scottish family, a critical analysis of the days-of-the-dead celebration in Oaxaca, the cultural-social functions of Danish historical ballads, narrating and narratives about pregnancy and childbirth experience and their relationships to attitudes and health,

Chicano folk medicine from Los Angeles, folk ideology within the Jewish labor movement in the United States, and a survey of Brazilian folk narrative scholarship.

The first American Ph.D. program in folklore was established at Indiana University in 1949. Indiana University and the Memorial University of Newfoundland award B.A., M.A., and Ph.D. degrees in folklore. M.A. and Ph.D. degrees in folklore are awarded by UCLA and the University of Pennsylvania. Four universities have M.A. programs in folklore: New York University, Western Kentucky University, University of North Carolina, and University of California at Berkeley. Several universities' folklore graduate programs award their degrees through other departments. The Folklore Program at George Washington University awards M.A. and Ph.D. degrees through the university's American Studies and Anthropology departments. The Graduate Concentration in Folklore at the University of Texas at Austin awards M.A. and Ph.D. degrees through Anthropology and the Ph.D. through English. Several universities have concentrations in folklore or folklife studies available within other departments or programs. The New York University Department of Art and Art Education, for example, offers a specialization in folk art, the NYU Department of Performance Studies permits concentration in folklore studies, and the English Department of the State University of New York at Buffalo offers as one of its four Ph.D. concentrations a program in folklore, mythology, and film studies.

Many folklore programs incorporate or work closely with archives or museum facilities. The Indiana University Folklore Institute, for example, includes the Archives of Traditional Music (with more than 200,000 sound recordings) and the Folklore Library (with more than 20,000 volumes). The New York University Graduate Program in Folk Art Studies is offered jointly with the Museum of American Folk Art. The University of North Carolina recently acquired the extensive collection of materials of early commercially recorded southern folk and country music developed by the John Edwards Memorial Foundation.

Some of the academic programs—such as those at Indiana University, UCLA, the University of Texas at Austin, and the University of Pennsylvania—try to cover the entire range of folklore methodology, theory, and research. Others specialize or assign primary focus to certain areas of folklore work. The program at George Washington University, for example, emphasizes aspects of traditional material culture.

Folklore courses are now offered on a regular basis in more than 450 North American colleges and universities. Most teaching of folklore in colleges and universities is done by folklorists based in English depart-

ments and, to a lesser degree, by folklorists in anthropology departments. English and anthropology departments frequently offer a basic folklore survey or introductory course. English departments also offer graduate and undergraduate courses in American folklore and in areas of folklore specialization that dovetail with English department concerns, such as folktale, ballad, traditional narrative, and oral poetry. Folklore courses are also included in American studies, ethnic and women's studies, and many other programs.

In 1984 the American Folklore Society and the American Folklife Center began a long-term study of folklore in American colleges and universities. The report will provide information on courses offered at undergraduate and graduate institutions, degree programs, program concentrations, and faculty specializations and training. (The most recent survey of undergraduate programs in folklore is Ronald L. Baker, "The Study of Folklore in American Colleges and Universities," *Journal of American Folklore* 91[1978]: 792-807.)

Since folklore subjects and methods are often important elements in college and secondary courses in literature, history, and sociology, registration in graduate and undergraduate folklore courses tends to be more eclectic than other university disciplines. Schools of business and public administration are beginning to include in curricula either courses or units on organizational stories, corporate culture, and organizational symbolism. There has been a great expansion in recent years of folklore courses taught in schools of education. Knowledge of folklore genres and processes can help teachers better understand the students themselves: games children play, jokes they tell, beliefs they hold, and rumors they entertain are often sensitive indicators of aspects of their thinking that are usually apparent in no other way.

Many high school teachers have found that introducing their students to the collection of local traditions and family folklore has contributed substantially to the students' sense of community and their understanding of their own worlds. A recent experimental project in Oakland, California, uses modern folklore as a way of helping teenagers develop writing skills and learn about the nature of folklore at the same time. The students, many of whom are not fluent writers, use folklore from their own lives as a vehicle for experimenting with three kinds of writing—narration, interviews, and exposition. They begin with folklore from their childhood, then move on to modern urban legends, graffiti, ethnic and family folklore, folk heroines and heroes, and slang and teenage folklore.

The best known and most successful high school program began in 1966 in Rabun Gap, Georgia, when students began working on *Foxfire*, a class newspaper that dealt in large part with family and local traditions.

The first *Foxfire* anthology was a national best-seller in 1972, the eighth volume is in production, and more than five million *Foxfire* books have been sold. Similar projects have been started in Kennebunkport, Maine; Lebanon, Missouri; Bell Gardens, California; and other cities.

## FOLKLORE AND ORGANIZATIONAL LIFE

Some of the notable collections in the twentieth century have been of occupational folklore, especially the lore of miners, loggers, and the oil industry. Recent years have witnessed the growth of a field focusing on the study of organizational symbolism and corporate culture. In 1983, for example, the Center for the Study of Comparative Folklore and Mythology and the Behavioral and Organizational Science Group at UCLA jointly sponsored a conference on organizational folklore. In 1984, the Faculty of Commerce and Business Administration at the University of British Columbia directed a major symposium on organizational culture and life in the workplace; members of the American Studies Department and the Work-Learn Center at the University of California at Davis organized a conference on corporate culture; and the European Group on Organizational Symbols held an international conference on organizational symbolism at the University of Lund in Sweden. Participants in those conferences were folklorists, management theorists, and business leaders.

The stories that people tell, the ways they decorate their work space, ceremonies in which they take part, and ritualistic interaction provide data essential to understanding human concerns and the culture of an organization. Forms of expressive behavior and aspects of organizational culture may play an important role in clarifying and communicating organizational philosophy and objectives, enhancing managerial styles and methods, and improving life in the workplace. In years past, corporations occasionally employed folklorists to help prepare corporate oral histories; folklorists now are more likely to help corporate executives understand the dynamics of the institutions they direct.

## FIELDWORK

For anthropologists, the term "fieldwork" usually denotes a long stay in a culture very much different from the scholar's own. Folklorists can do fieldwork anywhere; the stay might be long or short, the work done all at once or in the course of many repeated visits. For folklorists, the term "fieldwork" refers more to a process of recording data than to where the information is collected. Folklorists might travel halfway

around the world to do research, or they might walk halfway down the block to do it.

Folklore and literary studies differ in this important regard: while the primary documents of literary study are fixed and absolute, the primary documents of folklore study are constantly changing in form, style, and function. A scholar studying Shakespeare or Melville begins with the plays of Shakespeare or the fiction and poetry of Melville; other materials may be important, but they are always secondary. The folklorist studying a folk tradition, a genre, or a community begins with the folklore in its real context. Since only a small fraction of the world's music and narrative is written down, folklorists—along with their colleagues in such fields as anthropology and ethnomusicology—provide our primary access to and often the only documentation of an extraordinary range of important cultural information.

For such reasons, most folklorists do fieldwork. They develop an interest in certain kinds of materials, genres, texts, or communities; they go out and observe performances, and they collect information. They may collect with pen and notebook, or they may use tape recorders or sophisticated video and film equipment. Modern folklorists tend to be more aware than their forebears how greatly their own styles and abilities and concerns influence what is collected; most are sensitive to the need for detailed documentation that explains their findings. Recording songs or stories or filming celebrations or rituals is not enough; the folklorist must also describe the way the recordings were made, explain why they were made, provide information about what was left out, and detail the nature of the relationships between the collector and the source of the information. Only with such supplementary data can later collectors make extensive use of the materials gathered.

Before the 1950s, most folklore fieldwork consisted of the pursuit of items: songs, stories, proverbs, cures, techniques. The idea was that the material to be studied and understood was in the items themselves. In recent years many folklorists see items as just part of the subject; they focus more on the event in which items occur and see the texts or techniques as elements in a complex range of behaviors and interactions requiring documentation and understanding. The modern folklorist, then, needs the traditional skills not only of the literary or fine arts scholar, but also of the social scientist examining communities in action, and knowledge of the wide range of technical devices specially suited to acquiring the kind of information appropriate to folkloric studies.

The results of folklorists' fieldwork take many forms. The bulk of materials may be deposited in archives and museums for the use of other folklorists and for historians, sociologists, and other scholars. Recorded materials might be issued as documentary phonograph re-

cordings or edited for radio broadcast. Photographs might be edited for books or used in exhibitions. Film and video materials might be edited for classroom use or for general broadcast and exhibition. Some fieldwork appears in the form of reports and workshops for organizations. Most commonly, fieldwork is presented in print—as articles in journals or in books.

## ARCHIVES

Archives preserve folk traditions and skills and make them available for study and appreciation. Their contents reflect the interests of the individuals and institutions that have built and maintained them. Some focus on a genre (music, beliefs), on ethnicity (Native Americans, Lithuanians), on religion (Mormons, Shakers), on geography (Detroit, the Northeast), on work (fishing, farming), or on artifacts (pottery, carvings). A few organizations, such as the Archive of Folk Culture at the Library of Congress, recognize a wider obligation to the rich variety of traditions in the nation as a whole.

The kinds of documentation in archives vary with their focus. Collections may consist of hand- or typewritten notes, sound recordings, photographs, videotapes, correspondence, clippings, publications, and actual samples of material culture like quilts and duck decoys. Since such holdings are often unique and fragile, the archivist sees that they are kept secure, free from deterioration or abuse. Cylinder and tape recordings, for instance, are stored under strict temperate and humidity control, and working copies are made available to scholars and the general public. Paper and photographs are kept in acid-free files, while slides are protected in special plastic sleeves. Delicate weaving and embroidery are kept unfolded, away from bright sunlight, plastic, and dust.

Since archives are useful only when their contents are accessible, archivists develop efficient ways for storing items and information and maintain finding aids (sometimes elaborate) for locating what is needed. Generally, similar items are kept together by type, size, or shape. Three-by-five index cards, printed catalogs with cross-listings, or electronic retrieval systems can point the way to all holdings from North Dakota or from Cambodian refugees, for instance, everything collected by Vance Randolph, all variants of “Casey Jones” or the vanishing hitchhiker story. *The Folklore and Folk Music Archivist*, published by the Archives of Traditional Music at Indiana University (10 vols., 1958–68), presents detailed descriptions of indexing and cataloguing systems used in archives around the world, as well as information about

collecting and documenting folk music. The Archiving Section of AFS discusses solutions to storage and classification problems, computerization and other technological advances, ethical issues in granting or restricting use of materials on deposit, and similar questions.

Professional folklore archiving began in earnest in the United States with the establishment of the Archive of Folk Culture (originally the Archive of American Folk-Song) at the Library of Congress in 1928. The Archive was conceived as a project to gather and preserve examples of folksongs in the United States. With the much-heralded WPA documentation projects of the 1930s and increasing professionalism among folklorists, the numbers and quality of field recordings grew, as did attention to ethnic, occupational, and regional customs, lore, and spoken-word traditions. In the 1940s the Archive launched a series of documentary recorded albums, which has continued to the present day and has encouraged the production of documentary recordings in the private sector. The Archive recently estimated that its holdings contain more than 225,000 sheets of manuscript materials and 30,000 cylinder, disc, wire spool, and tape recordings preserving more than 300,000 items of folksong, folk music, folktales, oral histories, and related materials. In addition, current field-documentation projects of the American Folklife Center become part of the Archive for preservation and public access.

Many archives with large folklore collections also include historical materials of various kinds. The Archive of American Minority Cultures, for example, established at the University of Alabama in Tuscaloosa in 1979, documents southern black history and culture (including the Civil Rights Movement, urban history, and labor history); southern women's literature, oral history, and political activism; folk religion; folk medicine and herbal remedies; midwifery; traditional arts, crafts, and architecture of the Deep South; and traditional music, with an emphasis on black religious music. The Archive's holdings include videotapes, audiotapes, phonograph records, slides, photographs, personal documents, manuscripts, curriculum guides, unpublished theses and dissertations, bibliographies, and print materials such as newsletters and serial publications. The Archive actively promotes public outreach by means of documentary radio programs, record albums, photographic exhibits, and publications.

There are about 180 other folklore and ethnomusicology archives and related collections in the United States. While a few of the regional archives are housed in public libraries, museums, historical societies, and the offices of state folklore and folklife programs, most are based at colleges and universities and have frequently resulted from state and community fieldwork projects undertaken by folklorists on the faculty



and their students. Local archives, attuned to the regional, occupational, and ethnic traditions of the citizens they serve and study, often engage in educational programming, such as folk festivals, field projects, radio programs, and workshops. They share their resources with the public and encourage use and further contributions, thus becoming advocates for the preservation of a community or region's cultural heritage.

Archives form a natural, necessary complement to serious collecting and scholarship. They are as essential to professional folklorists as libraries are to literary scholars or as manuscript collections are to historians. The depositing of a sensitive, well-organized, and well-documented collection—whether by a team of folklorists who organized a complex, government-funded survey of traditions in the Blue Ridge, or by a school-teacher who noted playground games and jump-rope rhymes, or by a cowboy who cared enough to write down the songs that meant something to him and his buddies—is itself an invaluable contribution to scholarship.

## MATERIAL CULTURE AND FOLKLORE IN MUSEUMS

Specialists in material culture study have long sought to identify and understand America's folk-built past. In recent years they have begun to record the observable behaviors of workers making things, persons receiving folk objects, and participants in events making use of objects. Folklorists try to understand how symbols are created and changed, how objects function for people, and how designs are conceived and executed. Since objects and actions commonly "speak" louder than words, folklorists look at material culture as communication and learning.

Folklorists working in or with museums collect, preserve, document, and interpret all kinds of material culture. Architecture, arts, crafts, foodways, and clothing, for example, reflect the work, play, customs, beliefs, celebrations, and rituals of any people. Such artifacts are central to folklife exhibitions and interpretive programs, whether set in large or small anthropological, art, historical, occupational, religious, ethnic, or local museums.

The first American museum for history, ethnology, and folklife opened in 1851 at Newburgh, New York, in a stone farmhouse that had once been George Washington's headquarters. Nineteenth-century anthropological investigators of Native American cultures deposited their field notes and collections in what today are important research museums for folklorists and other social scientists and humanists: the Smithsonian Institution, the Museum of Natural History (New York

City), the Field Museum (Chicago), Harvard's Peabody Museum, and Berkeley's Lowie Museum.

Early members of the American Folklore Society such as Otis Mason and Stewart Culin argued for the study and preservation of material folk culture in Society-sponsored programs. The director of the University of Pennsylvania Museum, Culin was also Curator of the American Folklore Society and organized exhibits of material folk culture for the Madrid World Exposition in 1892, the World's Columbian Exposition in Chicago in 1893, and the Atlanta Cotton States Exposition in 1895.

The Antiquities Act of 1906 and the establishment of the National Park Service in 1916 gave further impetus to museums and to folklorists interested in folklife and material culture. However, many major art and history museums and the open-air restoration complexes like Henry Ford's Greenfield Village (Michigan), John D. Rockefeller's Colonial Williamsburg (Virginia), the Wells family's Old Sturbridge Village (Massachusetts), and Eli Lilly's Conner Prairie Pioneer Settlement (Indiana) devote more attention to elite and middle-class culture than to folklife. Folklorists did not take major roles in museum planning, acquisitions, and activities until the 1960s, when material culture and sometimes museology courses were regularly offered in folklore training centers at the University of Pennsylvania, Indiana University, the New York State Historical Museum at Cooperstown, and elsewhere.

Since the 1960s, increased state and federal assistance (primarily from the Institute for Museum Services, the National Museums Act, the National Endowments for the Arts and Humanities, and the Office of Archeology and Historic Preservation) has spurred museum development. Of particular interest to folklorists has been the "living historical farms" movement, which began in the 1950s with the Lippert Farm at Cooperstown and the Freeman Farm at Old Sturbridge Village. Folklorists have been actively involved there and in similar facilities such as the Iowa Living History Farms (near Des Moines), the Jensen Museum of Man and Daily Bread (Logan, Utah), and Kipahula Living Farm (Hawaii). They have also conducted field and ethnohistorical investigations to provide strong interpretive contexts for ongoing exhibits, collections, and research resources at museums like the San Francisco Maritime Museum, the Lumberman's Museum (Patten, Maine), the Iron Range Interpretive Center (Chisholm, Minnesota), Historic New Harmony (Indiana), the Norwegian-American Museum (Decorah, Iowa), the Tucson (Arizona) Barrio Viejo district, and Chicago's Polish Museum of America.

The Museum of American Folk Art (New York City), the Museum of International Folk Art (Santa Fe), the Museum of Folk Art and Contemporary Crafts and the Museum of Folk Art (San Francisco) are exclu-

sively concerned with folk artists, their creative products, and their milieus. The Mingei International Museum of World Folk Art started with the San Diego Museum of Art and in 1979 acquired space in a major regional shopping center. It has since mounted some twenty major exhibitions and published several annotated catalogues.

Museums have also hired folklorists to assemble and interpret temporary and traveling shows like the retrospective of Afro-American material culture at the Cleveland Museum of Art; the Colonial Long Island gravestones exhibit at the Stony Brook Ethnographic Museum (State University of New York, Stony Brook); "Fiestas of San Juan Nuevo: Ceremonial Art from Michoacán, Mexico," at the Maxwell Museum of Anthropology (University of New Mexico, Albuquerque); "Pascola: Ceremonial Complex in Arizona and Sonora," at the Heard Museum (Phoenix); and "Festas Açoreanas: Portuguese Religious Celebrations in California and the Azores," at the Oakland Museum. The 1984 Olympic Committee sponsored an exhibition of Mexican and Mexican-American folk traditions for the Plaza de la Raza, Los Angeles. Catalogues, lectures, slides, demonstrations by folk artists, and other interpretive features are part of all such exhibits, and the extensive background materials become part of the museums' holdings available for future researchers.

Folk material culture can provide evidence of the everyday past and supply the visible proof of changing beliefs and customs. Such studies help us understand creative impulse and interpret how personality is conveyed through objects and technical activities. Folk material culture study can be a major resource for understanding relations between social identity and expression, personal conduct and communication, and human idea and design.

## ADDENDUM

In recent years, The American Folklore Society has, as its official publication *Folklore/Folklife* illustrates vividly, prospered and expanded both in size and in point-of-view. That it has done so is in no small part due to the supportive attitude of various foundations, most especially the National Endowment for the Humanities. Though the National Endowment for the Humanities did not, of course, make any grants directly to the Society, it did support many projects related to folklore and engendered by members of the Society. Indeed, there are few members of the American Folklore Society who have not profited at least indirectly from grants made by the National Endowment for the Humanities.

Some of these awards (for example, travel grants given by the American Council of Learned Societies) can be traced directly to the National Endowment for the Humanities. But had National Endowment for the Humanities funds not also been available for other scholarly projects, fewer funds would have been available from the American Council of Learned Societies. Other grants, and these examples are selected from primarily those made during the past five years, benefited many more members of the Society than the individuals to whom the awards were made, and they are directly traceable to the National Endowment for the Humanities. For years, the National Endowment for the Humanities has supported summer seminars for college teachers. Just before he died, Professor R. M. Dorson presented seminars for two years in a row entitled "The America Theme in American Folklore." Though many of the students who enrolled in these seminars were not members of the American Folklore Society, most later joined the Society. Similarly, the National Endowment for the Humanities supported the seminar conducted by Professor John Szwed at Yale University during the summer of 1984, a seminar called "A Folkloristic and Anthropological View of Afro-American Culture," revealed to many non-folklorists what folklore is all about and brought them into the Society. In a slightly different manner, Professor Linda Degh, then President of the American Folklore Society, was supported by the National Endowment for the Humanities in bringing together an international spectrum of scholars to study the ethnography and folklore of a Hungarian-American community which not only expanded our knowledge of immigrant contributions to American society but also brought many eastern European scholars into contact with American folklorists. In addition, *The Handbook of American Folklore*, edited by the late Professor R. M. Dorson and Ms. Inta Carpenter, was supported by the National Endowment for the Humanities, and the book has achieved international acclaim.

Indeed, the list of grants and awards by the National Endowment for the Humanities to individual members of the American Folklore Society is extensive and varied. Professor Mark Slobin is being supported through a grant made to the Cantors Assembly of New York City by the NEH for a study of the cantor as an individual. Ms. Ruth Rubin is receiving support for compiling an anthology of Yiddish folksongs; Professor Gladys-Marie Fry has been given an award to study slave-quilting in the antebellum South; Professor Charles Perdue, Jr., has National Endowment for the Humanities support for his study of Virginia's New Deal programs on folk culture; and so it goes. At least twenty such projects directed by members of the American Folklore Society are presently being funded by the National Endowment for the Humanities.

Obviously, the National Endowment for the Humanities has made a major contribution to the development of the American Folklore Society through its support to individual members of the Society.

In 1988–1989, the American Folklore Society will celebrate its centenary. This may now be the time for the National Endowment for the Humanities to consider giving general support to learned societies as units as well as to individual members of such societies. There are a number of projects which the committee charged with planning the centenary celebration have been charged with promoting: *e.g.*, an extended index of *The Journal of American Folklore*, a history of the American Folklore Society, histories of the various Departments of Folklore in the United States, biographical studies of major folklorists, the promotion of folklore as an academic discipline, the integration of folklore as an international discipline, etc., etc. Perhaps it is time for the constituent societies of the American Council of Learned Societies to consider recommending to the National Endowment for the Humanities that it give higher priority to grants to the societies themselves rather than simply to individual members of the constituent societies.

There is no doubt that the American Folklore Society would have grown even without the support of the National Endowment for the Humanities, but the growth would have been stunted. Centuries ago Alexander Pope, following the dictates of Francis Bacon, said “The proper study of mankind is man.” A couple of decades ago, Alfred Kinsey pointed out that mankind was a more fruitful source of information about mankind than were fruit flies. The American Folklore Society is involved in the study of mankind. What is needed today is substantial support for not only individual members of humanistic societies, but also support for the societies themselves.

# AMERICAN HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION

---

President: William H. McNeill, University of Chicago  
Delegate to the ACLS: Philip D. Curtin, The Johns Hopkins University  
ACLS Conference of Secretaries: Samuel R. Gammon, Executive Director

Prepared by: Arthur S. Link, Princeton University (AHA President 1984); William H. McNeill.

## THE PRESENT SITUATION OF THE DISCIPLINE OF HISTORY WITH SPECIAL ATTENTION TO PRESENT AND FUTURE NEEDS

The value of historical and humanistic study and teaching scarcely needs reiteration, since it is these studies that define our various and overlapping public identities, sustain group cohesion, and provide the ground for common action. Capacity for culturally defined common action is what makes us human and raises us above animal creation. But we can only benefit from shared values, outlook, expectations, and the corresponding capacity to work together toward common goals if our historical and humanistic education, and the learning that undergirds it, prepares us to do so. How to nourish social cohesion without sacrificing truth is the persistent dilemma of humanistic discourse. The liberal tradition holds that freedom of expression for any and every private voice is the best way to attain both goals. Recent experience with ideological uniformity enforced by the police power of the state, whether in Iran or Cambodia, supports the liberal faith and reinforces older demonstrations of the unacceptable costs of thought control.

On the other hand, the market place of ideas, left to itself, can be a very confusing place. Deliberate efforts to encourage new lines of intellectual effort have proved their effectiveness ever since Rockefeller money went into research in yellow fever at the beginning of this century; and the recent growth and diversification of historical research in the United States could not have occurred without the large-scale support for new ventures coming from public sources and private foundations alike.

Research and the growth of historical knowledge depend today upon substantial support from funding agencies. Adaptation to altering cir-

cumstances can best be assured by continuing the pattern of the recent past. The remarkable success of historians in extending sophisticated research to the nonwestern world after the Second World War attests to the impact of such support. Geographical expansion was matched by intensified inquiry in the older fields of European and American history, where new themes and new methods drastically altered older views of what was important in the past. Thus the expansion in the number of historians in the postwar decades was matched by the opening of new and fertile lines of research. In one field after another, American historians came abreast of the best practitioners and often surpassed foreign historians in their own fields. This professional achievement since 1945 is truly remarkable and is one of which Americans may well be proud.

But success creates its own problems. Some of the difficulties within the profession of history which have arisen or have become more intense in recent years are amenable to correction or amelioration. Here the National Endowment for the Humanities ought to play the leading role. But there are other problems which may have to be endured rather than solved, since deliberate intervention is more likely to make things worse rather than better.

Three such problems deserve consideration here. They afflict the historical profession in particular, but they are also shared to some degree by other humanistic disciplines. They are: 1) the boom-and-bust rhythm of recruitment into academic life which has manifested itself so sharply since the Second World War; 2) the wide gap between schooling (especially at high-school and college levels) and research; and 3) the fragmentation and narrow specialization of much historical scholarship, which leaves the task of revising the overall picture of the past, as corrected by new knowledge in each specialized field, to take care of itself.

1) A fifteen-year academic boom between 1957 and 1972 brought large numbers of new historians into academia. Demographic expansion lay behind this phenomenon, but it was exaggerated by the public policy of responding to Sputnik by investing heavily in colleges and universities in order to produce a better educated nation. Contraction since 1973 has been painful. Entry into the profession has become a tiny trickle, at the very time that Ph.D. training centers achieved unparalleled output. The worst period for young historians is already behind us, but drastic distortions remain in the age pyramid of practicing academic historians. In the 1990s, when the swollen numbers who entered the profession in the 1960s, begin to retire, a new boom in the academic market place will set in if retirements are matched by new hirings.

Wise policy ought to seek to reduce the swings of boom and bust. In boom times, persons of lesser ability and dedication dilute the historical

profession, and in bad times persons of superior ability go into other professions. A more even pattern of recruitment across future decades is needed to guard against fluctuation in standards of admission to the profession and to assure a healthier distribution of age cohorts within departments. This is particularly true because the admission of women and, to a lesser extent, of minorities to graduate training in the boom years has vastly increased the pool of creative talent. Active encouragement of this access should continue as a matter of both public and private educational policies even in the lean years.

An obvious step for the remainder of the 1980s is to multiply postdoctoral appointments by offering two- and three-year grants, equivalent to a term as assistant professor. This would allow talented historians to remain in the profession through the next few lean years and make them available for hiring in the 1990s. Such postdoctoral appointments ought to involve part-time teaching at host institutions as well as research and writing to prepare these young people for smooth and easy entry into the standard career path when openings increase.

2) The awkward gap between schooling and research in history appears to have widened since the Second World War, partly because research has become so specialized and diverse, and partly because schools and colleges have responded to demands that they serve society by providing practical instruction in matters as diverse as driver education, drug abuse, vocational training, and what is vaguely called "social studies." School hours devoted to such things detract from traditional academic subjects; and, as humanistic disciplines yielded time to these newcomers, the task of shaping a common culture for the nation tended to shift away from churches, schools, and colleges to television, records, and movies. A nationwide effort must be made to restore sound history to the "basic core" curricula of secondary schools and colleges and to the proper training of people who teach history.

Reliance on commercially supported TV programs, pop records, and movies to shape our common culture has the result of making the lowest common denominator into a ceiling. A world view which emphasizes sex and violence, instant gratification, and naively personalistic and presentist interpretations of public events is likely to result. Wisdom does not lie that way; and a people nourished mainly on our most popular TV programs is unlikely to sustain effective public policies. This is perhaps, the most important long-run issue now confronting the American people. How we respond to it will in large measure determine the future of this nation and of the world.

One path is to widen communication between different levels of humanistic and historical teaching. Summer institutes and other meeting grounds, where high-school teachers, college teachers, and research



historians can meet and talk, should be multiplied. But this by itself is not enough. A more promising possibility is to infiltrate the audiovisual communication network with really first-class historical materials. This has only rarely been done. Historians have not overcome professional diffidence and inexpertness in film-making. Film experts, on the other hand, usually bring distorting entertainment values to the task of creating an historical film—values that collide head on with the academic standards prevalent among historians and other humanists.

Nevertheless, a beginning has been made, and in the next twenty years a worthwhile goal for the funding agencies of all the humanistic disciplines might well be the production of a wide range of really high-level audiovisual materials for use in classrooms and libraries, and for public broadcast as well. Serious discourse on historical themes which makes really skillful use of visual reinforcement can be very powerful in educating the young and the public at large—quite as powerful as any of the sports spectacles and soap operas with which our television screens are overburdened.

Large sums will be needed to produce such audiovisuals. Organizational arrangements will have to be invented which will allow the best historians to cooperate with the best film makers, without either side having to surrender its professional standards. This will not be easy, and some mistakes and miscarriages have to be anticipated in any such effort to mix hitherto largely antithetical professional traditions. But high risk and high gain often go hand in hand.

There are also unsolved questions of ownership, royalty rights, distribution methods, and cost recovery (if any) that plague large-scale and systematic exploitation of audiovisual instruction. Careful study of these matters will be needed before the National Endowment for the Humanities or any other granting agency enters the field. Perhaps a new corporation for making and distributing historical films should be established. Perhaps existing bodies—universities for example—should be entrusted with the task of bringing historians and film makers together. Alternatively, nonprofit ad hoc enterprises might perhaps be set up for particular production, e.g., a series on United States history, world history, the history of science, and the like.

If policy can do anything to narrow the gap between historical research and schooling during the next twenty years, this seems by far the most promising direction in which to go. We have become attuned to the audiovisual experience, and it is high time that the academic world claims a voice in the medium, if it is not to lose its accustomed weight in society at large. Resources boldly committed to the creation of serious historical films might go far to narrow the gap between schooling and

research and begin to challenge the exaggerated role that popular entertainment now plays in shaping the culture of the nation.

3) Fragmentation of the historical profession and the narrowness of some historical research will cure itself only if leaders of the profession begin to address the central questions of historical meaning and interpretation more directly. If research scholars busy themselves solely with concerns peculiar to themselves, the basic outlines of national and world history, taken for granted by an older generation, will simply become lost. To date, no new intelligible view of the past has emerged that incorporates all the new lines of research. As a result, teachers required to present American and world history in schools and colleges find it difficult to keep their teaching up to date, and when they try conscientiously to do so, sampling of this and that produces a distressing fragmentation and incipient incoherence.

Specialization is both necessary and desirable. Mastery of the sources requires it. But historians also ought to pay more attention than they have paid of late to synthesis and interpretation. Otherwise detailed results of specialized research languish in the obscurity of library shelves, and research historians are liable to find themselves cut off from effective communication with the rest of the world, talking only to themselves. Changes in graduate-school training that will encourage and invite broader perspectives need to be made, and granting agencies can and should play a role in accelerating this development.

Perhaps the pendulum will swing back toward synthesis of its own accord. Serious effort to address the public at large pulls in that direction, and a few historians have always been able to command a public audience for their writing. If film-making really took off in the next two decades, that, too, would focus talent on overall questions of how to understand the past. Grant-making agencies might also encourage individual efforts by seeking out ambitious works of synthesis and interpretation for support. But for the most part, readjustment of the distribution of effort within the historical profession and other humanistic disciplines is probably best left to individual initiative and the rewards which await successful synthesizers in the market place. Overeager management may simply back a sick horse and thereby discredit, rather than strengthen, historical synthesis and interpretation.

In conclusion, it is important to remember that, despite all our problems, historical study in the United States is in a state of healthy growth. Our problems arise, mainly, from recent rapid expansion. Putting historical knowledge together into an intelligible whole is important; but continuing to explore frontiers of knowledge is no less important, even though such research inevitably tends to strain and eventually to dis-

credit existing general schemes of interpretation. Persistent and unceasing tension between these goals is the lifeblood of a vigorous historical profession. The tension is real enough in the mid-1980s, and its existence is proof of the vigor and continued creativity of historical thinking in the United States today.

Breast beating is inappropriate in these circumstances. Pride, and the aspiration to do even better in time to come, is the proper attitude to take toward our recent professional accomplishments. Policy can help to repair inequities and may even narrow the gap between research and teaching. But individual genius, effort, and dedication to the chores of teaching, as well as of research, is what ultimately sustains the historical enterprise amongst us. These are best nurtured by leaving historians as free as possible to do what each of them can do to expand knowledge and understanding of the past.

If the price of such liberty is apparent disorder and occasional raucous divergence, it is a price worth paying to assure that no avenue of historical inquiry goes unexplored and that our historical learning remains open to new winds of doctrine and to new angles of vision. These new growths all require appropriate ventilation and testing against the professional standards of criticism passed on to us by our predecessors. New historical sensibilities which survive such professional scrutiny must in turn be fitted into our inherited concepts of the value and meaning of the past. Only then will the profession perform its function of adapting historical knowledge to the exigencies of the times and to the ever-changing context of human experience at large. Only then will the dual goals of historical study be attainable: the nourishment of social cohesion through the maintenance of a shared past, whose lineaments conform to the most rigorous test of truthfulness which human minds can bring to all the available data from that past.

Upon this foundation, and this foundation only, can good citizenship in a democracy rest. Persons ignorant of their country's history and traditions are not likely to be able to make intelligent political decisions. Persons ignorant of other cultures and traditions may fall prey to prejudice, narrow nationalism, and xenophobia. A nation as powerful as the United States must have citizens who are well-informed about their own and other peoples' history if they are to be good citizens in a world which desperately needs enlightened leadership.

# AMERICAN NUMISMATIC SOCIETY

---

President: Harry W. Fowler, American Numismatic Society (*pro tempore*)

Delegate to the ACLS: Roger A. Hornsby, University of Iowa  
ACLS Conference of Secretaries: Leslie A. Elam, Director

---

## COMMITTEE

Glen W. Bowersock, Institute for Advanced Study  
Leslie A. Elam  
Harry W. Fowler  
Roger A. Hornsby  
William E. Metcalf, American Numismatic Society

## THE PRESENT STATE OF SCHOLARSHIP AND TEACHING

In most respects, we echo the 1964 report. American numismatic scholarship ranks with the best in the world, and is in many ways better than that in countries that have much longer traditions in the discipline, and in which numismatics is taught at the university level.

Certainly the American Numismatic Society, quite self-consciously, provides the most accessible major collection in the world, together with a library that is definitive in the field. It also has the most ambitious publications program of any numismatic institution. Staff members regularly conduct seminars in ancient numismatics in the Department of Art History and Archaeology at Columbia University, and all of them have lectured widely both in this country and abroad.

As noted in the 1964 report, some American universities conduct courses in numismatics: noteworthy ones in addition to Columbia include Harvard, Yale, Princeton, Cornell, Minnesota, Texas, Washington University in St. Louis, and Michigan. The American Numismatic Society encourages and has fostered this development, which is so common in Europe: virtually all of those who conduct such courses were students in the ANS Graduate Seminar, which began in 1952 and has now educated over three hundred students in numismatics and numis-

matic method. Many of these students have made significant contributions to the literature of the discipline.

## THE RELATION BETWEEN SCHOLARSHIP IN NUMISMATICS AND THE TEACHING OF HUMANISTIC SUBJECTS

As noted in 1964, numismatics is a specialized discipline to which significant contributions can be made only by specialists. On the other hand, basic familiarity with coins as artifacts and as testimony to the history of material culture can be taught even at the high school level, with an emphasis on their importance for the study of history, art, archaeology, and economic history. Such teaching can be done by those who have received training either in university courses or at the Graduate Seminar conducted by the American Numismatic Society. The value of numismatic evidence continues to be recognized in a theoretical way, particularly in graduate curricula, but there is little concrete support for formal programs of instruction.

Although, as observed in the preceding paragraph, some teachers make use of coins at the secondary school level, much wider use of numismatics would be profitable. Since 1964 the American Numismatic Society has made available four new teaching slide sets as well as four travelling exhibits designed to illustrate the importance of coins and money in human history and culture.

## FINANCIAL SUPPORT PRESENTLY AVAILABLE

It is unfortunate that we must restate, almost *verbatim*, the content of the 1964 report: in this country, there is no money designated for research in numismatics except that provided by the American Numismatic Society itself.

Sadly, the Society's resources are not sufficient to permit full realization of its goals. The stipend for our Graduate Fellowship has not been raised in years, and those for the Graduate Seminar and the visiting scholar have not kept up with inflation; as a consequence it becomes increasingly difficult to attract the largest pool of talented applicants and to make foreign scholars' participation in the seminar financially realistic. A curatorial training program adopted in the 1960s to educate scholars from countries rich in numismatic finds exists in name only, and we are unable to provide formal assistance to scholars or students who wish to have access to our facilities.

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

Even more than in 1964, numismatists and scholars in humanistic fields recognize the fact that the use of scientific disciplines has been all too limited. Although some national institutions such as the British Museum and the Smithsonian Institution have in-house capability for metallic or metallographic analysis, such tools remain beyond the means of most institutions, despite the obvious importance of the possible results. Only the smallest portion of coins surviving have been analyzed by modern scientific method; and yet the determination of a coin's alloy with accuracy and precision can be a crucial factor in determining not only its intrinsic value but, in some cases, its origin. Our need to rely on outside institutions or individuals who have access to such methods as neutron activation, x-ray fluorescence, or atomic absorption spectrophotometry has hampered our efforts to exploit our resources to the fullest.

### POLICY

As stated in *The Humanities in America* (Berkeley, 1980, p. 2), "Whether defined by questions, methods, or fields, the humanities employ a particular medium and turn of mind." Further, "Study in the humanistic disciplines is not limited to texts," and "The essence of the humanities is a spirit or attitude toward humanity" (p. 3). Obviously the American Numismatic Society is committed to the goals of understanding the human experience, even if only in the way that it can be interpreted through the history of money. Although numismatics may seem to be at the "institutional or intellectual boundaries of the humanities" (p. 8), we believe that our discipline not only informs its students but introduces them to a methodology that is more broadly applicable. The National Endowment for the Humanities has not, to date, been sympathetic to this point of view, refusing to support a ground-breaking exhibition that has attracted enthusiastic response from the general public as well as our ongoing Graduate Seminar.

The question is not one of elitism *versus* populism: we cater to the general public in a variety of ways, but our primary purpose is education. The Graduate Seminar, our Graduate Fellowship, and our new survey exhibition (which opened in September 1983) are all concrete evidence of our commitment to both general and specialized understanding of the role of coins and money in the history of culture.

We have also tried to apply the most modern technology to our holdings. Our new exhibition includes a computer terminal available to the public, through which an individual may inquire about any object on display, and obtain not only a text amplifying that in the exhibit, but a bibliography that will be of use in our library, which is open to all. The library itself is exploring computerization in order to make its immense resources more accessible. In addition, since August, 1981, we have been creating a computerized record of the collection with the intention of providing not only an inventory but a tool useful to students and scholars. The many inquiries we have received, and to which we have been able to respond only because this inventory exists, have fully justified the effort and expense.

## PRIORITIES

In the following paragraphs we address priorities as identified in *The Humanities in America*. We affirm our commitment to the quality of education in our elementary and secondary schools, and our willingness to assist in this regard.

That research in the humanities must be supported, and without reference to immediate public issues, is almost too obvious to require restatement. Our own institution would benefit profoundly from greater access to the "complicated apparatus" that could further refine our knowledge of the artifacts with which we work, as well as from relief from inflation and "the financial needs of fellowships, libraries, . . . and publishing" (p. 20). Our cultural institutions must receive sufficient funds for their preservative and educational missions: our own organization is faced with chronic deficits that threaten these functions. We advocate a greater commitment on the part of the National Endowment for the Humanities to the needs of smaller, specialized institutions—and suggest that this might be done through matching grants.

We fully endorse the view that educators must reaffirm the value of the humanities. We have always emphasized the value of specialized study, in context, to a well-rounded humanistic education; in fact we have sometimes gone overboard in stressing the importance of our discipline as an *ancilla* to others rather than a legitimate study in its own right. Our role in the community of humanists has been of the highest priority, especially since 1952, when the Graduate Seminar came into being; we are now as committed as ever to that role. As stated in our 1964 report, "Numismatics is closely connected with virtually all the other humanistic disciplines."

We affirm the need for collaboration between cultural institutions and sources of support. Our experience has been largely positive in the

private sector, largely negative in the corporate world, even with financial institutions that might be expected to take an interest in the history of money.

“The humanities cannot be accurately described in terms of elitism and populism”, and “when the humanities do not relate directly to contemporary issues or draw large crowds, the reason should be sought in the private and detached qualities of some humanistic inquiry rather than in its alleged irrelevance” (p. 21). We believe that our performance in interpreting our collection for our audience—albeit a small one—has been outstanding. We have made every effort consistent with our means to bring science and technology to bear on both the interpretation and the accessibility of our collections. We have committed a substantial portion of our operating funds to the generation of a computerized database for the collections, and anticipate doing so for our library, in both cases with a view to making them available to those who are not able to visit our premises. We view technology as a means of providing information and furthering our educational function; we hope to make the awareness of the importance of numismatic evidence a more significant part of the humanistic experience, and we continue to believe that the fundamental knowledge of classicists, historians, art historians, and economists has been broadened significantly by our efforts, especially over the last three decades. We continue to be committed to the interpretation and widespread use of our holdings, and to accessibility to the public through our exhibitions, library, loans, and traveling displays.

## SUMMARY

We wholeheartedly endorse the “Summary of recommendations” included on pp. 22–24 of *The Humanities in America*. The final paragraph dealing with the NEH is particularly incisive: the NEH has lacked a clear direction and focus, and needs to identify for its constituency its policies of support and its means of implementing them. This once done, it should be the easier for the National Council on the Humanities to advise on allocation of funds and for the Congress to authorize them. More fundamentally, the Endowment should construe its definition of the humanities as broadly as possible, without divisive ideology or rhetoric.



# AMERICAN PHILOLOGICAL ASSOCIATION

---

President: Helen Bacon, Barnard College  
Delegate to the ACLS: Michael C. J. Putnam, Brown University  
ACLS Conference of Secretaries: Roger S. Bagnall, Columbia  
University, Secretary and Treasurer

Written by: Helen F. North, Swarthmore College  
After consultation with:  
Helen Bacon  
Julia Gaisser, Bryn Mawr College  
Richard LaFleur, University of Georgia  
Martin Ostwald, Swarthmore College  
Michael C. J. Putnam

The discipline whose current situation and present and future needs are described in this report is the Classics, the study of the Greek and Latin languages and literatures (including Byzantine Greek and Mediaeval Latin), Greek and Roman history, philosophy, and political theory, and such ancillary disciplines as epigraphy, papyrology, and palaeography. The American Philological Association is the professional body representing the Classics. Its concerns are exceptionally numerous and diverse, since classical studies embrace not only a variety of subjects but also many distinct methods of approaching the ancient world and—what is more—address an audience ranging from students in high school, college, and university to significant numbers of non-professionals of all ages and occupations for whom the issues addressed by Greek and Latin authors or exemplified in ancient history are of enduring interest.

It has been well said that classical studies constitute the very heart of the Humanities. They are central both as an actual discipline and as a paradigm for the Humanities as a whole. Historically, many branches of the Humanities have developed out of the Classics, and the field as now defined accommodates within its boundaries examples of most types of humanistic study—language, literature, history, philosophy, comparative philology—whose presence in the totality of the Classics constitutes a bridge to the separate disciplines now established elsewhere. Moreover, classical studies by their very nature require the synthesis of interdependent modes of investigation and thus provide a model for the intellectual life as an ideal. Ours is the only field in which

languages and literature are so closely allied with history and philosophy that they are regularly taught in the same academic department, quite often by the same people. The fragmentation unfortunately typical of many individual subjects and of the Humanities themselves today has never been characteristic of the Classics, which constituted the first “area study” and continues to be interdisciplinary as a matter of necessity.

The unique value of the Classics to the national interest stems in part from this paradigmatic role, one aspect of the timeless reality of the discipline. But at present another potential contribution commands close attention. There is now a nationwide realization (stimulated by such reports as those of President Carter’s Commission on Foreign Language and International Studies, President Reagan’s Commission on Excellence in Education, and the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching) that it is essential for our citizens to find ways of transcending parochialism and preparing themselves to understand the place of the United States in the world of today. For this purpose nothing is so efficacious as the study of a foreign language, combined with the study of a culture at once very different from our own, yet the source from which our own has developed. Latin and Greek, together with the study of ancient history, fulfill this function in a unique way. In addition, Latin is supremely effective in facilitating the learning of all Romance languages, while Greek provides the basis for our scientific and philosophical vocabularies. Study of either language has a beneficial, measurable effect on the improvement of English vocabulary and style, and the increase of reading comprehension.

## CURRENT PROBLEMS RELATED TO TEACHING THE CLASSICS

Twenty years ago, when the National Endowment for the Humanities was established, the Classics faced certain problems that were clearly seen and, to a large extent, shared with other disciplines in the Humanities—perennial problems related to teaching and scholarship, and to communication with the world of non-professionals, the world that all the Humanities exist, ultimately, to enrich by making truly human. The creation of the Endowment helped in a multitude of ways to solve or ameliorate some of these problems. There can be no field that has derived more benefit than Classics from the programs sponsored by the NEH. The provision of time and financial support for research by both senior and junior members of the profession, the availability of funding through outright gifts or challenge grants for libraries, publication, research tools, professional travel, and summer seminars for col-

lege teachers, and support both for specifically classical centers of research and teaching (the American Academy in Rome, the American School for Classical Studies in Athens) and for institutions of broader scope to which classicists may apply (the Institute for Advanced Study at Princeton, the National Humanities Center at Research Triangle Park in North Carolina)—all these programs have served the Classics well and have enabled classicists to arrive at a position in which they are today better able to serve the national interest.

But one problem was not foreseen twenty years ago, because its emergence was to be the result of something that had not yet occurred—the catastrophic damage done to traditional academic values by the changes that devastated high school and college curricula in the late sixties and early seventies. It was at that time, under pressure from misguided demands for relevance, for unrestricted freedom in the choice of courses, and for the establishment of pleasure in place of rigor as the touchstone in education, that foreign language study in general was curtailed or even abandoned in many high schools and colleges, no language more swiftly and drastically than Latin, which appeared the least relevant, as it undoubtedly was the most rigorous of foreign languages. In 1962 there were 702,000 public high school students enrolled in Latin classes in the United States; by 1976 the number was 150,000, a decline of seventy-nine percent.

The results are now notorious, both from the personal experience of all who had to cope with them and from a series of studies made in the late seventies and early eighties, which demonstrated both the abysmal ignorance of English vocabulary and grammar and the lack of reading comprehension on the part of high school and college graduates and the efficacy of Latin to improve the situation. Thanks to the concern thus aroused, nationwide, the picture in the high schools has improved dramatically since 1976, with a steady increase in the number of students studying Latin, an increase of 12½ percent by the end of 1982. The upward trend is likely to continue, both because of continued concern on the part of parents and educators (and even students themselves) and because of the development of new programs, livelier methods, and more attractive materials for teaching high school Latin.

In turning the situation around, the NEH did not play any significant role, and in fact its early tendency to favor programs characterized as “innovative” put traditional curricula at some disadvantage, but here too the picture has changed for the better. The Endowment is now making a commendable effort to strengthen the teaching of subjects such as Latin that are central to a liberal education, and is increasingly interested in funding summer programs for teachers in secondary schools, as well as colleges. Such programs are urgently needed, be-

cause the increased interest in high school Latin and the restoration of a language requirement for admission or graduation at many colleges have created a new demand for qualified Latin teachers, who are currently in extremely short supply, the experience of the seventies having inevitably discouraged college students from preparing themselves to teach Latin in the high schools. Recent NEH-sponsored Latin institutes designed to repair the critical shortages have proved so popular that it has been necessary to turn away dozens of applicants. The need for many such programs in all parts of the country is evident; NEH is in a position to staff the high schools of the United States with a whole new generation of Latinists.

Teachers of the Classics at the college level confront different, though related, problems. Since so many students have had no opportunity to study Latin in high school, beginning Latin has become a college subject, as beginning Greek has been for many years. By now the need for intensive elementary courses in both languages has been met. What we now need are follow-up courses capable of maintaining the interest of more mature students and enabling them to advance as rapidly as they have learned the languages to begin with. New textbooks are urgently required, but textbooks are one of our biggest problems. Even the age-old, outmoded texts, designed for students who came to college with four years of high school Latin and a thorough familiarity with the gerundive, are now prohibitively expensive and frustratingly apt to go out of print just as the semester begins. New texts that employ modern approaches to language study and are realistic in their expectations (recognizing, for instance, that students brought up on television have less general knowledge and read with greater difficulty than their counterparts twenty years ago), textbooks whose cost is minimal—these are among the greatest needs of classical teaching today. An intelligent, much appreciated effort to help solve this problem was the support given by NEH to the Bryn Mawr series of Greek Commentaries, which is now about to be supplemented by a comparable series of classical and mediaeval Latin texts. Such support, provided at the most basic level of learning and teaching and therefore operative at every subsequent level, could well be multiplied for other branches of classical studies. For example, epigraphy and papyrology, two of the fastest growing subsidiary disciplines, suffer from a lack of inexpensive materials for elementary or intermediate work.

Further problems of classicists teaching at the college level are related in different ways to the present heavy demand for introductory courses. Teachers must undertake a great deal of elementary work that is usually remote from the area of their specialty, and they almost invariably carry overloads because of the size of the territory that must

be covered. Especially necessary under these conditions are frequent opportunities to continue research and engage in the professional travel that is utterly essential if classicists are to keep in touch with the living reality of Greek and Roman culture. The NEH Summer Seminars for College Teachers, particularly those conducted at the American Academy in Rome and the American School in Athens, are of inestimable value for their participants and those whom they return home to teach with deeper insight and renewed vitality.

## CURRENT PROBLEMS RELATED TO SCHOLARSHIP AND THE DISSEMINATION OF ITS RESULTS

We continue to look to the Endowment as a major source of support for scholarship and research. Scholarship in the classics, as in all other branches of the Humanities, is essential for our continued existence. Only through research can we advance the sum of knowledge—this has always been true and should go without saying. But we must also respond to the fresh insights and new methods that have transformed literary and historical studies in the last twenty years (and will continue to transform them in ways we do not now foresee). There has of late been a great burst of activity in our field as Classicists react to influences from other disciplines (anthropology, psychology, linguistics, the application of computer technology to epigraphy, to mention only the most obvious sources); classical scholarship has been immeasurably enriched in consequence. By the same token, classical contributions to other fields are now the object of increasing interest; we need classicists trained to interpret them. Research grants supporting studies of (for example) the debt of Robert Lowell's poetry to his Latin sources can be of permanent value both to the Classics and to the criticism of modern poetry. Interdisciplinary studies will be of increasing importance in the future, and it is essential that we be prepared to contribute to them. A notable advantage of our field is that the close relation among all its component parts, referred to earlier, accelerates the diffusion of new ideas and methods of investigation throughout the discipline. Thus the new interests and methods developed in historical studies after World War II quickly spread to ancient history and now affect classical studies in general. Our need for people who can transcend the boundaries of their own specialty and communicate with scholars in other fields becomes ever more acute. We look to NEH for ways to encourage and support wide-ranging, boundary-crossing enterprises. This is one of the surest ways to attract the best and liveliest minds to the study and teaching of the Classics, itself an interdisciplinary subject.

If communication between high school and college teachers needs to

be improved, and classicists need to communicate more effectively with scholars in other fields, what shall we say about the need to stimulate intercourse between professional classicists, at every level, and non-professionals, who usually respond with interest and enthusiasm whenever we find ways to exhibit the treasures of the classical world? Ways of doing so have never been systematically assessed, yet if we believe in the value of infusing American culture with the Humanities and accept the centrality of the Classics in the Humanities, we should be giving the most serious consideration to methods of making classical studies accessible to everyone interested, and indeed of capturing the attention of many with whom we have never been in touch, so that the results of our study will not be confined to ourselves, our peers, and our students. We would welcome leadership and support from the NEH in our search for ways to address this problem, perhaps through cooperation at a professional level with experts in the use of movies, radio, and television, certainly in the production of books that make the Classics more available and attractive to the general public, from childhood on.

An example of a successful, small-scale effort to bring together scholars and non-professionals was the recent venture of the American School in Athens, which recently welcomed thirty-six members of an organization of "under-fifty" corporation presidents and their wives, provided them with guidance in visiting the recently excavated Royal Tombs in Vergina, and then held a conference in Athens to discuss the activities and needs of the School. Many such meetings, subsidized by the NEH, could help considerably in persuading influential members of the business world to cooperate in the colossal tasks undertaken by poorly-endowed centers where research and teaching occur. It will, of course, require special ingenuity to make research in literature, history, and philosophy as exciting to the public as archaeology.

Further desideranda in support of research include more numerous and more generous travel grants, to permit attendance at meetings, particularly international meetings, where American classicists can participate in the scholarly intercourse that is the lifeblood of our discipline, and increased support for libraries (in both the purchase of books and the installation of technology). The recent NEH challenge grant to the Library of the American Academy in Rome exemplifies this kind of assistance at a fundamental level. Much more is needed. We cannot forget that in periods of stagnation or decline libraries safeguard the substance of the Humanities, preserving them until changed conditions inject new vitality into the traditional disciplines. A fine library is like the spark hidden beneath the ashes, ready to blaze forth anew, to which Homer compared the temporarily exhausted Odysseus, as he slept on the shore of Scheria.

But even when adequate libraries exist, there will be many classicists teaching in undergraduate institutions and two-year colleges for whom they are inaccessible, either because of distance or because of the high cost charged by graduate libraries for use by outsiders. The new NEH program that subsidizes in a modest way travel to research centers is an excellent innovation; it deserves to be expanded and extended to many more scholars. It would also be helpful if funds could be provided to pay library fees; a relatively small investment here could produce significant results.

The motto of the American Philological Association is *Psyches iatros ta grammata*, "Literature, physician of the soul." It is proper for us to assign a high priority to the publication, as well as the preservation, of *ta grammata*. The NEH has in the past provided assistance in funding the publication of certain work done under its auspices, and we look to it for continued help along these lines. We also hope that the Endowment will recognize consistently its responsibility for carrying through to the point of publication worthy projects to which it has given initial support. It is frustrating to see, as we sometimes do, a long-range project of unquestionable distinction, which can bear fruit only after years of research (because it requires the kind of reflection and maturity of scholarship that cannot be accelerated by the use of computers) deprived of support after initial encouragement, so that new projects may be funded. Both categories deserve support; neither should stifle the other.

For virtually all scholars working in the Humanities, classicists perhaps more than most, publication will continue to depend on subventions to university presses. Such support is essential if the results of research are to be published at all; it is doubly important today as the most practical means of bringing the cost of scholarly books down to a reasonable level. To assemble a working library is now impossible for young—or old—scholars, when a single volume of fewer than two hundred pages routinely costs upwards of \$60.00, while texts that require Greek type or illustrations soar out of sight.

Yet another problem that must be faced is the considerable number of well-qualified young classicists unable to find permanent positions, but anxious to remain active in the field. The increase of graduate programs in Classics as in all other areas in the post-sputnik period led to the production of large numbers of professionals, but the contraction of the market in the seventies has meant that many classicists do not find jobs or after a successful probationary period cannot be tenured because departments are no longer expanding. Many vacancies will be created by the retirements expected in the next decade, but there is a real danger that we will have too few—or too few competent—candidates to fill them. The famine now being experienced in the high schools will

spread to the colleges. We need to foster these younger people and provide them with productive positions now, so that they will be available when they are needed. (We have already lost some of our most able young scholars to other areas of employment.) A reasonable solution would be to provide a much greater number of three-year appointments to involve teaching and research than are now available. If the NEH could fund many such fellowships, we could hope to maintain our supply of replacements for the future and at the same time reduce the teaching load of departments at present overburdened.

Moreover, we do not forget the classicists—young and not so young—who have been forced out of the profession by the contraction of the job market in the seventies and have taken up other callings. Some of them are still eager to continue productive scholarship, but find it difficult to do so without an academic base. Whether or not they look forward to reentering the profession when the opportunity arises, they represent an asset that a society valuing the Humanities should not sacrifice. If the Endowment could provide assistance for such independent scholars—to enable them to engage in research, perhaps even more to facilitate meetings with other classicists—it would not only help the scholars concerned and advance the cause of the Humanities in general, but it would make a real contribution toward fostering the cooperation between the academic and non-academic worlds that we strongly advocate.

Most of the needs and problems addressed in this report testify to the vigorous growth of classical scholarship and teaching in the twenty years just past. To a very considerable extent we owe our present health and growing pains to various forms of nurture provided by the NEH, which has magnificently encouraged the present generation of classical scholars and helped them to make the results of their scholarship more widely available through publication and teaching. Therefore we enthusiastically recommend the re-authorization of the Endowment, without whose continued assistance our discipline would in certain respects become desperately impoverished. While we recognize that the Endowment is by its nature and organization vulnerable to political pressure, hence more likely than independent foundations to set policy or make decisions in response to demands for something other than pure intellectual excellence, we trust its leaders to guard against such dangers, as well as those inherent in an ever-expanding bureaucracy. One of the most reassuring aspects of the Endowment's performance over the first twenty years has been its ability to retain, almost from the beginning, a number of staff members in charge of key operations whose scholarship and integrity command respect. Their continued presence speaks well for the Endowment, and inspires confidence in its future.



# AMERICAN PHILOSOPHICAL ASSOCIATION

---

Chairman of the Board of Officers: Kurt Baier, University of Pittsburgh

Delegate to the ACLS: Max Black, Cornell University

ACLS Conference of Secretaries: David Hoekema, University of Delaware, Executive Secretary

---

## COMMITTEE

Robert Audi, University of Nebraska

David Hoekema

Alasdair MacIntyre, Vanderbilt University

Anita Silvers, San Francisco State University

Robert Sleight, University of Massachusetts, Amherst

## PRIORITIES AND NEEDS IN PHILOSOPHY

In 1964 the Board of Officers of the American Philosophical Association appointed a committee of five distinguished scholars to submit a statement on the needs of philosophy. Their statement, submitted to the Commission on the Humanities, identified a critical shortage of teachers in the humanistic disciplines, including philosophy, as “one of the most urgent problems” of the day.

Twenty years later, after a generation of graduate students has found the competition for teaching positions intense and permanent tenure elusive, the undersupply of qualified teachers in the humanities has been remedied more effectively than anyone hoped or feared. The number of students pursuing graduate study in the humanities is increasing more slowly than it once did and in some areas is declining. The number of students who complete the Ph.D. degree and enter the academic profession lags still further behind, as a greater proportion of students use graduate training as a step toward employment outside academia. Nevertheless the listings published each year in the Association’s employment newsletter, *Jobs for Philosophers*, elicit dossiers by the hundreds. Candidates outnumber openings, in varying ratios, at every level of academic employment.

Facts such as these might suggest a climate of doom and foreboding in

the philosophical profession. Yet no such climate prevails. Philosophy remains a vigorous discipline in which conceptual advances and innovative methods continue to spring up. The clouds which appear on the horizon have not dampened the commitment of philosophers to the discipline nor impeded the lively exchange of ideas among them.

There are many reasons for the continued liveliness of the philosophical profession. Among them, we hope, are the programs and activities of the American Philosophical Association, which is dedicated to serving the needs and interests of the profession. The federal government has also played a vital role, particularly through the National Endowment for the Humanities, which was created in response to the 1964 *Report of the Commission on the Humanities* of which the APA committee report cited above formed a part. Our purpose in this report is to identify that role as precisely as we can and to assess its importance to work in our discipline.

We approach the question of the present urgent needs and priorities in the field of philosophy from the standpoint of work already in progress. What we say on behalf of our profession is founded on the contribution which examples of such work in progress can be shown already to have made to the fundamental tasks of the humanities. Our examples are chosen for their diversity as well as their importance, but we will make no attempt to offer an exhaustive list of areas of important current work.

It is our contention that of the cases which we will cite a crucial underpinning for the academic enterprise has been provided by the National Endowment for the Humanities. Furthermore, we can see no alternative to continuing support of the same kind and of at least the same order if progress in this work is to be sustained. Not all of the needs which must be met are of a kind appropriate for Endowment support: it is not the task of the Endowment, for example, to fund permanent full-time teaching positions in either public or private universities and colleges. But even the funding which other sources have provided for this purpose—insufficient as, in some cases, it has been—could not have been as effective in helping philosophers to achieve what has been achieved in the past twenty years without the aid that the Endowment has supplied.

The six examples that we cite concern six areas of inquiry and teaching. But a number of them exemplify one function which philosophy is perhaps unique in discharging in the academic curriculum: precisely because philosophy investigates the fundamental assumptions and values of different forms of human inquiry and activity, it is also able to lay bare the complex relationships and links that connect these different forms. Hence it is not surprising that philosophy often has to operate in close connection with other academic disciplines

and so is able to demonstrate the interconnectedness of academic and more specifically humanistic inquiries.

Our first example is the transformation of the study of ancient philosophy which has occurred in the last twenty years. It is a central task of the humanities to show how we may both see the past of our culture as it truly was in all of its distinctiveness and also link the themes and insights of past thought to contemporary issues. The history of the study of Greek philosophy in the last two decades shows us philosophy discharging these humanistic responsibilities. Both by the scholarly elucidation and translation of texts and by the interpretation and reinterpretation of those texts, the place of Plato and Aristotle in the definition of that rational conversation which constitutes our culture has been reinforced in striking new ways. And in this work the achievements of academic philosophy are inseparable from those of scholars in classical studies.

A second example is very different. It is vital for a citizen of a modern democracy to understand what the natural sciences have to teach and their bearing on the rest of human life. A large part of this task devolves upon disciplines other than philosophy. Yet an essential part of it belongs to the philosophy of science; it is only in the light of the insights into the structures of scientific theory and observation afforded by philosophy that the history and sociology of science can be illuminatingly written. The reexamination of fundamental approaches to the philosophy of science which has arisen from recent work in this field therefore has an importance which reaches far beyond the discipline of philosophy.

Another area of importance to democratic society is the search for a standard of justice and fairness by which societal institutions and policies may be judged. The contribution which political and moral philosophers have made to this task in the past decade is particularly striking by contrast with the diminished interest in such areas shown by leading philosophers in the decades preceding. Philosophical inquiry into the nature of a just state, the standard for fair distribution of societal benefits and costs, and the nature of the cognitive and normative bonds which create a community form an essential background for the work of the legislator, judge, or civil administrator.

Fourth, the work we have mentioned in all of these areas, and in other areas of philosophical inquiry as well, could not have been carried through without continually drawing on recent work in areas traditionally regarded as the heartland of philosophy, the areas in which the object of inquiry is the relationship of human beings as believers, language-users and reasoners to those realities which are perceived, spoken of and reasoned about. Here there occur what are often thought

of as *the* problems of philosophy—the problems of knowledge, truth, reference, and intentionality. Successful work at this fundamental level is a necessary condition of success elsewhere in philosophy.

Fifth, one of the exciting features of recent philosophy has been the increasing convergence of strands of thought derived from radically different and hitherto often hostile philosophical traditions in the context of their treatment of highly specific problems. The nature of mental representation is a key topic for the human sciences; and in the dialogue with psychologists which inquiry into that topic requires, contributions derived from the Husserlian and other Continental traditions have enriched the same debates to which philosophers in the Anglo-American tradition have contributed.

Finally, there are certain areas in which the public importance of philosophy is particularly obvious because its subject matter is a topic of broad public concern. A case in point is that of medical ethics, in which philosophers have not only written extensively but have also contributed by serving on ethics committees of local hospitals and on national and presidential commissions. In other areas as well, from euthanasia to environmental policy, philosophers have made extensive and important contributions to the discussion of matters of public concern.

These contributions of philosophy are diverse. Nevertheless all of them depend for their flourishing upon the same kinds of support. There is first of all the need of individual philosophers, sometimes alone and sometimes in cooperation with others, to devote themselves to extended inquiry in particular areas. This need is best met by the awarding of short-term fellowships to individuals working at the frontiers of such inquiry and of research grants, often longer-term, for extended projects. Second, it is important from time to time in each area of the discipline to fund research conferences at which progress can be evaluated and future goals identified. Third, both individual inquiry and cooperative research need to be funded so that the curriculum may be developed in a way that benefits from philosophical inquiry in particular areas—and here the needs of the curriculum at high school and even more junior levels as well as the undergraduate and graduate curriculum must be served. Fourth, special seminars and institutes must be offered in order to provide philosophy teachers, including those who teach at two-year and community colleges, and philosophy teachers in high schools the opportunity to participate actively in the philosophical community. Finally, there are specific needs which philosophers share with the rest of the scholarly community, for example: to maintain local, university, and independent research libraries; to travel to conferences and research centers; and to bring distinguished visitors to campuses whose faculty resources are limited.

## AMERICAN PHILOSOPHICAL ASSOCIATION

The needs and priorities of philosophy for the next ten years are not surprising, then, in the light of the last twenty. What we have learned in these years, using the resources provided by the Endowment, will enable us to make even better use of such support in the future. But we have also learned that if the Endowment does not continue to afford these resources, in amounts at least equal to those available in the recent past, they are not likely to be supplied by any other source.

For there is presently no other source of support for work in the humanities which could take the place of the Endowment. Universities and colleges face the next twenty years with economic prospects that permit no easy optimism. If they continue to fund sabbatical and other leaves to the extent and at the level that they have done in the past few years, we shall be fortunate. Moreover, such support would have been radically insufficient without the supplementation provided by the Endowment. Support for release from normal teaching duties is essential both in order to encourage completion of research projects and to enable teachers to keep abreast of current work by others in their field.

What about the American Council of Learned Societies and its sources of foundation support? What about the foundations themselves? We are enormously grateful for what has been provided by these sources. But if we take away the Endowment's contribution, what remains would have been too sporadic, too unsystematic, and simply insufficient in quantity to meet the needs of the profession. Without the Endowment's programs, we would not now be able to point to the progress of which we are rightly proud.

Humanistic disciplines do not stand still: they either progress or decline. Failure to continue providing the kinds of support that we have cited will not merely diminish the prospects of future achievement. It will prevent us from preserving the progress which the past twenty years have brought.

In 1964 our predecessors emphasized the need at that time for greatly increased resources for the training of teachers in the humanities, including philosophy. But what they and their successors were forced to learn was that the training even of excellent teachers is not enough. We still need to train excellent teachers, of course, and for that reason the provision of an adequate number of dissertation fellowships for graduate students, whether from private or public sources, is as urgent a need as any of those mentioned above. But the teachers thus educated will only be fully effective if they are part of the kind of flourishing discipline and profession which cannot be sustained without the several kinds of support which the Endowment has provided.

Without continued Endowment support of at least the magnitude of

AMERICAN PHILOSOPHICAL ASSOCIATION

the past decade, both research and teaching in philosophy will suffer, and basic education in the United States will significantly decline. It is vitally important to us all, members of the community of scholars and teachers and members of the larger society as well, that this support be continued.

# AMERICAN POLITICAL SCIENCE ASSOCIATION

---

President: Richard F. Fenno, Jr., University of Rochester  
Delegate to the ACLS: William T. Bluhm, University of  
Rochester  
ACLS Conference of Secretaries: Thomas E. Mann, Executive  
Director

---

## COMMITTEE

Walter F. Murphy, Princeton University, Chair  
William T. Bluhm  
Margaret G. Hermann, Ohio State University  
John S. Nelson, University of Iowa  
Lucian W. Pye, Massachusetts Institute of Technology

## I. INTRODUCTION

In western civilization, the Sophists began the systematic study of politics. With Socrates and Plato, that study became the heart of philosophy. In these respects, political science can claim to be the earliest and most lasting of the humanities. Modern political scientists still address the issues with which these early philosophers dealt, those of community, justice, law, legitimacy, freedom, equality, and persuasion. These issues continue to reverberate in contemporary debates about the nature of scientific work in general and, in particular, the place of questions of value in politics and the study of politics. "Ethics and public policy" is a burgeoning field in the political science of the 1980s. Moreover, public affairs and political rhetoric are now surging to the forefront of attention in history, literary theory, philosophy, and other disciplines largely outside of the social sciences.

Like the other social sciences, political science asserted its independence from philosophy and law through a series of methodological revolutions starting late in the nineteenth century and recurring at generational intervals since. The most recent revolt, that of behavioralism, came after the Second World War. It looked to physics for models of inquiry that would cleanly divide scientific investigations of

politics from more historical, literary, journalistic, and judgmental studies. At the same time, political scientists transformed concepts and practices of their own discipline through new technologies for collecting and processing information about politics.

Many behavioralists stressed the contrast between new projects in political science and the discipline's continuing commitment to humanistic issues and techniques. Behavioral ideals and conceptions of science rolled rapidly over many older studies of American politics. But these new models of scholarship came more slowly to other areas, such as comparative politics and international relations. In these parts of political science as well as to some extent in public law, humanistic methods of historical explanation, cultural analysis, and textual interpretation proved tenacious and often indispensable, with styles of inquiry characteristic of social science appearing more complicated, costly, and problematic than expected. Under the heading of political theory, the discipline retained an entire field devoted to analytical, epistemological, historical, ethical, imaginative, and institutional projects that were distinctively humanistic.

The methodological revolution that began in the 1950s has left behavioralism as an integral and respected part of political science. The discipline retains a commitment to objective, systematic, and quantified observations of human behavior. Humanistically as well as scientifically, it continues to refine its quest for rigorous explanations of such behavior. Over the past thirty years, however, the impetus toward a science of politics has produced many surprises. For example, most social scientists now concede that normative assumptions underlie most, if not all, scientific analyses, a concession that requires philosophical inquiry into values, lest supposedly scientific scholarship degenerate into ideology. As a result, every field in political science is becoming a complicated conversation among scientific and humanistic approaches, to the benefit of both.

## II. HUMANISTIC DIMENSIONS OF POLITICAL SCIENCE: SYMBIOSIS

Much recent work in the discipline draws on promising combinations of classically humanistic and scientific studies. Furthermore, the very development of distinctively social scientific methods has elicited greater need and concern for characteristically humanistic inquiry. Use of survey research to study political attitudes and systems of belief has enhanced interest in the interpretation of political symbolism and the rhetoric of political communication. Empirical comparisons of political participation in different countries has stimulated study of the meanings



of such concepts as authority, democracy, legitimacy, representation, and rights. Actors' definitions of such terms must be understood and linked to their meanings in scholarly conceptual frameworks—a phenomenological enterprise. The arms trade, economic interdependence, and international migration lend new urgency to the need to develop philosophies of just war, basic rights, and citizenship. Studies of political organization increasingly combine surveys and participant observation with interviews, interpretations of documents, and assessments of the symbolism peculiar to each culture.

The state of the main subfields that comprise the discipline makes more vivid the manner in which political science has increasingly encompassed both the humanities and the social sciences. In comparison with most academic fields, political science has traditionally embraced a wide variety of approaches and methods. Established traditions tend to be found more in the subfields than in the discipline as a whole. Moreover, within each subfield there are strikingly different combinations of social scientific analyses and humanistic concerns.

#### A. Public Administration and Policy Analysis

To fulfill its objectives, policy analysis has joined the technical, analytical modes of social science with ethical evaluations ordinarily associated with the humanities. This linkage is essential even in “cost-benefit” analysis, whose goal of a measure of efficiency that can be calculated in dollars masks its assumptions about a myriad of values other than money.

Indeed, concern for human values in policy analysis, which gathered momentum in the 1970s, was intended and widely understood within political science to represent a step beyond behavioralism and toward renewed appreciation of the place of humanities in the discipline. Substantive public policies involved include agriculture, business, defense, education, environment, health, welfare, human rights, labor, safety, technology, trade, and transportation. In these areas, policy analyses joined social-scientific studies of the processes and products of policymaking to humanistic studies of the historical contexts of programs, the ethical value and philosophical coherence of both ends and means, and the imaginative projection of alternatives. Also among the humanistic concerns evident in policy analysis are studies of the political rhetoric of hearings and rulings, jurisprudential implications of legislation, ideological and cultural influences on implementation, ethical implications of strategic and tactical planning of programs, and normative criteria for evaluating success, failure, or needs for modification.

In short, the policy movement is resurrecting a field of political

inquiry in which intertwining of the humanities and social sciences is inescapable. More generally, it is encouraging humanistic sensitivity to the political significance of research in every other field of the discipline. For it reminds political scientists of the practical inspirations and implications of their research and teaching, that moral values always lie at the heart of political practice. The sprawling family of formal models, analytical theories, and public-choice theories used in policy studies employ assumptions about "rationality," the universality of certain orderings of preference, and concepts such as "maximizing" and "satisficing" that demand philosophical examination.

#### B. Formal Theory and Empirical Application

Application of game theory and related theories of rational choice in studies of legislatures, voting, arms races, and other topics of political science requires use of humanistic data and methods. For example, the rational-choice paradigm of inquiry into decisions and strategies has long relied for its evidence on humanistically thick descriptions of legislative, executive, and judicial processes. Similarly, the attention of that paradigm to structures of economic preference and courses of political action has produced a series of humanistic studies: historical accounts of formations of coalitions, rhetorical treatments of cognition, philosophical assessments of value, and literary analyses of change in desires and standards. Other branches of formal theory and modeling involve the same sorts of mappings as do structuralist studies of literature. Still others combine introspective techniques long prominent in the humanities with computer simulations of political thinking or interaction.

#### C. American Politics

The signs of closer relationship between political science and the humanities are hardly limited to policy analysis and formal theorizing. In American politics, the most behavioral field of the discipline, there is renewed interest in the histories of political parties, the texts of political socialization, and the rhetorics of political communication, ranging from campaign speeches to the commands of the Constitution.

Political scientists' most profound explanations of the nature of the American democracy have invariably combined humanistic concepts and empirical analysis as, for example, explanations of why class-based politics did not arise in America as in Europe, the pluralistic character of American politics, or tensions within the American creed. Although the behavioral approach has been extensively used in this subfield, the basic concepts and problems have remained those of a humanistic tradition. The central concerns of the study of American politics have

long been questions about the essential character of constitutional democracy and the advancement of ideals of liberty, justice, and order in a modern technological society.

More recently, there has also been considerable ferment arising from efforts to define viable public philosophies for the current state of the American polity. Efforts by those on both the political left and right have been noteworthy for sharing a common appreciation of the necessity of a humanistic dimension for their public philosophies. At the same time, contemporary defenders of the liberal tradition have been seeking to rearticulate, in more humanistic terms, their understanding of that tradition.

#### D. Comparative Politics

Comparative politics has been an exceptionally dynamic subfield, replete with humanistic elements. The new dimension of political development of the Third World has broadened the scope of comparative politics and tightened its connections with humanism. The end of Western colonialism and the emergence of new states in Africa and Asia posed a great challenge to comparative politics. Initially, political scientists met that challenge by attempting systematic comparisons based on statistical analysis of various forms of aggregate data. Their emphasis was thus on building theories for an empirical science. Over time, however, it has become apparent that to understand political development and modernization it is necessary to go beyond contemporary data and examine in a comparative framework different historical traditions and political cultures.

To be sure, even the earliest works on comparative political development generally acknowledged the importance of historical and cultural backgrounds of countries; but the more recent trend has been toward an ever deeper appreciation of the need for an essentially humanistic grasp of the total culture before attempting analysis of contemporary issues. Thus expansion of comparative politics to include political development has also nudged area studies back into the mainstream of political science.

The traditional focus of area studies had been very much on the uniqueness of cultures. In this respect, the subfield was quintessentially humanistic. By introducing a comparative dimension to area work, political scientists helped to break down barriers in the study of the separate cultures. The result has been a combination of humanistic and social scientific approaches that has significantly advanced knowledge. Furthermore, the need to learn foreign languages and to immerse oneself in historical and cultural knowledge before engaging in field work has strengthened the humanistic dimension in the training of political

scientists—though, as we later note (see III A), economic factors severely restrict the number of people who can take advantage of such opportunities.

#### E. Political Culture and Ideology

The subfield of political culture became an autonomous part of the discipline when public opinion polling and sample surveys were relatively fresh innovations. At that time, quantification of political attitudes seemed to offer the best means to determine how cultures differed in conceptualizing politics. But, as the subfield matured, it changed in ways parallel to those of comparative politics. More and more scholars found it necessary to go beyond currently held opinions and to analyze underlying societal values. In turn, this shift made researchers revert to more historical approaches. Consequently, the study of political cultures has tended to augment social scientific analyses with more traditional modes used to explore political ideologies, textual analysis and philosophical reasoning of an essentially humanistic nature.

#### F. International Relations

International relations was once solidly positioned in the humanities as a variation on diplomatic history. Training involved learning to use archives and gaining skill in textual analysis. In the postwar years, introduction of game theory and formal modeling moved the subfield more into the social sciences, a move spurred by the gravity of problems of nuclear arms in a bipolar world.

Recent years have seen a partial return to the traditions of the humanities. Several causes are immediately apparent. First, the persistent threat of nuclear holocaust that led some scholars to formal modeling has also driven others to review historical analogies. Second, numerous issues in current international politics—such as questions of the legitimacy of intervention in domestic politics of foreign nations and rules for acceptable use of force—call for answers that can best be found in the humanistic traditions. This reawakening has been hastened by concern for research about conditions for peace. Finally, there has been an awareness that abstract theories of strategy and deterrence will be dangerously flawed if they do not take into account actors' different cultural predispositions.

Thus, the idea that the complexities of the international system might be reduced to abstract models of different types of systems, each with its definite set of rules, has been tempered by appreciation of the significance of particular cultures and traditions that shape the behavior of nations in world politics. The result has been a new basis for

integrating the humanistic and social scientific aspects of political science.

### G. Public Law and Jurisprudence

Public law and jurisprudence have provided a critical foundation for the study of politics, for these subfields address such basic issues as the origin of the state, proper allocations of authority in a polity, and procedural bases for achieving justice. With respect to the United States, public law has offered an essential perspective on political history.

In addition, these subfields have been characterized by attempts to elucidate more precisely the core values of American political culture. The division of labor between the teaching of constitutional law and jurisprudence in law schools and programs of political science is largely found in the latter's humanistic emphases. Rather than focusing on technical aspects of formal legal doctrines, political scientists have concentrated on identifying and analyzing the various competing, and sometimes conflicting, values underlying the polity, and the tasks of courts and judges in discovering, interpreting, reconciling, and applying—often creatively—these values.

The importance of the humanistic tradition in political science for enriching the study of cultural values is even more apparent in comparative constitutional law and jurisprudence. Here much of what we have already noted about comparative politics and political culture is equally relevant.

### H. Political Economy

Largely because of numerous problems shared by advanced industrial states, we are experiencing a revival of political economy, a subject that was influential in forming the social sciences. Interestingly, whereas early practitioners of political economy, such as Karl Marx and Adam Smith, were trying to break from the humanistic tradition and, in the spirit of positivism develop a science of society, many scholars today are moving in precisely the opposite direction. In seeking to break down artificial barriers between political science and economics and to view more clearly the interrelation of economic and political forces, students of political economy are now raising anew many of the basic questions of classical social theory and political philosophy. This sort of inquiry imparts a strongly historical orientation to the subfield.

The result has been a reaggregation of many concepts that in preceding decades political scientists had sought to disaggregate. For example, in trying to conceive the relations between state and society, political economists tend to see the state as a single, autonomous actor.

In this respect, there has been a return to an approach that once bulked large in political philosophy, but which modern political science sought to clarify by speaking of specific institutions and individuals who comprise "government."

Although coming to the subject from different directions, present-day political economists share with classical social theorists a concern with how science and technology affect political, economic, and social systems. Whereas their predecessors were responding to the industrial revolution, the current generation of political economists is trying to understand equally profound changes in "post-industrial" society stimulated by the enormous impact of science and technology.

What is significant in these developments is that a subfield, as it responds to the social consequences of scientific advancement, should find it essential to return to some of the fundamental concerns of humanistic traditions. This reaction suggests that in the future political science, as it confronts its own urgent problems, will increasingly find it essential to combine the methods and concepts of the humanities with those of the social sciences.

### I. Political Philosophy

The continued importance of the humanistic tradition expressed in political philosophy is manifested in several ways. Classical political theory continues to define many of the fundamental problems, phrase the critical questions, and provide the crucial concepts that inform and directly or indirectly guide scholarship in political science, including that which is the most self-consciously scientific. Analyses of voting behavior, sample surveys, and aggregate data relating to categories of political systems as well as studies of implementation of public policy can be recognized as almost always addressing matters that were first identified as significant in classical political theory.

In addition, the enduring role of classical political theory in the discipline has meant that political scientists, as a community of scholars, never completely lost a feeling for the importance of dealing with basic values. While the scientific revolution pulled the discipline as a whole toward the goal of creating a science that would be value free, a continuing respect for the role of theory preserved a legitimate place for the serious treatment of values.

### J. Philosophy of Political Inquiry

The subfield of the philosophy of political inquiry examines the epistemological basis for knowledge about political systems and political behavior. A decade or more ago this subfield was essentially limited to philosophy of science and defenses of quantitative methods. In the last

few years, however, questions have been raised about the appropriateness of the practices of the physical sciences for the study of human behavior. As noted above, the behavioral revolution of the 1950s and sixties, with its stress on empirical research and acceptance of a form of logical positivism, suggested that political science should model itself on an idealized version of the physical sciences. Recent developments in the discipline, however, have made it obvious that the philosophical bases of political science are not restricted to such an understanding of knowledge.

Some political philosophers have begun to reassess the traditional canon of classic texts—to ask whence the tradition comes, what has been omitted, and how better canons might be created. Relatedly, the discipline is undertaking the same reconsiderations of meanings and roles for theory that have been widely noticed in literary and historical studies. As movements such as existentialism, neomarxism, phenomenology, structuralism, deconstructivism, and bioethics have left imprints on the humanities, they have also influenced political science, as have evolutionism, political economy, sociobiology, and cognitive science. As a result, political science serves as an important crossroads for virtually all inquiry in the social sciences and humanities. Thus the discipline helps to create lasting patterns of conversation and cooperation that enliven investigations throughout the academy.

#### K. Summary

As our review of the subfields suggests, the lines between humanistic and scientific approaches in political science have blurred. Subfields that at one time were resolutely scientific have recaptured many of the assumptions and concepts associated only with the humanities. Even though it is not easy to gauge the exact extent to which scholars in various subfields are involved in what can be called the humanities, in comparison with a decade ago there has been a notable convergence of the concepts and methods of the humanities and the social sciences. In every subfield there are large numbers of scholars who in their research and teaching are utilizing humanistic approaches. Even this brief overview should make it clear that while political science is customarily classed as one of the social sciences, it is in fact a discipline that has also been and will continue to be an intimate part of and a contributor to the humanities.

### III. HUMANISTIC POLITICAL EDUCATION: AREAS OF NEED

The problems of American higher education of which William J. Bennett spoke in November, 1984, are widespread and serious. Colleges

seem to be admitting a larger percentage of students who are unprepared for systematic, tough-minded analysis either in the humanities or the sciences, then often worsen the situation by failing to require, or perhaps even offer, a rigorous education in the liberal arts. As a result, those people returning to high schools as teachers or going on to graduate schools to prepare themselves to become scholars frequently remain ill-equipped to serve the next generation. As we shall discuss later in this report, the economics of the academic market place also discourage the best of students, those who have alternatives, from pursuing careers as teachers and scholars. As a report of the Department of Education noted in 1984:

The realities of student learning, curricular coherence, the quality of facilities, faculty morale and academic standards no longer measure up to our expectations. These gaps between the ideal and the actual are serious warning signals.

One may question whether, aside from the economic outlook for beginning scholars, there was a time when things were much better; that does not mean things are not bad now. The effects of these general problems may harm political science no more than other disciplines, but the injuries are real in the present and their threat to the future even more grave.

#### A. Colleges and Universities: Recruitment and Training of Political Scientists

With college costs increasing and the academic job market declining, more students, undergraduate as well as graduate, are part-time citizens of academe, getting their education when they can afford it and maintaining some economic security while they pursue further education. A report of the Department of Education issued in 1984 said that more than half the students in colleges and universities were commuters and more than forty per cent attended only on a part time basis. The figures would be smaller were two-year community colleges not included, but those totals would still be impressive.

These numbers help explain why much of academia is pervaded by an atmosphere of narrow careerism. A large share of students are basically interested only in courses and training that will help them with their immediate economic opportunities and look askance—or at best with longing—at classes and faculty who spend time with theory, classical ideas, or philosophy. For political science, this trend means fewer students are receiving the foundation in political theory or in the philosophy of political inquiry needed to put their learning into perspective.



NEH's summer seminars for college faculty taught by political scientists on such topics as human rights and discrimination, inequality and contemporary revolutions, religion and politics, and the American experience have helped teachers realize how readings in political theory, political philosophy, and jurisprudence can be interwoven in an exciting manner into other course work. But there is a need for more direct support to departments of political science to encourage innovative ways to get students to examine the roots of their discipline as well as to fund the important humanistic enterprises we have described above.

Among the more important educational aspects adversely affected by students' career-mindedness is the study of foreign languages. In graduate as well as undergraduate programs, there has been a gradual decline in requiring proficiency in two or even one foreign language. This diminution in language training has lessened understanding of other cultures and peoples. Thus, as the world is becoming more interdependent, American students are becoming more parochial. Elimination of funding for language institutes and fellowships has aggravated this situation.

Money is needed to help support students to receive language training and to enable faculty and institutions again to provide such training. To help language institutes provide students with an understanding of the social and political thought and institutions of a people as well as their language, it is important that humanistically trained political scientists play a significant role.

Decline in training in foreign languages is only one symptom of a more general malady afflicting graduate education. Several recent studies have documented not only falling enrollments but also a sharp decline in the quality of applicants, as measured by the Graduate Record Examination. All of us have unhappy tales of our brightest students choosing law over academia and, more importantly, choosing economic security over their preferences for a profession. It is sufficient for our purposes to note that, while in the mid-1960s some seventy-five per cent of those who graduated *summa cum laude* from Harvard/Radcliffe went immediately to graduate school, only a third did so in 1980. What the chairman of Princeton's Department of History recently noted about his students accurately reflects the situation in political science:

Ten years ago . . . it was common for one-third to one-half of this department's highest honors [*summa*] graduates to go on for graduate study. At present there is usually one very hardy and courageous soul among the highest honors recipients who is so committed to history that he or she is willing to brush aside all the gloomy predictions about

the state of the job market and embark upon graduate training in this field.

Furthermore, the loss of talent continues in graduate school, as even some of the most promising young students become discouraged at the dismal economic prospects for teaching and scholarship and, in the midst of an apparently successful quest for a doctorate, opt to change to professional schools. "In such circumstances," Princeton's President William G. Bowen has remarked,

the temptation to admit less well qualified candidates in order to attract enough students to constitute a 'critical mass'—or the number which, at some point in time, was believed necessary to give a program vitality and breadth—is a real one, hard to resist.

To ensure that people interested in and capable of making a contribution to the humanities are not lost to other professions, political science badly needs a program of graduate fellowships. Those sponsored by NEH might well be reserved for research on dissertations with a humanistic focus. As our earlier review of the subfields of political science revealed, there are many questions and issues with a humanistic thrust of interest to our students. Initiation of National Humanities Fellows would signal to the next generation of students the importance of the humanities and, within political science, of the exploration of humanistic questions. More broadly, these fellowships would, along with the other programs we suggest, help attract and retain many bright young people for whom pursuing a career in humanistic scholarship may seem the functional equivalent of accepting the status of mendicant monks.

## B. Elementary and Secondary Schools

Assisting students to understand the humanistic aspects of political studies falls not only within the domain of the faculty at the college level, but also concerns teachers in elementary and secondary schools. Students at younger and younger ages are being confronted with conflicts among values as well as with the ever-shrinking nature of the world. It seems important that high school students begin to read and think about how others throughout history have dealt with problems analogous to those confronting them.

The newly instituted NEH summer seminars for secondary school teachers are helping social studies teachers to develop such curricula. The American Political Science Association with NEH support has become involved in compiling a sourcebook on the Constitution. Careful thought, however, needs to be given to capturing the imaginations of

young people. The NEH Youth Projects, with their focus on using radio and television as well as on field trips to involve high school students, show evidence of getting students' attention. Use of role playing and learning by analogy might also be useful tools. By reenacting the Constitutional Convention much like college students run a Mock United Nations or law students conduct a moot court, high school students might be more directly introduced to what is involved in the American political system. By having them reenact similar kinds of historic events from other political systems, high school students might be better able to put the democratic system into perspective. Such historical role playing could be institutionalized and run on college campuses in the summer by an interdisciplinary team of scholars in the humanities. Students could be nominated by area social studies teachers to participate.

### C. Beyond the Academy

Learning does not end with college or graduate school, nor does the need for civic literacy or global civics. "Being a citizen today," a former cabinet member has lamented, "is essentially a spectator sport." There is a growing need to help American adults become better informed and thoughtful so that they will know how, and will want, to participate. Examples of successful projects include the "Civic Literacy" program at the University of Oklahoma. Operated as part of an adult education program, the project enables participants to inform themselves and to think critically about public policy. Among the issues considered have been the political implications of technology, scarcity, and the paradoxes of freedom.

A general problem in running such programs involves collecting and making available materials that could be used by the local media and community organizations. Political scientists on the faculties of colleges and universities could offer considerable expertise here. Many political scientists are playing leading roles in NEH's efforts to celebrate the bicentennial of the Constitution. Members of the discipline are directors of or consultants to virtually all of the programs funded by the Endowment to inform the general public. Political scientists are similarly involved in Bicentennial projects supported by state humanities councils.

Like civic literacy, global civics involves providing adults with the education needed to become responsible citizens in an interdependent world. That such education can have payoff is seen in the effects on business in Lynchburg, Virginia, that briefing books on various countries' culture and history have had. Through an NEH supported project at the Cross-Cultural and Foreign Language Resource Center at the

Central Virginia Community College, businessmen in the area are learning basic language skills as well as about the cultures of countries they are pursuing as markets. Development of self-instructional materials on the political, social, religious, and intellectual aspects of a variety of cultures could help diminish the "ugly American" image so prevalent around the world and enhance the experiences of Americans travelling and working abroad.

#### IV. THE NEEDS OF HUMANISTIC SCHOLARSHIP AND RESEARCH IN POLITICS

##### A. Support for Beginning Scholars

Most beginning scholars were born during the baby boom; their current and potential students are products of much less fertile years. This demographic imbalance, coupled with a retreat by government and many private foundations from supporting scholarship, has contributed to job insecurity as well as unemployment and threatens further to deplete the next generation's pool of able academics. Moreover, heavy teaching loads for junior faculty and a scarcity of money for research are depriving a large share of those people fortunate enough to find employment of opportunities to establish a solid basis for a meaningful professional career. In political science, we confront an urgent need for a program of postdoctoral fellowships to permit some of these individuals to convert dissertations into books or articles and to begin scholarly projects to increase their likelihood of obtaining tenure-track positions.

Two related trends in the academic market contribute to the gravity of the situation. First is the "graying" of the professoriate. Those who joined the learned professions before and at the early stages of the time when the children of the baby boom matured are still relatively young and so are far from retirement. Congress further distanced many of the people by banning mandatory retirements below the age of 70. Second, foreseeing no significant rise in the number of students until the year 2000, many colleges and universities are reluctant to create additional tenure-track positions and are relying instead on temporary appointees.

Scholars who become part of the "gypsy" group find themselves in a catch-22 situation. They are typically expected to do a great deal of teaching in their temporary positions and, thus, their time for doing research is minimal. Yet it is research and publication that will enable them to secure permanent positions. This condition can be all the more unfair because whether one contracts the "gypsy" syndrome is often dependent on luck—on the number of positions available in a subfield in the year a person goes on the market and the number of more established political scientists who want to move.

What are most needed here are two programs. First is one of post doctoral fellowships that would allow beginning scholars opportunity to lay a foundation for their careers, to have the time to turn their dissertations into books or articles or to begin new projects that would advance knowledge. The second is an expanded version of the summer seminars sponsored by NEH, discussed below.

#### B. Support for Established Scholars

Because of the tightness of the academic job market, the mobility, both within and across institutions, of faculty who have tenure-track positions seems to be decreasing. For many people, especially those at so-called teaching institutions that demand long hours in the classroom while also demanding scholarly production, the future seems only somewhat brighter than for the gypsies.

NEH's summer seminars for college teachers have enabled many faculty to renew their scholarly talents. Moreover, these seminars have provided opportunities to interact as well as to share information and ideas about research with others in the same area. There is a pressing need to continue and expand this program, not only to open such experiences for more people in the smaller institutions but also for many faculty now excluded, that is, those from departments that advertise doctoral programs but in fact run only limited M. A. programs. Scholars at these sorts of institutions may be members of somewhat larger departments than those at small teaching colleges, but they frequently have no colleagues in their own or perhaps even closely related subfields and experience a strong sense of professional isolation that interferes with both their teaching and scholarship.

There is also need for a series of frontier programs to provide opportunities for interdisciplinary activity. As the problems the country and the world face become more complex, it is increasingly important for those in the humanities and social sciences to have opportunities to work together to bring their varying perspectives and ideas to bear on collaborative research projects. In considering questions such as the proper allocation of authority in a polity, the procedural bases for achieving justice, the essential features of constitutional democracy, or the rules that should govern the use of force, social scientists and humanists can benefit from exploring each others' assumptions and sharing ideas as well as criticisms.

Groups of five to fifteen scholars in the social sciences and humanities could come together for an intensive period of sharing perspectives on an issue and begin to define how each member could address specific aspects of the larger problem. As they complete their research and write

up their results, participants could then meet periodically for feedback and further reflection. A final report would involve integrating the various members' products.

### C. Crosscultural and Interdisciplinary Scholarship

As well as involving interdisciplinary teams, such frontier programs could also involve cross-cultural teams of scholars. The research conferences, supported by NEH, on how parliaments have affected public support of governmental regimes offer an example of this type of program. Joint research and analysis by scholars from several nations would not only enable social scientists and humanists to tackle problems of importance, but would also provide varying cultural perspectives on the issue and force participants to come to grips with their own ethnocentric biases and the effects of such biases on their research. Questions that have global implications, such as how to define and achieve justice in North-South relations and when it is legitimate to intervene in the domestic politics of other nations, can only be adequately studied by crosscultural teams of scholars.

To promote collaboration between those doing research in the humanities and in the social sciences, NEH could sponsor, at the conventions of various professional associations, a series of brief workshops that focus on the capacities of humanists and social scientists to work together toward solving problems of practical or academic significance. These workshops might also be used to highlight research projects that NEH believes are particularly exemplary or initiatives like that on the bicentennial of the American Constitution for which fresh ideas are in short supply.

## V. PRIORITIES

The slackening of interest in scholarship that many private foundations have shown during the last decade make support from NEH for humanistic aspects of political science all the more urgent. The priorities for political science, as we see them, are not easily stated because they are so closely connected to each other. We have divided our ordering under the headings of education and scholarship, and further subdivided needs under each. We emphasize, however, that the discipline needs a coherent set of programs that attack the core of the economic and demographic problems that at this juncture beset all the humanities, indeed, all of higher education.

## A. Education

1. *Graduate Fellowships.* The most serious educational needs are for graduate fellowships so that political science can continue to attract and adequately train the people who will form the next generation of scholars. These fellowships could be of two kinds: those, modeled on the old National Defense Language awards, specifically marked for the study of foreign languages to allow students to understand the values and cultures of other countries; and others of a more general sort to aid students whose dissertations deal with political problems that are humanistic in nature.

2. *Faculty Seminars.* Only slightly lower on our scale would be an enlarged program of seminars for faculty at teaching institutions, a term that would include some that style themselves universities but in reality seldom offer work at the doctoral level. These seminars should not only be larger in number than those currently offered but might also be of several sorts. Some would follow the current pattern of encouraging scholarship, while others would focus on problems of teaching, focusing on such matters as development of curricula and preparation of materials for courses that might either try to redraw the lines of subfields, create new subfields, or take a new approach to traditional subfields.

3. *Humanistic Sensitivity and Civic Literacy.* We would also give a high priority to NEH's continuing and expanding the sorts of programs described above, in Section III A and III B, for teachers and students at the high school level and also for segments of the general public. Much of the support that the Endowment is providing for the Bicentennial of the Constitution is working toward these ends, but that anniversary will soon be behind us. We would hope that NEH would continue to support long ranged programs to increase both the sensitivity of high school students to humanistic concerns and the civic literacy of all citizens.

## B. Scholarship

1. *Fellowships for Research.* The first priority we see is for several programs of fellowships. One would be at the postdoctoral level to assist beginning scholars in laying the foundations for productive careers. A second would be for more established faculty who have not yet made their mark but who have demonstrated, perhaps through work done at a summer seminar, a marked capacity. The third would be a continuation of NEH's current program for scholars who have already built reputations for scholarship and need time further to advance knowledge. A side effect of all three programs would be to encourage able graduate students to pursue academic careers.

2. *Summer Seminars.* Our second priority is for an enlarged program of summer seminars for college teachers, described above. Coupled with a fellowship program specifically designed to help faculty too senior for postdoctoral grants but who have not yet established themselves as scholars, these seminars could provide immense incentives for creative research and analysis, as well as help recruit and retain able people.

3. *Collaborative Research Projects.* Connected to but not a necessary part of fellowship programs would be support for interdisciplinary and crosscultural research projects, described above under IV B. Support for both sorts of projects would seem to fall squarely within the core of NEH's mandate.

## VI. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

In all the major subfields of political science the once sharp divisions between the humanities and the social science are being bridged, some partially, others fully. The ambition to realize a purely scientific study of politics has been increasingly modified by greater appreciation that meaningful analysis of human societies calls for an approach that denies that there can or should be any incompatibility or contradictions between the humanities and the social sciences.

Regarded as a set of research projects, political science provides a striking demonstration of the interdependence of the humanities and social sciences. Within its substantive researches, the discipline time and again weds humanistic traditions of scholarship to social-scientific methods of inquiry—in the service of fuller comprehension of politics, more prudent conservation of worthy institutions, more astute criticism of existing practices, and more imaginative creation of politics to come.

Perhaps most evident here is the falseness of any distinction between “humanistic” and “social scientific” techniques of research and analysis. Political scientists were quick to utilize quantitative modes of analysis. More recently, however, they have been joined by the colleagues in the humanistic disciplines. Historians whose interests range from the Bible to trade in the Mediterranean world to the condition of slaves in the American South are trying systematically to collect and analyze data. Other scholars are using computers to enhance textual analysis of documents such as the New Testament and, under a grant from NEH, commentary on the *Divine Comedy*. At the same time, political scientists in all subfields of the discipline are wrestling with problems of finding, defining, and applying values, of the interplay of historical forces, of the nature of culture, of textual interpretation, and of the uses of rhetoric.



AMERICAN POLITICAL SCIENCE ASSOCIATION

It is quite possible that we are at a stage when there will be a reversal in the bifurcation of the humanities and the social sciences. If in fact such a development is the dominant trend of the day, then it is critical that funding for scholarly work respond by recognizing that political science is at the forefront in shaping the issues and concepts that will be necessary for a civic debate on the outlines of a new public philosophy.

# AMERICAN SOCIETY FOR AESTHETICS

---

President: Alexander Sesonske, University of California, Santa Barbara

Delegate to the ACLS: Francis Sparshott, Victoria College, University of Toronto

ACLS Conference of Secretaries: Arnold Berleant, Long Island University, Secretary-Treasurer

---

## COMMITTEE

Arnold Berleant

Curtis L. Carter, Marquette University

Allan Casebier, University of Southern California

Hilde Hein, College of the Holy Cross

Francis Sparshott

The submission made to the 1964 *Report of the Commission on the Humanities* on behalf of the American Society for Aesthetics was substantially the work of those who had founded the Society in 1942 and guided its development since then. As such, it stands as an authoritative statement of the fundamental aims of the Society and it would be inappropriate to withdraw it or replace it. But it will be in order to comment on changes in the direction of research and in professional orientation that have taken place in the last twenty years, even if these call for no more than minor modifications to the Society's original statement.

### *I. The 1964 Submission*

The Society's earlier submission may be summarized as making four remarks and establishing seven needs. The remarks were to the following effect.

1. A rising interest in the arts in the United States had not been accompanied by a sufficient understanding of their inherent value or of their social function. The ASA existed to correct this unbalance.

2. Academic study of the arts was confined to their practice and their history. History departments and practice departments lacked mutual contact, and neither made any systematic study of theory. Part of the ASA's mission was to overcome this fragmentation.
3. Since the 1920's, the study of aesthetics had become expert and professional, cross-disciplinary, and oriented more toward science than toward speculation. The ASA reflected this tendency.
4. The ASA derived its orientation from German models, but was itself becoming a model for other national societies for aesthetics.

The submission enumerated seven desiderata, as follows. It was not suggested that each of these was in immediate need of institutional funding, but presumably the understanding was that any source whose general mandate was the funding of the humanities should be cognizant of them.

- i. Support for individual research.
- ii. Support for group activity—interdisciplinary meetings and general liaison among those professionally interested in the fine arts from a theoretical standpoint.
- iii. Support for publication, especially in view of the fact that publications on the arts may be exceptionally costly to produce.
- iv. Support for translation (including translation of American works into foreign languages).
- v. Support for international cooperation.
- vi. Support for popularization and educational work.
- vii. Support for graduate study, especially since there are now few if any institutions where properly comprehensive studies of aesthetics can be pursued. The authors point to the often-lamented fact that “established disciplines” define as interdisciplinary and hence amateurish any study, however closely integrated, that does not fit their own administrative guidelines.

## *II. The Situation in 1984*

The 1964 submission did not explicitly state something it plainly assumed: no one in America is formally employed as a student or teacher of aesthetics as such. The American Society for Aesthetics is not a professional organization in the same sense as the American Anthropological Association. Of those of its members who labor for hire, the majority belong to professional organizations with which their working conditions and their career prospects are more directly linked, wherever their hearts may lie. The Society functions to represent an interest, not a professional body. This situation, though it does not

obtain in all parts of the world, is by no means peculiar to the United States or even to English-speaking countries.

The 1964 submission, as the work of the senior members of the Society, represented tendencies that had, for good or ill, already ceased to dominate the field of aesthetics; and what were then the new tendencies are now themselves probably being superseded. Caution is required in projecting the research interests and support needs of a field of study in which reorientations are likely. Comments on aspects of the 1964 submission in which modifications seem called for should be considered with this caveat in mind. None the less, the following remarks are offered on each of the four observations and seven prayers listed above.

1. A more mature attitude to the arts prevails now than prevailed then, though the arts are always a target for money-savers in hard times. Current modes of social and moral criticism have generated a more urgent and intelligent concern with both public and personal implications of artistic practices and interests. At the same time, the number and vigor of avant-garde and fringe movements in the arts in the last quarter of a century have given new point to theoretical aesthetics. The nature and status of the arts are less challengeable and more obviously debatable than they were, and the credentials of aesthetics accordingly better accepted.
2. The theoretical shallowness and lack of integration complained of still prevail, though perhaps less so than formerly. Whatever may have been the case in 1964, art departments do nowadays recognize that it is within their mandate to offer instruction in aesthetics. A special position is occupied by literary studies, in which a rising interest in critical theory is one of the most striking phenomena of the period. The transformation amounts to a rediscovery and rejuvenation of rhetoric as a branch of study, philosophical in character although not always so in method. These studies fall within the domain of aesthetics as our Society conceives it, and are in fact continuous with comparable studies in the other arts. At present, the appropriate academic liaisons and integrations seem slow to occur.
3. The orientation toward science was in part a reaction against modes of ambitious speculation that are no longer dominant. In any case, the "scientific" orientation, based on German models from the early part of the century, has not prevailed. The change is doubtless connected with the change of emphasis within anthropology from descriptive/analytic studies to structural explanations. The seriousness and (in that sense) professionalism of aesthetics has, however, continued to advance, but has taken new

forms. On the one hand, aesthetics has won respectability in the self-styled mainstream of American philosophy, through the belated recognition that the arts comprise the greater part of the world's most elaborated symbolic systems and are accordingly of central importance to our post-Fregean era; while, for those whose mainstreams flow in other channels, comparable developments in hermeneutical and phenomenological philosophy find the arts equally germane to their central concerns. Thus, although it is still true that philosophy departments have little time for aesthetics, to express contempt for the subject is no longer (as it was in 1964) an acceptable mode of behavior. On the other hand, within aesthetics itself, a growing tendency to investigate the aesthetics of particular arts is true to the empirical spirit of the 1964 submission and may well lead to a re-thinking of the more general theories of art that prevailed in the early years of this century. At the same time, the increased interest in literary theory already alluded to is allied with an interdisciplinary tendency to examine language-like behavior in all fields, with a catholicity of interest such as the 1964 submission wished to bring to the arts. It is not at present clear whether this branch of study ("semiotics") will prove academically viable, or how it will relate to aesthetics—they overlap, but do not coincide; but, in any case, the study of aesthetics acquires new significance, and a more central place in humanistic studies, from this new context.

4. The Society is still outstanding among national societies of aesthetics for its size and solidity. Domestically, it is not clear whether its former mandate will not come to be shared with societies devoted specifically to hermeneutics, phenomenology, semiotics, the philosophy of literature, and so forth. The 1964 submission's claim to speak for aesthetics in America without any qualms about their authority to do so might today be qualified by recognition that the new prominence of the field may answer to a redistribution of interests; as noted above, the society is a subject-interest group and not a trade organization with a vested interest in its own continuation. These issues of jurisdiction, however, are not directly relevant to our present concern, which is the present state and future prospects of a branch of the humanities rather than of a particular organization. Meanwhile, in the international field, an International Association for Aesthetics is in the process of being formed—its constitution was adopted at an international congress in August 1984 and awaits ratification. The formation of this association, which it is hoped will prove the first effective instrument of international cooperation in our discipline, is largely the result of

pressure exerted over many years by representatives of the American Society.

The original statement of desiderata needs little amendment. What was good then is good now. In the following updating remarks, the numbering used before will be retained; if a number is missing, that is because the original recommendation stands without comment.

- ii. The need for group meetings and liaison has been increased by the growing concern for aesthetic issues in administrative and legal circles. Art law and environmental aesthetics are matters of steadily growing concern, and a general awareness of theoretical issues in the arts and in aesthetic matters generally is accordingly more than ever a desideratum.
- iii. The need for translation seems less urgent than it did, though the need certainly continues. More is getting translated now. No doubt this is partly because the financial support has in fact been provided.
- vi. Part of the need for cultural diffusion has been met by summer institutes, funded directly or indirectly by NEH; it is not clear what other specific activities the authors of the 1964 submission may have had in mind. We endorse the prayer, but have no particular courses of action to recommend.
- vii. The need for graduate study devoted specifically to theory in the arts and aesthetics broadly conceived is more pressing than ever, in view of the proliferation of relevant fields of study.

### *III. Summary and Conclusion*

Since its origins (as a self-aware topic) in the eighteenth century, aesthetics has been multi-faceted and many-levelled, ranging necessarily from considerations of basic epistemology to lofty questions of connoisseurship and broad issues of social policy. Consequently, it is a field in which emphases constantly change and are as constantly contested. Although problems and emphases as well as organizational alignments have continued to change in the last twenty years, the need for the study of aesthetics is as pressing as ever. The changes in question have at once strengthened the position of such studies and complicated their institutional connections. As with many other fields of study, the advent of the computer is changing many things. In our case, however, the changes are less in what we do than in the intellectual climate in which we pursue our interests: symbolisms and communication systems have become a hot topic. What has not changed

is the need for an interdisciplinary concern with the issues that the American Society for Aesthetics was brought into being to confront, under whatever changing aspect those issues may from time to time present themselves.

It is perhaps not out of place to observe that such a discipline or field as aesthetics, the funding of which in its own right is not within the administrative purview of any employing agency, is exceptionally dependent on disinterested subvention from an independent funding agency such as the NEH has been—and, we trust, will continue to be. The American Society for Aesthetics was brought into being by individuals able to support its initial activities out of their own fortunes. That situation has not, of course, continued, and cannot be expected to recur. A continuing scholarly organization such as this cannot, in reason, rely on casual subventions, and, while its ongoing operations may be in principle self-sustaining (though with much incidental assistance from generous institutions), it is very limited in the extent to which it can support such works as it may from time to time propose in the public interest. It is fitting that the public interest should continue to find public expression in the responsible use of public funds.

# AMERICAN SOCIETY FOR EIGHTEENTH-CENTURY STUDIES

---

President: Harry Payne, Colgate University  
Delegate to the ACLS: Felicity Nussbaum, Syracuse University  
ACLS Conference of Secretaries: R. G. Peterson, St. Olaf  
College, Executive Secretary

---

## COMMITTEE

Robert Darnton, Princeton University  
Georges May, Yale University  
Felicity Nussbaum  
Jane Perry-Camp, Florida State University

The Committee which drafted this report acknowledges a particular debt to "The First Fifteen Years of ASECS," Jean A. Perkins' Presidential Address delivered at the 1984 ASECS Annual Meeting.

Our report seeks to describe the present situation of the American Society for Eighteenth-Century Studies, and to provide direction for future needs of the Society and for the support of humanistic learning and scholarship. We have seen a remarkable increase in awareness of the intellectual and artistic richness and the continuing relevance of the eighteenth century, an awareness signified in the last few years by major artistic exhibitions in Europe and America, by the undertaking of enormous scholarly editions of eighteenth-century works in all fields, and by the United States Bicentennial celebrations. The eighteenth century, indeed, brought into being not only the United States of America, but also the modern British Empire and modern France. It was the age of Voltaire and Diderot, Swift and Johnson, Goethe and Lessing, Hume, Kant, and Vico, Wesley, Franklin, and Adam Smith, Newton and Lavoisier, Bach and Mozart, Hogarth and Watteau.

Founded in 1969, ASECS is an interdisciplinary group of approximately 1600 members that fosters interest and encourages investigation in the achievements of the eighteenth century. The largest of the fifteen national societies constituting the International Society for Eighteenth-Century Studies, ASECS holds an annual meeting with the



assistance of one host university or a consortium of institutions in an urban area. The Society publishes an interdisciplinary journal, *Eighteenth-Century Studies*, the largest North American journal devoted to eighteenth-century studies. It also publishes *Studies in Eighteenth-Century Culture*, an annual volume representing the best papers delivered at its Annual Meeting and the many regional meetings of eighteenth-century organizations affiliated with ASECS. The Society publishes a quarterly *News Circular*, as well as an elaborate directory of members and interests. Since 1972 the Society has awarded an annual prize to a North American scholar for the best article on an eighteenth-century subject, and since 1978 it has become the James L. Clifford Prize, in honor of one of the Society's founders. Since 1976 ASECS has also awarded an annual prize in honor of Louis Gottschalk, another of its founders. This prize goes to the year's most distinguished book on the eighteenth century. In addition, at the 1984 Annual Meeting it inaugurated the Clifford Memorial Lecture, delivered that year at Boston by one of the most influential of contemporary scholars, Donald Greene.

An innovative program to support work with important collections was initiated in 1982. ASECS joined with three eminent research libraries with strong holdings in the eighteenth century—the Folger, the Newberry, and the Clark—to subsidize short-term fellowships for research by members of the profession who are no more than ten years beyond the Ph.D. degree.

Support for the Society comes from annual dues, as well as from institutional members who sponsor our annual meetings, subsidize our various publications, and contribute as members of ASECS itself. The number of institutional members has grown from 25 in 1970 to a current 88. In spite of recent stringent years, the Society has remained solvent, though it must rely heavily on external funding sources for special projects.

Throughout its young life, American Society for Eighteenth-Century Studies has depended on the National Endowment for the Humanities as an important funding source for the academicians, the scholars and amateurs with no formal institutional ties, and the museum and library staff who compose its membership, as well as for support for ventures by the whole Society. For example, NEH provided a small grant in 1975 that allowed ASECS to survey its members' needs for research tools. This led to a series of feasibility studies to determine whether a short-title catalogue of eighteenth-century British imprints could be developed. That project expanded beyond the Society to involve not only the British Library and the Library of Congress but libraries large and small around the world. It is probably the largest and most technologically

sophisticated cataloging project ever undertaken. Though the ESTC now operates independently of the Society, its leadership in North America comes from Henry Snyder, a former president of ASECS. And it would not have come into being without the efforts of the Society's members, officers, and committees—the complex network of communication which is the American Society for Eighteenth-Century Studies. This project continues to thrive, and will continue to need support.

The support of NEH has been significant also in maintaining the Society's international exchanges. The most important international convention for eighteenth-century scholars is, perhaps, the quadrennial Congress on the Enlightenment, the first of which was held in Geneva in 1963. ASECS was "conceived" during the second of these, held in St. Andrews, Scotland, in 1967. The fourth in this series, and the only one held in the United States, took place at Yale University during the summer of 1975. The NEH participated generously in making that event memorable. Near the time of the American Bicentennial, the conference reminded many international scholars that the United States of America is itself one of the great interdisciplinary achievements of the eighteenth century.

NEH also awarded two grants to ASECS for the creation of a greatly enlarged annual, interdisciplinary bibliography. After a complicated history in which the ever-expanding requirements of the project seemed certain to exceed the Society's financial capacities, the Society separated itself from it, arranging at the same time for it to continue to exist with an editorial office at Louisiana State University and a commercial publisher (AMS Press in New York). Now among the most respected of specialized bibliographies, it continues to be available to members at a low price, and many of the Society's members contribute reports to it and participate in its complex and far-ranging editorial structure.

ASECS has stimulated the interchange and publication of interdisciplinary research, and through its annual meeting and the meetings of its regional societies, it has provided an intellectual network for scholars in separate disciplines who might not otherwise learn of each other's work. In addition, it has initiated discussions concerning the ways to stimulate and reward excellence in teaching. ASECS and its members are, thus, deeply indebted to NEH for its support of research, publication, teaching, and scholarly projects and strongly endorse the reauthorization of the Endowment at this crucial moment in the history of the humanities.

## II

The American Society for Eighteenth-Century Studies will continue to require NEH's support in the following areas, both for its individual

and institutional members and for the work of the Society as a whole: research and publication, co-operative scholarship and projects, preservation and dissemination of eighteenth-century texts, library support, and teaching and curricular development. The Society urges that NEH should not only be born anew, but made stronger, healthier, and better endowed in the future. The Society's commitment to interdisciplinary work complements the scholarly groups organized around single disciplines, to which, indeed, most members also belong. In the eighteenth century, artists and composers, poets, dramatists, historians, and philosophers, saw no artificial boundaries circumscribing the fields they tilled; or, if they saw any, they were wont to climb over them. The modern fragmentation of disciplines did not exist when Jefferson and Madison sent letters between Paris and Virginia about classical literature, gardening, electricity, and Locke.

For fifteen years ASECS has provided a rallying point for an increasing population of dedicated dix-huitiémistes, and they have produced so much first-rate scholarship that the eighteenth century now stands out as an important field of study. At the time of Watergate and the bicentennial celebrations of the American Revolution, the American people developed a fresh interest in their origins as a nation. At the same time but in an entirely different sphere, the scholarly world turned increasingly toward a mode of understanding that could be characterized as "interpretive." Instead of attempting to formulate general laws of behavior, social scientists began to concentrate on the ways in which people make and communicate meaning. Anthropologists, sociologists, and even legal scholars drew new energy from the kind of analysis that seems peculiar to the humanities: the study of symbols. The interpretation of texts and behavior as signifying practices became a central concern for disciplines that had constituted themselves as separate bodies of knowledge a century earlier. But all paths lead through the eighteenth century, the century that is in many ways the location and historical moment of the formation of the modern age. So, strange as it may seem, eighteenth-century scholars occupy a strategic place in modern intellectual life. In the late twentieth century, when there is greater recognition that disciplinary boundaries are not self-evident but indeed are constituted by culture, language, and history, the lack of disciplinary boundaries in the eighteenth takes on renewed interest and significance. Indeed, this may be an unprecedented time for the re-evaluation of the nature of interdisciplinary and transdisciplinary studies; and societies such as ASECS may well lead the way in determining what, how, and by whose authority certain kinds of knowledge are constituted as a discipline, or as strategies for approaching disciplines.

The cooperation and collaboration required by interdisciplinary work must often be carried out by a team of two or more scholars, each of whom has mastered at least one of the standard disciplines. Very few could compete as “walking encyclopedias” with Diderot, Jefferson, or Kant. Yet support for these kinds of projects tend to be more difficult to obtain than that for individual projects, perhaps because foundations and university administrators may find collaborative plans more unwieldy to assess, cumbersome to administer, or uncertain of completion. A good example is the number of major editorial projects currently under way in the area, and in which many members are actively involved, including the James Boswell papers, the Founding Fathers Papers (Adams, Jefferson, Franklin, etc.), Rousseau’s correspondence, and the complete works of Diderot, Johnson, and Voltaire, among others—many with NEH support.

As these few examples also suggest, projects of this sort also tend to be international in nature. Whether based on this side of the Atlantic or the other, nearly all of them currently enlist the participation of U.S. based scholars, most of whom are members of ASECS. It is essential that these scholars be afforded the opportunity to continue the sort of collaborative work which, in the last few decades, has firmly established American leadership in an area which had not traditionally been viewed as one of this country’s areas of distinction.

Another consequence of the frequently international nature of interdisciplinary work and collaborative scholarship is that many scholars must travel to foreign countries to conduct research or to attend professional gatherings. These gatherings too, whether in the West or in the East, tend to be supported by national governments, and Americans have traditionally been well represented. It is therefore essential to intellectual exchange, as well as our national interest, that a mechanism continue to exist and be expanded and improved whereby such scholarly travel can be supported—that international communication among eighteenth-century scholars not be jeopardized by airfare increases.

The activities of the future NEH should also include continuing to attract the highest quality of minds to humanistic scholarship and, for the sake of future generations, into the teaching of the humanities. NEH needs to continue to encourage the infusion of research and theory into the classroom. The humanist researcher-teacher needs both time and facilities to share his explorations and the excitement of discovery (and the disappointment of a futile search) with his students—and to encourage the diffusion of the knowledge to secondary school teachers as well. The NEH seminars for teachers offer an irreplaceable opportunity for graduate and undergraduate faculties to interpret and translate the production of knowledge into something useful and stimulating to the

secondary school teacher—a need that is even more urgent today than twenty years ago, when NEH began. Similarly, NEH should continue to encourage the interrelations between the academic and non-academic worlds in programs such as conferences and seminars. Groups of citizens in positions of leadership (political, business, professional, artistic, and academic) could come together for intensive discussion of texts and ideas on, for example, the formation in the eighteenth century of some common feature of the modern age.

ASECS wants to continue to urge the Endowment's assistance to academic presses to encourage publication in the field of the eighteenth century. In addition, libraries are still central to humanistic learning. Support is needed to continue to purchase books and periodicals, and to preserve extant priceless documents; to catalogue materials; to duplicate rare or frequently used documents; and to make the profusion of existing materials accessible through annotated bibliographies and catalogues. Much of this is to be accomplished through new technology and the use of computers in order to implement new systems of cataloguing, electronic publishing and document delivery, and subject access. All of these research tools will be of essential value to eighteenth-century scholars, and NEH should continue to be at the forefront in encouraging the application of new technology to the interdisciplinary work on the eighteenth century.

ASECS does not hesitate to recommend that NEH should be continued without drastic overhauling. It has been a great help in the past, and the Society and its members plan to continue to collaborate with it in the future. Both NEH and ASECS draw on a diverse and scattered constituency. Each represents ancient and sometimes esoteric forms of humanism before a citizenry that frequently does not understand them and more frequently does not understand the importance of supporting them with public funds. And each serves as a meeting point and clearing house for different disciplines rather than as a forum for a single group. In particular, ASECS hopes to foster the diffusion of knowledge about the eighteenth century. The American people need to know more about the Age of Enlightenment. American schoolchildren need to be encouraged to ask basic questions about the fundamental documents of their political culture—for example, what is so self-evident about the truths proclaimed in the Declaration of Independence? We want to find a way to cope with the other phenomenon that struck Toqueville with such force: the difficulty of improving the quality of culture in a mass, egalitarian society. In history, in literature, in philosophy, in art and music history, the new emphasis is repeatedly on the interdisciplinary and transdisciplinary—the recognition that all texts are situated within the complex discursive practices of a social or cultural formation, what-

ever the discipline. It is time, for example, to re-examine and reconsider the choice of canonical works and texts in the fields eighteenth-century studies touch; a time of rethinking the nature of historical documents as objective facts or as constructions and deconstructions of reality; and of questioning the notion of "periods" or "ages" of thought as self-evident paradigms for constituting knowledge. It is a time of increasing questioning within and across disciplines concerning their methodology and their assumptions, a time when methodologies in all disciplines are being refined, and a time when rather than assuming that we all know the values that we want to proselytize through the humanities, we begin to debate the self-evident nature of those values.

While recognizing our debt to NEH, we do not want to gloss over our differences with it. ASECS is one of the self-generated and self-governing voluntary associations that Tocqueville saw as essential to the health of the American body politic. In contrast, NEH is a creation of the government. It cannot avoid a certain degree of politization and bureaucracy. Those tendencies may have a poisonous effect on humanistic studies. The NEH should not attempt to represent the humanities in the way that Congress represents voters, nor should it spread out the funds at its disposal so that something goes to everyone among the interest groups knocking at its door. It should put quality first. The future NEH should dedicate itself, in the most disinterested manner, to furthering the highest quality of intellectual pursuit by sheltering its programs and projects from political pressures. And, just as different languages may describe the world in differing ways, NEH, like ASECS, should foster a climate that encourages a plurality of languages, a plurality of interpretations, a plurality of ideologies.

It might be possible, for example, to allow NEH to evolve into something like a Federal Reserve Board for the humanities—a powerful, well-funded, and independent group of people who would not be the creation of a particular party or president, but rather would be appointed for a limited term. Although members have been impressed with the peer-review panels of NEH and the quality of its staff, most still think it advisable to restrain bureaucratic growth, to avoid overly elaborate reviewing, and to minimize paper work. Instead of leaning in the direction of populism or bending to political pressures, NEH should make sure that the public's money goes to those with the most talent and to the most promising projects. An independently appointed governing board might help to achieve that apolitical, or multipolitical, end.

ASECS, then, strongly urges the reauthorization of NEH. Both as individual scholars and as members of ASECS, we are grateful for its support in the past, support which has encouraged the genesis and the

completion of projects that would not have existed without its help. We would urge an even greater level of support for research, publication, libraries, travel, and cooperative scholarship. The NEH should continue to finance the publication of documents like the papers of the Founding Fathers, and it should do more to defray the rising costs of journals and scholarly meetings. It should support the research interests of independent scholars who, for reasons beyond their control, fail to find regular academic employment. In order to raise the general understanding of the eighteenth century, we think the NEH should continue to direct attention to teaching and educating American children in order to encourage their ability to transcend the present moment through their knowledge of the past, to enable them to imagine and to design a future. At a time of fundamental rethinking of the humanism on which much of the humanities is based, it should support interdisciplinary efforts to welcome scrutiny of the natural assumption that man is the source of meaning and history, an idea that took its origin in the eighteenth century and shaped the modern world. What better way to continue to re-examine the production of knowledge than by tracing the ideas to their roots in a world we need to know better, the world of the eighteenth century?

# AMERICAN SOCIOLOGICAL ASSOCIATION

---

President: Kai Erikson, Yale University

Delegate to the ACLS: Kai Erikson

ACLS Conference of Secretaries: William V. D'Antonio,  
Executive Officer

Prepared by: Alan Sica, University of Kansas and University of  
Chicago

With the advice of:

Howard Becker, Northwestern University

Robert Bellah, University of California, Berkeley

Robert Bierstedt, University of Virginia

William V. D'Antonio

Paul DiMaggio, Yale University

Kai Erikson

Wendy Griswold, University of Chicago

Joseph Gusfield, University of California, San Diego

Paul Hirsch, University of Chicago

Robert Jones, University of Illinois, Urbana

Donald Levine, University of Chicago

Charles Page, University of Massachusetts, Amherst

Richard Peterson, Vanderbilt University

John Reed, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill

Michael Schudson, University of California, San Diego

Theda Skocpol, University of Chicago

Ann Swidler, Stanford University

William J. Wilson, University of Chicago

## SOCIOLOGY AND THE HUMANITIES: A NEW PARTNERSHIP

Much has changed since 1964. At that time a group of eminent, humanistic sociologists drafted the predecessor to the present statement in anticipation of Public Law 89-209 (September 29, 1965), establishing the "National Foundation on the Arts and Humanities." The question they put themselves, "Do sociology and the humanities have any present working affinity?" was answered in a way consistent with the ethos of that intellectual period, when most scholars in their discipline seemed to be striving to emulate the methods of physical sciences.



They reported: "Probably the truest answer is, very little . . . 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." The schism they perceived has shrunk considerably in depth and width, and in its place a hearty dialogue between sociology and the humanities concerning methods *and* substance has been thriving for some time.

In Public Law 89-209, the term "humanities" was elaborately defined, taking in, along with much else, "those aspects of the social sciences which have humanistic content and employ humanistic methods." Even if debate continues over what exactly makes up "humanistic content and methods," virtually any definition would embrace much more of contemporary research by American sociologists than was earlier the case. Jacques Barzun, a bridger of gaps among disciplines, begins his recent book on William James by recounting his exasperation fifty years ago at the refusal of scientists and humanists to respect each others' work. Despairing of a solution to this problem, Barzun stumbled on James' encompassing notion of what humanities mean relative to knowledge at large: ". . . the study of masterpieces in almost any field of human endeavor. . . . You can give humanistic value to almost anything by teaching it historically. . . . The sifting of human creations!—nothing less than this is what we ought to mean by the humanities."

While it would be specious to link James' definition with most sociological research in this country, there is a growing, predominantly younger, and productive segment of the discipline which has responded warmly to humanistic currents. For example, many researchers are now following the early lead of Charles Tilly, Robert Nisbet, and others in bringing historical perspective and materials into sociology, even by becoming competent social, intellectual, technological, or economic historians in their own right. This trend has recently culminated in the establishment within the American Sociological Association of new research specialty "sections"—one on the world system, the other in comparative-historical sociology—which serve to study the evolution of our central political and cultural institutions. All of this has stimulated a blossoming of publications over the last decade treating, for example, the phenomenon of "state-making" in the history of Europe and elsewhere. In numerous volumes, chapters are offered by historians, economists, political scientists, and sociologists, each clearly composed in genuine dialogue. Such mutual instruction among disciplines was

much less common twenty years ago, especially as it turns around humanistic concerns.

Another major confluence today between sociology and the humanities appears within social theory. Whereas theorizing among sociologists in the 50s and early 60s often originated in deductive, nomological models that emphasized axiomatization and hypothesis-testing, today alternatives, some from Europe and England, are strongly felt in the United States. These have led decisively away from "formal" theory-construction of the earlier period. Many theorists now master aspects of linguistics, epistemology, moral theory, aesthetics, and related humanistic fields in an effort to deal more fully with human experience. Equally important is the reciprocal attraction felt by humanists, notably philosophers and historians, for contemporary social thought. It is now commonplace for American philosophy to respond to themes raised in concert with social theorists. Not only, then, do sociologists enrich their research by embracing humanist technique and learning, but humanists profit as they consider what social theorists have been doing since the unhappy period of "the two cultures."

Closely related to these developments are new streams that flow from the study of "culture" understood quite broadly. In the past Kenneth Burke and Erving Goffman introduced "drama" into social research, and their followers have systematized and tested their ideas via "dramaturgical" analysis. The basic question of interpretation, how cultural life is to be understood by the non-participant, has been taken up by a number of contemporary writers, all of whom find their moorings in humanistic philosophy. Clifford Geertz (an anthropologist educated by the social theorist Talcott Parsons) influences thinking about such problems in many disciplines, both within social science and without. The philosophers Heidegger, Husserl, Scheler, Wittgenstein, and Gadamer have all found a place within recent sociological analysis of culture, through the techniques of ethnomethodology, phenomenological sociology, symbolic interactionism, and other interpretive (or "hermeneutic") strategies of research. The somewhat lonely figures of Robert MacIver, Willard Waller, Robert Bierstedt, Lewis Coser, Kai Erikson—to name the best known—who helped sustain humanistic sociology during its nadir, have now been joined by a host of researchers making new use of Harold Garfinkel's ethnomethodology, Herbert Blumer's symbolic interactionism, Alfred Schutz's phenomenological sociology, and related enterprises. More and more, humanists understand texts as specific types of social action, and sociologists conceive of social action as texts, so the necessary interplay among the two "camps" becomes all but inevitable.

In the avant-garde, one can even find sociologists who have adopted narrative techniques and research procedures which follow the lead of fiction writers and other creative humanists, once thought to be completely at odds with social science. Still others have taken up the challenge of capturing social reality through photography and movies. Another branch of the field has begun assimilating interpretive techniques originated in literary criticism, biblical studies, and the analysis of historical documents, both as an aid to sociology's methods and as itself—the process of social interpretation—a substantive concern worthy of study. When these new ideas and research are added to the more established world-system and state-formation schools, it is clear that the enmity or mutual misunderstanding that blocked dialogue between humanists and sociologists has been in large measure overcome.

It would require more space than is available here to analyze why sociologists have begun taking humanist perspectives and materials as seriously as their predecessors took other components of sociological study. Surely part of this change is attributable to funding losses for projects of the scale that became feasible in the late 60s, most of which abided by a physical science model of research. But even if money had continued to flow to sociologists carrying out elaborate research agendas, it is likely that elements of history, philosophy, literature, literary criticism, aesthetics, and other humanist forces would have registered within the field, simply because the conventional research procedures had already shown their practical and theoretical limits. There were too many equivocal findings and too much pressing human experience left out of deductive nomological analysis not to alarm a sizeable portion of the discipline.

Compounding these affairs internal to sociology were currents from the wider intellectual world. Saussure, Levi-Strauss, Foucault, Gadamer, Ricoeur, and others could not easily be ignored. The complaint was heard, not just from outside the field but from within, that sociology was sacrificing substantive depth and breadth for overly precise methods and measurement. A compromise toward some influential middleground began to be felt, especially among younger practitioners who identified closely with the humanities. Philosophers, historians, creative writers, and artists have always led in sensitizing their publics to major problems and changes within American life. The wastefulness that resulted from belittling these styles of intellectual and artistic work struck sociologists unusually hard when enrollments began to fall in the mid-1970s. When students who had been resistant to traditional offerings agreed to study "sociology through fiction" or "sociology in film," the discipline at large took notice. Also, rapidly growing interest in

women's studies, ethnicity, and area studies called upon sociologists to broaden their work, and begin making more use of humanistic material.

Coupled with deeper theoretical problems that undercut social research, a tilt began toward engaging the humanities positively in the sociological enterprise. Journals like *Social Text* and *Theory & Society* appeared with editorial boards whose members came from many disciplines, including prominent representatives from sociology. Edited volumes on the logic of social research were published by scholarly groups in the U.S. that were equally heterogeneous. Members of a world-wide interest group, who agreed on the broad utility of anthropological theory, semiotics, hermeneutics, structuralism and post-structuralism, even deconstruction, began to transcend their own discipline's perimeters. A cosmopolitan era had begun, and sociologists with broader interests than had typified the field in some time joined in.

Running concurrently with such research, often inspired by foreign scholars, were other works more characteristic of American cultural and political life. Popular culture, advertising, sports, religious life, romance novels, sects of all kinds—each became more legitimate targets for sociological analysis, but of a different sort. Rather than distancing themselves from their data in the name of objectivity and value-neutrality, sociologists took phenomena of study more on their own terms. A range of methods developed, or were redeveloped after lying fallow, which in their structure and intention shared more with research techniques from history, literary criticism, even psychoanalysis, then physics or chemistry. Within sociology today the subfields which accommodate this research—e.g., sociologists of culture, religion, law, language, knowledge—have ascended from marginal positions to their present respectability precisely because a number of younger sociologists have joined the few older colleagues who have committed themselves to studying what had long been considered “unsociological.” It had become obvious that culture, writ large, was rivaling politics and economics as a determining factor in social life. Moreover, sociologists had taken their traditional projects, regarding social problems, stratification, and the impact of industrialization on rural societies, as far as they could. If *The Hobo* or *Middletown* symbolized sociological work of an important style during a period of jarring economic change fifty years ago, *Hip Capitalism* (about a rock radio station), *Discovering the News* (newspapers), and *Hollywood Studio Musicians* were the fruits of alternative sociology in the 70s. The goal had not changed—to understand American society as accurately as possible—but the locus of study and the relationship between researcher and the phenomena of interest were not what they had been.

If one considers important books—those that win awards, inspire imitation, and give intellectuals something to discuss—as signals of a discipline's direction, as opposed to technical articles that fill journals and receive scant attention from a broader public, then perhaps the humanities and sociology have at last been fruitfully joined. Two prominent books recently published by sociologists are Howard Becker's *Art Worlds* and Paul Starr's *The Social Transformation of American Medicine*. Neither could have been written by an intellectual without sociological education, yet both have found avid readers in many disciplines, including the humanities. There is indeed a sociological way of looking at the world, which justifies the field's existence. But the claims of an earlier generation, that sociology had to enroll in the ranks of physical science in order to prove its distinctive usefulness, do not enjoy the ring of authenticity they once did. If sociology and the humanities have not merged, they have lately admitted to each other their mutual need and the loss when pretending otherwise.

# AMERICAN STUDIES ASSOCIATION

---

President: Michael H. Cowan, University of California, Santa Cruz,

Delegate to the ACLS: Leo Marx, Massachusetts Institute of Technology

ACLS Conference of Secretaries: John F. Stephens, University of Pennsylvania, Executive Director

Prepared by: Michael H. Cowan  
John F. Stephens

The American Studies Association is one of the nation's largest and oldest interdisciplinary professional organizations. Chartered in 1951, the ASA now has approximately 2,300 members. They come from many fields: history, literature, religion, art, philosophy, music, science, folklore, ethnic studies, anthropology, material culture, museum studies, historic preservation, architecture, sociology, political science, communications, journalism, education, library science, gender studies, popular culture, and others. They include persons concerned with American culture: teachers and other professionals whose interests extend beyond their speciality, faculty and students associated with American Studies programs in colleges and high schools, museum directors and librarians interested in all segments of American life, public officials and educators concerned with the broadest aspects of education. They approach American culture from many directions but have in common the desire to see America as a whole rather than from the perspective of a single discipline.

The ASA publishes a major scholarly journal, the *American Quarterly*, bibliographic reference works, a newsletter, and curriculum materials for use in courses ranging from introductory American Studies to graduate seminars on special topics. The ASA holds national and regional meetings for the discussion of research, teaching, and other professional concerns. It supports and assists programs for teaching American Studies abroad, encourages the exchange of teachers and students, and maintains fraternal relations with American Studies associations in 21 countries. The following is a statement prepared by the American Studies Association toward the 1985 reauthorization of the National Endowment for the Humanities.

## THE PRESENT STATE OF AMERICAN STUDIES

### A. Origins.

The formation of the first American Studies programs was a creative response to the bias against the study and teaching of American materials in tradition-bound history and English departments. But more was at stake than the introduction of new subject matter. Many of the teachers and scholars who first became interested in American Studies in mid-century were eager to escape the narrow pedagogical and methodological confines of the traditional disciplines. Influenced by the emerging concept of culture in its modern anthropological sense, they had begun to look at American thought, institutions, and behavior as a whole from what would be called an interdisciplinary perspective.

Another purpose served by establishing American Studies as a field was to permit entrance into the Academy of teachers belonging to hitherto excluded social groups, especially ethnic and religious minorities. In many institutions it was more difficult for "outsiders" to break into long-established departments than to achieve recognition in a new field like American Studies. Unlike the establishment professors, who presumably felt secure in their own sense of American identity, the newcomers were much more likely to have a compelling personal interest in the whole ambiguous subject of American-ness. Undoubtedly, many of them were inspired by the movement for cultural democracy of the New Deal era and, unlike the traditionalists, they sought to dignify the study of American popular culture.

Furthermore, in back of the American Studies idea, there was also a conception of the United States as a social ideal. At the outset, American Studies was bound up with the anti-fascist New Deal version of progressivism, and was energized by a characteristic 1930-40's sense of social purpose and idealism.

### B. Development

The astounding growth of American Studies as an academic program was made possible by the peculiar demographic patterns in education after World War II. The great expansion of college enrollments provided the bodies to take the undergraduate and graduate courses and to staff the proliferating program. American Studies achieved institutional maturity along with the rise of area studies programs and the enlargement of traditional departments because of the expansion of the American system of higher education.

What about the results? In 1958, there were 72 programs with undergraduate majors, 15 institutions offering master's degrees, and 13 PhD granting institutions. In 1978, 272 offered bachelor's degrees, 52

had master's degrees and 32 had doctorates. In 1984, 302 offered bachelor's degrees, 60 master's, 30 doctorates, with another 10 offering associate's degrees in American Studies. While the figures alone are impressive, they do not tell us much about quality. What is happening in American Studies programs? First, those teaching in the programs, both young and old, are concerned teachers. They want to promote a very high quality in undergraduate education. Second, they want to relate the university to the surrounding community in new ways. They do not want to divorce education from the way people work and live. Third, they continue to do new kinds of research and also introduce new courses into their programs. The courses range from popular culture to material culture, from black literature to ethnicity and folklore, from community studies to women's studies. Fourth, they are often developing relationships with high school and community college teachers. Finally, they are searching out ways to become involved in international education and study.

These concerns are surely not limited to people working in American Studies. But one senses within American Studies programs especially a growing sense of community which reflects the commitments shared by teachers and students alike.

### C. Dilemmas

American Studies has been successful intellectually and institutionally during the past thirty years, and this success has posed its own kind of dilemmas. As the field established itself, its proponents discovered a supposedly common intellectual perspective, now denominated the myth-symbol-image synthesis. But the interpretations said to be classic American Studies were quickly absorbed into the traditional disciplines. As a result, American Studies continues to look for new intellectual frontiers to justify its independent existence. The foreign and domestic troubles of the United States during the 1960s and early 1970s spawned a new American Studies interest in minorities, ecology, popular culture, and the common people, and the need for intellectual justification has perpetuated these concerns into the present. This pluralism of interests, however, exacerbates the problem of finding a perspective and a method that will be unique to American Studies as such. The search for synthesis, to provide an intellectual unity for the field, is the supreme challenge facing American Studies today.

Not only is the consistent quest for intellectual identity a continuity within changes taking place in American Studies, but so is the nature of the intellectual approach taken to that synthesis. If culture was the



unifying concept of the classic American Studies synthesis, then society is the foundation of the new synthesis that seems to be emerging so rapidly. A social-materialist approach now pervades the newer scholarship, whether focusing upon neo-elites, material culture, or *mentalité*. Intellectual history has lost its place of prominence to be replaced by social history and the social interpretation of cultural phenomena. New humanistic trends in the social sciences offer the possibilities for cooperation across disciplinary lines. And American Studies can serve as a clearing house and focus of interdisciplinary effort.

The spiritual reaffirmation of America that is emerging in the 1980s poses a challenge to American Studies. On the one hand, the attitude should lead larger numbers of students to the field. On the other hand, many of the teachers in the field came to intellectual maturity in a quite different cultural climate and their tendency to criticize American institutions conflicts with the trend. Thus American Studies programs can offer an intellectual haven for the dissenting minority or the affirming majority. The back-to-basics trend in education also means the elimination of experimental and experiential credits in favor of more orthodox classroom practices. Once again, American Studies teachers will face the dilemma of resisting or joining the trends. New times, however, call for new remedies.

## THE FUTURE OF AMERICAN STUDIES

The study of American culture, history, and literature comprises the largest single subject field supported by the National Endowment for the Humanities. We hope that in the next twenty years of the Endowment's history, the agency will continue to assist in providing for the innovative leadership and financial support for American Studies, which is absolutely essential if Americans are to "know thyself." To this end, we would like to offer some suggestions concerning the future policies of the Endowment:

1. The Endowment's Division of Education Programs supports projects that link high schools and colleges through the interest in common of teachers at all levels of the subject matter they teach. Because the study of American culture is one of those primary subjects in the high school curriculum that is not likely to be eliminated by the vagaries of local school levies, the Endowment should increase its effort to encourage university scholars and secondary school teachers to collaborate on multi-year projects that include frequent interaction among faculty members.

Furthermore, the Endowment should further the development of new and imaginative *interdisciplinary* American Studies curricula in the primary and secondary schools, perhaps in cooperation with the Department of Education and the National Institute of Education. The summer institute program, which brings secondary-school teachers to improve their knowledge of the field under leading research scholars, should be developed further.

To enhance the quality of undergraduate teaching in the nation's colleges, universities, and community colleges, the Endowment should also sponsor teacher training institutes, perhaps modelled on the generally successful summer institute program, but to be directed by the most gifted teachers in the humanities.

2. There are predictions of a cyclical upturn in the school-age population which will begin to affect university and college enrollment levels in 5-7 years. At the same time, talented undergraduates are eschewing graduate work in the humanities for more "rewarding" studies. As a result, there appears impending a short-fall in the number of qualified college and university teachers within the next decade.

In order to assist PhDs in the humanities to remain in the Academy during the hiatus in employment opportunities, the ACLS has recently initiated an important new fellowship program to support 6 to 12 months of humanistic research by recent recipients of the doctorate. The program, correctly, addresses the need "for continuity of professional humanistic capabilities" and "the desirability of more successful candidates in a higher risk area." This far-sighted ACLS program cannot do what needs to be done alone.

Accordingly, we urge the Division of Research Programs to establish a similar fellowship program, to assist American Studies PhDs of the 1980s to continue their research and to remain in academic life until their services on university faculties are required.

3. Recent patterns of NEH grant-making suggest that some Endowment officers and panelists may be favoring support of projects that reflect the narrow pedagogical and methodological interests of the traditional disciplines. As competition for grants increases, it's clear that the present administration of NEH has drawn the line closer to the more conventional, least controversial, kinds of scholarly research, and is not inclined to fund the more experimental projects funded by the previous administration, *i.e.*, interdisciplinary projects and those in women's and ethnic studies. This is a very disturbing pattern to us if it is true. We believe that the Endowment should continue to support the refinement of the humanistic thought, add to it, and disseminate an understanding of the core of humanistic knowledge throughout the public. To fulfill this

purpose, it should support the contributions of interdisciplinary scholars working toward synthesis, as well as those struggling to correct imbalances in the definition and scope of American culture studies.

In conclusion, we will support the efforts of the Endowment to play an increasingly creative and effective role in national cultural life and join with it in becoming a more public presence on behalf of socially responsible humanistic study.

# ASSOCIATION FOR ASIAN STUDIES

---

President: James William Morley, Columbia University  
Delegate to the ACLS: Robert Smith, Cornell University  
ACLS Conference of Secretaries: Russell Fifield, University of  
Michigan, Secretary-Treasurer

---

## COMMITTEE

Frederick M. Asher, University of Minnesota  
Karen Brazell, Cornell University  
Ainslie T. Embree, Columbia University  
William H. Frederick, Ohio University  
Robert P. Goldman, University of California, Berkeley  
Marius B. Jansen, Princeton University  
Leo Ou-fan Lee, University of Chicago  
Patricia Steinhoff, University of Hawaii  
James L. Watson, University of Pittsburgh  
Eleanor Zelliot, Carleton College

A plea for the support of Asian humanities<sup>1</sup> must be set in the context of their place in the general academic enterprise of humanistic learning, and that place, we would insist, is at the core, not on the periphery, of the curriculum. This does not mean that we would claim equal time with Western humanities (although that is not an unthinkable proposition) but rather we are asserting that our intellectual life will be impoverished without the inclusion of the creative achievements of the great Asian civilizations. Twenty years ago the *Report of the Commission on the Humanities* began by defining the humanities as “the study of that which is most human,” and noted that “they have played an essential role in forming, preserving, and transforming the social, moral, and aesthetic values” of our civilization. It is under that broad rubric we locate the Asian humanities. As our colleagues noted in their submission to the *Report* at that time, all humanistic studies labor under

<sup>1</sup> The geographic reference in “Asian humanities” is to the great civilizations of East Asia, Southeast Asia, and South Asia, the areas within the scope of the Association for Asian Studies; in humanities we include the study of literatures, art, systems of thought, including religions, and history.

many disadvantages in our contemporary society as they endeavor to fulfill their civilizing and transforming function, but the Asian humanities, as latecomers to the academic world, find it especially difficult to assert their claim on scarce resources.

It is useful to point out one change in emphasis from twenty years ago that emerged as our committee considered the situation of Asian humanities at the present time. Our colleagues then were inclined to stress a dichotomy between the social science disciplines and the humanities in the Asian field. There was some feeling that the social sciences dealing with Asia were in a favored position because of the availability of funds through foundation and government support. Asian humanists, it was suggested, were in many cases "second-class citizens" in the academic community. Our view is that this polarization between the humanists and social scientists no longer exists to any significant degree, and we have an unhappy sense that Asian studies in both humanities and the social sciences are equally beleaguered. In discussing the situation in Asian humanities, we are also, then, to a considerable extent speaking of needs that are as important to social scientists as to humanists.

Asia is often too broad a term for specific references in the humanities and in making our report, we have drawn upon the knowledge and experience of specialists in the East Asian, South Asia and Southeast Asian fields. We have found it useful to separate to some extent comments on different geographical areas as there is often considerable variation in the development of certain fields as well as the availability of resources. Our report is, of necessity, a composite document, representing a wide spectrum of views and experience.

## I

A number of general comments may be made on the current situation that point to needs that must be met in the future. Asian studies in American universities were, in the main, established after 1950. This means that within five years or so, the entire front line of specialists—those recruited and trained in war-time programs or in the 1950's—will retire. It was a generation that had its problems, but its members had to be reasonably broad, since they had so little company (and consequently knew so little fear?), and they had a first-hand feel for their areas, usually for their languages, and knew—and usually enjoyed—the responsibility and commitment of building up institutions. This made some of them arrogant, no doubt, but it also made them dedicated.

The next generation was on the whole less broadly experienced. It

was trained, sometimes too rapidly, in an era when jobs were readily available, and its emergence into positions of leadership was delayed by predominance of the first team. It also developed less language competence in some cases; field work and first-hand contact in some countries, notably China, was difficult or impossible, and its members had less first-hand experience.

The data base of American scholarship on Asian is becoming impressive. Thirty years ago one could expect Asian specialists to have some kind of literacy beyond their own area; today they may have it, but are more likely to be hard-pressed to keep up with one segment. There is a danger of having scholars settle for that data base, instead of going back to the original language material on which most of it was based.

The present and recent student generations have received much better language instruction, have had little of their energies drained off into organizational activities, and their commitment has been tested by the job market. Field opportunities have also increased dramatically in many areas, but U.S. scholars no longer come as liberating representatives of the only real superpower, and they have to make it on their own. a true mutuality becomes possible and in fact essential.

## II

In this new situation, emphasis on language training is of singular importance. We join with others, notably the authors of the recent survey of foreign language and area studies, *Beyond Growth; The Next Stage in Language and Area Studies*, in urging the importance of continued funding for training in Asian languages of all levels. But the humanities have a special responsibility to insist that the arguments for language training should not be stressed too exclusively in terms of the nation's economic or political needs; language training should be seen as a fundamental part of the humanities, of value in its own right.

Related to this emphasis on language is a continuing need for large-scale support of translation projects in all the major Asian languages. One of the more hopeful features for Asian humanities has been the NEH with its innovative programs to support creative scholarship in the humanities. Particularly impressive has been the NEH Translations Program which has stimulated a considerable amount of new humanistic research into a wide variety of Asian texts that have been either untranslated or poorly translated. Many of these works have the potential to add to our understanding of the peoples and cultures of Asia and so to help fulfill the essential task of forming and deepening our cultural values.

## III

While the study of Asian humanities has increased in colleges and universities, a frequent comment has been heard that humanists who work on Asia are often isolated in area studies departments, and not integrated into disciplinary departments; This invites the notion that Asian humanities are exotic, or distinct from disciplinary concerns. The isolation makes them vulnerable not only to the judgement that they are expendable in times of economic hardship, but it relieves disciplinary departments of the obligation to hire Asian specialists with their limited resources. The solution is two-fold: Asian humanists must be sure that they are integrated into disciplinary departments, and they must find means of insuring that their research and teaching are considered essential to disciplinary departments.

This process of integration will not be easy. Many specialists in Asian humanities are still unable, although they are willing, to talk with other humanists at the same intellectual level. The debate between discipline and area approaches still besets us, and the new generation of Asian humanists will be compelled to acquire more sophisticated theory and methodology. On the other hand, some scholars in Asian literature and history have made valiant efforts in this direction, and they say that scholars in the Western fields have not reciprocated, often under the excuse of lack of linguistic expertise. Cross-fertilization is crucial if the term "inter-disciplinary" studies is to mean anything, and Non-Asian humanists should be encouraged to acquaint themselves with the Asian cultures even through translations.

Within the community of Asian humanists, three kinds of dialogue should be encouraged. First, colleagues from different geographical areas should engage in meaningful exchanges. As of now, not only have we not made much connection between, say, China and India, but even the Chinese and Japanese humanists have not communicated sufficiently with each other. Secondly, the two relevant disciplines in the Asian humanities—literature and history—have not reached any meaningful disciplinary common ground. A third kind of dialogue is needed to break down the artificial barrier of the so-called traditional and modern period. Modernists have often been trained with little or no knowledge of the complex cultural background of each nation's culture. On the other hand, scholars with pre-modern interests tend to show little interest in the twentieth century.

What is needed are, first of all, more diversified symposia and workshops for purposes of exploration of other disciplines. Conferences on a very narrow subject which present the research results of individual specialists are useful but there is not enough creative dialogue. Work-

shops with longer durations (one or two years, meeting at regular intervals) by smaller groups are more useful. Secondly, we still need more good translations. In the China area, for example, we need translation of contemporary works of literature and more knowledge of media sources (classic Chinese films, paintings, other graphic arts, and performing arts). Through the years, NEH has helped greatly in these areas, but funding is needed for creative approaches to link Asian and Western humanistic studies.

At this point, a concern of many scholars in the Association for Asian Studies should be noted, and that is the importance of making available the resources of the universities in Asian studies to the secondary school curriculum. Many attempts have been made in this direction, but they have not been well-coordinated or well-founded. Scholars in the Asian humanities have a special obligation to share with all scholars in the humanities in insisting on the proper role of the language, literature and art of the great traditions in the secondary schools.

## V

Over against the argument for closer links with the Western humanities and with new methodologies, the question has been raised of possible dangers in this direction. One member of the Committee suggested, for example, that "an examination of recent publications in Indian humanities, shows many of the standards of scholarship have been eroded by inappropriate ideas from religious studies, structuralism, etc. One of the disturbing results of this has been that a good deal of contemporary scholarly publication and the papers presented at conferences and symposia have taken on an uncritical stance that seeks to validate the cultural phenomena of India and other Asian nations rather than to investigate them. What is needed is the encouragement of more critical and hard-headed type of humanistic scholarship."

This comment is given as a reminder that in the Asian humanities there is much work of a basic kind that remains to be done for which funding is hard to find. The study of Asian humanities must be directly related to the human and social realities of the regions that produced them. "If Asian studies is to continue as a creative and living tradition of scholarship it will need the energy that is now draining away and this will mean honest and open, even unflinching criticism of the field and the directions it has been taking," was the conclusion of the above quotation. In specific terms, this means, imaginative funding for research projects that may at times not be in line with the latest academic fashions but which are in the nature of fundamental research.



## VI

Economic and sociological changes in American higher education over the past several years have eroded the numbers of students willing to make a serious commitment to the humanities. Asian humanities have always been much less popular and less well staffed and funded than their Western counterparts and have tended to attract only a small and special subset of humanities students, and a general decline in humanities enrollments in our universities is therefore bound to be keenly felt in the area of Asian Studies. A further exacerbation of the problem is to be perceived in the case of South and Southeast Asian studies. In our undergraduate population the language, and cultures of East Asia, particularly China and Japan, have continued to attract a considerable amount of interest, partly because of the perception that career opportunities in business are related to knowledge of these areas. This is not true of South and Southeast Asian studies and it is this area that appears likely to suffer the most serious decline in its already small student population base.

If current trends in higher education continue, declines in student enrollment will be followed by retrenchment in staffing and funding. This will initiate, or perhaps merely accelerate, a cycle that could undermine the great advances in humanistic scholarship directed towards South and Southeast Asia that characterized American higher education in the sixties and seventies. It is not likely that the near future will witness anything like the efflorescence of interest in India language, literature, religion, and general culture that characterized the sixties. It is essential, therefore, that institutions such as NEH be supported and strengthened in their efforts on behalf of Asian humanities. Legislators, administrators, and ultimately the electorate, must be shown that it is in the best interests of this nation to remain open to and in touch with the peoples and cultures of all parts of the world even though our political and business ties may not be close. Events such as the Festival of India and other artistic and cultural programs should strongly represent to government and private sources of funding the vital importance, not just in political and economic term, of this country's maintaining a strong and diverse community of area specialists. Similar efforts should be made by scholars towards university administrations who have been increasingly forced to apply strict cost-accounting standards to academic programs and so many have come to regard South and Southeast Asian studies at all but a few very large institutions as dispensable luxuries held over from more prosperous times.

The impression of a declining interest in South Asia must be set against the fact that religion departments have continued to add spe-

cialists in Hinduism, Buddhism and Islam, so that young scholars trained in the field of the History of Religion find positions and add greatly to scholarly understanding of this dimension of Asian culture. This is a hopeful sign, exhibiting an understanding of the need to approach religion in a scholarly way in a scholarly setting.

External events do affect academic interests, and the current interest in India occasioned by the *Gandhi* movie, and nostalgia for the imperial past shown in other books and films seems to have brought about at least a brief new interest in India. More can be read into this than faddism. The interest in Gandhi reflects a concern with the non-violent alternatives, and the imperialist nostalgia deals not only with days of English grandeur, but also with European-Asian encounters, thus reflecting deeper levels of meaning.

## VII

While Chinese humanistic studies are generally in a much better condition than those relating to South and Southeast Asia, these are some areas of particular concern.

After nearly thirty years of self-imposed isolation, China has begun to open its doors to Western scholars. The easing of restrictions on physical access has been accompanied by an unprecedented boom in the publication of Chinese scholarly works, and humanists who specialize in Chinese studies are finding it difficult to keep abreast of new developments in their respective fields. It is particularly important, given these changing conditions, for the American scholarly community to maintain its high standards of research on all aspects of Chinese civilization. An example of the difficulties facing China specialists is the constant struggle to sustain the Universities Service Centre in Hong Kong (managed by the American Council of Learned Societies and sponsored by grants from various funding agencies). Two generations of American scholars have been trained at this center; over three hundred books and thousands of articles have been produced by researchers who have worked there. And yet, the Universities Service Centre is facing the possibility of closure—precisely at the point when the American scholarly community most needs an independent base for the study of modern Chinese culture and society. Other examples could be cited: During the past decade a virtual avalanche of archaeological and art historical data has been released by the Chinese. Unfortunately, there are no more than a handful of trained specialists in this country who are able to assimilate and evaluate these new materials. The same might be said of other fields such as musicology, philosophy, and religious studies. It is obvious that the NEH has an important role to play in

making it possible for American scholars to take advantage of these unprecedented opportunities in Chinese research.

## VIII

This last comment returns to what has been a constant theme of most recent discussions of the state of Asian studies in general and of the humanities in particular, the problem of funding scholarly research. There is general agreement by scholars in the Asian field that research resources, while reasonably adequate in some fields, are very unevenly distributed. A very large proportion of scholars in the Asian field are spread across the academic landscape far more broadly than in the past. We have many very well-qualified scholars teaching at institutions which cannot provide the research support they need to maintain their skills and continue making contributions to knowledge. The NEH role is particularly important here because it can serve individuals, as opposed to Title VI, which is oriented to supporting the major centers. Scholars outside centers need to be able to compete for research funds that, while they may not be earmarked for Asian studies, at least recognize the special needs of Asian scholars and do not penalize them for their esoteric interests.

Humanists in the Asian field, including humanistic social scientists, require basically *time* to do their research, rather than visible resources (other people's labor, computer time, equipment, etc.). Yet the expenditure of the scholar's own time is the most difficult research cost to justify. For Asian humanists, the time burden is further compounded by the language and culture gap which the research enterprise must cross.

Asian humanists require three rather different types of research time. The first, and most self-evident, need is for time in the field to collect materials for new projects and consult with colleagues. An important aspect of research time in the field is the need to maintain perishable linguistic skills. This is one of the most urgent tasks confronting Asian studies.

The second requirement is uninterrupted time for the arduous task of working through the material acquired in the field. It takes a long time to train Asian specialists, whatever their discipline, and Asian humanists take the longest because their work requires the greatest depth of knowledge of the language and culture. What is less acknowledged is that the research of fully trained Asian scholars takes more time to complete, because of the same linguistic and cultural barriers. Even if one can read Japanese fluently, the discipline of taking comprehensible notes slows the task down enormously. The most experienced Asian scholar still grapples continually with ambiguous nuances

and unfamiliar references which can only be clarified by arduous detours into reference materials which—assuming they exist at all—are also written in an Asian language and often awkwardly organized.

A third necessary form of research time is the brief follow-up trip to the field. An experienced scholar who is immersed in a topic can accomplish a tremendous amount in a few weeks in the field, which may speed the completion of the work. Travel costs, as well as escalating living costs in many areas of Asia, make such trips impossible for most scholars without outside research support.

These three types of research support for individuals need to be acknowledged, and probably provided for through separate competitions. When they are pooled, the competition tends to favor the initiation of new research through longer stays in the field, at the expense of support to complete work already begun.

It is sometimes suggested that Asian humanists tend to work on individual research topics rather than the collaborative, cumulative projects that characterize the social and natural sciences. This is a misperception of the situation. Asian humanists are necessarily scattered rather thinly and the manpower needed to undertake massive, labor-intensive projects is not concentrated in one geographic area. Since the late 1950's specialists have tried to overcome this through research conferences and workshops. The form is awkward, but could be improved by some reconceptualization and new types of support.

If the research conference is understood as a mechanism for collaborative research by a team of scholars from different institutions, then the form can be adapted to meet the group's needs. This may mean support for a longer series of meetings, each of longer duration, among a smaller group of scholars. Such an arrangement could push beyond the now difficult to publish conference volume toward monographs which reflect collaboration in every chapter, rather than through the standard editor's introduction and conclusion. There have been a few such working groups already, and the field is ripe for more. What is needed is a source of funding sympathetic to both the content and the form of such research.

A related problem is the increasing difficulty of obtaining scholarly publishing outlets (particularly for conference volumes and other multi-authored works) without some subsidy of publication costs. The problem is greatly exacerbated in the Asian humanities because of the need to include text in other writing systems. It is further compounded in those disciplines that require expensive plates to illustrate the manuscript. Some provision needs to be made for publication cost subventions, either through a competitive publication fund for manuscripts that have already been through the referral process, or through the inclusion

## ASSOCIATION FOR ASIAN STUDIES

of publication costs in research grants, as is often done in the natural sciences.

In summary, support for the Asian humanities is needed under five major categories:

1. The teaching of the languages of Asia and for programs to encourage the retention and use of these languages once they are acquired;
2. Grants for individual scholars engaged in both new and continuing projects;
3. Collaborative research in the Asian humanities, including released time for the individual participants, travel support so that collaboration can truly occur, and publication support to ensure the dissemination of the results of the research;
4. Symposia for humanists who are often isolated from others in their field, as well as workshops to encourage cross-regional and cross-disciplinary studies.
5. Efforts to make available the existing resources of Asian studies in colleges and universities to secondary schools.

## IX

We conclude by returning to our insistence that the claim for resources to support Asian humanities is based on our belief in their intrinsic value in enriching our cultural experience. At the same time, we would also insist that knowledge of the great cultures of Asia will be a salient element in the destiny of our country in a world where the nations of Asia will play a dominant role in every sphere of human activity.

# ASSOCIATION OF AMERICAN GEOGRAPHERS

---

President: Risa I. Palm, University of Colorado  
Delegate to the ACLS: Julian Wolpert, Princeton University  
ACLS Conference of Secretaries: Robert T. Aangeenbrug,  
Executive Director

---

## COMMITTEE

Michael P. Conzen, University of Chicago, Chair  
Donald W. Meinig, Syracuse University  
Yi-Fu Tuan, University of Wisconsin  
Wilbur Zelinsky, Pennsylvania State University

## GEOGRAPHY IN THE HUMANITIES

Given geography's roots in classical antiquity, the discipline has long possessed a broad intellectual concern with the earth as the home of man that succeeding specializations of knowledge have done little to diminish. Notwithstanding all the bifurcation of fields that modern science has encouraged, geography, like history, continues to offer a frame of reference for viewing the meaning of human affairs against the coordinates of space and time. Modern geography pursues an agenda of inquiry so wide that parts of it are often perceived as falling under several of the major administrative rubrics of knowledge, namely, science, social science, and the humanities. The vitality of the discipline, however, depends on the free development of ideas in each of these spheres and their unhindered cross-fertilization—barriers to which have long plagued American geography, even following the establishment of the National Endowment for the Humanities. It is insupportable to view sponsorship of the discipline as the major responsibility of only one of these spheres. Geography in the humanities has occasionally appeared a somewhat muted enterprise, which impression serves only to limit the fruitful commerce of ideas often attainable between geography and history, literature, and philosophy, as well as most of the other traditional fields in the humanities. Unfamiliarity with the intellectual

scope of modern geography has from time to time handicapped official custodians of the humanities in strengthening the discipline's humanistic role in needed ways, so the occasion for this report is timely and welcome.

Geography examines and interprets the relationship between man as an occupier and shaper of the earth's surface and the environment thus encountered and modified over the whole span of human existence. In the context of the humanities, this relationship extends from social thought and collective action to individual perception and behavior. As studied by geographers, this relationship is interpreted through various forms of global and regional synthesis of the formative factors in areal organization, with particular attention to the nature of people's attachment to and transformation of place, as expressed in the character of the cultural landscape. As practiced, geographical scholarship discovers, delineates and decodes human imagery of the earth for the latent meanings it holds for sense of being and purpose, and when well done through evocative writing and carefully chosen graphic imagery represents an artistic as well as a scientific contribution to humane thought. This concern for mankind and individual in proper relation to the continuously changing physical and cultural setting gives geography its unique role in scholarly enquiry.

## FORMER BIASES, NEW DIVERSITY

Twenty years ago, the predecessor report to this recognized in the conduct of American geography a "noticeable bias" against the humanistic dimension of the discipline and in favor of a hard scientific approach, powered by quantification, based on perceptions at the time of what types of geographical research were more likely to gain financial support. The implication was made that, with the creation of the National Endowment for the Humanities (NEH), humanistic endeavors in geography would better flourish and the bias within the discipline would disappear or diminish. That desired change has to a welcome degree become evident, but not so much for the reason implied. The continued popularity of the scientific mode of enquiry retarded geographers' response to the creation of the NEH, and participation in and success by geographers in NEH programs has over the last two decades been less intense and visible than hoped for. On the other hand, intellectual changes in the practice of American geography during the period have been much more favorable to humanistic pursuits than has been generally credited outside, and provide a basis now for arguing confidently for increased participation of geographers in NEH programs. A substantial reaction against scientism in geography has taken place, not only for its

excesses but also on account of the major gaps and inadequacies in its agenda. A better balance between modes of enquiry now exists, and a genuine florescence of interest and writing on humanistic issues has occurred throughout the discipline during the last decade in particular.

## SELECTED GEOGRAPHICAL ISSUES IN THE HUMANITIES

This is not the place for an extended review, but the diversity of interest can be illustrated by the following small selection of orientations in contemporary and historical geography. There is of course no priority or hierarchical structure implied in this selection and its ordering, but rather a fleeting glimpse of a few of the issues and themes that animate many geographers with humanistic interests.

Human awareness of and concern with the physical environment is basic to geography. It can be argued, however, that public discourse about the composition and role of environmental quality in society is dominated by functionalist preoccupations, and that, despite the political activism of the environmental movement, thinking about the issue lacks a certain utopian flair. We know a good deal individually and collectively about environmental quality—that is, we know what kind of environment we do not want (toxic waste dumps, soil erosion, flooding, and visual blight, for example), but we know with far less certainty the kind of environment we do want (and how much of what, where). As a result, nostalgia substitutes too readily for clear thinking about common and preferred as distinct from merely minimal goals.

This theme can be carried over into the realm of the built environment, where obsolescence is endemic. What is obsolescence, and what individual and social consequences flow from different definitions of it? What rights do those with resources and power have over others in the spatial patterning of new and old living environments? Who decides the form of domestic and public spaces, and the rules by which these spaces are used? When is old fabric no longer usable, when and where should it be saved, by whom, for what reason, and on whose behalf?

More generally, what relation exists between human settlement patterns and technology? The latter serves too easily as scapegoat for social planning ills and benign harbinger of new lifestyles. What are the consequences of technological applications for environment balance, and what modifications in environmental attitudes does technological change bring?

Sense of place figures prominently in geographers' thinking about people and their environments. How landscapes are perceived and understood reflects on environmental satisfaction and social rootedness,



and regional consciousness plays a significant role in defining personal identity and communal values. Furthermore, geographical scales of awareness (the family, neighborhood, region, nation, etc.) are crucial in molding individual experience and relating it to larger entities.

These and other issues come together in the pursuit of historical geography. Regardless of methodological approach, the historical perspective in geography seeks to contribute a coherent view of the continuous shaping of peoples and cultures in particular regional and national settings. Places are created by history, and by reconstructing changing use of resources and creation of settlement morphologies, we come to appreciate the enormous human potential of places.

This expands to encompass a study of comparative regionalism that offers a desirable framework for a holistic world view. The need continues for improved international understanding in America, and learning to live with others near and far who are different by understanding why brings together regional historical geography and a host of allied humanities.

## NEEDS

Support for geographical research from NEH over the last two decades has been spotty. It has come largely in the form of some research fellowships and funding for interdisciplinary programs, especially cartographic projects such as historical atlases. A definite belief exists in the discipline that the level of support has in the past reflected more the poor representation of geographers on general program review panels (and the attendant unfamiliarity with geography of many panel servers from other disciplines) than the quantity and quality of proposals, and that that in turn has discouraged heavier submissions. Recent indications, however, suggest that this pattern happily is changing somewhat for the better. Given the steady and solid widening of humane interests in geography, both a general strengthening and a broadening scope of support seem warranted. The following sections attempt to outline needs felt important in a number of separate contexts within the discipline.

## SCHOLARSHIP

### *Fellowships and Research Grants*

Continuation of the individual research fellowship program and the research grants program is vital. For those in academic settings, institutional pressures impinging on research time are rising, for a variety

of reasons, and in some cases sabbatical and leave programs are being eliminated or trimmed. In an era when research funds are tight, and alternative funding sources sometimes redefine guidelines in ways that limit the free pursuit of knowledge in the interests of short-term goals, the need for National Endowment fellowships and grants is all the more essential.

A decided need in human geography is to improve the conditions under which original books, not just articles, can be written. An overwhelming proportion of the best and most imaginative work in human geography appears in book form—regional monographs, conceptual think-pieces, synthetic treatments—and yet the discipline is in many ways very tied to article-length, journal communication. Adequate fellowship support can materially improve the prospects for a greater frequency of such sustained enquiry.

### *Conferences*

Similarly, support for scholarly conferences needs to continue. In particular, there is a need at this time for “stock-taking” conferences, or “retreats,” in which acknowledged leaders and promising newcomers can review general achievements in particular lines of research and propose new directions in carefully prepared position papers with extended discussion. Such reflective conferences would be especially valuable, for example, between geographers and historians. Often, this kind of reappraisal is better served by special conferences than by grandstand or command performances in isolated sessions at typical annual meetings of constituent associations. In an era when so much pressure is exerted to supply occupational training for prospective employment, even in the academic sphere, the need for opportunities to reexamine the intellectual bases of human geography is compelling, and would go far in combatting the undue influence that technical vocationalism wields in our society today.

### *Research Materials*

Geographers have special needs regarding source materials in graphic and cartographic form. More than most other archival materials, historical and contemporary maps and photographs are often poorly collected, stored, and made accessible. Since maps are not yet standard components of national cataloging programs, there is a particular need to support cartobibliography projects. NEH has underwritten some excellent programs of this sort, but the surface of this problem has only been scratched.

Related to this, the need to connect evidence from a variety of sources to political-territorial units requires development of reliable research

materials dealing with spatial organization. Historical county boundary data files exemplify this need, and a recent pilot project demonstrated their viability and value. Support is urgently needed to complete this resource to provide national coverage, otherwise what exists will be no more useful than a library full of books limited to authors between A and F.

A third type of research material requiring continued Endowment support is the reference atlas. Costly though some recent methods of historical atlas development have proven to be, the value of such projects cannot be overstated. Alternative methodologies and less expensive practical arrangements for producing such atlases besides those funded to date by NEH do exist, as the national historical atlas projects of Canada and Australia are now demonstrating. The national cultural significance of historical atlases sets this type of project in a context far broader than simply the interests of geographers alone.

Other desirable research materials deserving support include various types of geographical gazetteers, from the conventional kind to more experimental ones such as lost and changed placenames, as well as dictionaries of geographical terms and regional compendia of distinctive folkways.

## ACADEMIC TRAINING

### *Graduate Fellowships*

Notwithstanding wide fluctuations in the availability of academic teaching positions from time to time, the teaching profession will continue to need replacements and new employment sectors such as public history and environmental management will seek new recruits with advanced training in the humanities, including geography. We feel that continued support of dissertation research and writing without distractions is a supreme investment in advanced academic training and an unparalleled avenue towards higher standards.

### *Institutes*

Beyond fellowship support, however, two principle needs exist in sharpening traditional skills needed by geographers engaged in humanistic research that are currently supervised only casually, literary skills and the art of field observation. These have become problematical over the years because of initially external circumstances, and it is felt that summer institutes devoted to their accelerated development are highly desirable. The secular national decline in writing skills that students enter college with has affected geography with particular

severity. In history, the sequential order of events through time permits wide and easy use of narrative writing, but good geographical description requires an ability to write about phenomena distributed in at least two-dimensional space in which the sequential order of discussion is anything but clear. The lack of skilled writing experience among geographers in training now hampers their maturation into effective and imaginative scholars. Comparatively few university teachers, though they may well concede the shortcoming, have the dedication or indeed the opportunity for remedy on any substantial scale.

Field observation is a fundamental means of securing certain types of geographical evidence. The so-called scientific and quantitative "revolution" that swept through American geography and crested in the 1960s greatly popularized extensive use of statistical data drawn from institutional sources to the detriment of field-gathered evidence. As a result, a large portion of practically a whole generation came to professional maturity with a substantial disdain for, if not actual ignorance of, the value of field observation. While this was less true of humanistically-inclined geographers, the loss of visual acuity produced a measurable retardation in the development of historical geography, landscape studies, and geographical work on folkways and cultural behavior.

To rectify these weaknesses we recommend the support of summer institutes, of perhaps four to six weeks, for intensive exposure to and training in advanced geographical writing and field observation, to be conducted by master geographers respected for their technical accomplishments with these skills. While aimed primarily at graduate students unable to benefit in this way from their normal study program, these institutes might also cater to selected faculty keen to upgrade their competence, particularly those in institutions offering advanced degrees in geography where they could better influence new entrants to the discipline.

## SECONDARY EDUCATION

Widespread geographical illiteracy is a matter for national concern, and there is little disagreement that something major needs to be done, particularly at the high school level. It is readily accepted in thoughtful circles that a rudimentary geographical knowledge of the world that individuals live in is, or should be, in this age, a birthright. It is not merely a matter of knowing the location of important things around the world, but also knowing the explanations behind those locations and developing the power to reason geographically. There is much to be

done in raising the sophistication of the geography taught in the secondary schools of the United States. Much of that effort needs to be made through other institutional channels, but there are some steps appropriate for NEH to support.

### *Curriculum Conferences*

In the short term a valuable step would be to hold a series of conferences between high school teachers and administrators, school board members, and university geography teachers to address issues of modern geographical knowledge, and therefore course content, structure, and preparation of associated materials and teaching aids. Such conferences would ideally cater to national, state, and local constituencies in order to bring some degree of order and uniformity of standards to the public discourse on this subject. Here, the recent historical bias towards a "social studies" (social-scientific) view of geography in some educational quarters increases the importance of undertaking a broad humanities initiative in this sphere. Thus geography could play a valuable role in helping to refurbish and reintegrate the humanities in American high schools.

### *Summer Institutes*

The high school teaching corps responsible for geographical instruction needs major help, and summer institutes for teacher retraining are an urgent matter. The professional organizations such as the Association of American Geographers and the National Council for Geographic Education are working to provide some intellectual leadership in defining the scope and content of the new geography to be taught in schools, but have clearly insufficient material resources to follow through on these initiatives without assistance. NEH could, and should, offer a program that would support college faculty capable of responding enthusiastically to the challenge of retraining high school geography teachers, until parallel efforts in schools of education could add to their number properly trained fresh recruits.

## OUTREACH: GEOGRAPHY AND THE GENERAL PUBLIC

The interest of ordinary Americans in geography is amply, if indirectly and imperfectly, gauged by the nine million membership of the National Geographic Society. And yet, despite the existence of one of the largest and most active organizations ostensibly devoted to the popularization of a scholarly field, there is a very distinct need for NEH sponsorship of geographical work aimed at a general audience.

The National Geographic Society's magazine has kept alive since a former age of exploration a broad interest among the general public in the geographical diversity of the world and the character of faraway places, especially during a period when many academic geographers specialized in phenomena and study methods seemingly remote from popular interest. As it happens, the National Geographic Society gives more coverage to the work of biologists, anthropologists, and other earth and social scientists than geographers. This implied cleavage in the potential mechanism by which advances in scholarly geography are to be passed on to a wider audience has only recently begun to be narrowed, with benefits yet to be measured. But the newer collaboration with academic geographers notwithstanding, the evident function of the *The National Geographic* is as much to entertain as to educate. The strict editorial control of content that typifies most of the Society's publications and television specials leaves much room for independent ventures in developing national media projects focussed on the professional concerns of modern geography.

#### *National Media Projects*

Examples of suitable print, film, and television projects that NEH should support revolve around issues in which individual and social values can be searchingly explored, while avoiding the glib affirmation of the "American Way of Life" as a cultural given. One such illustration might be a film or television series on the evolution of America's regional landscapes since the beginning of human occupation, examining how they have been modified by succeeding generations with changing aims, tools, and techniques. Conflicting values would surely emerge and be shown to have left their imprint in the relict patterns of surviving buildings, structures, and artifacts from earlier eras. Another possible kind of project might be a daring series of regional guides to the human geography of America's states, regions, and cities. (In another time the Federal Writers' Project created a now-classic library of masterpieces of regional description—the WPA guides—most volumes superbly illustrated with the work of some of the best photographers and artists of the day. That was nearly half a century ago and the books now are greatly valued.) A growing interest in the character of the nation's extraordinarily varied landscapes in this present-day recreation-oriented age suggests the suitability of a new effort in this direction, based on the regional insights of modern geographers.

A related context for similar outreach is that of the museum. Historical museums have exploded in popularity, many devoted to local aspects of the past. In their further development and movement towards more sophisticated modes of presentation geographical setting and

other themes can play an enhanced role. Historical and cultural geographers are particularly well equipped to join historians and others in sustaining this drive. Particular support should also be given to travelling exhibits. These can be concerned both with foreign cultures (most opportunities have been defined largely in terms of the interpretation of the arts rather than broader humanistic themes), and also with regional folk and modern cultures within America. For example, exhibitions devoted to eastern "culture hearths" could travel through the west interpreting for westerners some of the ancestral origins of their own regional characteristics, much changed of course through migration and mixing. Conversely, western-oriented exhibits could tour the east in order to present the myths and realities of the western experience in sharper perspective.

Other possibilities include media projects that would, for example, look at comparative cultural values in foreign lands: not just with an anthropological perspective, but with concern for modern economic, political, and resource issues that shape other peoples world outlook and define their so-called national interests. Or, a series could be visualized on "preferred environments," to reiterate a theme mentioned earlier, in which some attempt might be made to explore the problems raised in any attempt to reconcile different views about what environments should contain within specific geographical locales. This would draw upon ideas and opinions from the whole spectrum of interests and offer intriguing confrontations of incompatible values.

### *Regional Studies Centers*

Much of the study and definition of initiatives such as these can stem from the intellectual leadership of university-based regional studies centers. It has been axiomatic in geography since the dawn of the discipline that regions differ in their physical and social composition, and that these differences affect the functioning and transformation of the whole range of local, national and international entities from farms and cities to nations over the whole course of human history. Other disciplines in the humanities are increasingly ready to acknowledge the interpretive value of regionalism. There exist of course numerous interdisciplinary foreign area studies programs in the United States under a variety of auspices, their national worth readily recognized in diplomatic and commercial as well as scholastic terms. Now there is growing awareness of the similar significance of regional differences within the nation, and the field of American studies well illustrates both the inescapable role of regionalism in defining "things American" as well as the cooperative and lively exchange of ideas between disciplines on this score. Rejection of such models of American development as

Anglo-conformity and the melting pot and acceptance of such concepts as culture hearths, culture regions, and pluralism within America have opened up wide new vistas for reinterpreting the varied bases of American identity and organization along regional lines.

A number of regional studies centers of varying age and sponsorship serve to exemplify the potential of this intellectual thrust: the Institute for Southern Culture, the program in American and New England Studies in Boston, and the Center for Great Plains Studies in Nebraska, to name only three. We believe that the value of nurturing the establishment of several additional regional studies centers, perhaps through challenge grants, is readily apparent and major support of that kind would offer an unsurpassed opportunity for the various disciplines of the humanities to work together on scholarly issues fundamental to understanding the internal evolution and diversity of the nation. Geographers' long-standing concern with regional study and synthesis well suits them to play energetic, and indeed perhaps central, roles in the life of such enterprises. The work undertaken in these regional centers would, of course, generate a substantial flow of ideas and findings appropriate for public dissemination and provide a splendid example of academic outreach.

#### *State and Local Projects*

Considering the relationship of the National Endowment for the Humanities to state humanities councils, some of the foregoing proposals could also be supported feasibly at the state level. A particularly attractive theme at the regional scale would be examinations of the "sense of place" that localities evoke in different kinds of people, drawing out their attitudes towards their surroundings.

## CONCLUSION

It is evident that we express great satisfaction in the existence and general accomplishments of the National Endowment for the Humanities over the last twenty years, and consider its continued robust presence in national life to be of the highest priority. In particular, we have entered a period in which "partnership" between government and other institutional sectors of society is being vigorously pressed with the near-status of formal policy. As far as this relates to cultural activities and programs, such a trend makes it more important than ever that a body such as the National Endowment support the future humane study of our world without bias. In this endeavor, geography will continue to serve as a committed partner in the humanities.



# BIBLIOGRAPHICAL SOCIETY OF AMERICA

---

President: G. Thomas Tanselle, John Simon Guggenheim  
Memorial Foundation  
Delegate to the ACLS: Marcus A. McCorison, American  
Antiquarian Society  
ACLS Conference of Secretaries: Irene Tichenor, Executive  
Secretary

---

## COMMITTEE

G. Thomas Tanselle, Chair  
Howell J. Heaney, Free Library of Philadelphia (Emeritus)  
John Lancaster, Amherst College  
Ruth Mortimer, Smith College  
Roger Stoddard, Harvard University  
Irene Tichenor

The field of bibliography, as represented by the Bibliographical Society of America and a number of other bibliographical societies in the English-speaking world, is concerned with the study of books and manuscripts as physical objects. It is founded on the dual recognition (1) that these materials are cultural artifacts deserving study in their own right and (2) that the texts, or intellectual contents, they transmit may be affected by the means of transmission and thus may be better understood as those means are better understood. The field therefore encompasses the history of the trades (such as typefounding, papermaking, printing, binding, and publishing) that contribute to the production of these artifacts, as well as the analysis of the physical evidence preserved in the artifacts themselves. The listing of material on particular subjects—an activity the products of which are sometimes called “bibliographies”—is not a concern of the field of bibliography but rather is the responsibility of every field toward its own literature. A subject listing becomes of bibliographical interest only when it pays careful attention to the production history of the items recorded; and the only purely enumerative listings that are relevant to the field of bibliography are those dealing with its subject matter. Consequently bibliographical studies may examine any books or manuscripts,

regardless of their subject content, so long as the focus is on the way in which the physical evidence in those books or manuscripts illuminates their own production history or the texts they contain. General studies of the history of the production of books and manuscripts (or their parts), based ultimately on this kind of examination of specific examples, are therefore also part of the domain of bibliography.

The origins of the field as a professional discipline with a sense of identity can be traced—like those of many fields—to the last third of the nineteenth century. In England, Henry Bradshaw's work analyzing the type and structure of incunabula—and the work of those he influenced, such as Robert Proctor and A. W. Pollard—laid a foundation for the scholarly study of books and helped establish the climate in which a Bibliographical Society could be founded in London in 1892 and the Sandars Readership in Bibliography at Cambridge in 1894. By the time the Bibliographical Society of America was founded in 1904, the next major development was in its formative stages: A. W. Pollard and two younger English scholars, R. B. McKerrow and W. W. Greg, were beginning to show how the textual criticism of English Renaissance drama is affected by an analysis of the physical evidence present in the printed volumes that are the sources of that literature. One of the remarkable scholarly achievements of the first half of the twentieth century was the continuing exploration, largely in connection with English Renaissance books, of the recognition that printed texts, like manuscript texts, cannot be fully understood apart from an examination of the factors that caused the physical product to emerge as it did. By mid-century the work of Fredson Bowers and Charlton Hinman made the United States an important center for this kind of research. Of particular influence were two of Bowers's achievements: his establishment of an annual, *Studies in Bibliography* (1948– ), which has promoted bibliographical analysis and published the work of such scholars as William B. Todd and Allan Stevenson, who pushed the analytical approach into new areas; and his writing of *Principles of Bibliographical Description* (1949), which codified the English tradition of physical description and promulgated more rigorous standards for the treatment of modern books.

In England and the United States, the bibliographical societies have over the years supported publications—both serial and monographic—that have disseminated some of the most significant work along these lines. The most famous of the many publications of the Bibliographical Society in England is the *Short Title Catalogue* of pre-1641 English books (1926), now in course of revision; that of the Bibliographical Society of America is Frederick R. Goff's *Incunabula in American Libraries: A Third Census* (1964; supp. 1972), now serving as

the nucleus for a computerized union catalogue of incunabula in progress at the British Library. Two other widely known publications—Joseph Sabin's *Bibliotheca Americana* (1868–1936) and Jacob Blanck's *Bibliography of American Literature* (1955– )—have also been produced under the auspices of the BSA. (The most recent of the BSA's separate monographs are Thomas R. Adams's *The American Controversy: A Bibliographical Study of the British Pamphlets about the American Disputes, 1764–1783* and Richard J. Wolfe's *Early American Music Engraving and Printing*.) These two societies—with their major journals, *The Library* and the *Papers of the Bibliographical Society of America*—have been joined by a number of others, such as (to name those with significant serial publications) the bibliographical societies of Oxford, Cambridge, the University of Virginia, Canada, Australia and New Zealand, and Northern Illinois. Book-collecting societies, following the lead of the English Roxburghe Club (1812), have also been an important influence in the bibliographical world. The Grolier Club of New York (founded in 1884, twenty years before the BSA) has contributed most notably to bibliographical activity with its century-long series of meetings, exhibitions, and publications. By the turn of the century other clubs existed in Boston, Chicago, Cleveland, and Philadelphia, and now clubs are found in Albany, Baltimore, Los Angeles, San Francisco, and other places as well (in England there is a Private Libraries Association). Organizations of persons interested in particular aspects of books have also flourished, such as those concerned with printing—the Double Crown Club and the Printing Historical Society in London, the Rounce and Coffin Club in Los Angeles, and the Typophiles and the American Printing History Association in New York. Recently in the United States an Association for Documentary Editing and a Society for Textual Scholarship were formed. In addition to the receptions, meetings, conferences, and publications supported by these various organizations, and by the friends' groups of rarebook libraries, there are a number of independent journals, such as the *Book Collector*, *Publishing History*, and *Fine Print*, and several independent lectureships, the best known of which are the Sandars and Lyell series in England and the Rosenbach and Engelhard series in the United States. A particularly active forum for speakers in the field is provided by the Friends of the Book Arts Press at the Columbia University School of Library Service. The professional library world also offers an annual conference of bibliographical interest organized by the Rare Books and Manuscripts Section of the Association of College and Research Libraries. The annual Conferences on Editorial Problems at the University of Toronto are well established (and the proceedings of them are published); and the Center for the Book in the Library of Congress holds numerous

conferences, publishes books and pamphlets, and supports research, such as the current project to index the early copyright records. Under the auspices of the Modern Language Association of America, work is going forward on the revision of Donald Wing's short-title catalogue, covering 1641-1700; and, in the largest international cooperative venture of all, the Eighteenth-Century Short Title Catalogue is making excellent progress (assisted—for American imprints—by the North American Imprints Program of the American Antiquarian Society). These examples are perhaps sufficient to suggest that the field of bibliography has grown to be, and is presently, an extraordinarily active one.

The current state of the scholarly work emerging from all this activity was assessed in 1979 at the 75th anniversary meeting of the BSA, where the achievements and problems in four areas were taken up (see the Third Quarter 1979 number of the BSA's *Papers*). In the area of analytical bibliography, great strides have unquestionably been made in the last half-century, particularly in the analysis of English Renaissance books, although some of this work has been justly criticized for a lack of proper caution in its use of inductive evidence. This examination of the physical evidence present in books must obviously continue, however difficult it may be to interpret, alongside the search in external documents for evidence about the bookmaking process. The two approaches are complementary, and closer ties should in the future be forged between historians of printing and analytical bibliographers. Although much of the analytical work has been undertaken by literary scholars, literary critics have not always recognized the relevance of it to their concerns, and this connection also needs to be fostered. Furthermore, bibliographical analysis should be applied more intensively to books of recent periods and to books other than those considered to have "literary" contents, demonstrating in the process the connection between physical evidence and intellectual content in all written and printed matter of all periods. A second area of significant achievement has been descriptive bibliography: theoretical and methodological discussion has proceeded to build on the base established by Pollard, Greg, and Bowers, and a number of excellent individual bibliographies have put these new approaches into practice. But mediocre descriptive bibliographies continue to appear in quantity, partly because there are publishers for these works who do not insist on high standards and partly because some would-be bibliographers have not yet learned that a descriptive bibliography is a work of historical scholarship, at once a form of biography and a partial history of the book trade. Raising the general level of descriptive bibliographies to reflect current bibliographical thinking is thus another task for the future. A third area in

which remarkable developments have occurred in the last few decades is that of textual criticism and scholarly editing. Textual scholarship is of course not a solely bibliographical pursuit, but the findings of analytical and descriptive bibliography are essential to it—a point prominently exemplified in the series of editions produced under the auspices of the Center for Editions of American Authors (later the Center for Scholarly Editions) of the Modern Language Association of America. There has been, and will continue to be, vigorous debate over editorial theory; but there can be no disputing the relevance of physical evidence to textual decisions. Most of the editions that are firmly grounded in bibliographical research have thus far been produced in the field of literature. Recognition that this kind of research is equally pertinent to the establishment of texts in all fields is one of the great desiderata for the future. A fourth area of considerable recent activity is book collecting, an area that indeed has never been livelier. Dealers and collectors are, by virtue of their activity, bibliographical scholars; and their catalogues can be important bibliographical works. The best dealers and collectors are imaginative in finding new paths to pursue; but, as in any field, there are many others—including some who write introductory manuals—whose narrowness tends to trivialize the undertaking. It is to be hoped that in the future more dealers and collectors will come to understand their creative role in finding new connections between books and in opening up new lines of inquiry.

All these points, made in 1979, remain valid. But any characterization of the field today must take into account one further development, which has emerged more clearly in the intervening years: the growing influence of historians concerned with the role of the book in social and cultural history. This approach to book history is often referred to as *histoire du livre*, for it is associated with a group of French historians and their American followers. A debate has grown up between historians focusing on the reception and impact of books and those representing what is sometimes called the “Anglo-American” tradition of close analysis of the physical evidence in books. It is an oversimplification to generalize about national differences in this way; but the discussion does call attention to a fundamental issue—the relative roles in book history of evidence external to books (such as that found in printers’ and publishers’ archives or library records) and of physical evidence of production history found in surviving copies of the books themselves. Several conferences in recent years have addressed aspects of this question: the Rare Books and Manuscripts Section’s 1980 Boston conference (the proceedings of which appeared in print in 1983 as *Books and Society in History*) has been followed by meetings at the Herzog August Bibliothek in Wolfenbüttel and at the American Antiquarian

Society in Worcester, Massachusetts (which has instituted a Program in the History of the Book in American Culture). Clearly in this area, as in the others already mentioned, what is needed is greater communication and cooperation among scholars with different specialities.

Bibliography is thus full of great vitality at present. As a result of the existence of so much activity, the BSA has established a Committee on Bibliographical Projects to serve as a clearinghouse and to help stimulate cooperation. If satisfactory progress is to continue to be made toward the goals just outlined, a number of practical needs must be met in the coming years:

1. Interdisciplinary partnerships between bibliographers and other scholars should be promoted wherever possible in classroom teaching, student advising, the coordinating of research, and the practice of scholarship.
2. Large cooperative projects need to be initiated, or further supported, to accomplish tasks that cannot feasibly be completed otherwise. For example, efforts should be redoubled to assure the preservation of the records of printing and publishing firms and of the book trades generally, and guides to these records should be compiled and published. Furthermore, continuing support should be given to such established projects as the North American Imprints Program, the Eighteenth-Century Short Title Catalogue, and the Incunabula Short Title Catalogue.
3. Bibliographical education in graduate schools should be expanded, in recognition of the fact that bibliographical and textual knowledge is important for all who use written and printed matter, whatever the field. Such education should lead to a better general understanding of the nature and application of analytical bibliography as a historical discipline.
4. Fellowship programs, like that recently begun by the BSA, should be markedly expanded to promote bibliographical and textual research by individual scholars. The fact that 200 inquiries and sixty-six full applications were received for the nine fellowships the Society could award in 1984 is an indication of the need for an expanded program.
5. Further support for the publication of the results of research is needed. Proper support of education and of fellowships will contribute to the continued growth of sound scholarship, and expanded support of publication will help to ensure that the results of such scholarship appear promptly in appropriate form.
6. Assistance should be given to regional, national, and international conferences on all aspects of bibliography and textual scholarship;

it is particularly important to encourage interdisciplinary conferences, so that gaps like those which have sometimes existed between analytical bibliographers and historians or literary critics may be less likely to develop.

The nature of the field of bibliography is such that it intersects all other fields, since all fields involve written and printed communication. As a result, a number of institutions providing financial support in particular fields also affect bibliography. The National Endowment for the Humanities, in particular, has had a notable impact on bibliography because of the breadth of its programs and the depth of its support for such areas as reference books and editing (prominent examples of its support in these areas are the pre-1641 *Short Title Catalogue*, the *Bibliography of American Literature*, and some of the CEAA editions). The Endowment has been a significant factor in encouraging the work that has been achieved in the field in recent years, and its continuation is vital if that momentum is to be sustained.

# COLLEGE ART ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA

---

President: John Rupert Martin, Princeton University  
Delegate to the ACLS: Phyllis Pray Bober, Bryn Mawr College  
ACLS Conference of Secretaries: Rose R. Weil, Executive Secretary

Prepared by: Board of Directors, College Art Association of America

The College Art Association of America (CAA), founded in 1911, serves as the principal national learned society of historians, museum professionals, artists and critics of the visual arts. It is dedicated to the advancement of scholarship and teaching in the field.

## INTRODUCTION

Through support of individual scholars, institutions of learning and teaching, public programs, and resources for scholarship, the NEH has been instrumental in raising significantly the quality of the study and understanding of art during the past two decades. For this support, and on behalf of the individuals and institutions served by CAA, the Association registers its lively gratitude.

We believe that there are new challenges ahead, and that the Endowment will have a key role to play in many of them.

After describing briefly the cultural, social, and financial imperatives for federal funding in general, we speak to the difficulties that the "system" of the study of art is facing, and finally state important areas of need for the future. We should stress that we do not presume to suggest which of these needs should be addressed by a reauthorized NEH, or to what extent. Our purpose is to offer a representative list of our needs, in the conviction that a partnership of public and private monies is the best way to meet them.

## THE ROLE OF FEDERAL SUPPORT

In a climate where reasonable persons in some quarters have questioned the appropriateness of federal investment in culture, it is useful to describe briefly some cultural, social, and economic imperatives that we believe make the investment not only proper but necessary.



### *The Cultural Imperative*

Expenditure of public money to understand better what it means to be civilized needs no apology, even if there is no practical outcome, no utilitarian end.

Art is the one product of humankind found in all ages and all inhabited parts of the globe, and constitutes our main cultural understanding of the millenia before written history. The unbroken history of the making of art objects, questions about the mind of the maker, the insatiable urge to write and speak of art and artists, the battles of taste, the phenomenon of collecting, the mass appeal to both young and old—all are symptoms of a concern at the center of our understanding of what it is to be human.

While the scholar often offers new information, his/her contribution ultimately is interpretation, to the end of understanding that humanity. We believe that a healthy nation benefits from the enterprise of art, and advancement of the understanding of it is as surely a national priority as many more tangible aspects of the social agenda.

### *The Social Imperative*

More people are scholars and critics of art, more students formally pursue its study, and more people frequent museums than ever before in American history. Enhanced access to higher education and shifting demography have, and increasingly will, provide new audiences with new needs. Neglected cultures will receive new attention, and issues we believed settled will be reinterpreted. Scholars-teachers and their audiences will become racially and ethnically more diverse. The face of the field of art history is changing in an evolutionary manner, and we believe for the social good. All that can be done to foster this diversity will be money well spent.

### *The Financial Imperative*

We see the role of federal funding as a partnership with the private sector, public money as stimulus, challenge, leverage to the best performance of individual and institutional philanthropy.

In current and foreseeable circumstances, any lowered federal commitment to the arts and humanities would bring damaging consequences, for three reasons.

First, the inflation rate for scholarly goods and service runs well ahead of the inflation rate in general. The sharply escalating costs of books, journals, photographic services, and reproduction rights are cases in point.

Second, the activities of scholar-teachers are heavily centered in

colleges and universities. The combination of unfavorable population statistics and austere financial circumstances mean that many essential scholarly services will be in jeopardy, pushed aside by personnel costs.

Third, it seems likely to us that mounting intractable urban social problems will rightly escalate the pressure on limited philanthropic dollars.

With academic and museum budgets in a steady or reduced state, and costs escalating, the undesirable consequence will be less scholarly communication in the long run, an outcome that would erode the enterprise of teaching and learning. It therefore is essential that government set an example and challenge private dollars to remember the nation's cultural needs.

### *Difficulties of the "System" of Art Scholarship*

Not too long ago a scholar of art could do research abroad on a fully paid leave, acquire photographs or have them made at low cost, return and write his/her book in a library which as a matter of course acquired all significant new titles, pay low reproduction rights, occasioned in part by for-profit middlemen, and the need of non-profit owners to meet their own lean budgets. While excellent manuscripts are as hard to come by as ever, even the capable scholar finds fewer scholarly publishers now willing to do art books because of the high cost of illustrations, and publishers frequently require a significant subvention. Pointing a finger of blame is beside the point: the system is simply extraordinarily strained.

## THE NEEDS FOR THE COMING DECADE

We briefly describe major needs of the field, without reference to current NEH programs, and without prejudice as to whether or to what extent a reauthorized NEH should become involved. A priority order is not implied.

### *Conservation of Works of Art*

We believe that the well-being of works of art and the adequacy of environments in which they are preserved is a matter of highest urgency, and a growing problem in times when restricted finances and unresolved pollution problems threaten what by definition is a unique and irreplaceable resource. Special attention should be given to twentieth century works of art whose media are often non-traditional and physical properties not wholly understood, and to art in the form of film and video. The hour is late, and it would be folly not to make this a high national priority.

*Conservation of Archival and Library Resources*

We are only beginning to realize the magnitude of the library problem before us, graver in art than in some other fields in that microform is often a poor substitute for original illustrations. Archives and libraries until lately have not been sensitive enough to the health of their collections, and often now find themselves in a poor financial position to deal with the problem. Research on effectiveness and efficiency of methods is needed, as well as a degree of operational assistance for this special need.

*Conservation of Photographic Resources*

This problem is confined to older collections at a few institutions. Nineteenth century photographs and lantern slides are themselves now documents of value, often representing works which have either been destroyed or radically altered through deterioration. Photographs crumble, lantern slides break, and in the case of glass plate slides, are irretrievably lost. Such materials should be retired from teaching service; converted to 35 mm. film with a stipulation that converted materials be made available to other institutions at cost.

*Translation*

If, as seems likely, interest in the art of non Euro-American countries grows, translation from "exotic" languages will be required if anyone other than a handful of specialists is to be reached. Such work should be done by those competent in both the language and the substantive subject matter, which will entail inducement to specialists more inclined to other pursuits.

## CREATION OF NEW KNOWLEDGE

*Support of Individual Scholars*

This remains a cornerstone of scholarly progress. If, as seems likely, economic austerity continues and or deepens in academia, the institutionally-supported leave may become rare. A new dimension, to be with us for some years, is the scholar who is unaffiliated because no position is available. The problem is deepened by the extension of mandatory retirement to age 70, which means support of younger scholars is a particularly acute need. Those few sources of research assistance for such persons must be maintained, and an effort made to accommodate research schedules that do not coincide with annual or academic calendars.

*Support of Groups of Scholars*

Support should be given proposals for collective investigation of issues whose complexity and/or scope exceed the grasp of an individual scholar. The increase in the number of collaborative efforts in art history suggests that this is a promising trend.

*Support of Centers for Advanced Study*

Centers whose “free market” worth has been proved by attracting a variety of productive scholars should continue to receive support. Such centers provide a different sort of cross-fertilization than is available in a departmental setting, and are invaluable to the scholar who normally works in isolation.

*Support of Libraries*

The time is probably past for a wide program of building fine duplicate libraries on a regional basis. However, proposals to repair serious lacunae in particular fields, should be entertained, and related to specific scholarship in progress at a given institution. Support of reprints of classic works in editions too small to be commercially viable would be of enormous assistance to smaller libraries.

*Support of Visual Resources*

The opening of China and growing interest in the art of “Third World” countries presents a challenge analogous to that faced by European art historians a century ago. Intelligent campaigns of photography and architectural drafting should be anticipated, and supported contingent upon appropriate at-cost dissemination.

*Support of Archeological Resources*

The art historian/archeologist usually lacks both the competence and resources to investigate the nature of materials, techniques, and state of conservation, essential questions in many historical investigations. Funds are needed to acquire this expertise from appropriate persons.

*Language Training*

Marginal foreign language adequacy has been a bane of American humanists. A rise in interest in non-western art will compound the problem, for mastery of these languages is a long and expensive process. Consideration should be given to supporting scholars at any stage of their career who require further language training, with summer total immersion especially encouraged.

## THE DISSEMINATION OF SCHOLARLY KNOWLEDGE

### *Publication Subvention*

We see no relief to the financial plight of non-profit publishing, and believe a broad program of subvention will be necessary for both journals and books. This seems a particularly fruitful area for challenge or matching grants, a possible requirement being that the major financial sponsor of the research contribute a percentage of the subvention, as is frequently the practice in the sciences.

### *Alternatives to Conventional Publication*

Support may be needed for intelligent supplements to conventional printed journals and books. It is difficult to predict the possibilities offered by evolving technologies, but “on demand” refereed publication with electronic retrieval is an example of such a possibility. There will be false starts, but also promising initiatives worthy of funding.

### *Photographic Reproduction Rights*

CAA and the Society of Architectural Historians have committees at work in an attempt to ameliorate the situation. Whatever the outcome, the financial strains are such that the “system” may need support to facilitate the plight of both owners and users. The sums should not be great, but will be most important if a significant bottleneck is to be cleared.

### *Travel Funds*

National and international meetings are a major stimulus to scholarly communication, yet budget constraint has forced many institutions to reduce or eliminate support. Assistance is needed.

### *Conferences, Symposia, Summer Courses for Faculty Development*

The best of these are proven modes of scholarly dissemination, and they should continue to be funded. Special priority should be given to activities that hold promise of advancing/redefining aspects of the fields, and to courses for secondary school teachers who teach art history but do not have formal training in the field.

### *Popular Dissemination of Scholarly Knowledge*

We are committed as a profession to thoughtful interpretation of art for popular audiences, and sensitive to the fact that these audiences vary in their interests and state of preparedness.

### *Audio-Visual Aids*

While it is usually assumed that western art is well documented, there is a scarcity of good slides for teaching purposes. Non-profit projects with a dissemination component should be encouraged.

Films on art, architecture, and artists should be encouraged, with the dual criteria of scholarly excellence and state-of-the-art film technique.

Surprisingly, given the state of technology, most instruction in the history and criticism of art remains a matter of an instructor with two slide projectors. So far the potential of computer graphics, video disk and similar innovations plays little role in our classrooms. We believe consideration should be given to teams of scholars and media engineers who propose to develop new audio-visual technologies which will advance pedagogical techniques on a replicable and cost-efficient basis. Funding should be for promising pilot projects to allow scholars to concentrate for periods of time on pedagogical development. If successful such ventures should become commercial on a self-sustaining basis. Support should fund the initial development of "software," not a general program for support of equipment.

### *Electronic Communication*

Satellite transmission, interactive telecommunications, as many as 200 cable channels by 1990: technology has arrived, awaiting intelligent proposals from the custodians and interpreters of culture. The opportunity is here both to reach larger audiences than ever before, and to focus upon special audiences. Again we believe pilot projects will be worth funding, and that they are likely to emerge in both academia and museums. Multisource support will be needed, and projects must be held to a strict qualitative test. Intelligent use of the new media offers one of the most promising avenues to improved international understanding.

### *Museum Education Programs*

We should stress that much of what has been said above applies to the problems of museums no less than it does to college and university settings. In this section we speak particularly of the entire educational support system for both permanent and temporary exhibits. Nowhere is the need greater for sensitive response to audiences of different educational levels of achievement, and varying linguistic, racial and ethnic backgrounds. That need varies from the desirability of sophisticated catalogues widely distributed to proper linguistic representation on education staffs. All of these educational activities

tend to suffer in that corporate philanthropy is often attracted to the higher visibility offered by support of the exhibition itself.

*Research on the State of the Profession*

Support of information gathering and statistical analysis in the interests of understanding the health of the field and planning improvements is badly needed. Such support might come either to individual learned societies, or to a national organization working on behalf of the learned societies.

## CONCLUSION

We have tried to give a sense of representative needs (as opposed to wishes) our field will face in the years ahead. We will have to help ourselves to run effective and efficient institutions, and to give our best efforts in making our case to private philanthropy. It is our conviction that federal support will be a critically important partner in realizing these needs, and that as through history, so now, a society is judged in part by the quality of nurture it provides for the arts.

# HISTORY OF SCIENCE SOCIETY

---

President: Gerald Holton, Harvard University

Delegate to the ACLS: Joseph Dauben, Herbert H. Lehman  
College and the Graduate Center, CUNY

ACLS Conference of Secretaries: Audrey B. Davis, National  
Museum of American History, Smithsonian Institution,  
Secretary

Written by: Nathan Reingold, Joseph Henry Papers, Smithsonian  
Institution

When a committee of the History of Science Society in 1964 wrote a report affirming the advisability of establishing a national endowment for the humanities, they strongly asserted the humanistic nature of the history of science. The committee predicted a future in which it “will be more important to understand the relation of science to the historical process of the development of Western civilization” than to the strictly technical developments.

That prediction has come true, perhaps to a degree not contemplated by the authors of the 1964 report. As in 1964, the history of science still retains a concern with the internal growth of the technical concepts and data of the scientific disciplines and maintains friendly relations with the various institutions of the world of research and development. While there is no intention of severing those ties, the history of science has evolved in accordance with the 1964 prediction. That text talked of the importance of studying the interactions of the sciences with philosophy, the arts, religion, public policy, and social history (broadly construed). An unspoken assumption animated the committee—the existence of a “general culture” of Western civilization in which knowledge and uses of the physical and the biological had an integral role. Viewed as a community with broad-ranging goals, the current membership of the Society contains many individuals with considerable interests in technology, medicine, and the social sciences—as well as a widespread inclination to place technical developments within broader cultural and social contexts.

In twenty years the history of science in the United States has experienced considerable growth both in intellectual and in institutional terms. The National Endowment for the Humanities played a most honorable role here through its support of fellowships, research grants,



## HISTORY OF SCIENCE SOCIETY

scholarly editions, reference tools, institutes for teachers, and a challenge grant to the Society. There are indications this growth is continuing, perhaps even accelerating. For example, in the last five years, the membership of the History of Science Society has increased nearly 50%. Twenty years ago historians of science were thinly scattered over the academic landscape; today practitioners of the specialty are at many universities, four year colleges, and even junior colleges, as well as those contributing their skills in libraries, archives, museums, government, foundations, and industry. About sixty institutions of higher learning now give advanced degrees in the discipline.

Twenty years ago, it is fair to conclude, most writings by scholars in the history of science appeared esoteric to the preponderance of colleagues in adjacent disciplines, not to mention the general public. Impacts of new findings were real but understandably limited. Over the last two decades academic respectability was accompanied by a historiographic maturation and a decided effect on scholarly discourse beyond the confines of the specialty. Without attempting to specify all areas involved, let alone listing every consequential writing, among the areas of significant impact are: the intellectual life of the Middle Ages; natural knowledge in the Renaissance; the social and intellectual ferment of seventeenth century England; the growth and impact of the U. S. scientific community; the intellectual, economic, and political roles of science and scientists in nineteenth and twentieth century Germany; the reassessment of philosophy of science in historical perspective; the role of knowledge in technology and in economic growth; the origins of the social sciences; and how biomedical advances affected both concepts of self and the texture of modern life.

If history of science has flourished in the last twenty years, it is because its practitioners had the good fortune to work in a promising, then underdeveloped area for research. Historians of science are also the beneficiaries of the availability of superb manuscript and archival resources in such institutions as the Library of the American Philosophical Society and the Manuscript Division of the Library of Congress, as well as in the burgeoning collections in many university archives. The existence of great scholarly documentary projects for notable figures like Joseph Henry, Charles Darwin, Thomas Edison, and Albert Einstein is a significant asset for investigators. Also contributing to the growth of history of science, now and in the future, is the willingness of an appreciable number of scientific and technological societies to establish centers within their organizations devoted to furthering research in the history of science in humanistic as well as in

technical modes. That development underscores an important characteristic of the field.

History of science grew because it filled a genuine need in our society. That need transcended the obvious desirability of filling gaps in this, that, and the other portion of the intellectual landscape. History of science is one of the rare scholarly specialties implicitly and explicitly serving to link disparate specializations. History of science at best is a unifying or bridging discipline. Consciously or otherwise, historians of science are striving for broader cultural understanding, to juxtapose somehow the seemingly unrelated. Among these are attempts to integrate conceptual changes, social compositions, and institutional dynamics. Historians of science are not the only scholars so involved, but their contributions are quite significant. Typically, what historians of science contribute are reliable empirical data (social, technical, etc.) linked to patterns of conceptual change. One can describe the field as tacitly committed to an agenda of great scope and importance. Because of that, the considerable contributions of the last two decades constitute no more than a prelude to the tasks ahead. Perhaps two illustrations can indicate some future possibilities.

Although the 1964 committee stressed Western civilization, even at that date members of the History of Science Society had contributed to our knowledge of non-Western civilizations. The spread, the dominance of Western science and technology over the globe underscores our need to understand how non-Western societies devised cosmologies and how they used their knowledge of nature. Such information is required for its own sake and to provide a reliable basis for comparative analysis. Such work is underway on the indigenous cultures of Asia, Africa, and the Americas. No valid comparative analysis is possible unless we also have a solid base of reliable research results for the West, particularly for the history of the best research and development activities of twentieth century America. Here too, the National Endowment for the Humanities has served well.

In recent years a wide variety of teaching programs and research projects have come into existence on societal impacts of scientific and technological changes, particularly as these involve issues of value choices. As a field bridging specializations, history of science inevitably should have a role in these programs and projects. Historians of science are often, but not invariably, participants. These teaching programs and research projects necessarily start with current concerns and often seek answers in the short-term. To such ventures history of science contributes a long-term viewpoint both factual and conceptual. The National Endowment for the Humanities currently has a very active program

concerned with social impacts of scientific and technical change. The Society regards that support as an important part of the agency's mission.

Despite the considerable advances, intellectual and institutional, of the history of science in the last two decades a considerable need remains for support and encouragement. To put the matter in another form the very advances of the period 1964–1984 starkly illuminate shortfalls and weaknesses. Not all of the eminently reasonable hopes of the 1964 Committee have come to pass. Many colleges and universities still lack representation of our field on their faculties. The Society hopes to reach these institutions and trusts that the active interest of the Endowment in history of science will help to convince educational administrators of the value of the field. Related to the matter of teaching positions is the need to provide support to younger scholars at the predoctoral and postdoctoral levels, as well as grants to them for worthy research topics (in addition to support of established scholars). Because of its rapid growth the demographics of the field is decidedly slanted towards younger scholars. Existence of such funds from the National Endowment for the Humanities in the past has materially contributed to the field's maturation. In these days of budgetary uncertainty, we trust the Endowment will favor that support. The Society much appreciates the agency's support of scholarly conferences, an activity so important in fostering communication and stimulation among investigators. We hope the Endowment can increase its support of conferences.

Historians of science, like their colleagues in other branches of history, need materials and tools. Over the years the National Endowment has aided all branches of humanistic scholarship by its farseeing enlightened attitude. The History of Science Society is particularly mindful of the support given to reference tools; scholarly editions of unpublished sources; and the organization and description of archives and collections of rare books. The two great reference tools called for in 1964 are in existence: the *Dictionary of Scientific Biography*, 16 volumes, and the *Isis Cumulative Bibliography*, 1913–1965, 5 volumes. While the need for biographical and bibliographical tools will continue (both publications are being updated), a new generation of investigators is coming up with new projects reflecting their needs and, we have no doubt, will prove as enduring as contributions as the great works of the last generation. New editions of unpublished sources are under consideration. Among the members of the Society discussions are in progress on collaborative synthetic reference works summing up our current knowledge and pushing ahead to new approaches. The Society also commends the Endowment for its past support of translations of important primary and secondary works. While not wishing to neglect publi-

cations in the leading Western languages; we encourage the Endowment to underwrite the translation of works in less familiar European languages, as well as those from other linguistic areas.

Last but by no means least, the Society favors a strong, diversified program for the diffusion of knowledge (including popularization and pedagogic uses), of all the humanities, including history of science. Knowledge of the humanities is a needed attribute of an enlightened citizenry in a democratic society. We are not so naive as to expect every inhabitant of the country to acquire a considerable knowledge of each humanistic specialty. Whatever each and every person may learn by formal education and by the various forms of popularization, it is important that our fellow citizens at least have a sense of the importance of the humanities as an essential component of our culture.

As to dissemination of history of science, the Society believes that the Endowment's support of summer seminars in our field for other professionals has been very successful. Funds permitting, the extent of that activity merits expansion. We are also encouraged by the all too rare, but interesting, uses of history of science on television. As a long-term goal, the Endowment, the Society and other interested organizations should cooperate in the planning and execution of a multi-faceted program to convey reliable history of science to the general public. We think it an important part of the Endowment's role in enlightening our fellow citizens on the origins and nature of our distinctive civilization.

# LINGUISTIC SOCIETY OF AMERICA

---

President: Victoria A. Fromkin, University of California, Los Angeles

Delegate to the ACLS: Eric P. Hamp, University of Chicago

ACLS Conference of Secretaries: John H. Hammer, Associate Secretary, Margaret W. Reynolds, Administrative Director

---

## COMMITTEE

Frederic G. Cassidy, University of Wisconsin, Madison

Eric P. Hamp

D. Terence Langendoen, Brooklyn College and the Graduate Center, CUNY

G. Richard Tucker, Center for Applied Linguistics

Arnold M. Zwicky, Ohio State University

To take stock of the field of linguistics today and at the same time to gain a sense of the considerable change which has taken place during the past two decades, we begin by reproducing—with some alterations here and there—those portions of this Society's 1964 report which can be retained today as an accurate depiction. A cursory comparison of the text which follows with the length of the 1964 text will give a measure of the change which has characterized this fast moving field.

## I. [INTRODUCTION]

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

Scholarship. Linguistic scholarship in the United States is . . . active, lively, vigorous, with exciting research being carried on in many different areas . . . There is no longer . . . any tendency for American linguists to belong to a single school. There are now many schools, each with its . . . 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 . . . people in the field who are [notably] active tend to be very much overburdened. And since only a . . . portion of these . . . have much administrative ability, a few people tend to show up again and again on the same national committees. Fortunately, this situation is now . . . improving.

Information flow. Though the rest of this report deals only with linguistics in the United States, this topic must be viewed internationally . . . 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 . . . At the moment, the consensus is that a journal of linguistic abstracts is not feasible, except in [some] subfields of . . . linguistics . . . A series of volumes on the . . . state of linguistic research in various parts of the world . . . [was] published . . . under the title CURRENT TRENDS IN LINGUISTICS . . . [during the '60s and early '70s]

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

[Twenty] years ago . . . in the United States and Puerto Rico, a B.A. major in linguistics [was] offered at thirteen institutions, an M.A. in linguistics at twenty-four [institutions], and a Ph.D. in linguistics at twenty-three . . . [O]ther institutions offer[ed] degrees which . . . combine linguistics with some other discipline; and the number of institutions which offer[ed] courses of a more or less linguistic nature [was] totally unknown . . .

[T]here is [as yet] no national consensus as to what a B.A., M.A., or Ph.D. in linguistics should consist of . . . Where the institutions themselves are of high quality, it may be assumed that the courses and degrees in linguistics are also of high quality . . . [T]he Linguistic Institute . . . since 1928 . . . has been offered every summer (except for 1932–35) [1981 and 1984] under the auspices of the Linguistic Society and a cooperating 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 . . . supplement to the . . . offerings of the . . . graduate programs in linguistics throughout the country . . .

## 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 . . . field no cultural lag such as that which has characterized mathematics and the natural sciences until recently. Scholars hear of new developments at . . . meetings . . . ; if they miss them there, they soon read about them in journals . . . books [and informal working papers]; 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 . . . field of linguistics, the picture changes drastically . . . [At one time] 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 [in the United States] (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 . . .

The findings of linguistics have . . . [been] spread[ing] . . . into [modern foreign-language instruction and into] other academic disciplines, notably psychology and philosophy, and to a very small extent into literary criticism. At a more elementary level, a [weak] start has been made at applying linguistics to the teaching of reading and spelling and to the so-called language arts . . . 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 . . . outrunning theory, the time has . . . come when the entire role of linguistics in American education should be [reassessed] . . .

### 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 . . . [T]he results of . . . 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 . . .

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 . . .

### IV. NEW TECHNIQUES FOR TEACHING AND SCHOLARSHIP

[text omitted]



## V. SUMMARY OF NEEDS

. . . [W]e 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. [omitted]
  - 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. . . . [F]inancial support for . . . [an] international Linguistic Bibliography.
  - c. Financial support to insure the continuation of the annual summer Linguistic Institute.
  - d. Financial support for students of linguistics . . .
  - e. A general survey of the present and potential role of linguistics in American education: linguistics in relation to . . . foreign-language teaching . . . the teaching of English in schools and colleges, the teaching of reading, [the teaching of science], etc.

It will immediately be seen that of the old report Section II is relatively little changed, while Sections III and IV largely or completely fall away. The portions with little change reflect some of our continuing problems. Those with considerable change reflect progress as well as shifts in the weight and nature of our problems.

While, as has been seen, a significant part of our 1964 report stands more or less unchanged and true today, it should be emphasized that this is not to say that all is well with that part. Indeed that stable portion includes continuing concerns and problems recognized within the field of linguistics. Note especially that of the summarized needs (Section V) only one point has been eliminated.

Again, this is not to deny that important needs have been partially met during the past two decades. The NEH is much to be commended for having fostered imaginative translation projects, crucially important dictionary and other compilatory enterprises, and its challenge grant program which has benefited the LSA particularly for support of Linguistic Institutes and other special projects. The production of such basic research tools had practically no principled support in the United States before the NEH. Likewise, certain basic theoretical research has gained badly needed attention through the formation of a linguistics panel in the NSF a decade ago. It is urged in the strongest terms that such provisions as these be continued and appropriately enlarged. The

NEH summer seminars, and especially the research stipend programs, could usefully be augmented.

*The Present State of Scholarship in Linguistics*

The foci of activity in the field of linguistics have changed considerably in the past two decades. At one time the semi-annual meetings of the Linguistic Society served most needs for broad interchange of scholarship outside of publication. In the meantime important regional meetings and regular conferences on strongly cultivated areas of linguistic study have grown up; these meetings are lively, serious, important for enculturation of young scholars, and they produce many influential and prompt publications. Lack of support to departments and scholars raises financial problems in these days of rising travel costs; current disinclination to fund conferences on the part of granting agencies trammels attempts to organize many a potentially productive working session. Partly in response to rising costs and the reduction of support for travel, the Linguistic Society began meeting annually, rather than semi-annually, in 1983.

Based on the 1984 *Directory of Programs in Linguistics* published by the LSA, there are now 106 institutions in the United States offering a B.A. major, 85 offering an M.A., and 47 a Ph.D.; and, further, 80 institutions offer combined degree programs including linguistics leading to a degree, while dozens of others offer such courses without leading to a degree. There are now more than 178 programs in the United States and Canada offering graduate training in the teaching of English as a second or foreign language and/or in bilingual education—and the majority of these include a nucleus of linguistics courses as part of the core curriculum.

Most major universities have departments of linguistics offering the Ph.D. (and usually also the M.A. and the B.A.), and though individual institutions have their own foci of interest, graduate programs are roughly comparable at the major universities. The B.A., however, continues to lack definition: at some institutions it is a preparation for graduate study and research, at others it is designed as a general liberal arts program focusing on language, and at still others it is centered on applied linguistics, in particular TESOL and foreign language teaching. Most linguistics programs, even at the major universities, are small (5–10 faculty, 20–40 graduate students), and therefore expensive in the eyes of administrators. Moreover, the teaching situation in linguistics outside the major universities is often a hodge podge, involving eccentric programs patched together from existing faculty in a variety of disciplines. Across all institutions, there is tremendous variation in the extent to which linguistics, with either a humanistic or a social-scientific

cast, is offered to a general university audience. Some have large service courses for non-majors, and others have tiny programs. At many institutions, general linguistics is directed at very specific audiences (anthropology students, foreign language education students, etc.)

Although graduate degree programs in linguistics have over the past 20 years become clearly defined, the same is not true for baccalaureate degree programs. Therefore, it would now be timely to set up a commission to study the place of linguistics in undergraduate curricula and the nature and structure of the curriculum leading to the B.A. in linguistics.

There are certain areas and activities mentioned by other societies among the 1964 reports where linguistic knowledge and expertise impinge, and where collaboration and the channeling of effort should be encouraged and, as appropriate, funded. The American Anthropological Association mentioned (p. 66) *area studies*; these are as important today as they were then, and solid language and linguistic training is indispensable as underpinning for such studies. Far broader than this, the fields of anthropology and linguistics have long intersected in an enterprise known as *anthropological linguistics*, and the restructuring of the Anthropological Association currently recognizes this in the shape of a new constituent society; adequate provision should be made to encourage such activities which lie outside the primary interests of many anthropologists and yet risk being orphaned by formal linguistics. The Archaeological Institute of America stressed (pp. 72-3) the importance of languages to its activities, as did the American Historical Association (p. 117), the Association for Asian Studies (pp. 84ff.), the American Oriental Society (*passim*), and the American Philological Association (*esp.* p. 183). Several other constituent societies might easily have made similar statements. In all these cases there remains an important link with the newer field of linguistics, and that resides in the rejuvenated study of *philology* as it applies separately to each of these language areas in question; humanistic documents and texts can not be read and interpreted without adequate linguistic-philological safeguards. This is not to wish the whole arsenal of linguistics on other disciplines, but students of these fields must be aware of the tools they may need. Support is needed to restore these linguistic ties that help to bind together the humanistic enterprise. Finally, many of the concerns of the American Dialect Society (pp. 92-3) draw directly on the activities of linguists.

### *Personnel*

The explosive growth in numbers entering the field of linguistics has leveled off; membership in the Linguistic Society has been holding steady since 1975. Linguistics has not suffered the decline that has

characterized some fields, and there has been a commendable performance in attracting and placing women in the field, as the 1983 Report on the Status of Women in Linguistics illustrated. However, qualified applicants from language and racial minorities continue to offer a numerically small pool. Along with other disciplines, linguistics suffers from the lack of a rationalized adequate national policy of student support and talent attraction.

### *Flow of Information*

The "rapid flow of information" within the field, cited in the 1964 report, is increasingly restricted to subfields of linguistics, though within a subfield such as acoustic phonetics or ethnolinguistics news travels very fast indeed. The flow of information between linguistics and other disciplines is selectively good. Within the humanistic fields, philosophy and linguistics have developed particularly good relations in the study of semantics and syntax, especially formal semantics. Yet literary criticism and even textual studies are often undertaken in ignorance of the most fundamental facts about language. Applied linguistics continues to have considerable, though often faddish, effects on language instruction, including the instruction of the deaf, the study of reading (including Braille), and composition, and is beginning to have some influence in the study and treatment of language disorders. However, despite the substantial efforts of the Center for Applied Linguistics to disseminate basic findings about language, many groups remain ignorant of the nature of language, or committed to an erroneous folk theory. The problem is not, as some would claim, that linguists disagree on almost everything. Rather, people in general seem unwilling to abandon folk theories about language. This fact points up the enormous importance of good popular presentations of linguistics. The lack of these, cited in the 1964 report, has not really been remedied.

The flow of information from linguistics into the social sciences, computer science, and even mathematics is much improved since 1964. On the whole, this change has resulted not so much from activities of the NEH, as from support from other government agencies and from private sources of funding.

Bibliography and information flow are in a distinctly worse state than they were twenty years ago. The UNESCO Linguistic Bibliography has maintained high quality and relatively broad coverage of equal density, but it is always in arrears; and the editorial enterprise, based in the Netherlands, is of uncertain future. The MLA Bibliography for various reasons has not proven its worth to linguists, while its costs escalate dramatically. Moreover, these bibliographies do not begin to touch the worldwide network of semipublication (working papers and refereed

reproduction services) on which the field heavily depends. These bibliographies furthermore carry on a wasteful duplication of effort and processing: some specialized bibliographies (e.g. Indo-European in *Die Sprache*, and certain national bibliographic enterprises), the ERIC system, and running notes of publication featured by newsletters and journals give fair to excellent coverage of specialized subfields. A distinct service could be provided by organizing and consolidating the selected output of all such useful media. The management of a major linguistic bibliographic tool should be in the hands of a board of linguists.

More than once this report has alluded to the continuing need to inform the public on what is now really known of the nature of language and of our ability to exploit this knowledge for tasks of the world and of life. One route for such information lies through books, articles, and media presentations in the grand tradition of *haute vulgarisation*. To stimulate this there is need for encouragement, support, and released time for competent scholars.

The other route lies through the schools—a major task which should be the focus of a determined and informed effort over the next two decades at least. It is well recognized that our elementary and secondary schools must incorporate in their core teaching the findings and methods, the theory and practice, of the natural and social sciences, of mathematics, of literary and aesthetic study. Our knowledge of human language as a natural phenomenon must also be incorporated into that body of instruction; we must teach all citizens the rudiments of what we know about human language in relation to animal communication, about natural language in relation to designed or machine languages, about language in relation to culture, society, personality, logic, and thinking. This may suggest at first that linguistics should be an addition to the general science program; that may be.

But that is not sufficient. Linguistic activity and mastery is interwoven in most forms of humanistic study. It is far more than a simple handmaiden to composition, spelling, the language arts, foreign language grammar and pronunciation, restoration of historical or philological manuscripts or inscriptions, and the like. Linguistic knowledge is a way of viewing language-based products of man and of perceiving what is relevant by one consistent set of criteria. Our schools must not fail to include such preparation in their basic programs of instruction, nor delay in insisting on qualified teachers to furnish this in every school in the 50 United States. It is linguists who must devise and find the means to provide this essential component for our improved schools—tomorrow. They are willing, but they need help.

*Present State of Teaching in Linguistics*

Present-day linguistics is not only a field characterized by varied schools and approaches; it draws actively on a broad chronology of theorizing, from the formal grammar and phonetics of 1st millennium BC Hindu tradition, classical Arabic phonological theory, the logical syntax of the Greek Sophists and the Medieval Modistae, 19th century historical and comparative philology, the past two centuries of acoustical physics, anatomy, psychology, logic, poetics, and ordinary language philosophy. Commonly taught courses in linguistics today contain elements of all these. The theoretical scene today is turbulent and far from monolithic, by no means settled on a consensus. It is not chaotic; it is simply varied. There may be committed, even doctrinaire, individuals; but that is not the tone of the field today.

These varied strands and textures are, and should be, reflected in the diversity of linguistics programs found in the United States (and Europe) today. The huge explosion in linguistic publication mirrors this too. The organization of linguistics programs and their integration into American academic structures, however, are of some concern. Though there is a widespread consensus among active linguists on the main subfields of the discipline which should be covered in a scholar's background, there is great unevenness in translating goals into instructional programs.

The Linguistic Institute continues its central role in the field, serving as a national—now, in fact, distinctly international—summer school in the field and so helping to unify scholars and students from a variety of subdisciplines of linguistics and disciplines allied to linguistics. Support of the Linguistic Institute, formerly secured by Foundation aid no longer available, is an urgent concern. Also noteworthy is the growth of Summer TESOL Institutes. The TESOL organization, in 1979, launched the first of a series of annual Summer Institutes modeled on the LSA experience. These institutes have attracted as teachers some of the outstanding and regular contributors to this speciality.

*Relationship Between Linguistics and Society*

A number of factors converge to suggest increasing value placed on the role of language, and hence the potential contribution of linguistics in public life: the increasing awareness of the special problems faced by the large numbers of marginally educated, marginally literate refugees and immigrants who continue to come to the United States from Southeast Asia, from Ethiopia, from Haiti, from Eastern Europe and elsewhere; the problems of the non-English speaking native-born

Americans; the interest generated by numerous publications and committee reports which have recently focused attention on the problems of adult illiteracy in the United States; President Carter's insistence that government documents be prepared in clear English; work by a number of prominent members of the Society who have demonstrated that the linguist has a prominent role to play as expert witness in legal proceedings; attention focused by the recent Lambert report (*Beyond Growth: The Next Stage in Language and Area Studies*) (1984) on the necessity to improve the teaching of foreign languages—particularly the so-called low-volume languages.

The number of outlets for linguistic knowledge and of consumer fields seeking linguistic competence has increased significantly since 1964. Apart from the new and voracious fields of data processing and retrieval, computer programming, and speech engineering and technology, all of which have absorbed the skills of linguists, there have been instances of remarkable growth illustrated by the newer needs to teach English and foreign languages in special settings.

### *Summary*

The field of linguists, following a period of rapid growth that was led by a small number of scholars, has stabilized as an established field with a broad base of qualified professionals. Thanks in part to its close connections with many other academic fields, including new ones such as computer and information science, linguistics is increasingly recognized as vitally important in both scholarly and public areas. However, its continued development and impact is hampered by a lack of public understanding of what linguistics is and what linguists do. This obstacle could, in part, be overcome by competent popular treatments of the subject, a focusing of the undergraduate training in linguistics, and a recognition of linguistics as a component of instruction in the elementary and secondary schools.

# MEDIEVAL ACADEMY OF AMERICA

---

President: Laurence K. Shook, Pontifical Institute of Medieval Studies

Delegate to the ACLS: Milton McC. Gatch, Union Theological Seminary

ACLS Conference of Secretaries: Luke Wenger, Executive Director

---

## COMMITTEE

Milton McC. Gatch

John Leyerle, University of Toronto

Fred C. Robinson, Yale University

Eleanor Searle, California Institute of Technology

Laurence K. Shook

David Staines, University of Ottawa

In consultation with members of the Executive Committee of the Academy:

Caroline W. Bynum, University of Washington

Katherine Fischer Drew, Rice University

Julian G. Plante, St. John's University (Collegeville, Minnesota)

Richard E. Sullivan, Michigan State University

James A. Weisheipl, Pontifical Institute of Medieval Studies

## THE PRESENT AND FUTURE OF MEDIEVAL STUDIES

When the *Report of the Commission on the Humanities*, which led to the creation of the National Endowment of the Humanities, was published in 1964, the Medieval Academy of America was not one of the twenty-four constituent members of the American Council of Learned Societies that submitted a written report for inclusion in the larger document. This failure is probably symptomatic of the nature and function of the Academy two decades ago. It was an association of scholars in the humanistic disciplines in which medieval studies are conducted that existed for two chief purposes: to encourage scholarship by means of its own journal, *Speculum*, and monographic publications



and to elect a limited number of senior scholars as Fellows of the Academy in recognition of their accomplishments. The activities of the Medieval Academy have broadened considerably in the intervening years. It would be interesting to have had a report forecasting its future from 1964; one suspects that, save for certain aspects of the publications program, it would have contained few details that correspond with the description of the present state of medieval studies and the activities of the Medieval Academy of America in 1984.

*The Present State of Medieval Studies*

In recent years, despite the general decline of humanistic and linguistic disciplines from their relative strength in the years following World War II, there has been growing interest in North America in medieval studies as a subject for both undergraduate and graduate concentration. One could argue that medieval studies has become the most successful of the several areas for interdisciplinary or cross-disciplinary studies that have arisen in the last twenty-five years. This phenomenon has both stimulated and been stimulated by a high level of scholarly activity in American universities. Often programs in medieval studies have encouraged students to seek the linguistic and other special skills taught in the departments where the special topics within medieval studies are lodged; but occasionally students have been allowed to evade the necessity of acquiring linguistic and paleographical skills in interdisciplinary programs. On the whole, however, the last two decades have been good ones for medieval studies in comparison with other disciplines in the humanities.

The Medieval Academy of America, recognized as the organization central to medieval studies not only in the United States but also in North America, has become the focal point to which medievalists turn for support and scholarly encouragement at the same time as an informal network of regional and specialist associations and conferences devoted to medieval studies has come into being and has looked to the Academy for leadership and (in a very informal sense) legitimation. To this end, the Academy has since 1969 had a Standing Committee on Centers and Regional Associations to serve as a forum for medievalists interested in teaching, in the administration of institutes and centers for study and in the organization of regional groups. Meetings of the Academy were once held at Harvard University in Cambridge, Massachusetts, the home of its offices, and in alternate years at other institutions (usually in the northeastern United States). Annual meetings now move among universities with strong programs of research and teaching in medieval disciplines and have sometimes been held in association with the meetings of regional associations or other

conferences on medieval studies. The roster of meeting places since 1964 includes not only Harvard (twice) and Radcliffe College but also Brown University, the University of California at Los Angeles (twice) and Berkeley, the University of Chicago, Columbia, Cornell, Emory, North Carolina at Chapel Hill, Pennsylvania, Princeton, Toronto and the Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies (twice), Tulane University, Vanderbilt, Yale, and Western Michigan University (twice); in the next two years the Academy will journey to Indiana and New Mexico.

Not only has the Academy become a truly national institution, but also there has been an amazing proliferation of regularly scheduled annual conferences on medieval studies in practically every region of the United States and Canada. These conferences emerged spontaneously as a means of providing an outlet for the upsurge of research activity in medieval studies that had grown so prolific that it could not possibly be accommodated at a single annual meeting devoted to medieval studies. Regional conferences, all bearing the stamp of their model, the annual meeting of the Academy, have become vital instrumentalities in disseminating research results, generating new research, and enlarging the communications network operating in medieval studies. And the advent of these regional conferences has had another important effect often overlooked: they have been a persuasive force in convincing college and university administrators to commit resources to the promotion of medieval studies.

In the course of the last two decades, a number of interesting new institutions or programs in medieval studies have emerged. Prominent among them is the Medieval Institute of Western Michigan University. The annual medieval conferences of this medieval-studies center of an institution that does not offer doctoral degrees began as a gathering at which younger scholars and graduate students might test their wings; it has matured, overcoming problems of reputation and geographical inaccessibility, as an international congress at which substantial offerings are heard from scholars in all areas of medieval studies. The Institute, which (as we have already noted) has twice been host to the Academy, has also developed a publications program specializing in Cistercian studies and publications serving pedagogical needs. One of its recent publications is a collection of essays on *Medieval Studies in North America: Past, Present, and Future*, edited by Francis G. Gentry and Christopher Kleinhenz (Kalamazoo, 1982), published for the Academy's Committee on Centers and Regional Associations, a volume to which readers requiring a more detailed survey of the topics of the present report are referred. The Institute at Western Michigan represents what one might call a populist model for medieval studies: grounded in an academic program that does not progress beyond the level of Master of

Arts, striving increasingly (and successfully) for greater scholarly sophistication at the same time as it maintains a broad base for participation in its remarkably large and bewilderingly diverse annual conference. At the other end of the spectrum is the Center for Medieval and Renaissance Studies of the University of California at Los Angeles, not itself a degree-granting program but serving programs of doctoral studies and the research of advanced scholarship and emphasizing both scholarly publication and the maintenance of major resources for research. Kalamazoo and UCLA are but two examples of the kinds of institutions that have arisen and flourished for medieval studies since the 1960s.

Impressive surveys of academic programs, associations, and research centers on this continent will be found in *Medieval Studies in North America*, to which reference has already been made. It is an indication of the number of such programs that the Committee on Centers and Regional Associations had 99 institutional members in 1983. Although the present report is concerned primarily with the development of medieval studies in the United States, it cannot fail to make some special reference to the concentration of scholars, scholarly resources and projects, and publications programs at Toronto: in the University and its Centre for Medieval Studies and in the Pontifical Institute for Mediaeval Studies. These programs have become inseparable from medieval studies in the United States and make it anomalous to speak of anything but medieval studies in North America.

Publication programs have also flourished for medieval studies in America. The publication programs of the Academy and its prizes to recognize distinguished publication may be taken as indicative of general trends in the publication of medieval scholarship. As in 1964, *Speculum* remains in 1984 the principal and central publication of the Academy: a specialist journal with learned articles of general interest to medievalist scholars (as opposed, say, to papers addressing fine points of philology) and with a major review section that publishes substantial reviews of major publications from throughout the world. In 1964, the only other publication program of the Academy was the Publications series, devoted to works of so special a nature that even university presses might shy from publishing them: the corpus of Averroes, a monograph on *Financial Relations of the Papacy with England, 1327-1534*, and a Hebrew version of the *Gesta* of Alexander of Macedon, for example. Seventy-five volumes had been published between 1928 and 1964; the Publications continue to appear as Medieval Academy Books, but with rather less frequency owing both to their cost and to the availability of other resources for publication. The authors of the seventeen volumes published since 1964 (aside from three who work in

Israel, England and Canada) are located throughout the United States. The premier award of the Academy was and remains the Haskins medal for distinguished publication, named for the great Harvard historian who was a founder of both the Medieval Academy and the American Council of Learned Societies; its recipients are senior scholars and the works for which they are honored are monuments of fundamental research.

Since 1964 several publications programs and prizes have been added to the Academy's roster—underwritten, as were the earlier programs, primarily by the resources of the Academy. The *Medieval Academy News*, a newsletter to the membership whose existence is evidence of the increased activity in medieval studies and scholarship, appears three times a year. It has become an essential source of information concerning conferences, research projects, and the like. *Speculum Anniversary Monographs* (so named because instituted on the fiftieth anniversary of the Academy) are monographs published at reasonable cost, usually (but not inevitably) the work of younger scholars. Eight volumes have appeared in this series since 1977. Interest in encouraging the work of younger scholars is also manifest in two new prizes for distinguished publication: the Elliott Prize for the best first article by a medieval scholar in a given year and the John Nicholas Brown Prize for a distinguished first book in the medieval field. In a day when academic appointments have become difficult to obtain and even harder to retain to the point of tenure, these prizes have become valued signs of scholarly approbation. The Committee on Centers and Regional Associations and the University of Toronto Press collaborate in publishing *Medieval Academy Reprints for Teaching*, a series of reprints of books important for pedagogical use that (as is increasingly the case with important books in the humanities) have not been kept in print by their original publishers. This project came into being as the result of a Chairman's Grant from the NEH to the Committee. The grant supported a survey of the profession that documented the fact that many books regarded as essential for pedagogy in medieval studies had gone out of print, and it helped to demonstrate the need for a reprint series.

It is also symptomatic of the growth of medieval studies that the Academy has been involved in projects to enhance teaching resources in aspects of medieval studies. One example involves the teaching of paleography, a subject indispensable for advanced research in medieval studies but so special and requiring such great resources in staff and library treasures that few of the universities offering advanced studies in the disciplines of medieval studies can regularly offer advanced courses in working with manuscripts. In 1971 and 1972, Harvard University held seminars in which Greek, Latin, and vernacular paleography were

taught. The first of these sessions in particular was actively supported by the Academy and largely underwritten by an anonymous gift from a member of the Academy. Similar programs of study have taken place almost annually since 1971 with only an actively supportive interest from the Academy, and several were at least partially underwritten by grants from the NEH (e.g., Catholic University of America, 1974; University of Pennsylvania, 1975). These programs have vastly enhanced resources for the study of paleography in this country, and their effectiveness can already be discerned in the work being done by young American scholars. In another project related to pedagogy, the Committee on Centers and Regional Associations and Dumbarton Oaks, the Harvard center for Byzantine Studies in Washington, have sought and received support from the NEH for a pilot program that will make Byzantinists available as short-term visitors to colleges and universities. As public lecturers and participants in medieval studies programs, the visiting Byzantine scholars will widen the dissemination of knowledge concerning this extremely important but highly specialized aspect of medieval studies.

Two final matters must be mentioned in a survey of the present state of medieval studies in the United States. The first is the commencement of a number of cooperative research projects of great importance; the second the existence of a general or public interest in things medieval.

The National Endowment for the Humanities has greatly aided the establishment of several ambitious projects to produce needed and basic research tools since 1964. It is difficult to imagine that without the existence of governmental institutions like the Endowment and without international cooperation of scholars aided by several national funds for the support of humanistic scholarship these important projects could even have been contemplated. A grant from the NEH, administered by the ACLS, supports the *Dictionary of the Middle Ages*, edited by Joseph R. Strayer and published by Charles Scribner's Sons, which is now appearing and promises to become a major reference tool. It is aimed at a non-specialist audience of teachers, students and others who need easily available and reliable information about medieval life. A number of young scholars from throughout the world are working with support from a number of foundations, their universities, and the Endowment on a project to produce an index of Middle English prose. The comparable index for verse, *The Index of Middle English Verse* by Carleton Brown and Rossell Hope Robbins (1943), was based on the prodigious research of Carleton Brown with a small group of collaborators. The task for prose must deal with a far larger body of materials, and it is made feasible by individual grants to support mem-

bers of an informal association of scholars who have agreed to undertake the survey and description of manuscript materials in various libraries, principally in England but also throughout the world. Finally, a project to write a *Dictionary of Old English* is located at the University of Toronto. Using computer technology and the programming skills of a scholar in the United States, Richard L. Venezky of the University of Delaware (with support from the NEH and American foundations as well as Canadian agencies), this project has made remarkable progress. Already valuable publications (including a computerized corpus of the entire extant body of writing in Old English and a microfiche concordance) have appeared and have made this one of the monuments of scholarship in our century even before the primary work has begun to appear. Without the continuing presence in major Western countries of institutions like the National Endowment for the Humanities to supplement funds available through universities and private foundations, the next generation of scholarship will not be able to undertake such projects.

Finally, there exists a popular interest in things medieval which could conceivably become an avenue through which the scholarly world could work in its quest for a revival of teaching and interest in the humanities. Medieval fairs and the never-ending stream of Arthurian literature are examples of this phenomenon. At their worst, they are banal and trivializing; at their best, they are an important asset for furthering humanistic learning and interests in the general society. Through the state Endowments and work with the schools and regional associations, the NEH can both support and guide these developments.

### *The Future of Medieval Studies*

In reporting for the Medieval Academy of America, we have attempted, in the briefest possible way, to sketch the present state of medieval studies in North America—a scene very different from that of two decades ago and, on the whole, a healthy one. We have been bold enough to attempt not only to speak for the Academy, which remains primarily an interdisciplinary learned society of scholars in the disciplines within which medieval studies are conducted but also to describe a wider spectrum including manifestations of public interest in medieval studies (or ‘medievalism’) and the activities of organizations and institutions that are not under the direct aegis of the Academy.

Looking briefly to the future, we can attempt to speak of the kinds of scholarly undertakings we imagine will be needed if medieval studies in America are to remain healthy; but we can speak only from what we

presently imagine will be the needs for the kinds of activities the Academy has supported and can be expected to continue to support or to initiate. We anticipate that the Academy will continue to be the premier association of scholars in medieval studies, that it will continue to have a shaping and nurturing relationship to other American centers and associations for medieval studies, that it will continue to honor distinguished achievements of individual scholars by means of election to its Fellows and the award of prizes, and that its journal *Speculum* and other publications will continue to be important media for the publication and review of the research of medievalists.

It is to be expected that the basic research in medieval subjects will continue to be work produced by individual scholars. University support for the scholarship of faculty in the form of grants and leaves will continue to be the primary form of support, supplemented significantly by the grants of competitive programs sponsored by NEH, ACLS, the Guggenheim Foundation and others. Programs that honor scholars selected for support must be maintained and strengthened.

There will, in addition, continue to be major collaborative projects to provide basic tools for research, and all indicators suggest that such projects will continue to be expensive—as such things are measured in the humanities as opposed to the sciences. Several major continuing projects have already been mentioned. The computer may well make possible projects the likes of which could never have been imagined to past ages of scholarly endeavor. There has been talk, for example, of a computer-based corpus of the major Latin texts of the Middle Ages—based on Migne's *Patrologia Latina* but perhaps even broader in scope or (at least) taking advantage of more modern editions than Migne's whenever possible—which could function as a concordance and make possible studies of word usage and the history of ideas of a scope presently almost unimaginable.

On a more mundane level, it may well be the case that learned societies will be called upon to help support ancillary and foundational disciplines in which teaching cannot be maintained by all universities that sponsor medieval studies. Reference has already been made to the supportive role of the Medieval Academy in securing seminars in Greek and Latin paleography for the current generation of doctoral students in medieval studies. As classics departments become smaller or disappear, a similar function in supporting teaching of medieval Greek and Latin may be needed; and there may be a call for assistance in providing instruction at national centers in the Celtic languages, some of the medieval Germanic languages, and medieval Arabic and Hebrew, which are important linguistic adjuncts to many medieval research

projects but not the everyday bread-and-butter of medieval studies programs or of the offerings of departments, say, of English or French or History or Art History where one *can* expect to find faculty and graduate students who will need training in them.

Finally, there is a continuing need for editions of basic works from the Middle Ages that one can be certain will be kept in print, and there is an increasing need for a large corpus of reliable translations of those same works. Discussion has begun in the Academy of the possibility of sponsoring a project that would be comparable with the Loeb Classical Library for the works of Greek and Latin antiquity: a program that would present reliable editions of basic texts with translations on the facing page. Such a collection would be a resource for teaching and scholarship at all levels from the high schools to post-graduate research. The preliminary work of identifying the corpus of works to be included would, itself, be a daunting undertaking, for the body of writings in Latin from the Middle Ages is much larger than the body that survives in Greek and Latin together from classical antiquity; but the potential utility of a Library of Medieval Classics makes the task an inviting one.

Medieval studies are interdisciplinary. They gather together the efforts of students in a number of disciplines that touch upon the life and culture of the European Middle Ages. In recent decades medieval studies have been one of the most successful areas of interdisciplinary discourse and cooperation in the humanities. At the risk of seeming chauvinistic in our advocacy of medieval studies, we feel called upon to reflect on the reasons for the expansion of medieval studies both quantitatively and qualitatively in recent years.

This growth of interest and of output may, we suspect, be owing in large measure to the interdisciplinary and cross-disciplinary emphasis nourished by the Medieval Academy. In the years just after World War II, the range of subjects proper to medieval studies was relatively constrained. Since then under the aegis of an interdisciplinary approach that range has been vastly extended so that presently medieval studies embraces the total gamut of human activity. More significantly, the interdisciplinary approach has emphasized the necessity of interrelating the expanding range of topics and approaches germane to medieval studies with the result that medieval studies have remained more inclusive and (at the same time) more unified than any other area of humanistic inquiry. It is this open-ended and holistic character that has made medieval studies so appealing; here is one of the few places that inquisitive minds can comprehend the human enterprise totally and integrally. We believe it is just this kind of humanistic enterprise the National Endowment for the Humanities hopes to promote.



## MEDIEVAL ACADEMY OF AMERICA

The Medieval Academy of America has enlarged and altered its role in order to encourage the growth of scholarly activity and good teaching in its field. We hope that that Academy will be able to continue to encourage the study of all aspects of the Middle Ages and that resources for the support of teaching and scholarship will continue to be available through the Academy and such institutions as the American Council of Learned Societies and the National Endowment for the Humanities.

# MODERN LANGUAGE ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA

---

President: Carolyn Heilbrun, Columbia University

Delegate to the ACLS: Margaret McKenzie, Vassar College  
(Emeritus)

ACLS Conference of Secretaries: English Showalter, Jr.,  
Executive Director

---

## COMMITTEE

Carolyn Heilbrun

J. Hillis Miller, Yale University

English Showalter, Jr.

Theodore J. Ziolkowski, Princeton University

1964–84

Although in most respects the situation of American scholarship and teaching in literature and language has improved in the last twenty years, the tone of the 1964 report was marked by a self-confidence and an optimism that are not widespread today. In the early 1960s, American institutions of higher learning were expanding rapidly to provide education for the generation of the baby boom. Not only was the college-age population growing, but also the public was placing an ever-higher priority on getting a college education, thanks largely to the success of the GI Bill in the years following World War II. As education came to resemble a growth industry, publishers and manufacturers developed new products and technologies. The need to enlarge college faculties seemed inescapable, and so graduate school attracted many superbly qualified applicants. And, finally, in 1964 American scholarship had relatively recently achieved the position of world leadership it has enjoyed since. The 1964 committee stressed certain pressing material needs that must be met if scholars and teachers in language and literature were to do the job that society was demanding of them, that they were already doing extremely well, and that they were eager to do better.

The 1964 report listed as desiderata for the advancement of schol-

arship more frequent and more generously funded leaves of absence for research, improved bibliographical tools, expanded libraries and improved systems of access, and the development of regional centers for the humanities and of institutes for the advanced study of the humanities. For the advancement of teaching, the report advocated fellowships for secondary and elementary teachers, predoctoral fellowships, and postdoctoral fellowships. The report also called for more and better translations of works from foreign languages into English. It noted the demonstrated value of language laboratories and the promise of new technologies such as programmed learning, teaching machines, television, tapes and records, kinescopes, education by telephone, high speed duplication processes, computers, and microfilm; but it expressed uncertainty about the ultimate usefulness of some of the new tools and commented that development and testing would require heavy financial support from foundations and the government. The report ended by urging support for creative artists as well as for scholars.

In 1984, most of these desiderata have been realized, many of them through programs of the National Endowment for the Humanities. The NEH and several foundations have awarded hundreds of fellowships over the past two decades, to pre- and postdoctoral scholars and to faculty members at all levels pursuing research projects. The NEH has funded numerous projects in its research tools division, including bibliographies as well as editions, indexes, and concordances. Another NEH division has supported translation projects. Libraries have expanded their microform usage and have developed computerized systems to improve access. Institutes have been founded, and state humanities councils make local grants in all states. Numerous organizations of all kinds have been strengthened through challenge grants. Projects not envisioned by the MLA's 1964 committee, such as the summer seminars and the small grants for access to research materials, have made significant contributions.

Despite the advances achieved through NEH and foundation support during the past twenty years, the picture is not entirely rosy, even in the areas mentioned. Many institutions still do not make up the difference between fellowship awards and salaries. There has never been a significant fellowship program for secondary- and elementary-school teachers, and fellowship support for college faculty members has been declining. Library budgets cannot keep up with the rising costs of materials or with the salaries needed for librarians to process the growing volume of materials. Many excellent research projects still go unfunded, many potentially good scholars never have leaves, and released time for improving teaching or for developing a new competence remains hard to obtain.

In some respects, a 1984 reader of the 1964 document is tempted to say, “*Plus ça change, plus c’est la même chose.*” The 1964 report states bluntly, “A majority of college students do not speak, write, or read their own language well.” And though the claim that “a majority of problems in the teaching of foreign languages had been attacked [between 1952 and 1964], if not solved” seems like a quixotic delusion today, the shrunken language competence that the MLA documented among college students in 1952 has a familiar ring. So does the ambivalent statement about the new technologies, and rightly so; if “xerox” copying (already improperly lowercased in 1964) has long since proved its worth, the “kinescope” has faded from the vocabulary as well as from the classroom. The perceptions that students are not being adequately educated in English, that they often have no foreign language training at all, and that new technologies hold promise but have yet to justify their effectiveness—these seem to be recurrent themes in reports on the state of the humanities.

The extraordinary difference in tone between the 1964 Report and the present stems from circumstances outside the profession that apparently no one foresaw. Yet by 1968 the college population had already crested and begun to decline. The demand for college teachers in almost all fields turned out to be far smaller than had been projected. As the job market contracted, much of the optimism and self-assurance of the early 1960s faded. The legacy of that expansionist mentality compounded the problem; graduate programs had been enlarged and new ones created, faculty members had been hired to do research and teach graduate seminars, outstanding students had been recruited as PhD candidates. The new PhDs found no jobs, the faculty resented having to teach lower-level courses, administrators were forced to dismantle programs. A mood of depression and pessimism prevailed, although the members of the profession who had jobs and opportunities continued to produce outstanding scholarship, criticism, and teaching.

For complex social, cultural, and political reasons, the public’s respect for college also began to wane in the late 1960s and early 1970s, and the need for a college education came into question. Students and their parents looked for obvious, practical career applications in the curriculum. The humanities suffered severely as a result; the importance of language and literature studies, although real enough, is not easily perceived by everyone. Enrollments fell in English and foreign language departments; only the courses in composition and basic language skills retained some drawing power, often because they were still required for graduation. In general, however, a smaller college-age cohort chose a smaller percentage of language and literature courses. As a result, the job market shrank further, and the principal responsi-

bility of the typical college English or language professor shifted away from literary study.

Finally, the pervasive inflation of the past two decades has been particularly hard on labor-intensive fields like education. The only way to increase the productivity of faculty members is to increase the number of students they teach. But the cost can be reduced in other ways, chiefly by replacing high-ranking professors with part-time personnel and by holding salaries down. All three methods have been widely used. Institutions often discontinue courses with small enrollments, however important the subjects, and the threat that positions or programs will be eliminated hangs over many professors of language and literature. The economic pressure has of course further depressed the morale of the profession and has weakened educational programs by forcing faculty members to teach too many students, departments to use less qualified instructors, and institutions to drop vital courses.

In short, as we set out to address the status of the profession in 1984, we are confronting problems quite different from those our predecessors faced in 1964. We could almost reproduce their list of desiderata in the areas of teaching and scholarship and reduce ours to the simple phrase: more of the same. The study and teaching of languages and literatures have never been more exciting than they are in 1984, thanks largely to the achievements of the past twenty years. All the surface measures show the period to have been an age of unparalleled productivity in research and criticism. Books and articles have poured from the presses and journals, new presses and journals have been founded, conferences and colloquia have multiplied, and new learned societies have been established. The more profound indications are equally strong. Our sense of our literary heritage has been revitalized by the bold new perspectives of women and ethnic minorities; our sense of literature's function has been provocatively challenged by new theoretical perspectives; research on linguistics, language acquisition, and the teaching of language arts has flourished; innovative methods have improved the effectiveness of teaching; and a brilliant new generation of PhDs has joined the faculties of American colleges and universities. The support of the NEH led directly to many of these outstanding achievements, and we would strongly urge that the NEH continue and expand its existing programs.

Yet, though we are no less confident about the quality and importance of our teaching and our scholarly work than our colleagues were in 1964, we have a new concern about the state of our profession. The problems of 1984 affect us as human beings first and as professors of language and literature only indirectly, although powerfully. Our urgent concern

today is to preserve in our own lives the humane ideals of our thinking and reading and writing.

## THE STATE OF THE PROFESSION

[An abridgement of the 1982 Report by the MLA on the  
Future of the Profession]

Few of us have remained untouched by the serious difficulties afflicting our profession. Enrollments decline in many of the humanities, younger and older PhDs cannot make a living by teaching, and aging scholars of language and literature take “retraining” courses to prepare for remedial teaching. The news media hold up to us another catalog of public failures: scores in literacy examinations for entering freshmen have been falling steadily, American companies suffer losses on the international market for lack of foreign language expertise, and American diplomatic missions abroad have critically few staff members who know the local language and code of behavior. We have reasons to feel dispirited, and yet we know that, paradoxically, our collective disarray as a profession coincides with the national need, greater than ever, for the services we are qualified to provide. We have no more timely task than to induce society to foster basic literacy, foreign language competence, informed sensitivity to other civilizations and customs, and widespread access to instructive and illuminating literatures.

We discern four broad goals for the association: (1) in *education*, to restore the humanities to their traditional central role in both schools and colleges; (2) in the *profession*, to raise standards of performance for both students and teachers of language, composition, literature, and foreign cultures; (3) in *scholarship*, to enhance opportunities for research, in particular to combat the decline in support for libraries as the most essential of research facilities; (4) in *society*, to improve the stature of the humanities, in influence and rewards, within the educational community and the larger community.

### The MLA and the Process of Education

Whatever our problems today, it has never been more important to recognize that “the common good depends upon the free search for truth and its free exposition,” and we uphold the principles of the AAUP Statement on Academic Freedom and Tenure with undiminished energy: “Freedom in research is fundamental to the advancement of truth. Academic freedom in its teaching aspect is fundamental to the protection

of the rights of the teacher in teaching and of the student to freedom in learning. It carries with it duties correlative with rights."

Our course offerings continue to reflect our fundamental commitment to promoting literacy and the study of language and literature in the widest sense, and we energetically support all thoughtful efforts to shape our undergraduate and graduate curricula to fit the needs of our changing constituencies. We encourage efforts to increase interest and research in minority literatures. Our students belong to many cultures, and we should be ready to expand our ideas about what a true education means today. We are particularly concerned that budgetary and other considerations may not only curtail the growth of new programs such as women's studies, ethnic studies, and regional studies but even endanger their continuation.

We are also disturbed about the increasing tension between teachers of literature and teachers of composition. Scholars and practitioners in literature and composition need to recognize their joint interests. They share the goal of educating citizens to participate fully in a literate democracy; skillful scholarship and skillful teaching are vital to both fields. While the differences among special interests can be productive, they need not result in incompatible factions.

We should continue to seek remedies for the progressing paralysis of the public will to learn languages. In studying a foreign language one does acquire valuable skills, but to rest our defense there would be to capitulate to the mechanism of goods and the marketplace. By learning a foreign language students develop a greater understanding of what members of a different culture think, do, and create; the foreign language ceases to be "foreign," and the struggles to understand different forms of expression leave an indelible mark on students' sensibilities. Their awareness of new meanings and responses enables them to express themselves better in their native tongue.

The Rockefeller Commission on the Humanities called the improvement of education in our secondary schools the most important task facing American society today. Unfortunately, most high school and college teachers have long viewed each other either with indifference or with distrust and open hostility. If the MLA and other professional organizations seek to work more closely with secondary schools, there must be mutual respect.

## New Challenges to a Professional Organization

The Modern Language Association has worked "to promote study, criticism, and research in modern languages and their literatures and to further the common interests of teachers of these subjects," in the

words of our Constitution. The association's structure, however, has made it better suited to serving individual needs than the "common interests of teachers." Although we pass numerous resolutions and take action in the name of a group loosely called "the profession," the concept of a collective does not apply easily to our members. Most humanists function as individuals in both their teaching and their research, and they join the MLA on the same basis. There has nevertheless been progress in the following collective projects:

1. We applaud the many efforts now under way to build sturdy bridges between academia and the professions, business, and the media. We welcome these connections between worlds long divided by mutual misapprehension and suspicion and perhaps by a lack of genuine and precise information about each other.

2. The membership of the MLA cannot disregard the rapid technological advances that are affecting the profession and our world in basic ways. For the past sixteen years the MLA has served as a clearinghouse for information on adapting electronic processes and improving methods for disseminating data.

3. We believe that American society needs its humanists as much as the humanists need the support of other citizens. The MLA can continue to accomplish much through its officers and its headquarters staff and with the assistance of lobbyists, coalitions of professional groups, and allies; but some efforts would succeed better locally than they do nationally. Without the active involvement of members all across the country, the efforts of the leadership will die. In college towns, metropolitan areas, and other well-defined regions, teachers of language, composition, and literature could join with other humanists in the district to pursue common public purposes.

## The Profession and the Job Market

In our profession training has always been divorced from practice. We spend most of our time teaching, and relatively few of us engage in sustained research and continued publication. Yet graduate school curricula have not traditionally included accredited teacher training, and even today hardly any programs offer courses in teaching. It would be impossible to deduce from a study of graduate school catalogs of the postwar period that almost all the graduates of the programs so eloquently described actually teach for a living.

Admittedly, students in graduate schools generally do considerable teaching. In some graduate programs the system of sections serves as an opportunity for rigorous teacher training—and often for fine teaching. We regret, however, that departments frequently assign their



freshman teaching to graduate students not out of any serious pedagogical commitment but for financial reasons, or because tenured faculty are unwilling or unprepared to teach such courses.

Most of the statistical evidence, based on demographic, institutional, and pedagogical trends, indicates that the academic job market in languages and literature will continue to be characterized by an oversupply of PhDs, probably into the 1990s. Every city in the nation now includes citizens of exceptional talent and training, PhDs and ABDs in language and literature, who have been victimized by circumstances. After devoting immense energy to preparing for careers in teaching and scholarship, they now find themselves condemned to the fringes of their vocations or excluded altogether. It may be melodramatic to call the recent history of our profession a collective tragedy, but we have seen virtually unprecedented bitterness, disillusionment, and waste.

Many of the forces we now confront are on a scale that far exceeds our limited capacity for counteraction. We must, therefore, temper our recommendations with realism:

1. We must assign the highest priority to resisting the decline in academic job opportunities. Our profession needs to articulate its value more clearly and to defend its interests inside the academy. On its own and in cooperation with other organizations, the MLA should play a leading role in persuading academic administrators that language and literature deserve at least as much consideration in curricular and personnel planning as other fields receive. Ways must be found to keep younger colleagues in the profession until there are jobs for them; postdoctoral research and teaching programs offer one means. With fewer new members entering the faculty ranks, there is surely some danger of intellectual stagnation; we must find ways of offering faculty members opportunities to refresh their skills and to keep up with recent developments in their fields. Many doctoral programs have rightly discouraged applicants; but a decline in the number and quality of graduate students may mean that a generation of talented teachers and scholars will be permanently lost to the profession.

2. Although maintaining academic positions should be our primary concern, we must not ignore the issue of alternative careers. The loss of academic job opportunities means that more PhDs will pursue careers in industry, business, or government. We hope that in the near future our graduate programs will become spacious enough to lead to many careers, not as a matter of necessity but as a matter of course. In the meantime, we applaud the programs that have been set up to help prepare PhDs from humanities departments to enter nonacademic careers.

3. We should become more sensitive to our perceptions of the

nonacademic world and its perceptions of us. There is some evidence that American corporations wish to enhance their reputations in academic communities, especially among humanists; we should welcome the opportunity to enter into a critical dialogue with representatives of business and other fields outside our own.

## Recommendations for Action

### A. Teaching and Research

#### I. Literacy

Institutions of higher learning should meet the fundamental responsibilities of educating students to advanced levels of literacy. This effort should not be confined to composition and literature courses but should be extended across the curriculum.

#### II. Teaching and Composition

Teaching composition and teaching literature are the principal activities of members of English departments. Teachers and students are ill served by the ideas that teaching is less important than scholarship and that the teaching of composition is less valuable than the teaching of literature.

1. Teachers of composition should receive the same professional encouragement that teachers of literature receive.

2. Promotion and tenure committees should give full consideration to excellence in teaching at all levels.

3. Promotion and tenure committees should give scholarship in composition theory and pedagogy as much respect as they do literary scholarship.

4. All English department faculty members should explore the research methods and theories involved in the teaching of writing, participate in regional institutes and seminars, and familiarize themselves with recent developments in composition theory, research, and practice.

5. The MLA should establish more systematic and vigorous cooperation with organizations devoted to the study and teaching of writing and reading, including associations of rhetoricians, communications theorists, semioticians, and linguists.

6. MLA publications should make deliberate efforts to stimulate thought and research about the interrelations of literature, composition, and rhetorical theory.

7. The *MLA International Bibliography* should add a section on composition scholarship.

### III. Foreign Languages

No person can be considered liberally educated who has not become familiar with at least one foreign language and culture. All high school students should have the opportunity to study a language other than English, all college graduates should know how to read and converse in another language, and all adults should have ready access to foreign language instruction.

1. Colleges and universities should require skill in a foreign language for admission or treat the lack of that skill as a deficiency to be made up in noncredit courses.

2. Colleges and universities should make a more advanced level of proficiency a requirement for the bachelor's degree.

3. Colleges and universities should develop extension courses to enable adults to learn new languages or to become more proficient in languages studied previously.

4. Colleges and universities should develop imaginative and effective incentives for the study of foreign languages.

5. The MLA and other organizations should work toward implementing these recommendations by adopting guidelines for proficiency-based requirements, disseminating them to schools and colleges, and regularly monitoring institutional policy and practice.

### IV. Teaching Foreign Languages

The teaching of language is one of the principal responsibilities of foreign language professionals. Students cannot appreciate a foreign culture and its literature until they have become proficient in its language.

1. Teachers of language should receive the same professional encouragement and support that teachers of literature receive.

2. Promotion and tenure committees should give serious attention to teaching and scholarship in language acquisition.

3. The research methods and theories of language pedagogy should be made available to all language faculty.

4. The MLA should cooperate regularly and vigorously with organizations devoted to teaching foreign languages and with associations of semioticians and linguists.

### V. Support for Libraries, University Presses, and Research

Continued support for excellent scholarship is crucial to the future of the profession.

1. Cuts in aid for libraries, university presses, and scholarly projects should be vigorously resisted.

2. MLA members should study the plight of libraries and defend them as vitally important.

3. The staff of every university press should be dedicated to publishing work of the highest quality, under the supervision of a faculty board.

4. Administrators should recognize the essential differences between university presses, whose commitment to publishing scholarly works on recondite subjects requires institutional support, and business enterprises, which must be responsive, above all, to the demands of cost accounting.

5. All MLA members should seek ways to increase public support for good scholarship and for the good teaching that is its twin.

## VI. Curriculum

1. Undergraduate departments of language and literature should review their curricula at least every five years. Traditional canons should be examined in the light of women's studies, minority literatures, theories of composition, and emerging ideas in linguistics, philosophy, and other branches of critical reflection.

2. Graduate departments should consider annually the question of how their admissions accord with their placements.

3. Graduate programs should include introductions to the art and skills of teaching.

4. Graduate students should receive instruction in the use of computers for humanistic research and teaching.

5. Teaching assistants should receive systematic and rigorous in-service training.

6. Graduate departments should reexamine the traditional canons.

7. Graduate departments should develop curricula that will encourage and qualify MAs and PhDs to choose careers from a broad range of options inside and outside the university.

## VII. The Uses of Technology

The MLA should continue to lead learned societies in exploring the new technologies.

1. The MLA should broaden its function as a clearinghouse for information and resources in all areas in which technology affects our professional and scholarly activities.

2. MLA members should educate themselves in the new technology and become involved in making decisions about technology at their home institutions and elsewhere.

3. The MLA should provide for its members on demand at nominal cost the new services that technology makes economically feasible.

### VIII. Continuing Education

Colleges and universities should extend instruction beyond the campus to such institutions as hospitals, factories, and prisons and actively participate in developing the many courses that large business firms provide for employees. Colleges and universities should also make plans for teaching students who wish to continue their education after working hours or to return to school.

### IX. Liaisons with the Schools

The MLA should establish regular liaison with elementary and secondary education systems to promote mutual respect and understanding and to provide a basis for shared information.

1. The MLA should seek ways of improving relations with other organizations of language and literature teachers—the NCTE, the AATs, and so on—that already successfully foster cooperative programs involving faculty members at all educational levels.

2. The MLA should identify and publicize successful ventures in which colleges and secondary schools have cooperated to improve the teaching and learning of English and foreign languages.

3. Departments should initiate exchanges of classroom visits between high schools and colleges.

4. Teacher-education majors should join the appropriate professional organizations.

5. Students preparing for teaching certification should not be relegated to secondary status in their departments.

### B. Employment

#### X. Affirmative Action

The MLA reaffirms its commitment to affirmative action.

#### XI. Teaching Loads

The Association of Departments of English, an organization sponsored by the MLA, has developed Guidelines for Class Size and Workload in English courses; and as efforts to increase teaching loads continue, it should be widely circulated and periodically revised. The Association of Departments of Foreign Languages, also sponsored by the MLA, should prepare and distribute similar guidelines for foreign language departments. The ADE guidelines suggest that composition sections should have a maximum of twenty students and literature courses a maximum of thirty-five (if the instructors lack qualified help) and that college English teachers should spend no more than twelve hours per week per semester in the classroom if they teach only

undergraduate courses and no more than nine hours per week if they provide graduate instruction.

## XII. Faculty Development and Cooperative Arrangements

Every college department should institute a systematic program of faculty development tailored to local conditions and needs.

1. Each program should arrange for a counselor to work privately with teachers who need help on professional matters.
2. Institutions should provide assistance and sabbatical pay for faculty who seek appropriate education in new special fields.
3. Institutions should initiate faculty exchanges.
4. Institutions should develop consortia.
5. Departments within a region should explore the possibility of cooperating among themselves.

## XIII. Independent Scholars

The profession should facilitate the scholarly activities of those working outside the academy.

## XIV. Careers

The profession should continue to develop alternative career opportunities for humanists.

1. Graduate schools should assign members of the placement staff to counsel doctoral candidates in humanities on alternative careers.
2. The MLA should publish and periodically update a prospectus of advice for persons with graduate training in the humanities who are considering or seeking employment outside the academy.
3. The MLA should expand its file of members with nonteaching careers in order to provide a network of contacts and advisers.
4. The MLA should devise an inventory of teaching jobs abroad.

## AFTERWORD, 1984

The 1982 report contains a statement deploring the abuse of part-time faculty. At almost the same moment, the association adopted a statement on the use of part-time faculty, developed by an ad hoc committee of the ADE. This statement reads in part:

The recent dramatic increase in the use of part-time teachers in many departments of English and foreign languages is already threatening departmental integrity, professional standards, and academic excellence. Although some part-time appointments add significant dimensions to curricula and some professionals prefer to accept

only part-time academic appointments because of other commitments, most part-time appointments are not made for educationally sound reasons. Indeed, the primary motivation for many of these appointments has been to reduce the cost of instruction.

The MLA urges college and university administrations to make new and concerted efforts to eliminate the excessive use of part-time teachers, to improve the conditions under which part-time teachers are employed, and to recognize the professional status and important contributions of such teachers. Continuation of excessive, unplanned use of part-time teachers can only exacerbate administrative difficulties, invite student dissatisfaction, and threaten the quality of education.

## GUIDELINES

1. Each department should develop a long-range plan that clarifies the use of both temporary and permanent part-time teachers in terms of departmental needs and goals.

2. All part-time teachers should be treated as professionals.

3. If there is a recurrent need for the services of part-time teachers, departments should consider establishing a cadre of permanent part-time teachers, with appropriate fringe benefits and incentives.

We have some comments to add to this statement. Graduate students make up a large group of part-time teachers. It is highly desirable that PhD candidates have supervised teaching experience as part of their professional training, and it is appropriate for advanced graduate students to have part-time teaching as a source of income. Departments should not, however, attempt to retain students as inexpensive staff members by encouraging them to delay completing their degrees.

We would also add a general recommendation that colleagues in our fields welcome opportunities to serve in administrative posts on their campuses. Many of our recommendations call on institutions to adopt or alter policies. These institutions are governed, or at least strongly influenced, by administrators drawn from the faculty. The fields these administrators represent will obviously receive more sympathetic hearing and benefit from more effective advocacy than will other fields; yet, humanists often decline to serve, preferring to pursue their individual interests.

The prospects for the profession look more hopeful and morale seems higher in 1984 than it did as recently as 1982. The job market remains severely depressed, but the candidates now receiving their degrees entered graduate school already aware of the difficulties, unlike those who were caught in the crisis of the early 1970s. Moreover, projections

suggest that new jobs will be opening at about the time a student entering graduate school in 1984 can expect to receive the PhD, in the 1990s. At the undergraduate level, there are signs of renewed interest in the humanities; enrollments in foreign language courses, for example, rose 4.5% from 1980 to 1983. In response to the numerous studies of American education that appeared in 1983 and 1984, many educational systems have moved to strengthen instructional programs in English and foreign languages, and many colleges and universities have adopted or stiffened admissions and graduation requirements. This trend would seem to indicate greater demand for PhDs in language and literature in the near future.

Despite the relatively hard times of the recent past, outstanding students have continued to enter graduate programs. Intellectually, the field has grown more and more attractive, as the traditional canon has been enlarged and revised, as the perspectives of other disciplines have been brought to bear on literature, as new teaching methods have been developed. Some of the most wishful recommendations of the 1982 report are already being realized, for public opinion seems to be shifting in our favor; and perhaps some of the pessimism is therefore no longer appropriate. The specific calls for action remain sound and will serve to guide our policy for some time to come. The most urgent need, however, seems to be to find a way for the PhDs of the 1980s to survive in the academic world.

## CONCLUSION

The Report of the Commission on the Future of the Profession was intended for members of the Modern Language Association. Some of its recommendations have been omitted from this summary because they seem to concern only the association itself. Others that may appear to fall into the same category have been included because they affect other institutions as well, even though the MLA has been charged to take action. We expect that the audience for this report will be wider and more diverse than the membership of the MLA. The questions dealt with should concern variously the National Endowment for the Humanities; other federal agencies such as the National Endowment for the Arts, the Library of Congress, and the Department of Education; government policymakers at all levels; foundations; corporations that support education; the American Council of Learned Societies and our fellow learned societies and professional associations; institutions of education at all levels; and ultimately the public at large.

We have, then, tried to describe the state of the discipline as a whole, not simply our role as a learned society or our relation to the NEH. But



since the occasion for the report is the reauthorization of the NEH, it seems useful to summarize the recommendations, both explicit and implicit, that most directly relate to the NEH.

1. The NEH should maintain and if possible expand all its existing programs. Its support for scholarship, research, the development of research tools, faculty development, editions, translations, institutional endowments, and so on, has been crucial to the excellence of American work on language and literature during the past twenty years.

2. The NEH should serve as the public advocate for the humanities. It should publicize the work of outstanding humanists to the nation at large, and it should defend the interests of humanists in the competition for resources. It should try to explain the innovative and original work in the field to those from other fields, especially outside the academy; and it should zealously protect the freedom of humanistic scholars to think and write as their consciences dictate.

3. The NEH should continue to seek out and encourage the best work being done in the humanities and, to ensure that it supports excellence in all fields, it should continue to rely on peer review of proposals. Peer review is the strongest guarantee that NEH programs will stay insulated from political pressures.

4. In assigning priorities to programs, the NEH should give special consideration to the following areas: libraries and other institutions of scholarly communication; faculty development; new fields of study; applications of technology to humanistic studies; cooperation between humanists at different levels and across fields; relations between scholarship and teaching.

5. The NEH should ensure that humanists outside the academic mainstream have opportunities to qualify for NEH programs.

# ORGANIZATION OF AMERICAN HISTORIANS

---

President: Arthur S. Link, Princeton University  
Delegate to the ACLS: David F. Allmendinger, Jr., University of Delaware  
ACLS Conference of Secretaries: Joan Hoff-Wilson, Indiana University, Executive Secretary

---

## COMMITTEE

Allan G. Bogue, University of Wisconsin, Madison  
Arthur S. Link  
Anne Firor Scott, Duke University

With approximately 12,000 participating members and institutions, the Organization of American Historians is the largest scholarly association dedicated solely to serving the interests of the scholars, teachers, and researchers specializing in United States history. Like the American Historical Association, the OAH publishes a major scholarly journal, holds annual meetings for the discussion of research and other scholarly concerns, and provides a considerable range of other scholarly services to its members. The following is a statement prepared by this association on the program of the National Endowment for the Humanities:

Section 3 of the organic act of the National Endowment for the Humanities unequivocally placed history among the disciplines that the new agency was empowered to nurture. Despite this fact, panel participants and Endowment staff are sometimes believed to make a distinction between humanistic history and other kinds that presumably fall outside the sphere of interest of the NEH. This is not surprising. Historians themselves disagree about the nature of their discipline and the methods and objectives most appropriate in the study of history. In primary and secondary education, educators have grouped history with the social sciences as a social study. A brief comment on the nature of history and historians is therefore in order.

Historians study the human past and think, talk, teach, and write about it. In so doing, individual historians often have very different objectives and may differ considerably in their methods of research and

in the ways that they choose to present their findings and conclusions. Some historians, for example, may carry their study of a great figure of the past beyond the documentary sources to the point where intuition comes into play. However, if this scholar is deeply steeped in the sources, that apparent intuition is a kind of understanding of the age based upon long immersion in the documents which reveal the thought and values of a bygone culture. Other historians just as legitimately may seek to recreate the life of the common folk of that same era, an enterprise perhaps based on the statistical reconstruction of demographic patterns that were incompletely understood by the individuals of that time. Yet our awareness of these configurations may allow us to see new meaning in the writings of the leading thinkers of the time. Both types of historical enterprise, and many others, make their contribution to our understanding of the ways in which human beings have lived, thought, and responded to challenge, adversity, and success. Some historians very properly study "high culture." Others, just as appropriately, examine mass or popular culture, or the culture of particular communities or social groups. Again, some historians choose to report their findings in narrative form, others adopt an analytical style, and still others may combine the two approaches. In the work of various types of historians, Americans of the present generation can and do come better to understand the challenges and dilemmas of their own lives.

The skill, penetration, and analytical honesty of the researcher and, above all, the freshness and explanatory power of the findings reveal the importance of new research and not the degree to which it conforms to artificial boundaries or the conventions of the past. It is in these terms that the historians of the Organization of American Historians hope that the officers and panelists of the National Endowment for the Humanities will assist them in that search for "wisdom and vision" to which the declaration of purpose in the organic act dedicated the Endowment.

The Endowment was created in 1965 at a very important juncture in the history of the historical profession. A great surge of enrollment in the schools, colleges, and universities was creating an eager demand for teachers at every level. During the decade of the 1960s, the number of college and university teachers increased to unprecedented levels. Some university history departments doubled in size between 1955 and the early 1970s. Teachers' colleges became universities and developed ambitious graduate programs. *The Directory of American Scholars* of 1963 listed 6,700 historians in colleges and universities, not counting those in two-year institutions. The number was 9,500 in 1969 and 12,000 in 1978. During the 1950s and 1960s, sweeping changes also occurred in the subject matter of the discipline as historians broadened their inter-

ests significantly. They developed different approaches to economic, political, and social history, and growing numbers became interested in writing, for example, the history of ethnic minorities, women, working people, and the family. The geographic and national dimensions of history also expanded greatly during these years as historians set about to develop a cadre of historians interested in the peoples of the Third World.

During the latter part of the 1960s, a larger proportion of Americans saw history as relevant to the social concerns of the day than ever before. Members of the general public flocked to historic sites in unprecedented numbers, and the federal government developed additional programs under which sites of buildings of national historic interest or cultural value were preserved. The growing number of historians employed outside academia aroused interest in the training of historians for public service. But changes in both demography and the national mood of Americans during the early seventies ushered in a period of retrenchment and depression among historians in schools, colleges, and universities. The demand for public- and secondary-school teachers diminished. This caused a decline in college history enrollments and constricted opportunities for employment. Even so, history faculties have remained to the present at a level far above that of the 1950s, and population specialists are predicting an increased demand for teachers and college faculty at the end of the current decade.

Data do not exist which permit a definitive statement, but the proportionate increase in the number of practicing historians during the 1960s and 1970s apparently far exceeded the increase in the number of awards made by established independent funding agencies in furtherance of historical research. The grant program of the NEH played a major role in alleviating this stringency, although it could not by any means remove it.

In evaluating the record of the Endowment during its first twenty years, most historians would agree to award the Endowment a high grade. In general, its officers and affiliated advisory panels have developed imaginative and comprehensive programs for discharging the mission which Congress set for it. The development of a large cadre of referees and the development of high standards of evaluation was particularly impressive through the first fifteen years of the Endowment's history. The programs developed to allow college and secondary-school teachers of history to update or to retrain themselves appear to have been highly useful and effective. Some of the grants of the Research Division have made hitherto inaccessible sources widely and conveniently available to considerable numbers of historians. And many historians have added important works to the literature of American history as a result, in part, of Endowment fellowships.

Despite the very definite success and contributions of the Endowment during the last twenty years, there are respects in which its contributions have been of concern to informed historians. Some of that concern is mirrored in our discussion of the definition and scope of history. Some Endowment officers and panelists may have interpreted the scope of history too narrowly. Some of them may have looked too much to the past and too little to the present and the future in defining goals and in evaluating proposals.

The general appropriation of the Endowment has never been commensurate with the great expansion that occurred in the educational system during the Endowment's existence. Since 1980, significant budget cuts have further reduced the ability of the Endowment to fulfill its function. In 1983 the NEH budget was some 66 percent of the 1980 total. And the rationale that giving from the private sector would compensate for the reductions has certainly not proved to be justified. The incidence of the budgetary reduction in program support is also disquieting. It is the Endowment's responsibility to foster the "realm of ideas and the spirit," and this responsibility involves not only widespread dissemination of cultural knowledge within the population but also constant revision and addition to the basic inventory of ideas. There is—if one wishes to put it another way—an obligation on the part of the Endowment to refine the heritage of humanistic thought bequeathed to us and to add to it, and also an obligation to disseminate a discerning understanding of the core of humanistic knowledge throughout the public. As between the two, the function of refining past knowledge and adding to it is of the greatest importance, since upon it particularly rests our ability to be "masters of our technology," as the organic act mandates. In the statement of purpose that serves as preface to the organic act for the NEH, we find heavy emphasis placed upon the need for outstanding scholarship and leadership in the "realm of ideas." Viewed from this perspective, the allocation for independent scholarly research provided within the budgets of the Endowment has always been inadequate and has become even more so within recent years. It is from the independent research component in the Endowment's budget that a revitalizing and innovative flow of ideas must for the most part come. But the allocations to Fellowships and Seminars and to Research Programs within the Endowment budget was reduced some 22 and 28 percent between 1980 and 1983 while the State Programs budget (particularly representative of the dissemination role) fell by only 8 percent. We are also concerned by the charges made in recent publications that the Endowment has sometimes given inadequate recognition to minority representation in peer review, and that the system of peer review has been weakened in other respects.

We hope that during the next twenty years of the Endowment's history, the agency will continue to assist in providing the innovative leadership and material support for the humanities which is absolutely essential if Americans are to be "masters of their technology and not its unthinking servant." To this end we wish to conclude our statement with some suggestions concerning the future policies of the Endowment:

(1) The budget cuts of the last several years should be restored to the agency, and a policy of carefully supervised growth in programs maintained over the next decade at least. If we lose the race for survival in which mankind is engaged, it will not be, we believe, because our government gave too little support to the basic sciences, but rather because we failed to nurture humanistic values and to read correctly the social lessons of the past. We believe, in particular, that the fellowship program should be reinforced with substantial additional funding.

(2) The humanities have suffered especially from the fluctuations in enrollments in our educational system. Some of the holders of recent Ph.Ds are driving taxis or holding other positions for which their training did not prepare them. Talented undergraduates are turning away from the humanities in their search for "rewarding" careers. In the meantime, specialists in population trends are predicting a cyclical upturn in the school-age population which will begin to affect the university and college enrollment levels by the early 1990s. Current indications suggest that adequate replacements will not be available initially to replace the professional cohort that began teaching in the 1960s or to satisfy additional needs for staff which may occur. An NEH program designed to assist history Ph.Ds of the mid and late 1980s to remain in academic life until their services are required would contribute very considerably to the quality of higher education during the next decade.

(3) Although there are dedicated and brilliant teachers of history in our primary and secondary schools, college teachers of history in general find their students to be on the whole poorly prepared, and many college students have been so repelled by their experiences with history at lower levels that they resolutely avoid contact with the subject when they go to college. We are aware that these matters are in part the responsibility of the United States Department of Education and of the National Institute of Education. But they are also the proper concern of the Endowment, and we believe that the agency should further the development of new and imaginative history curricula in the primary and secondary schools, perhaps cosponsoring a program to this end with the National Institute of Education. The summer institute program, which allows secondary-school teachers to refresh their knowledge of the field under the direction of leading research scholars, has been beneficial and should be developed further.

(4) There has been a good deal said and done during the last two decades about the role of audiovisual materials and multimedia presentations in revitalizing the teaching of history in the classroom. The Endowment has made a considerable commitment in this area. We believe that the results of such activity have been beneficial but mixed. The need for more rigorous quality control has been shown in many instances. Too often the producers and the filmmakers have been more concerned with artistic criteria than with producing a product that will be maximally useful in the classroom. Yet there have been brilliant contributions. We would stress, however, that the brilliant and well-informed teacher must always remain at the heart of the teaching process; the multimedia contribution can be a valuable supplement, but it can never displace the innovative and inspiring classroom instructor. We believe therefore, that it would be wise for the Endowment to reserve to itself the functions of developing showcase presentations and experimentation. We also believe that the term "multimedia" should be interpreted in a broad sense. Investigation of the potential of the personal computer as an aid in the classroom teaching of history should be undertaken as part of the media programs of the Endowment.

(5) Programs in which high-school teachers return to colleges and universities in guided leave programs for exposure to new dimensions of scholarship have proved remarkably effective in the past. A nationwide program, carefully controlled for quality, would make professional knowledge available to teachers most able to adapt it to the educational needs of our future citizens.

(6) Never have the interests and approaches of historians been so diverse as they are today. Many historians are concerned that this characteristic of the profession had deterred its members from undertaking works of broad synthesis—studies which would be read with interest by members of the general public, as well as by educators and students. In fact, much of the current synthesizing activity is being directed by the commercial textbook publishing companies. Few are satisfied with the way in which this is being done. We hope that the National Endowment will investigate the possibility of sponsoring a number of major synthetic projects, turning to master historians who have displayed an aptitude for synthesis—perhaps to provide, for example, a "new, new" American Nation Series, but differently conceptualized and without the weaknesses of its predecessors.

(7) We have been impressed by the breadth of the Endowment's efforts to foster the development of research materials in the humanities. Here, too, we see the need for the application of rigorous evaluation criteria, but we also see continuing opportunities for service by the Endowment. Particularly, we should like to see the Endowment

## ORGANIZATION OF AMERICAN HISTORIANS

investigate the possibility of providing greater assistance to the production of microform reproduction of research materials in history, particularly the creation of microfilm or microfiche copies of manuscript collections. More development of machine-readable data sources can, perhaps, represent another important area of development. A conference might well be arranged to evaluate past NEH activities in these areas and to identify new areas for future action.

(8) Many members of the OAH have been involved as consulting humanists in the state programs of the Endowment. We recognize the importance of this area of activity. A general public that understands the value of humanistic studies is essential in the long run to the maintenance of humanistic studies within the centers of higher learning. The state programs contribute in a major way to providing such an informed public. Some of the programs developed at the state level have been remarkably successful in arousing interests of a continuing sort. But some historians have been impressed as well by the unevenness of the programming, the reluctance with which some project directors utilize their designated humanist advisors, and the evanescent nature of some projects. We believe that an enhanced concern with quality control is appropriate at the state programming level.

In conclusion permit us to reiterate what we said at the beginning of this statement—that history is the collective memory and the cement which enables societies to understand themselves. Sound history, based upon an openness to truth, is one of the most important foundations of good citizenship. Persons ignorant of their country's history and traditions are not likely to be able to make intelligent political decisions. Persons ignorant of other cultures and traditions may fall prey to prejudice and a narrow nationalism. A nation as powerful as the United States must have citizens who are well-informed about their own and other people's history if they are to be good citizens of a world which desperately needs enlightened leadership.



# RENAISSANCE SOCIETY OF AMERICA

---

President: Roland M. Frye, University of Pennsylvania  
Delegate to the ACLS: Patricia H. Labalme, Columbia University  
ACLS Conference of Secretaries: Eugene F. Rice, Jr., Columbia University, Executive Director

Drafted by: Paul Oskar Kristeller, Columbia University

Approved by the Executive Board, Renaissance Society of America after revision by:  
Roland M. Frye  
Patricia H. Labalme  
Eugene F. Rice, Jr., Columbia University

In 1964, when the establishment of a national agency for the humanities was publicly discussed, and when at the initiative of the American Council of Learned Societies, of the Council of Graduate Schools in the United States, and of the United Chapters of Phi Beta Kappa, a Commission on the Humanities was formed to explore the state of the humanities in this country, the Renaissance Society of America, in its capacity as constituent society of the ACLS, prepared a report on the present situation and the present and future needs of our discipline. This report was submitted to the ACLS and to the Commission on the Humanities and was subsequently printed, along with the reports of the other constituent societies of the ACLS, in the published report of the Commission on the Humanities (1964, pages 207–213), and it was also printed (the only such report to be so), in the Congressional Record, as an appendix to the text of the law establishing the National Endowment for the Humanities (Congressional Record, 89th Congress, First Session, vol. III, part 1, January 4, to 27, 1965, Exhibit 2, pages 237–239).

Now that the NEH has been in existence and active for twenty years, the Renaissance Society of America is submitting another report on the present situation and future needs of our discipline, on the occasion of the reauthorization hearings scheduled by Congress for the spring of 1985, and at the request of the ACLS. Our emphasis this time will no longer be on the need for federal support of the humanities and especially of humanistic scholarship, something that up to 1964 had not existed. At that time, the establishment of the NEH was a major innovation in the history of American culture. In the meantime, during the past twenty

years of its existence, the NEH has been operating successfully, has made a major contribution to American scholarship and civilization through its various activities, and has more than justified the hopes entertained at the time of its establishment. The NEH has been a successful and much needed institution. It should continue to receive from Congress adequate funding in order to maintain and, if possible, to expand its activities. We strongly recommend that the NEH continue to limit its support to the humanities as defined in the text of the law ("language, both modern and classic, linguistics, literature, history, jurisprudence, philosophy, archeology, the history, criticism and practice of the arts, and those aspects of the social sciences which have humanistic content and employ humanistic methods"; see Public Law, 89th Congress, S.1483, September 29, 1965, Sec. 3a). This definition was based on the definition proposed in the printed Report of the Commission on the Humanities (1964, page 10) and repeated by Dr. Robert Lumiansky at the joint Hearings before the Special Subcommittee on Labor of the Committee on Education and Labor, House of Representatives, and the Special Subcommittee on the Arts and Humanities of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare (United States Senate, 89th Congress, First Session, on H.R. 334 . . .) and similar bills to establish national foundations on the arts and humanities (Part 1, February 23 and March 3, 1965, page 125). The Renaissance Society of America helped to formulate this definition and has always supported it. The NEH should continue to avoid wasting its resources on projects and activities that claim to belong to the humanities, because of popular confusion or interested distortion, but which in fact belong to the arts, to the social sciences, or to social or political activities, pursuits that in themselves are entirely legitimate and worthy of support, but for which other resources are available and for which the limited resources earmarked for the humanities should not be drawn upon.

Moreover, as a scholarly organization, the Renaissance Society of America is most directly interested in the support of humanistic scholarship, research, and publication. It is, for general and professional reasons, also interested in the improvement of our educational system, from elementary and secondary schools through colleges to graduate schools, both in terms of the curriculum and of teacher training, in the accessibility and preservation of our cultural resources such as libraries, archives and museums. We are much less interested in the popularization of the humanities through the media, state programs, textbooks, or popular books. We do accept the fact that support of popularization has been included in the program of the NEH, and we realize that much public, political, and institutional support for the NEH

is focused on this aspect rather than on scholarship, but we feel very strongly that within the spectrum of activities supported by the NEH, popular and state programs should not receive greater emphasis or larger funds than those devoted to scholarship and education.

In the field of education, there has been a regrettable decline in the quality of the curriculum and of the teachers during the last few years and decades, both in the elementary and secondary schools and more recently in the colleges. This decline affects not only the preparation of future graduate students, college teachers and scholars, but also the general cultural background and outlook of future businessmen and professionals and of the general population. We need high school graduates who master not only the necessary skills of reading and writing (which many of them now lack) but also are able to reason correctly and to judge critically, and who know the facts of history and geography that provide the basis and context for our political and cultural life. They should also learn at least one foreign language in order to become more conscious of their own language, to overcome the provincialism of their outlook, and to get the proper perspective on their own place in the multilingual and multicultural world in which we live. The same applies even more so to our college education which is responsible for the outlook of our future professionals, businessmen and political leaders. College instruction should again include, as it did in the not too distant past, required courses, not only in the sciences and arts, but also in the humanities, that is, in foreign languages, in history, and in literature and philosophy other than contemporary. With its support for curriculum improvements in the colleges, and with its seminars and institutes for college teachers and for secondary school teachers, the NEH has done a great deal to improve our educational system. More recently, the NEH has appointed a Study Group on the State of Learning in the Humanities in Higher Education (in which one of our Board members was included), and has prepared a report on this subject.

In the area of cultural and scholarly resources, the NEH has helped some of our leading museums and research libraries to preserve their holdings that are threatened by physical deterioration, and to make their holdings more accessible through better catalogues, something from which all working scholars are bound to benefit.

In the area of doctoral and postdoctoral research and publication, the NEH should continue its active support of individual scholars, as well as of cooperative projects and conferences, and its help in the preparation and publication of reference works, research tools, editions, and also of translations (especially from languages not widely known in this country).

The Renaissance Society of America warmly approves all these activities and contributions, and we gladly express our gratitude for the support given by the NEH to many of our members and to other Renaissance scholars in their individual projects. We especially appreciate the generous support given by the NEH to several cooperative projects sponsored and administered by our society:

1. Annotated lists of medieval and Renaissance Latin translations and commentaries (*Catalogus Translationum et Commentariorum*, directed by F. Edward Cranz), along with a Microfilm Corpus of the Indexes of Latin Manuscript Catalogues, and a corpus of Indexes of unindexed Latin Manuscript Catalogues (RT-22949-75-562 and RT-27215-77-1200).
2. A microfilm corpus of all unpublished inventories of Latin manuscript books through 1600 A.D. for deposit in the Library of Congress (directed by F. Edward Cranz, RC-20795-84).
3. List of Uncatalogued Renaissance manuscripts (*Iter Italicum*, directed by P. O. Kristeller, RT-23069-75-614).
4. Renaissance Latin Aristotle Commentaries (directed by Charles H. Lohr, RT-23634-76-417 and RT-27964-77-194).
5. Latin translations of Aristotle (directed by Charles B. Schmitt, RT-0730-79 and RC-20465-83).

We are confident that these projects, when completed, will be extremely useful, not only for Renaissance scholars, but also for classical scholars, medieval historians, and students of early modern history, including such fields as philosophy and the sciences, theology and law, and the theories of the arts and of music.

We urge that these activities be continued or even expanded, and that the policy be maintained of judging the merit of projects submitted objectively and according to strict scholarly standards rather than to popular appeal, apparent political or social relevance, or current fashion (for the quality and solidity of a scholarly project stands often in inverse proportion to its "relevance" or fashionable appeal). In this way, the NEH will help the scholarly community at large, and especially the American Council of Learned Societies and its constituent societies (including the Renaissance Society) to encourage and help both younger and older scholars, both individual and cooperative projects, as well as the quality of education and teaching on all levels.

Thus the NEH, along with several private foundations and institutes and with our major universities, will have an important mission in maintaining the level of American scholarship in the humanities which

has been quite high in recent decades but which is now threatened by a variety of social, political and ideological pressures and fashions, both in the public world and in the academic community itself. This will also help to raise the cultural outlook of the average citizen and of the general public to a level worthy of the political tradition and the international position of this country, and of its acknowledged contribution to the natural and social sciences, to the arts and literature.

# SOCIETY FOR THE HISTORY OF TECHNOLOGY

---

President: Melvin Kranzberg, Georgia Institute of Technology  
Delegate to the ACLS: Arthur L. Norberg, Charles Babbage  
Institute, University of Minnesota  
ACLS Conference of Secretaries: Alex Roland, Duke University,  
Secretary

Prepared by: Arthur L. Norberg

With the assistance of:

Brooke Hindle, Smithsonian Institution  
Thomas P. Hughes, University of Pennsylvania  
Reese V. Jenkins, Thomas A. Edison Papers  
Edwin T. Layton, University of Minnesota  
Alex Roland

## THE HISTORY OF TECHNOLOGY

### *Preface*

In the past several years, a number of historians of technology have reflected on the state of their subdiscipline. Within their statements they commented on the place of the history of technology among the humanities and social sciences, and the need to better understand the place of technology in our society. These reflections appeared in society presidential addresses, articles in published guides to the field, and major conference papers. What follows is a synthesis of these reflections, written in August 1984 at the request of the American Council of Learned Societies. The Society for the History of Technology prepared the synthesis to illuminate its place among the humanities and to acknowledge the support and encouragement of the National Endowment for the Humanities.

### *Introduction*

Throughout their history, Americans have shown an intense concern with technology. Debates on today's problems and tomorrow's needs invariably raise issues associated with the development and impact of technology. Over the past 200 years technological change has become associated with economic growth and changing social conditions. As a result, it is not uncommon in analysis of social problems to focus on

solutions that employ more technology. Similarly, discussions of the economy often emphasize the advantages of promoting more technology. We come to see technology itself as a solution to problems. Consequently, many Americans seek more effectively to control the processes of invention and innovation; to understand better and exploit the relations among science, technology and business; to improve the allocation of resources for research and development so as to capitalize investment faster; to stimulate the interplay of various economic sectors with more realistic results; and to mitigate the negative consequences of technology. Such discussions reflect the dominant place of technology in our lives.

In an effort to understand and solve these problems, scholars from a variety of disciplines are applying their distinct methods to studies of technology. These researchers find that their studies are improved by appeals to historical data. Indeed, many earlier historical works on technology development and impact came in response to demands of economists, engineers, policy analysts, and historians to know more about the part technology has played in cultural development. Over the past 25 years a number of the issues raised by these early workers in the field have been taken up by a new breed of specialist: the historian of technology.

### *The History of Technology*

The emergence of this subdiscipline of history followed a recognition that the knowledge and outlook of engineering graduates could be improved through study of the humanities. Curricula reform in the early 1930s reflected a felt need to make engineering students better acquainted with the world's literature. Following World War II, technology and its affect on society rose to be a major concern. This new concern is what produced and sustains the history of technology. Curricula reform of the late 1950s and the 1960s responding to this concern included a shift to the history of technology. This reflected a need to make the humanities more relevant to engineering students. Later courses emphasized the connections between technology and society and the social causes and effects of technology, including, but by no means limited to, industrial history. These changes were an attempt to make history of technology useful and important in engineering education.

In part this happened as planned; a number of historians of technology are associated with schools of engineering. But very early there was also a broadening of the field to study how the American character has been affected by our involvement with technology. Historians in this area have studied such things as values and choice in

our society and the “technological imagination” in literature. Their place is in general history programs, American studies programs, and museums. Museum development is perhaps one of the most visible aspects of the history of technology. New Smithsonian museums focused on technological development join others like Sturbridge Village, Merrimack Valley Textile, Ford, and GE, to name only a very few. Studies from these programs and museums have enriched our understanding of cultural life in the United States and its similarities and differences with that of other societies.

Curricula and museum reform occupied only a part of the historians’ efforts. The major focus was research. Approaches to research in the history of technology include (1) internal examinations of the technical aspects of technological phenomenon; (2) “systems builders” analysis; (3) business or economic reviews; (4) social history; and (5) analyses of artifacts. These categories reflect the range of professional positions held by historians of technology. While most can be found in academic positions, in the last 20 years the number in museums, industry, and government has grown to match the concerns of these sectors with the place of technology in their development. Some of the scholarship of these historians and their present needs will be explored below.

A recurring theme throughout the emerging literature is the pervasive influence of technology across all facets of human endeavor. The history of technology should be a matter of deep interest and significance to all those concerned with the past, present, and future of mankind. Conversely, historians of technology have come to appreciate the role of culture in shaping technological development. All this has made the National Endowment for the Humanities an important source of support for historians of technology. Reduction or loss of that support, at a time when concerns about the increasing technological specialization of our society are being raised in many sectors, will reduce our understanding of the technological imagination we employ and endanger our ability to understand ourselves.

### *Two Decades of Research*

As a profession with its own organization and programmatic emphasis, the history of technology was new in the mid-1960s. While good internalist studies existed, much of the literature had grown from the needs of other disciplines to understand the nature and impact of technologies. Economists interested in economic cycles sought to learn more about invention and innovation to control the processes more effectively. Sociologists and anthropologists examined technical change as one aspect of cultural change. Social historians focused either on



specific technological developments as watersheds of social change or on the lives and works of inventors and entrepreneurs. In the past 20 years, historians of technology have added to this literature and at the same time provocatively broadened the areas of interest in technology. Indeed, their work in these broader areas is helping us to understand both the interdependence between evolutionary and revolutionary perspectives on technical change and the relations between today's problems and yesterday's difficulties.

The early work in history of technology was directed, however, at a new, more critical internal history, which would lay the foundations of a new discipline. Thus, we have the writings of Lynn White, Jr., Carl Condit, Cyril Stanley Smith, and Eugene Ferguson, combined with the editorial work of Mel Kranzberg. An analysis of the last 20 years' literature in the history of technology shows that the base on which the field stands continues to be studies of internal developments in particular technologies—bridges, clocks, communications systems, computers, power systems, automobiles and so forth. In addition to keenness about the technology, we observe a continuing interest in inventors and entrepreneurs and the recent addition of business history to understand the contextual factors influencing technical developments.

These historians interested in internal history focused on one of two sets of concerns. One set was concerned with problems that turn out to be quite old, with roots in the Middle Ages and the Renaissance. Medieval technology still engages us because of the remarkable changes society experienced over 1,000 years ago. Moreover, these studies of the Middle Ages offer benchmarks to examine the nature of technological change and the mechanisms of technology transfer, subjects of considerable interest in modern times.

A second set is specific to modern industrial society. For example, to a quite old concern—the contributions to technology of American mechanics—have been added new concerns such as the increasing dependence of science and technology on each other, the rise of the modern corporation; the rise of the corporate state spurred on by technology; and professionalization of the engineering community.

Contemporary concerns have stimulated research in new areas, such as ideology and technology, women and technology, effects of technology on the environment, and the role of values in technology. The question of "external" history has boomed into primary importance for most new historians of technology. This is fundamentally the contextual history of technology. Besides examining the effects of social aspects on technology, historians have gone on to investigate the role of technology in technocracy, feedback systems, and engineering ideology, with

sometimes surprising results. Each of these studies requires the construction of new data bases on types of research and locations where it was performed, economic data, movement patterns, and power use. In addition, this new emphasis on recent developments led to a strong surge in archival and curatorial activities and the preparation of new resources and research tools.

By the middle of the 1970s this new body of work cried out for synthesis, something that had not been possible with the small body of literature extant just a decade before. In 1978, a number of historians gathered in Roanoke, Virginia, to consider the social relevance of the field and the large, organizing principles that held it together. These historians set out to consider what critical issues in the field if pursued might bear fruit in understanding the large principles and to discuss possible actions on the part of the Society for the History of Technology (SHOT) to stimulate work on these issues. The participants saw the growing interest in technology creating an unprecedented market for works in the history of technology. New biographies of inventors such as Edison and Bell had appeared; books on the origins of new technological developments such as the computer and its industry were attracting public interest; and prime-time television shows on technology received respectable ratings. At the same time, new campus programs in the history of technology or "technology and society" drew students from all segments of campus, not just from engineering programs.

The Roanoke gathering led to direct conclusions of how SHOT could assist in the stimulation of synthetic works and the promotion of campus programs through publication of biographical essays, development of slide kits for use in courses on various educational levels, preparation of guides to museums and historic sites, and creation of a bureau of exchange for information on curricular developments. Some of these have appeared since.

It is too soon to assess the effects of discussion at the Roanoke meeting on the critical issues faced by historians in the field, but if the recent periodical literature is any indication, the approaches to historical study of technology by historians of technology has broadened further.

While this research and reflection transpired, the number of publication outlets grew, particularly in the 1970s. In 1964 only one U.S. journal devoted its pages to research in history of technology and the relation of technology to society: *Technology and Culture*. In the past decade five journals began publication, and this does not include the rise in attention to technology in older journals devoted to other subjects or to chronological periods. A smaller increase in the number of journals occurred in Europe as well.

*Support and Needs*

Support for these studies has been varied and cyclical. Historians interested in technology have received most of their support from the National Endowment for the Humanities, for the social aspects of the effects of technology, and the National Science Foundation, for the technical dimensions, though there have been crossovers. The support has not, however, kept pace with the demand. As interest in the subject spreads to other disciplines, research proposals increase and many cannot be funded no matter how meritorious.

Student demand and public interest in the nature of technology and its impact on society raises expectations about what can and should be done by historians and others interested in these questions. There are too few people concerned with these questions and, even at the present funding levels, too little support to fulfill their expectations. Moreover, even if there were enough people, it is questionable whether the needed base of scholarship now exists to offer meaningful analyses and conclusions about the impact of technology on society in more than a handful of historical instances. Recent steps to advance this scholarship have been too few. In the history of technology there is only one major editorial project in process: the Thomas A. Edison Papers Project. Volumes of some of the Benjamin Latrobe papers have begun to appear and publication of the William Thornton papers are in preparation. But the papers of other important engineers and inventors—Elihu Thompson, Albert Hull, to name only two—would add greatly to our knowledge of the interplay between technology and social change; unfortunately, the trend away from major editorial project funding places these people at a low priority.

This represents only one type of resource demand. In order effectively to explore many of the internal issues contained in the chronological areas mentioned above, more research must be done on the contexts surrounding technological development and its impact. For example, frequent requests are made to learn more about the origins of the computer. Almost in the same breath we hear expressed concerns about and demands for detailed study of the impact of the computer. And this is only one technology needing study. Add to this the larger questions involving the Industrial Revolution, the Information Revolution, the accelerating rate of technological change, and the rise of big business and its dependence on technology, and we can generate a long list of topics needing research. All of these problems point to the importance of developing the resources for future research, including archives, artifacts, machine readable materials, papers projects, visual materials, and additional biographical and bibliographical tools.

The need for sustained and, where possible, expanded support is pressing. To meet present demands and opportunities, we must:

- Increase fellowship support for students to pursue graduate study and research.
- Increase research funds for technical and contextual studies of technology. Only when further investigations are done can historians offer more assistance in examining societal concerns involving technology.
- Provide support for post-doctoral fellowships.
- Provide assistance to exploit the results of earlier projects, such as the work of the Historic American Engineering Record and geodetic and census survey data of various kinds.
- Stimulate the construction of data bases to provide statistical information about the engineering profession and to uncover regional similarities and differences in technology use.
- Promote interdisciplinary research involving historians of technology and other humanities disciplines.
- Provide support for comparative study of the development of technology, especially across national and cultural development.

A substantial portion of the momentum achieved by the history of technology community in its attempts to understand cultural development and the role of technology in societal affairs can be attributed to the support provided by the NEH. Reduction of its programs or reorganization to exclude studies of technology would reduce this momentum. But more important, in a technological age, when society is reaching out to understand its involvement with technology, to do anything but increase support for the humanities is to risk losing our humanity. In our headlong drive to promote the various technological aspects of our economy, we cannot overlook or cast aside those aspects of culture that reveal our concern for each other.

# SOCIETY OF ARCHITECTURAL HISTORIANS

---

President: Carol Herselle Krinsky, New York University  
Delegate to the ACLS: Isabelle Hyman, New York University  
ACLS Conference of Secretaries: David Bahlman, Executive Secretary

Written by: Carol Herselle Krinsky

With the assistance of:

Richard Betts, University of Illinois  
Richard Candee, Boston University  
Marian C. Donnelly, University of Oregon  
J. D. Forbes, University of Virginia  
David Gebhard, University of California, Santa Barbara  
Richard Howland, Smithsonian Institution  
Elisabeth MacDougall, Dumbarton Oaks Research Library and Collection  
Osmund Overby, University of Missouri, Columbia  
Adolf K. Placzek, Columbia University (Emeritus)  
Damie Stillman, University of Delaware  
Stephen Tobriner, University of California, Berkeley

## ARCHITECTURAL HISTORY: PRESENT SITUATION, FUTURE NEEDS

Twenty years ago, Professor J. D. Forbes and Dr. Richard Howland reported widespread agreement among their consultants that architectural historians shared several major interdependent concerns about the

- A) Examination and analysis of architectural examples and of related documents, both verbal and pictorial
- B) Dissemination of the findings and the orderly presentation of the story of architectural development
- C) Physical survival of significant and beautiful areas and individual monuments.

These concerns persist today. In addition, what may be unique about architectural history within the humanities is its potential to contribute to positive change by exerting an impact on the practice of architecture, landscape architecture, and planning. The theoretical and historical writings of such historians as Vincent Scully, Colin Rowe, and the late

Rudolf Wittkower have influenced contemporary architects, and "post-modern" tendencies in design reflect concern for history and context.

A) In connection with the first matter, Messrs. Forbes and Howland reported on the need to establish: 1) photographic archive(s) of world architecture, perhaps enlarging some existing collections; 2) archives of architectural drawings; 3) surveys of urban and rural American architecture; 4) a national museum of American architecture; 5) an institute of American architecture.

*Present situation:* Great progress has been made toward meeting these goals, thanks to scholars' private initiative, and to support from scholarly institutions, foundations, the National Endowment for the Humanities (which assists archival and library activity, museum work exhibition, research, and publication, and scholarly research and publication), and the Department of the Interior (which assists survey and preservation activities). Non-governmental support has accounted for more than half of the funding, showing a national commitment to the study of our built environment.

Archives of architectural drawings now exist in many parts of the country, preserving locally the records of regional achievement. Regional dispersion is considered preferable to concentration in only one repository but a central register of the location of written, pictorial, and oral history records is now maintained at the Library of Congress under the title of COPAR (Cooperative Preservation of Architectural Records). There is also a Union List of Archives, with an excellent index. The Art and Architecture Thesaurus project of the international English-language Architectural Drawings Advisory Group is developing verbal cataloguing standards for architectural drawings, a newly-appreciated type of historic record and artistic expression. A start has been made in coordinating information with the International Confederation of Architectural Museums and with coordinators of archival information at UNESCO.

Surveying and recording of American architecture and engineering are being carried out by the Historic American Buildings Survey, the Historic American Engineering Record, State Historic Preservation offices, municipal landmarks preservation commissions, and neighborhood and homeowner groups, often coordinating effort with the keepers of the National Register of Historic Places and with the National Trust for Historic Preservation. Surveys in specific areas are carried out under Uniform Land Use Review Procedures. Local chapters of the American Institute of Architects conduct extensive examinations of buildings in order to prepare tours and guidebooks for the organization's conventions. Environmental education teachers promote the investiga-

tion of the built environment by students in elementary and high school. The Vernacular Architecture Forum has promoted awareness of previously neglected buildings around the country. The Society of Architectural Historians has taken giant steps toward a nationwide survey by scholars who will write the volumes in its forthcoming series, *The Buildings of the United States*. This will be a state-by-state study of the architecture and built environment of the whole country, written by scholars but intended for the general public as well as for students and specialists. While much surveying has been done with support from the Department of the Interior, the selection of the most significant examples, their interpretation, and their presentation in context are the responsibility of scholars in the humanities.

As to museums, the National Museum of the Building Arts has been established in Washington, D.C. It is now much more common to have architectural exhibitions with scholarly catalogues in universities, in museums (the architecture and design departments of the Museum of Modern Art, the Cooper-Hewitt Museum, and the Art Institute of Chicago are especially prominent), and in special venues (the Drawings Center and the Urban Center in New York City, the Schindler House in Los Angeles, the Chicago School of Architecture Foundation, among others).

A single Center for the Study of American Architecture, cannot serve a nation as large as ours, but research institutes in architecture have been established at the Center for the Advanced Study of the Visual Arts at the National Gallery of Art in Washington, D.C., and at the Buell Center of Columbia University in New York City in coordination with the University of Texas at Austin and other institutions. The National Endowment for the Humanities has also funded interdisciplinary projects, some based at museums (e.g., Old Sturbridge Village in Massachusetts, which coordinated a study of textile industry communities, 1790–1840), and others focused on significant regional sites (e.g., St. Mary's City, Maryland). These projects have brought formerly more isolated researchers together. They, along with other projects, have stimulated the expansion of architectural history to encompass additional aspects of the built environment and its philosophical, social, and economic context.

*Future needs:* The primary need is to maintain and strengthen the work and standards of the existing enterprises. If the needs articulated twenty years ago had not been so compelling, thousands of our citizens would not have worked hard to meet them. National Endowment for the Humanities Challenge Grants have been outstandingly successful in generating public support for the activities pursued by the various

professionals whom our Society serves. Continuing support of several types will be required:

1) Continuing cooperative effort among scholars, institutions, and government agencies. Given the recent development of a commercial market for architectural drawings, it will also be important to have dealers, owners, and scholars share information as to the whereabouts of material in private lands, even if owners do not grant wide access to it.

2) Support for the physical preservation of archival materials, including written documents, photographs, drawings, and models. This will require further efforts at public education, even beyond the audience now addressed by the publications of the Society of Architectural Historians (*Journal*, *Newsletter*, *Preservation Forum*) and the COPAR Newsletter. There must also be renewed emphasis on the training of conservators to preserve them properly. The libraries and archives which have catalogued holdings and made them available to increasing numbers of users face funding cutbacks; we must keep our institutions accessible.

3) Scholarly contribution of accurate abstracts to the International Repertory of the Literature of Art (RILA), preparation of accurate indexes to periodical literature, and the sharing of information and offprints on regional periodical literature in the United States and beyond.

4) Financial support for the work of cataloguers, librarians, conservators, the COPAR supervisors, and those who produce scholarly and public-education materials.

5) Financial commitment by state and local governments for agencies to survey and maintain significant elements of our architectural heritage.

6) Funding for public exhibitions such as those already offered with NEH support such as Boston's "Place over Time" or New York's "Grand Central Terminal." These focus the attention of scholars and enlighten the public; their printed and illustrated catalogues ensure that the efforts have permanent and widespread resonance.

There is also a serious need for *new* types of support for several projects of the greatest use to scholars and their audience:

1) A non-profit, perhaps cooperative, source of photographs for publication, and possibly also of slides used for teaching. There should be some new means of meeting the sometimes prohibitive cost of photographs and publication rights. The recent and rapid rise in charges by private and institutional suppliers of photographic prints



and reproduction rights prevents publication of works on architectural history if the authors cannot afford the costs. This is especially a problem for articles published in scholarly journals which do not pay authors, or published in books for which the author must subsidize a university press. Existing photograph suppliers would not be driven out of business, because they own old views or other unique images; a new non-profit source of images would supply current views.

2) Help in meeting the significant expenses of architectural drafting, surveying and measuring, erecting scaffolds, and related activities which are essential to many projects in architectural history.

3) Assistance in meeting travel expenses. It is unwise to write about buildings and areas that one has not seen, or to deal with the biography of an architect when one has not had access to his archives. One cannot order microfilms of archives if one has no idea of what the repository contains. It is also important to provide funding for travel by scholars and related professionals to scholarly conferences and study tours, so that people can teach and write about what they have seen in three dimensions and in context. The Society of Architectural Historians funds student scholarships to its own domestic tours and annual meetings but unfortunately the number of recipients is, by necessity, small. The American Council of Learned Societies offers funding for scholars who read papers at international meetings. Summer seminars for college faculty held at large universities have been given in the last few years and have proven their worth, even though the number of scholars served so far has not been large. An expanded, carefully supervised program of intensive scholarly travel is an important unmet need.

4) Support for scholars during leaves taken for purposes of research and publication. Some colleges cannot offer paid sabbatical leaves or adequate compensation during sabbaticals, so that the scholars there have been unable to complete work that might benefit us all. The National Endowment for the Humanities has done much to meet this need, as have certain foundations; the need continues. Those funding groups which allow money to pay for typing, word processing, and the preparation of manuscripts for publication are especially to be commended.

B. In connection with the dissemination of results, we note that several needs articulated in 1964 have been or are being met, while other needs still require attention.

*Present situation:*

1) Materials needed for study have been made more widely available. Some out-of-print treatises have been reprinted by private pub-

lishers. Efforts are underway for translation projects which will make important works more widely available to Americans. Documents are now more routinely printed as appendices to articles on architectural history. Some drawings and documents have been disseminated on microform, and the Archives of American Art maintains multiple microfilm copies of its holdings in several regional study centers.

2) The architectural Index and RILA now supplement the Art Index to guide readers to information.

3) A multi-volume encyclopedia of architects has been published, as recommended in 1964.

4) Many local architectural guidebooks have been published by historians, architects, and amateurs in the last twenty years, and commercial guidebooks to certain cities now include information about local architecture; this is true in Chicago, Boston, New Orleans, New York, Annapolis, Columbus, and elsewhere. They cater to the vastly increased public interest in the built environment, a development of the last twenty years. As noted above, the Society of Architectural Historians has inaugurated the comprehensive *Buildings of the United States* series; the 1964 report recommended an effort of this kind.

5) Public and cable television stations, and a few cinemas and university film programs show films and videotapes on architecture, urbanism, and preservation. Several of these, on topics as varied as Islamic architecture and the use of public open space have been widely circulated; distinguished scholars, planners, architects, and social scientists now participate enthusiastically in developing them. A television series on American architecture is now being produced, aided by government support.

6) Several innovative teaching programs have been funded by universities and the National Endowment for the Humanities, e.g., the summer seminars mentioned above, the social science/architecture curriculum at the University of Missouri at Kansas City, the Urban Design Studies Program and an interdisciplinary course at New York University.

7) More journals now include articles on architecture and the built environment, including *Winterthur Portfolio*, journals published by schools of architecture, and publications of local American Institute of Architects chapters.

The greater availability of publications, archival materials, and new study programs has stimulated our members to deal with subject matter that was hardly studied when our last report was written; we refer, e.g., to the subjects of industrial and commercial archaeology, vernacular architecture, landscape history, and urban history.

*Future needs:*

1) Support for publications. Printing of illustrated journals and books is increasingly expensive. Many scholarly works cannot be published without subvention; this may soon be the case with our *Journal*, the only American publication devoted entirely to original research and documentation of architectural history and closely related fields. Private and foundation support helps to meet the needs but cannot meet them all, so that some public funds will remain essential.

2) The need to facilitate cooperative scholarly efforts by experts at different institutions. This affects work on multi-volume works of reference, on annotated corpora of documents, and on biographies of major figures.

3) The need to find more effective ways to disseminate the results of educational innovations, such as the programs at Kansas City and New York noted above. Those in charge of successful programs could prepare curriculum guides, or serve as consultants elsewhere.

4) The need to refine ways of sharing scholarly investigation with the general public which lives and works in the buildings we study, with teachers and the school-children who will build our future environment, and with specially concerned citizens such as developers, community planning boards, and local preservationists. British schools have developed local itineraries relating architecture, history, engineering, and geography; architectural historians could be consultants for comparable efforts here.

Among the beneficial effects of such programs might be some impact on preservation and on the problem of vandalism, in addition to providing stimulating intellectual pleasure accessible to young citizens at every level of intelligence.

C. In connection with the physical survival of significant and beautiful areas and monuments, we are heartened by some developments of the last two decades and aware of the need for continued vigilance.

*Present Situation:* Great progress has been made in the preservation of our heritage. Local landmarks preservation commissions, state offices of historic preservation, the National Trust, the officers of the National Register, the Historic American Buildings Survey, the Historic American Engineering Record, the Victorian Society, the Art Deco Society, and our own Society of Architectural Historians are among the groups active in the study and conservation of the best of our past achievements. There are now planning tools such as air rights transfers

and scenic easements that were hardly discussed in 1964. The National Trust, the AIA, and the Preservation League of New York State are among the groups offering courses for architects, contractors, and craftsmen active in preservation. Programs in preservation of historic architecture have been established in Vermont, New York, Kansas, Arizona, and other states, proving the nationwide need for these services. Historic preservation has demonstrated its profitability, and has shown its potential for the consolidation of neighborhoods and civic efforts.

*Future needs:*

1) There must be increasingly sophisticated standards devised to insure that the significant monuments are identified and preserved.

2) It will remain important to continue and even increase craftsmen's training programs, perhaps focusing on unemployed youths and on displaced construction workers. The building program at St. John the Divine in New York City can serve as an example. (It should be noted that preservation activities benefiting from government and private support generate employment.)

3) There will be continued needs for conferences on economical preservation methods, and on ways to coordinate preservation activity and historic research with city planning goals. Preservation is no longer understood only as gentrification. Architectural historians can aid in formulating local standards of significance and rarity, and in the understanding of popular arts, civic symbolism, authenticity of evidence, and both the process of change and the maintenance of our heritage.

D. Other needs:

1) Most consultants emphasize the need for support of foreign language study. Certain subjects, such as the influence of German architecture on American nineteenth century architecture, have been neglected in part because of inadequate study of German by some American students. Increased interest generated since 1964 in Far Eastern, Islamic, Soviet, and sub-Saharan architecture can only be satisfied after sufficient language study is undertaken.

2) Guest teaching by expert architectural historians in colleges of art and in schools of architecture is desirable whenever the studio faculty lacks advanced study of architectural history. Incentives are probably needed to encourage such schools to recognize that trained historians may offer important ideas unknown to designers who lecture on history.

3) Increased undergraduate teaching of the history and meaning of our built environment. Many institutions now offer only a semester of “appreciation” of painting and sculpture. But as architecture and landscape are the arts we live in, the understanding of these subjects is of use as well as of intellectual importance.

4) Development of library resources—books, periodicals, photographs—in more areas of the United States than enjoy excellent resources now. The holdings are richest in libraries in the Boston-Washington corridor, in Illinois, and California. Considerable progress has been made in Texas in recent years, but more needs to be done in other regions.

Repeatedly, our consultants cited the need for the support of research and publication in architecture. National support helps local effort to gain credibility and adherents. It also promotes scholarship in areas that are relatively backward in this field, and where local foundation support may therefore be unavailable initially. Another advantage of national support is the potential for retaining excellent young scholars in academic life; without a support network or adequate research opportunities, they may well leave the humanities for other work. National support offers guidance to college tenure committees in deciding which young scholars are meritorious; recipients of past National Endowment grants will already have been judged favorably by independent nationwide consultants.

Research in the humanities aids humanity’s self-understanding. In the case of architecture, scholarship also affects our ability to comprehend and manipulate our environment. Architectural historians have increasingly found ways to communicate their findings with the public, and to respond to the public’s eagerness to understand the past and to derive meaning from current activity in the design fields. Our own Society’s substantial lay membership reflects this common enterprise.

For these reasons, architectural history and related fields merit sacrifice by individual researchers and teachers, and support by schools at all levels, by foundations, and by public agencies. Extraordinary work has been done since the Forbes and Howland report was written, much of the work matching the recommendations offered in 1964. The achievements of the past two decades give us satisfaction and hope, but also remind us of how much there is left to do.

# SOCIETY OF BIBLICAL LITERATURE

---

President: Wayne Meeks, Yale University

Delegate to the ACLS: William R. Baird, Texas Christian University

ACLS Conference of Secretaries: Kent Harold Richards, The Iliff School of Theology, Executive Secretary

Prepared by: Kent Harold Richards

The purpose of our work is to stimulate the critical investigation of the classical biblical literatures, together with other related literatures, by the exchange of scholarly research both in published form and in public forum. This purpose is accomplished through the initiative of individual scholars and the cooperation of diverse academic institutions. Since our 1964 statement of priorities, we continue not only to pursue our research in the library, study, and field, but in order to reach expanded results we seek new coalitions. These have emerged in projects and partnerships initiated over the last twenty years.

We have established a major publication program. In addition to our *Journal* founded in 1880, we have started another quarterly, *Semeia*. Annually we produce around thirty monographs in fourteen series. Our editorial teams consist of over fifty member volunteers. These publications are primarily aimed at scholars and students in the discipline. We are involved in joint publications with other publishers. These include a major dictionary of the Bible for the non-specialist. Financial support for these publications come from sales as well as private and federal grants. Increased funding for a growing publication program must emerge in the last part of the twentieth century.

We have established a network of regional, national and international meetings for the scholarly community. Our annual meeting, held jointly with the American Academy of Religion, brings together 3500 scholars. A dozen regional meetings host smaller gatherings. Most recently we have established an annual international congress to serve our international constituency which numbers over 500. The program for each of these meetings consists of seminars, panels and lectures along with exhibits by the major publishers in religious studies. These forums for discussion and debate remain sensitive to the frontiers of research while not losing sight of the unresolved, traditional dilemmas. The oral presentations of highest quality regularly find their way into the

published forms available to all in the discipline. These various meetings and the resulting publications bring an increasing administrative demand which exceeds the current volunteer support given by numerous individual scholars.

The accomplishments over the last twenty years are gratifying but we look to the future. Our needs into the 21st century—the Society’s second century—will reach fruition through the imaginative goals of the scholar in concert with thoughtful corporate minds and bipartisan federal support. Our task with others in the humanities is to secure the bond between the nation’s health and the role of the humanities.

Our priorities both overlap those of the humanities in general and are idiosyncratic to biblical studies. The continued growth of our publications, the opportunities for face to face encounters with colleagues and the everyday needs faced by an organization responsible for 5000 members must press toward new levels of excellence. Looking toward the future there are several tasks which must appear on our agenda. The categories include:

- Interpreting the Study of Religion
- Developing Archives
- Building Databases for Research
- Stimulating International Communications
- Training Biblical Scholars and Teachers

### *Interpreting the Study of Religion*

Biblical studies is one segment of the academic study of religion. Scholars studying religion employ diverse methods. We must clarify and interpret these methods and our purposes to academic peers and the general public. This priority emerges because confusion continues to exist regarding our methods, purpose, scope and definition. Even the American law which defines the humanities evidences the confusion. The inappropriate designation “comparative religion” appears along side the appropriate designations of literature, philosophy and history. The term used in the law is a method within the study of religion, certainly not the designation of the entire discipline.

Misunderstandings of this kind signal the necessity to interpret the discipline. Projects which aid this have only begun in a modest fashion. Several monographic series on the Bible in North America are underway. They provide new vantage points for better understanding the Bible and biblical scholarship. They will serve as a historical background for better interpreting the relationship between the scholar’s work and the religious practices of diverse persons.

The separation of church and state in America has led to the disre-

gard for the academic study of religion. In the 1980's religion has emerged as a "glamour" issue. It has captured front page headlines. The so-called Year of the Bible (1983) is an example of our inability to converse with the public. The opportunity to exchange ideas on this occasion went unattended by congressional sponsors, religious leaders, as well as individual scholars and the learned society. A skillfully developed media project for public television would have provided one avenue of interpretation. We should look to this in the future since it would help dispell some ignorance and call forth thoughtful reflection on such important issues as the significance of major religious documents in the formation of cultures, ideas and institutions.

### *Developing Archives*

An archives for the discipline of religious studies is underway. The Society of Biblical Literature's participation is the result of the 1980 centennial project of the Society. The archives consists almost entirely of organizational records and minutes. While many of these records may seem of little historical value they do preserve the social structure of a learned society, attest to a variety of practices related to the academic institutions of this country and exemplify the interaction of a group of intellectuals with the public issues of their time. The archives of all learned societies will become an important resource as historians attempt to assess the role of these unique organizations in the intellectual life of America.

In addition to societal archives we need to collect the papers of major religious thinkers and scholars. At the present time there is no central register of the numerous, individual collections of these papers in university libraries. There is no record of the countless papers which sit in the attics of the relatives of these persons. If funding were available, we could coordinate these archival projects. The ease of use and the economies gained in centralization are significant.

Associated with the archival demands are the significant preservation needs confronting every discipline. Several projects are underway but, at the projected rate of microforming the monographs and journals from the 1860's which are on acid paper, we will continue only to fall behind in preserving these rapidly deteriorating volumes. The partnerships demanded in preservation are between librarians and specialists within the various areas of the discipline, oddly enough a partnership not closely enough attended to by either side.

### *Building Databases for Research*

Biblical studies scholars have attempted to establish several databases for the discipline; however, none have succeeded. Scholars



located away from major research centers have begun these projects. They are usually underfunded and lack some of the necessary skills. Scholars near the centers of research are less motivated to begin these projects because of the accessibility of resources despite the fact that the mere accessibility of resources does not constitute a database. New partnerships are needed, if a well conceived database is to emerge.

Biblical studies is a discipline which demands extensive primary and secondary resources. Manuscripts are found throughout the world. Major scholarly work is carried on in a panoply of ancient and modern languages rarely encountered in other fields. Methodological diversity seems the order of the day. All of this indicates the need for a major database project which would make these resources more easily accessible. Some of the necessary prerequisites for building a database are present. There are a variety of indexing and abstracting services. There are numerous efforts underway to computerize diverse texts. The list could be extended. The Society is best positioned to initiate such a database project since it includes the scholars from both those who sense the need for such a project and those with the major resources. It must therefore take the leadership by calling an international consultation to examine the alternatives.

Such a project is in its initial stages. Consultations have begun on several reference tools desperately needed. The most prominent examples are in the area of lexicography. The 1984 Annual Meeting of the Society occasioned a meeting of biblical and classicist scholars to revise Moulton-Milligan, *The Vocabulary of the Greek New Testament Illustrated from the Papyri and Other Non-Literary Sources*. The group will meet again in 1985 and has sought private and federal funding. During 1985 discussions will begin on a revised English-Hebrew lexicon. A text and translation project related to Ancient Near Eastern documents has just begun here and intends to cooperate with both the French and German projects of a similar type. Each of these ventures would be fundamental to any database in biblical studies. More importantly, the above mentioned projects have brought together learned societies in biblical studies, classics and oriental studies. This interaction highlights concretely the mutuality of humanities research.

### *Stimulating International Communication*

Biblical studies throughout the world has been influenced, if not guided by the work of nineteenth century European scholarship. The *Journal of Biblical Literature* was typeset in Germany well into the first third of the twentieth century. Many of the major North American scholars received part of their training in a European university or at some time in their career have spent research time with formative

scholars in those contexts. This factor along with the increased work of persons throughout virtually every part of the world suggests the necessity of providing avenues for scholarly dialogue on an international scope.

The scholarly initiatives exerted by American researchers means that many outside America are interested increasingly in working with the persons and ideas originating here. A new interest in the contributions of North American biblical scholars has been marked by a major new publication series. The volumes focus on the major contributions of scholars as well as schools. There is no chauvinistic slant, but an effort both to understand the influences from abroad as well as the unique contributions. American biblical scholarship has had little sense of its own role in the international setting. It is not important to make claims of originality or to argue for who has the initiative. What is important is that we recognize that the context of scholarly debate and publication extends beyond the two sides of the Atlantic and reaches the lands surrounding the Pacific and Indian Oceans as well.

To this end the Society has begun an International Meeting. It has spawned new articles for our journals, encouraged manuscripts from scholars outside the English language world and presented an opportunity for the sharing of research and ideas. The products are tangible as well as visionary. The face to face meeting of scholars from different contexts who work on the same issues can prompt new levels of understanding. The liberal academic world speaks frequently about the need of the world's political leaders coming together to settle the problems of war and peace, but it has neglected to apply these needs to its own work.

The cost of these international congresses and the resultant research projects is extensive. This is an area of underfunding in the humanities. Biblical studies recognizes the richness of our international resources and looks to providing a model in this dimension of our responsibilities.

### *Training Biblical Scholars and Teachers*

The projected needs for teachers by the end of the twentieth century pales in significance to several other needs in biblical studies. Among these are the need for young scholars in a variety of specialized areas. The lexicographical projects just mentioned are classic examples. The number of highly competent specialists is limited. Few advanced degree programs anywhere in the world are producing these persons. The economic woes within higher education, coupled with the lack of glamour and the need for extraordinary rigor in these specialties has not presented a favorable context of support or any rewards.

Many of these specialized needs are basic to biblical studies. They are

also interrelated with other humanistic disciplines. The availability of persons to prepare up to date lexica is not a luxury within disciplines grounded in texts. The need for textual critics to prepare sound critical editions accessible to many is not an extravagant appeal. Dictionaries and properly edited texts are used by the beginner as well as the accomplished researcher. If persons are not trained to provide these tools for the beginner there will be no beginners or at best poorly educated ones. If accomplished researchers do not have these tools their work will be second rate. In sum, biblical studies' self advancement and its ability to contribute to interrelated disciplines stands on new generations of scholars. Stimulating teaching and appropriate tools for learning rest on solid scholarship. Most importantly this nation's memory, health and capacity to participate in the world community depend upon vital, generative research. Biblical studies will assume its portion of responsibility through renewed commitments and new partnerships.



## The Reports of the Learned Societies

American Academy of Religion  
American Anthropological Association  
American Antiquarian Society  
American Association for the Advancement of Slavic Studies  
American Dialect Society  
American Folklore Society  
American Historical Association  
American Numismatic Society  
American Philological Association  
American Philosophical Association  
American Political Science Association  
American Society for Aesthetics  
American Society for Eighteenth-Century Studies  
American Sociological Association  
American Studies Association  
Association for Asian Studies  
Association of American Geographers  
Bibliographical Society of America  
College Art Association of America  
History of Science Society  
Linguistic Society of America  
Medieval Academy of America  
Modern Language Association of America  
Organization of American Historians  
Renaissance Society of America  
Society for the History of Technology  
Society of Architectural Historians  
Society of Biblical Literature