The First Century

AMERICAN COUNCIL OF LEARNED SOCIETIES
Advancing the Humanities Since 1919

half a century for the advancement of scholarship and education in the humanities.

It is with the shared conviction that every achievement in the humanities is a vital step in national progress, that I commend your Council for its admirable record.
The world cannot just be explained, it must be grasped and understood as well. It is not enough to impose one’s own words on it: one must listen to the polyphony of often contradictory messages the world sends out and try to penetrate their meaning.

—Vaclav Havel, former president of Czechoslovakia, address to the Academy of Humanities and Political Sciences, Paris, October 7, 1992
or one hundred years, the American Council of Learned Societies has sought to help the humanities fill their essential role in scholarship and society. Some readers may ask, what are the humanities? The humanities comprise those fields of knowledge and learning concerned with human thought, experience, and creativity. By exploring the foundations of aesthetic, ethical, and cultural values and the ways in which they may endure, be challenged, or transformed, humanists help us appreciate and understand what distinguishes us as individuals as well as what unites us.

Marking its centennial year has provided ACLS an opportunity to reflect on its origins and evolution, to take stock of accomplishments, and to share some thoughts on where it is heading. This publication is not a comprehensive portrait. Necessarily synoptic, it cannot fully chart the many projects, personalities, issues, and ideas that are part of the Council’s history. It is meant to be an introduction to the different strands of ACLS’s work. The narrative is thematically organized to provide a sense of the scope of ACLS’s endeavors over one hundred years and to highlight selected programs that advanced the Council’s goals.

The range of the seventy-five learned societies represented by ACLS indicates the great reach and variety of humanistic scholarship (see p. 71). As this roster suggests, humanistic inquiry is not limited to particular departments or fields. It encompasses all areas of research and learning that ask fundamental questions about the way individuals and societies live, think, interact, and express themselves. Accordingly, the humanities may also include work in such fields as sociology, psychology, and anthropology. Like the sciences, the humanities involve the analysis and interpretation of evidence. But their subject matter concerns those aspects of the human condition that are not necessarily quantifiable or open to experiment. The results of humanists’ scholarship may be as esoteric as a highly theoretical book or as practical as an encyclopedia. The humanities do not exist on a remote intellectual island. They overlap with the social and natural sciences, enriching all fields of knowledge and inquiry.

Researchers interested in the intellectual and organizational history of the humanities might consider the records of ACLS a portal to further inquiry. The archives of ACLS are held at the Library of Congress. With the support of the Henry Luce Foundation, the Council will be making the full set of its reports, newsletters, and bulletins available online in its centennial year.
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The humanities give societies coherence, an understanding of the past, an appreciation of the world’s cultural mosaic, and an awareness of the values essential for creating a just future. The humanities are a vital realm of knowledge, but that knowledge does not sustain itself. It requires support and leadership. For one hundred years, the American Council of Learned Societies has provided both.
he American Council of Learned Societies advances the humanities as a funder, an advocate, a convener of critical stakeholders, and a catalyst for scholarly innovation. ACLS programs today represent the largest single source in the United States of portable research fellowships in the humanities and interpretive social sciences. More than 14,400 have been awarded over ten decades to scholars at different stages in their careers. The work supported by these awards has produced knowledge and advanced fields. But ACLS also serves a broader leadership role. It was at the forefront of early efforts to seed and develop new areas of study and to build channels for international scholarly exchanges and cooperation. From its earliest days, ACLS has been a leading advocate for the humanities—in the academy and with funders and policymakers—while also seeking to convey the humanities’ value to the public. One milestone achievement sparked by ACLS was the creation in 1965 of the National Endowment for the Humanities. Since then, each ACLS president has testified before Congress in support of robust appropriations for the NEH.

ACLS’s leadership strategy reflects its commitment to scholarly self-governance. While it helps scholars explore promising lines of inquiry, the Council itself never had a master plan for how the humanities should evolve. It has created a process that lets ideas bubble up and be tested by other researchers. Through participatory research-planning committees and other activities, ACLS and its member learned societies provide scholarly communities the opportunity to map out their intellectual future and establish directions, standards, practices, concepts, vocabularies, and evidence that advance our understanding of how human creativity expresses meaning across ages and cultures.

**Origins**

ACLS was created in the wake of World War I as European statesmen sought to rebuild civil society’s fractured international connections. In this spirit, leading humanities scholars set out to forge an international federation of academies that would foster collaboration to strengthen the field. A meeting to plan what became the Union Académique Internationale was scheduled for the spring of 1919 in Paris.

But how should the United States be represented? Lord James Bryce, the former British ambassador to the United States and an astute writer on American affairs, had earlier sought guidance from his friend, historian J. Franklin Jameson. Should an invitation be extended to the American Academy of Arts and Sciences or the American Philosophical Society, both founded in the eighteenth century and each a venerable constellation of scholars and cultural leaders? Jameson replied that those exclusive, self-selecting institutions were incompatible with America’s civic ethos. The possibility of a federation of “large democratic societies . . . accorded better with our mores.”

The case for support of the humanities is the case for the preservation and improvement of the very bases of our civilization.

—ACLS President Frederick H. Burkhardt, testifying before Congress, February 26, 1965
With Jameson’s prompting, two American scholars—Harvard medievalist Charles Homer Haskins and Columbia University international law professor James Shotwell—attended the Paris meeting as observers. Meanwhile, the idea of creating an American federation moved forward. On September 19, 1919, delegates from ten scholarly societies convened at the American Academy of Arts and Sciences in Boston. The group envisioned an organization that would represent American scholarship abroad while also tackling critical issues affecting the humanities at home, particularly the challenge of securing a place in the emerging research culture at U.S. universities.

Before the meeting ended, a constitution had been proposed for the American Council of Learned Societies, with a mission “to advance the general interests of the humanistic studies, and ... maintaining and strengthening relations among the societies which are represented in it.” More than an academic enclosure, the founders considered humanistic studies a mode of analysis present in many disciplines. They were not interested in drawing intellectual boundaries, but rather in expanding means for crossing them. This also applied to the scholarly research they hoped to encourage.

The destruction wrought by World War I fostered an internationalist philosophy that shaped the goals of the original group. They believed that future prospects for world peace could be strengthened through cultural understanding and intellectual exchange.

Some Notable ACLS Members Through the Years

**Hiram Bingham**
Anthropologist, explorer of Machu Picchu
Governor of Connecticut, U.S. Senator
ACLS Executive Committee, 1920–1924

**Edwin F. Gay**
Economic historian
First Dean of the Harvard Business School
ACLS Delegate and Committee Member, 1926–1938

**Margaret Mead**
Anthropologist
Vice Chair, ACLS Board of Directors, 1952
Committee Member, 1957–1961

**Robert Oppenheimer**
Theoretical physicist
ACLS Member-at-Large, 1957–1961

**John Hope Franklin**
Historian
Member of the ACLS Board of Directors, 1959–1963
Haskins Prize Lecturer, 1988

**Erwin Griswold**
Legal scholar
 Solicitor General of the United States
Member of the ACLS Board of Directors, 1960–1964
ACLS Delegate, 1966–1968

**Terry Sanford**
Legal scholar
Governor of North Carolina, U.S. Senator
President of Duke University
Member of the ACLS Board of Directors, 1970–1972

**Hanna H. Gray**
Historian
President of the University of Chicago
Member of the ACLS Board of Directors, 1971–1975

**Helen Vendler**
Scholar of literature
Member of the ACLS Board of Directors, 1985–1989
Haskins Prize Lecturer, 2001

**Kwame Anthony Appiah**
Philosopher, classicist
Member of the ACLS Board of Directors, 2004–2006
ACLS Board Chair, 2006–2012

*J. Franklin Jameson, one of the founders of the American Historical Association, was among the first advocates for the creation of ACLS.*
Waldo G. Leland: A Well-Connected Man

Waldo Gifford Leland, the first executive officer of ACLS, thrived in an age of institution-building. He organized both the 1919 meeting that founded ACLS and the Council’s first official convening in 1920. He led the Council from 1924 to 1946.

Leland connected to ACLS through his mentor, J. Franklin Jameson, one of the founders of the American Historical Association. Jameson was a professor at Brown University when Leland was an undergraduate there. In 1903, Leland took leave from his doctoral studies at Harvard to join Jameson in the Division of Historical Research at the Carnegie Institution of Washington. Leland spent twenty years on the institution’s staff, developing surveys of manuscript collections and advocating for public archives. He is recognized as one of the key founders of the archival profession—he was the second president of the Society of American Archivists—and as one of the most effective proponents of the establishment of the U.S. National Archives.

Leland’s work with the Carnegie Institution took him to Paris, where he formed his internationalist perspective, serving as an American delegate to the International Congress of Historical Sciences in 1908 and 1913. In 1909, Leland accepted Jameson’s invitation to become secretary of the American Historical Association, working mostly from Paris. At ACLS, Leland spearheaded the creation of the International Committee of Historical Sciences, which was to serve as a liaison between the international congresses. He was a member of the League of Nations’ Committee on Intellectual Cooperation and worked closely with the U.S. State Department in its early ventures into public diplomacy and in the founding of UNESCO.

Leland was ACLS’s principal representative to foundations and, just before and during World War II, to government funders. He persuaded New York Times publisher Arthur Hays Sulzberger to fund the development of the Dictionary of American Biography. After retiring in 1946, Leland remained in Washington, D.C., where he continued to advise the National Archives, the U.S. National Commission for UNESCO, and the National Park Service until his death in 1966 at the age of 87.
At the time, the American research university was still young, and the institutional infrastructure of scholarship was still being built. The Association of American Universities had been founded only nineteen years earlier, in part to help set standards that would convince European universities that leading U.S. institutions were worthy of respect. Modern learned societies that focused on professional scholarship and research were still novel, many not more than forty years old. The scholarship they promoted was to be rigorous but also engaged, both nationally and internationally. A number of the future leaders of ACLS, including Haskins and Shotwell, had been recruited into The Inquiry, the ad hoc brain trust convened by Edward M. House, President Woodrow Wilson’s chief adviser on European diplomacy during the war, to help plan post-war Europe. Members of The Inquiry served on the U.S. delegation to the Versailles Peace Conference in 1919.

After World War I, an emphasis on scientific knowledge influenced academic and funding priorities. The increased focus on the sciences, with no comparable investment in humanistic studies, seemed likely to marginalize the humanities. It was a critical moment in which to advance the new Council’s mission.

Ten societies ratified the proposed constitution in time to send delegates to the first meeting of the ACLS, held on Valentine’s Day, 1920, in the New York office of the recently formed Institute for International Education. Delegates attended to essential organizational matters and then quickly moved to chart the Council’s first course of action. One proposal was to develop a biographic encyclopedia, modeled on the British Dictionary of National Biography. Another project focused on exploring how to promote the study of China, a field that was notably underdeveloped despite China’s enormous cultural record. Both projects began in the following years and launched two strands of activity—publishing reference works (see pp. 24–25) and field-building (see Chapter 3)—that remain components of ACLS’s work today.

ACLS had ambitious plans but it did not have the means to carry them out. At the end of its first year of operation, its net assets were $402.21. That it succeeded in pursuing its early projects was largely the result of the Council’s persistent effort to put the humanities on the agenda of another set of nascent institutions, the general purpose philanthropic foundations. Charities had long existed, but the idea that extraordinary sums of money could be set aside for a purpose no more specific than “promoting the welfare of mankind throughout the world” (the mission of the Rockefeller Foundation, incorporated in 1913) was an institutional innovation. These new bodies, created with the wealth of industrial magnates, did have an overarching framework for their work. They intended to practice “scientific philanthropy,” targeting the root causes of social and human ills and not mere charitable palliation of suffering. This perspective quickly generated investments in science and medicine. However, it was not clear how the humanities would fit into this paradigm. Even some philanthropic leaders worried that a foundation “which gives the overwhelming proportion of its money on the purely scientific side is likely to discourage the study of the humanities in our universities.”
There was, however, one characteristic of the new ACLS that readily aligned with the perspectives of the foundations’ founders. Many of them were interested in institutional innovation, especially the industrial experience of aggregating scattered, small-scale enterprises into vertically integrated corporations on a national, even international, scale. Could this strategy be applied to academic research? The philanthropists had created a number of institutions designed to concentrate expertise and provide leadership for the dispersed and decentralized American research system. Rockefeller Institute for Medical Research, the Carnegie Institution of Washington, and the National Research Council would advance scholarship by developing research resources and guiding the development of specific fields.

Both representative of and responsible to the scholarly community, ACLS seemed a logical choice to carry this model of organizational leadership to the humanities. In the 1920s, the Carnegie and Rockefeller philanthropies gave the Council its first grants, recognizing that ACLS would “die immediately” without funds to implement its initial projects.

Philanthropic support enabled the nascent ACLS to begin experimenting with programs that would mature into trusted avenues for advancing scholarship. Awarding fellowships and grants to individual scholars, now one of ACLS’s signal activities, began in 1926 with a relatively modest program. Drawing on funds from one of the Rockefeller philanthropies, the ACLS Committee on Aid to Research distributed grants of up to $300 each to twenty-one applicants “engaged in constructive projects of research and who are in actual need of such aid and unable to obtain it from other sources.” The $4,500 awarded that year is a dramatic contrast to the $23 million ACLS distributed in fellowships and grants in 2018, an increase of 36,000 percent, calculated in inflation-adjusted dollars.

ACLS programs serve a range of purposes, from faculty development to field-building to international scholarly exchange. Guided by a rigorous peer-review process, the fellowships empower the scholarly community—applicants proposing diverse research topics and selection committees choosing among them—to set the agenda for the further development of their fields.

Starting in the 1920s, ACLS committees met to explore new subjects of humanities research. By promoting the study of China, ACLS became one of the first U.S. national organizations to systematically develop the study of civilizations beyond Western Europe and

### Early Projects

Promotion of Chinese Studies was one of ACLS’s early activities. Eminent Chinese of the Ch’ing Period, edited by Arthur Hummel, Sr., was among the first publications it supported.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Fellowships and Grants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1926</td>
<td>$4,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1946</td>
<td>$24,547</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1966</td>
<td>$789,903</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A Century of Growth: ACLS Fellowship Funds
the ancient Mediterranean. Work in China studies and Slavic studies in the 1920s, and Latin American studies in the 1930s, began building the broad intellectual framework for what became known as area studies.

The development of area studies was the most prominent example of ACLS’s role in incubating new fields. Referred to as field-building, this work relied on a research-planning process that brought together trans-institutional networks of scholars at a time when few universities had more than one specialist in any area. These explorations helped seed the fields of musicology, history of religions, African-American studies, intellectual history, and linguistics, especially the study of Native American languages. While ACLS had only modest resources to support exemplary projects, the value came in articulating a coherent program that could attract foundation support.

National and International Leadership

ACLS was created as a national organization to represent U.S. scholarship to the world. The Council’s international work reflects the conviction that knowledge and scholarship are not bound by political and cultural borders. ACLS provides opportunities for American scholars to advance their scholarly projects and develop contacts with overseas academic communities. Representation in the Union Académique Internationale provided one foothold in formal international structures. ACLS and its leadership also had a role in the League of Nations Committee on Intellectual Cooperation, the founding of UNESCO, and the early development of the Fulbright Program. In the late 1930s and 1940s, ACLS partnered with the U.S. State Department to open American cultural offices in Latin America as a way to strengthen hemispheric solidarity as World War II began.

The belief guiding ACLS and its member societies is that knowledge created by scholarship is a positive good in itself. This conviction is accompanied by a recognition that humanistic expertise also can have great practical application beyond the academy. This was amply demonstrated during World War II, when formerly esoteric research about distant times or cultures suddenly had great value. Members of ACLS research-planning committees were recruited by the U.S. Army, Navy, State Department, and Office of Strategic Services, a new intelligence agency. Innovative methods of language-teaching developed by the ACLS Native American Languages Committee were the basis for the Intensive Language Program that helped servicemen and women gain fluency in Chinese, Burmese, Arabic, and other languages. ACLS created the committee that became the research engine of the Commission for Preservation of Cultural Treasures in War Areas, made famous decades later in the film *Monuments Men*. Similarly, scholars appointed by ACLS, the Social Science Research Council, the National Research Council, and the Smithsonian Institution formed the Ethnographic Board in June of 1942 “to make the country’s scholarly and scientific resources available for emergency use.”

The decision to design ACLS as a federation of scholarly associations dedicated to humanistic studies is reflected in the Council’s constitutional mission. When the delegates of the member societies
gathered for the first time in 1920, it was agreed that ACLS should also regularly bring together the officers responsible for each society’s administration. Since 1925, those meetings have been occasions for sharing best organizational practices and innovations. Beginning in 2002, ACLS has periodically published the results of surveys of its member associations that analyze the vitality of the learned society enterprise. That enterprise has grown through the years, greatly expanding the number and range of ACLS member societies, some of which owe their genesis to deliberations at ACLS research-planning committees.

Near-Death Experience

The ascent of ACLS was not without turbulence. Its governance had to be adjusted as its members grew in number, and the practice of including two delegates from each became unwieldy and overly burdensome for its executive committee. In 1946, a board of directors was appointed, and the Council was redefined as one delegate from each society plus the board. The 1950s were a challenging decade. ACLS went through multiple changes in leadership, programmatic shifts, and financial stringencies. After Waldo Leland retired as director in 1946, ACLS had two leaders and three board chairs over the next ten years. Without an endowment or any significant reserves, ACLS was dependent on periodic foundation grants. When that funding stream dried to a trickle by 1955, insolvency loomed. Changes proposed to the foundations by several board members resulted in a renaissance that included new leadership and the relocation of ACLS headquarters to New York City.

Renewal

In 1957, with Frederick Burkhardt in the new role of president, ACLS resumed its national leadership of the humanities. It broadened its base by inviting colleges and universities to become associates of the Council. U.S. higher education underwent an epic expansion in the 1950s and 1960s, and ACLS focused on providing research fellowships for a growing professoriate. With scholarship expanding in new directions, ACLS steadily increased its number of member societies, reaching seventy-five members by its centennial year. Responding to the need for greater understanding of a diverse world, ACLS, jointly with the Social Science Research Council, maintained a series of scholarly committees that broadened and deepened the scope of international and area studies. New technologies promised new means of research and new forms of scholarly communication, so ACLS began in 1964 to promote work on what was then termed “computers and the humanities.”

A Century of Growth: Number of ACLS Member Societies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Societies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1920</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1940</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Winged Imagination

Both future ACLS President Fred Burkhardt and artist Saul Steinberg served in the Office of Strategic Services (OSS) during World War II. At war’s end, Burkhardt was responsible for processing OSS personnel for demobilization. When Steinberg appeared in Burkhardt’s office, eager to return to his fiancée in New York, Burkhardt discharged him quickly, without the normal delay of multiple debriefings. In 1962, Steinberg learned that Burkhardt was president of the ACLS, and he drew for him this whimsical picture of the humanities’ winged imagination.
The 1950s were difficult years for the ACLS, with upheaval in leadership, programmatic shifts, and the loss of a critical funder. Early in the decade, the Rockefeller Foundation, the Council’s major source of support, signaled its intention to reduce the size of its grants and, within five years, to cut off all support. Together these strains posed a serious threat to ACLS’s survival. This led an officer of the Carnegie Corporation to observe that “a combination of financial difficulties and the inept leadership of [ACLS Executive Director] Mortimer Graves was ... sending the ACLS to an appropriate spot in the academic cemetary [sic].”

Howard Mumford Jones would play a critical role in turning things around. Jones later provided a telling picture of the state of ACLS, then still based in Washington, D.C., when he became board chair:

“The ACLS was housed on the second floor of an ancient brick building not far from the Capitol. This might well have been built by the Pecksniff firm when Martin Chuzzlewit was a new book. The offices were at the end of a long flight of stairs almost unlighted, down which an imaginative person might have expected Little Dorrit to descend, and he would not have been surprised if, when he reached the top landing and opened the door, he had seen Tom Pinch mending a quill pen. Mortimer [Graves] alone had an office to himself; his staff—also gathered, as it seemed to me at first, out of Dickens—seated themselves where they could. There was neither sufficient shelf space nor closet room for the records. There were a few modern touches, like a telephone or two and some typewriters, but when one opened the door of the ACLS for the first time, he stepped back a hundred years.”

Jones went on to note, “This looked like the end of the line for the American Council of Learned Societies. Fortunately, darkness preceded dawn...”

Dawn broke because Jones, together with Whitney Oates, a Princeton classicist, persuaded their fellow board members to create an independent Commission on the Humanities that would report directly to Carnegie Corporation officers on the needs of the academic humanities and whether ACLS could meet them. The commission kept Carnegie, Ford, and Rockefeller officers apprised of its deliberations and then presented the ACLS Board of Directors with a plan to reorganize. The aim was to reinvigorate the Council and enable ACLS to exercise the leadership expected of it.

The board adopted the recommendations in 1957 and elected Frederick Burkhardt, president of Bennington College, the Council’s first president. Burkhardt crafted a new administrative structure and a new basic program centered on the direct support of research through fellowships. The board announced that headquarters would move to New York City. The new program was submitted to the Carnegie Corporation and to the Ford Foundation, which had recently made a major policy decision to support the humanities and the arts. In 1958 these organizations gave ACLS $3.1 million in grants.
Because the humanities depend on public support and require a public presence to achieve their full aims, advocacy has been an important dimension of ACLS’s work. While deeply embedded in the academic system, ACLS leaders have stressed that “research is not enough” by itself to make the case for the field and that the humanities should not be “merely academic disciplines confined to schools and colleges, but functioning components of society which affect the lives and well-being of all the population.”

Burkhardt’s successors built on the strong foundation he helped lay. With prompting from Robert Lumiansky, the next ACLS president, the U.S. Congress recognized ACLS’s public role by awarding it a Congressional charter in 1982. Lumiansky’s successor John William Ward died in only his third year in office, after advancing plans to diversify ACLS’s work. The eleven years of Stanley N. Katz’s presidency (1986–1997) saw great growth in ACLS’s international engagements, its public profile (including a vigorous response to the culture wars), and in the energy of its federative operations. John D’Arms began in 1997 to reinvigorate the ACLS Fellowship Program by increasing the number and size of fellowships awarded, a goal that required broad fundraising to boost the Council’s endowment. That work was followed by other successful development efforts, cresting now with the Centennial Campaign. After D’Arms’ untimely death in 2002, Interim President Francis Oakley, drawing on his long tenure as the president of Williams College, steadied the organization, introduced new administrative mechanisms, and spread an infectious enthusiasm. Pauline Yu became president in 2003 and significantly expanded the Council’s program and resources. Under her leadership, the total sum awarded in fellowships and grants tripled, the ACLS endowment grew by 110 percent, and new philanthropic partnerships were formed.

Bartlett Jere Whiting served as the Medieval Academy of America’s delegate to the ACLS from 1948 to 1975. His accounts of the annual meetings, described by former ACLS President Frederick Burkhardt as “wonderfully learned and witty,” were legendary among his colleagues. In 1975, ACLS published a volume, Respectfully and Finally Submitted, with reprints of all his reports. Here are a few excerpts that capture his distinctive voice:

1950 Each delegate was seated behind a placard which, like a banner with strange device, carried an abbreviation of his society. Your delegate, when occasion suggested, as it did once or twice, that he withdraw his mind from the proceedings, speculated as to what scholarship would make of “Medacadam” had it appeared in Finnegans Wake. A number of solutions, Joycean and Freudian, presented themselves, but the only constant factor was an artificial substance, of dreary hue, made to be ridden upon, and all too apt to crack.

1953 As is usual in such gatherings, pleasant, provocative, and futile efforts were made to define the humanities, and the customary views of alarm were leveled at their neglect by the public at large and at the greater support and esteem accorded less rewarding, though more rewarded, disciplines.

1958 It will be remembered that in recent years the Board of Directors has attempted to make the annual meeting an example of humanism in action rather than reports on the past and future of humanistic studies, reports which tended to view the past with nostalgic self-pity and the future in doleful dumps.

1959 The question of how the ACLS can demonstrate to the public the importance of the humanities soon boiled down to a consideration of whether or not the scholar should make a systematic effort to popularize his findings in such a way as to make them fit for consumption by periodicals more widely read than the learned journals of his particular cult. The problem is ancient and not easily answered.
A New Century

The challenges of advancing the humanities over the next hundred years are as daunting as those faced by ACLS’s founders in 1919. U.S. higher education is infinitely stronger than it was a century ago, yet it falls short in assuring a broad education to all who seek it and in increasing the diversity of the faculty that teaches students. Accordingly, ACLS has begun to extend the reach of its programs across the full spectrum of higher education, starting in 2018 with a program providing fellowships and other resources to faculty at community colleges, where more students study the humanities than in any other set of institutions. ACLS believes the humanities faculty of tomorrow must reflect the society it wants to serve. It is now a partner with the Mellon Mays Undergraduate Fellowship Program, which seeks to encourage minority students to pursue doctoral studies in the humanities.

Much of the public discounts the value of the humanities, considering the fields impractical and, therefore, profitless or even subversive because of their insistent questioning of all subjects. Responding to those misperceptions, ACLS in 2008 began its Mellon/ACLS Public Fellows program, placing recent PhDs from the humanities and humanistic social sciences in two-year staff positions at partnering organizations in government and the nonprofit sector. The goal was to demonstrate the effectiveness of analytical, expressive, and research capacities developed through education in the humanities.

Despite the continual invocations of “crisis,” the humanities are not in intellectual peril. The work now being done by the current and rising generations of scholars brings new knowledge to society with uncompromising rigor, analytical acuity, and tireless research. Looking toward its second century, ACLS is determined to provide those scholars—whether in research universities, liberal arts colleges, community colleges, organizations beyond the academy, or working independently—with opportunities to shape our understanding of how meaning is made and human creativity expanded.

PARTICIPANTS IN THE MELLON MAYS PROGRAM ATTEND ANNUAL SUMMER INSTITUTES TO DEVELOP SKILLS AND TECHNIQUES FOR PHD STUDY. THIS INSTITUTE WAS HELD AT EMORY UNIVERSITY IN 2014.
We have the privilege at ACLS of reviewing each year the vibrant panoply of new scholarship presented in fellowship applications. The importance of the questions posed, the acuity of the arguments made, the impressive range of evidence marshaled, and the expressiveness with which conclusions are presented all provide clear evidence of how robust humanities scholarship truly is.

**While surely arduous, the work of peer review is therefore also truly uplifting.**

—ACLS President Pauline Yu
The Humanities are undoubtedly more untidy than the sciences; they are the fields most intimate to the flux of lived experience and so to human beings’ sense of themselves in the world. Inevitably, then, scholarly interpretations are more personal, more contingent, and more contested. In the Humanities there always has been—and always will be—room for dispute as to what constitutes scholarship of the highest quality. Therefore, the process by which scholarship is evaluated, including the ways in which fellows are selected, becomes absolutely critical. ACLS has long been committed to scholarly peer review of applications, since this system best assures equitable and fair evaluation. . . . Our aim is to ensure that the ACLS Fellowship is nationally regarded as the result of a process that is at once rigorous, well informed, venturesome, and fair.”

—ACLS President John D’Arms, proposing to The Andrew W. Mellon Foundation a plan for reinvigorating the ACLS Fellowship Program, 1997.

Research fellowships are the primary means for producing knowledge in the humanities. Awarding of fellowships through rigorous peer review has been a component of ACLS’s work since the 1920s, moving to the center of the Council’s program after its re-founding in 1957, and growing exponentially in the twenty-first century. Since 1926, more than 14,400 scholars at various stages of their careers have received ACLS fellowships. Today, ACLS is the United States’ largest single source of research fellowships in the humanities.

As the respected representative of scholarship in the humanities and related social sciences, ACLS recruits more than 600 expert scholars each year to serve as reviewers. They assess the 6,000-plus applications received across all programs.

Although ACLS fellowships and grants provide scholars the opportunity to create and deepen knowledge through diligent research and thoughtful writing, the value of these awards is more than monetary. The rigorous peer-review process for selecting fellows bestows the validation of experts, and it gives reviewers the opportunity to identify promising new lines of inquiry. In so doing, the process helps the broader scholarly community determine its intellectual future.

The Fellowship Process

Each year, ACLS calls for applications to specific programs. (Currently, the process spans fourteen separate competitions.) Scholars submit an application outlining their proposed work, their previous accomplishments, and the names of individuals willing to serve as references. ACLS staff members screen the applications for eligibility, then forward them to reviewers selected for their expertise and balanced
Arthur C. Danto was awarded one ACLS Fellowship in 1961 and another in 1968. He was celebrated as both an analytical philosopher and as an art critic.

The beneficiaries of the fellowship competitions stretch beyond the award winners. All those involved—including reviewers, staff, and references—broaden and sharpen their understanding of contemporary scholarship through their participation. At the same time, the field in which each fellow works is enriched by new research. The public, too, stands to gain as ACLS Fellows follow the Council’s encouragement to engage in public outreach through their state humanities councils, which is stated explicitly in award letters. It is not uncommon for applicants who do not receive awards in their initial applications to succeed with reapplications. ACLS provides detailed anonymous reviewer comments and even, in some cases, modest grants to help strengthen proposals for future competitions.

The Broad Range of ACLS Fellowship Programs

ACLs’s central program, the ACLS Fellowships, is funded largely through the Council’s endowment. It supports research in all fields of the humanities and interpretive social sciences, and it is open to all U.S. scholars holding a PhD or equivalent record of research and publication. **ACLS Fellowships enable scholars with several years’ experience in full-time teaching and administrative duties to devote a full year to research and writing.**

What makes the central ACLS Fellowship program distinctive is its breadth. However, the Council has also designed more specific fellowship competitions aimed at building, renewing, or extending a particular field of study. One example is the East and Southeast Asian Archaeology and Early History program, which ACLS carried out from 2005 to 2010 in partnership with the Henry Luce Foundation. Some ACLS fellowships target particular junctures of a scholarly career, such as the years immediately following a PhD or the awarding of tenure, while others have narrowed in on specific research methods, including collaborative research or the innovative use of digital technologies.

ACLS Study Fellowships, offered from 1962 to 1983, supported professional development, giving scholars who were accomplished in one specialization the opportunity to gain competence in another field relevant to their research. Other programs have provided aid to teacher-scholars working outside universities, such as faculty at liberal arts colleges or community colleges. Over the past decade, the Council has developed programs, notably the Mellon/ACLS Public Fellows and the Mellon/ACLS Scholars & Society programs, that strengthen the contributions of humanities scholars beyond the academy (see pp. 40–41).
Financing Fellowships

The growth of ACLS fellowship programs has been fueled by the broadened base of funding over the Council’s history. For the first forty years, almost all ACLS operations and programs, including fellowship competitions, relied on foundation grants. The re-launch of the Council in 1957 moved aid for scholars to the foreground of ACLS programming, affirming that “[t]he individual scholar is the focal point of principal Council activities.”¹ Not only did ACLS’s new leaders persuade foundation officers to step up funding, the organization’s renewed energy also attracted additional supporters. Colleges and universities were invited to become associates of ACLS, and their annual membership subscriptions helped the Council maintain its activities. ACLS began to build an endowment to assure organizational continuity while maintaining its fellowship programs through foundation and NEH grants.

“ACLS is right to make the fellowship and grant-in-aid programs the heart of its activities directed toward the advancement of humanistic research and learning,” asserted an independent visiting committee appointed by ACLS President John William Ward in 1983.² Guided by this lodestar, ACLS began to raise funds to endow its fellowship program. By 1987, ACLS President Stanley N. Katz had raised $4 million for this purpose, completing plans begun under his predecessors. However, adverse market conditions suppressed investment returns in the late 1980s and early 1990s. When ACLS analyzed grant-making for humanities fellowships in 1993, it discovered “[h]igher ratios of applications to awards, declining total resources and individual stipends in real and absolute terms” at ACLS, the National Humanities Center, and the Guggenheim Foundation.³

Soon-to-be ACLS President John D’Arms, writing in 1997, also found that the number of fellowships offered by these three funders had fallen by 40 percent from the levels seen in the early 1980s.⁴ Determined to counter that trend, D’Arms began his presidency with a campaign to double both ACLS’s fellowship endowment and the amount of fellowship stipends it awarded annually. Pauline Yu achieved especially ambitious goals. Eleven of the fourteen current ACLS fellowship programs began under her leadership. With that growth, the amount ACLS distributed annually in fellowships and grants increased from $7.4 million in 2003 to more than $25 million projected for 2019.

Once funded only by foundation and government grants, the fellowship programs are now also supported by endowment earnings, membership fees from colleges and universities, and the contributions of generous individuals, including many past fellows.

A Century of Growth: Number of ACLS Fellows (Cumulative)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1930s</td>
<td>191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1950s</td>
<td>1,430</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970s</td>
<td>5,964</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990s</td>
<td>9,738</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010s</td>
<td>14,412</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ACLS annually convenes a meeting of heads of national fellowship-granting organizations in the humanities to discuss trends and best practices. Represented at the 2017 meeting were the Mellon Foundation, NEH, the Radcliffe Institute for Advanced Study, the NYPL Cullman Center for Scholars and Writers, the Center for Advanced Study in the Behavioral Sciences, the American Philosophical Society, the National Humanities Center, and the Getty Research Institute.
Decades of Supporting Scholarship

Selected examples from the many exceptional recipients of ACLS fellowships:

1920s

Gertrude E. Smith was assistant professor of Greek at the University of Chicago when she received a 1929 fellowship to prepare for press the manuscript of what would become her two-volume book, *Administration of Justice from Homer to Aristotle*. The book remains a key reference work for ancient Greek law. Smith was an eminent scholar of ancient Greece who became a full named professor at the University of Chicago and chair of its Department of Classics.

1930s

Lorenzo D. Turner, a linguistics scholar and professor of English at Fisk University, received a 1932 award to produce a descriptive grammar of the Gullah dialect, the unique creole language of the coastal islands and adjacent mainland of South Carolina and Georgia. Turner’s landmark publication, *Africanisms in the Gullah Dialect*, is credited with lifting this linguistic phenomenon from the shadows that had obscured the history of Gullah. Turner subsequently created African studies programs at several historically black universities.

1940s

Millicent Todd Bingham was the first woman to earn a PhD in geography from Harvard University, but she eventually abandoned the field to help with her mother’s work as Emily Dickinson’s first editor. After Bingham’s mother died, Bingham took on the task of preparing all remaining Dickinson manuscripts for publication. Her 1944 fellowship supported the completion of *The Poetry of Emily Dickinson*.

1950s

Richard W. Lyman was associate professor of history at Stanford University when he received a 1958 fellowship for his research on “J. Ramsay MacDonald and the Labour Party, 1918–1937—A study in political leadership.” Lyman went on to become provost and then president of Stanford University (1970–1980) and president of the Rockefeller Foundation (1980–1988).

1960s

Donald Heiney, a scholar of comparative literature, received a 1962 fellowship while he was an English professor at the University of Utah. His research led to the publication of *America in Modern Italian Literature*. Heiney later created and led the comparative literature department at the University of California, Irvine. He also wrote sixteen novels under the pseudonym MacDonald Harris, one of which was nominated for a National Book Award.
1970s

**Morris Dickstein**, an eminent literary scholar and cultural critic, was associate professor of English at the City University of New York when ACLS awarded him a 1977 fellowship for his research on ethnicity and assimilation in American literature and culture from 1890 to 1940. The author of numerous books, Dickstein remains a distinguished professor of English at CUNY Graduate Center and a senior fellow at CUNY’s Center for the Humanities.

1980s

**John D’Emilio** received a 1985 fellowship while assistant professor of history at the University of North Carolina at Greensboro. His research became the book *Intimate Matters: A History of Sexuality in America*, which later was cited by Supreme Court Associate Justice Anthony Kennedy in the 2003 historic ruling in *Lawrence v. Texas* striking down sodomy laws. A pioneer in the field of gay and lesbian studies, D’Emilio taught history, gender, and women’s studies at the University of Illinois at Chicago, retiring in 2014 as professor emeritus.

1990s

**Louise Mirrer** has been the President and CEO of the New-York Historical Society since 2004. In 1992, while a professor at Fordham University, she received an ACLS Fellowship for research on the oral literary repertoires of Judeo-Spanish communities, which resulted in her 1996 book *Women, Muslims, and Jews in the Texts of Reconquest Castile*. Mirrer later taught at University of California, Los Angeles; University of Minnesota–Twin Cities; and the City University of New York. As Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, she designed the CUNY Honors College, and introduced American history as a graduation requirement for all 200,000 undergraduate students.

2000s

**Lila Abu-Lughod**, the Joseph L. Buttenweiser Professor of Social Science in the Department of Anthropology at Columbia University, received a 2007 fellowship for research that provided an anthropologist’s view of the debates about "Muslim women’s human rights in the context of the ‘clash of civilizations’." Her most recent book *Do Muslim Women Need Saving?* was published by Harvard University Press.

2010s

**Alan Liu** is the Distinguished Professor of English Literature at the University of California, Santa Barbara, and an affiliated faculty member of the university’s graduate program in media arts and technology. In 2004, Liu published the book *The Laws of Cool: Knowledge Work and the Culture of Information*, and his 2012 fellowship supported research for two related projects. The first was a study concluding that the sense of history alters, but does not vanish, in today’s age of instant information. The second project provided a wide-angled view of the development of the digital humanities field.
The Fellowship Experience

Fellows’ reports and recollections underscore how extended and uninterrupted research and writing opportunities can transform both a project and a career. “I expected to be able to substantiate a small point quite easily, but as soon as I began to investigate the question it took on a life of its own,” recalled Joy Calico, a 2008 Burkhardt Fellow and now a professor of musicology and German studies at Vanderbilt University. “I suppose it is a matter of outgrowing the need to confirm my preconceived notions of what The Right Answer should be.”

At ACLS’s 2018 Annual Meeting, Quito Swan, history professor at Howard University, discussed his fellowship-supported research on “Melanesia’s Way: Black Internationalism and Diaspora in the South Pacific.” Swan described the 2016 fellowship’s transformational impact on his methodology. “I’m a trained historian . . . usually I want a date, a connection to an idea, that this person met that person and they said something about black internationalism,” Swan said. But with the benefit of his fellowship year, he had the time to deepen his encounter with local poetry, literature, and plays. “One of my colleagues encouraged me to ‘slow down,’ to actually read the poem, to engage the grammatical structures and phraseology from a different lens, to actually look at a photo beyond who’s in it, the intentionality of how it might be framed and the meaning behind the positionality—all vocabulary of other disciplines. This is why ACLS has been so important. It gave me the opportunity to ‘slow down,’ and I’m a much better scholar because of it.”

Former ACLS President Francis Oakley recently characterized his own 1968 ACLS fellowship year, during which he determined the need to revise his initial research focus, as allowing “time to make mistakes and time to recover.” Ellen Muhlenberger, associate professor of history at the University of Michigan, wrote of her 2014–2015 fellowship: “Being awarded an ACLS fellowship gave me time to consider ideas that otherwise would have lingered unexplored. It immediately expanded the scope of my project on death in early Christianity, but it also, more subtly, changed my sense of myself as a scholar.”

“There is no other fellowship-granting body whose judgment I trust as much as I trust ACLS, both to recognize quality and to give support at just the moment in someone’s career when they will most profit from it…. Attuned to current needs but unafraid to buck ephemeral trends, ACLS provides more than just funding for scholars; its fellowships and grants are a major pillar of strength for those of us who care about the humanities.”

—Caroline Walker Bynum, ACLS 1977 Fellow, University Professor Emerita, Columbia University, Professor Emerita, Institute for Advanced Study
Illustrative Fellowship Programs

The Burkhardt Fellowship Program for Recently Tenured Scholars

Since its launch in 1998, the Mellon-funded Frederick Burkhardt Residential Fellowships for Recently Tenured Scholars program has focused on a pivotal moment in the scholarly career. The immediate post-tenure years are a critical time for emerging leaders in their fields to sustain their scholarly momentum, to break new ground, and to develop approaches that will have lasting effects on scholarship and teaching. The Burkhardt program acknowledges the importance of this juncture through its support of long-term projects in the humanities by newly tenured faculty members at U.S. institutions. Several universities have adopted the program’s model and now aid longer-term research projects by their associate professors.

The Burkhardt program is designed to optimize its fellows’ ability to plan and execute ambitious projects that go beyond incremental additions to their earlier work. It has three distinctive elements: residence at a research center, ample support extending beyond a single academic year, and flexibility in the scheduling of the fellowship.

Awards have gone to more than 242 Burkhardt fellows, many of whom have emerged not only as leaders in their fields but also as leaders of educational institutions, including deans and presidents.

Luce/ACLS Dissertation Fellowships in American Art

The Luce/ACLS Dissertation Fellowships in American Art program is the Council’s longest-running program focused on graduate study. Begun in 1991, the program represents a durable partnership between the Henry Luce Foundation and ACLS to support new generations of scholars in the field of American art history. The program’s sharp focus on a specific career stage and a well-defined theme—object-oriented studies of American visual arts—has made it especially effective.

The dissertation fellowships are one component of the foundation’s American Art program, which is anchored by the conviction that artistic creativity in the United States is under-studied and under-appreciated relative to its importance to national...
and global culture. The fellowship program’s twenty-seven competitions have attracted a consistently strong pool of applicants pursuing doctoral research in American art history.

Luce/ACLS Dissertation Fellowships in American Art fund one year’s study, but the fellowships are long-term investments that pay dividends to the students the fellows teach, the colleagues who read their publications, and the people who visit the exhibitions they help curate.

**New Faculty Fellows Program**

The ACLS New Faculty Fellows program, which ran from 2009 to 2013, was designed to address the potentially catastrophic effect of the Great Recession on newly minted PhDs. Representatives of the ACLS Research University Consortium, meeting in spring 2009, expressed concern that new doctoral graduates faced a “jobless market.” They noted that while it takes a relatively long time to earn a doctorate in the humanities, a sudden economic change can close, even permanently, the brief window young scholars have to gain a foothold in the professions they have worked so hard to join.

The program recognized that this potential loss is not borne by individuals alone. Most doctoral students have received financial aid from their universities and third parties, and the enterprise of graduate education itself is subsidized broadly by universities and other sources. Much high-value human capital is liquidated in any academic job crisis.

After wide consultation with deans, directors of graduate study, and other academic leaders, ACLS presented The Andrew W. Mellon Foundation with a proposal for a program of “emergency postdocs.” Participating institutions could offer two-year appointments to new, carefully selected PhDs. With a Mellon grant, ACLS organized four annual competitions with the participation of

**Dorothy E. Roberts**, Professor, Africana Studies, Law, and Sociology at the University of Pennsylvania, delivering a talk at a 2018 TEDMED event. Roberts, author and co-editor of ten books, received a 2015 ACLS fellowship for her research project on “Interracial Marriage and Racial Equality in Chicago, 1937-1967.”

**Maya Jasanoff**, Associate Professor of History at Harvard University, received a 2009 Charles A. Ryskamp Research Fellowship to pursue research for this book, published in 2011 and a National Book Critics Award winner.
fifty-nine universities. The awards included an ample teaching stipend and research expenses. Otherwise-jobless new PhDs were able to stay in academia and more strongly position themselves for future tenure-track teaching jobs. The program supported 168 fellows. More than 80 percent of them continued in academic positions after their fellowships.

The Robert H. N. Ho Family Foundation Program in Buddhist Studies

One of ACLS’s newer offerings is global in scope, supporting scholars throughout the world with the aim of sparking innovations in the study of Buddhism, a complex and dispersed area of scholarship. The field of Buddhist studies is not new; ACLS supported a conference on the subject at the University of British Columbia in 1965. However, the range of disciplines, languages, and research traditions it encompasses needs a boundary-crossing network that could bring new specializations—such as art history, cognitive psychology, and ethnography—into the field.

In 2011, the Robert H. N. Ho Family Foundation invited ACLS to design and administer a program pursuing these goals. In consultation with the foundation, the Council developed a carefully articulated program with five separate competitions, three of which are fellowship programs. The fellowships target different career stages: dissertation research, post-doctoral research, and advanced research positions. To animate this new network, the program annually brings its fellows together for a conference with senior scholars of Buddhism at venues around the world. Through 2018, the program funded 150 fellows, 37 percent of whom were based outside North America. A 2018 independent review of the program commissioned by the foundation commended its “sterling reputation.”

As the demand for ACLS fellowships and grants grows, the Council’s board is committed to expanding the scope of opportunities that allow scholars to create and interpret knowledge. The growing complexity of the human experience requires no less.
CLS has a long history of developing critical works that distill scholarship and make it widely available. Its role has been similar to that of an executive producer. It contracts with publishers, mobilizes scholars to serve as editors and authors, and secures financial support.

These works have served as key resources for researchers, educators, and students, as well as for a broader public interested in the topics. The first ambitious project, *Dictionary of American Biography*, was proposed at the Council’s inaugural meeting in February 1920. Over the following eight decades, ACLS launched a number of other ventures that produced well-received, award-winning works that remain in use today.

**Dictionary of American Biography and American National Biography**

The *Dictionary of American Biography*‘s set of twenty volumes, published between 1927 and 1936, provided the first comprehensive collection of biographical portraits of significant American figures across a range of fields and professions. Originally funded by the *New York Times*, the *Dictionary of American Biography* was considered one of the great modern reference works and, together with its numerous supplemental volumes, served scholars for over sixty years.

In the 1980s, it became clear to historians that the dramatic growth in scholarship, as well as new interpretations of major historical figures, called for a fresh and more inclusive biographical reference work. A decade-long collaboration between ACLS and Oxford University Press produced the award-winning twenty-four-volume *American National Biography* (ANB), published in 1999, and continuously supplemented since. The ANB was designed to “reach into every corner of the past to reclaim the lives of thousands of often little-known men and women who have forged America’s distinctive character.” It provides a sweeping record of more than 17,500 Americans from all eras and walks of life who have influenced every aspect of American history and culture.

Henry Louis Gates, Jr., Alphonse Fletcher University Professor and director of the Hutchins Center for African and African American Research at Harvard University, described the ANB as “a monument of historical scholarship…. These biographical narratives, well-written and riveting, often read more like character sketches than dry, dusty history.” The ANB is available both online and in print. It is continually updated with new entries.

**Dictionary of Scientific Biography**

Considered one of the most comprehensive history of science reference works, the sixteen-volume series features personal biographies as well as explanations of scientific contributions by hundreds of scientists from antiquity through most of the twentieth century. Funded by a grant from the National Science Foundation, the first two volumes appeared in 1970. By 1980, the complete set was available.

For several decades the dictionary served as the major reference tool in the history of science.
The New York Times traced the publication of the series from the first announcement of its creation in 1965, labeling it an important contribution to the “relatively new field of history of science.” It also noted that a comprehensive collection of biographies had been on the “wanted” list of writers, teachers, students, and general readers for decades. In 1980, the New York Times featured a long review by Stephen Jay Gould, who called the complete set of volumes an occasion on which to “rejoice most fervently.” In particular, he praised the contributors’ craft in composing “broad, scholarly articles, not a dull catalogue of biographical fact.”

**Dictionary of the Middle Ages**

Produced with the help of an NEH grant and published between 1982 and 1989, the twelve volumes cover the period from 500 to 1500 in the Latin West, the Slavic world, Islam, and Byzantium. The project was the first major effort to create in English a comprehensive encyclopedia of the medieval world and served as a valued reference tool. With the emergence of new scholarship and interpretive approaches in subsequent years, scholars noted significant omissions, as well as a strong bias toward northwestern Europe. It became clear that a supplemental volume was required. The supplement, over 650 pages and published in 2004, addressed the problems and lacunae of the original and reflected the dramatic changes in Medieval studies.

**The Correspondence of Charles Darwin**

Charles Darwin’s brilliant work relied heavily on letters with botanists and scientists—often including diagrams, drawings, photographs, and even specimens from their field work—as a way to discuss ideas and gather “the great quantity of facts” that he used in developing and supporting his theories.
We realize that American scholarship...devotes itself rather narrowly to Western civilization, to the rather well worked fields of the modern languages and literature, to classical studies and modern and medieval history, ancient history and related studies; and that it would be a great advantage to us if the scope of our interest should be broadened to take in the cultures of the entire world.

— ACLS Director Waldo G. Leland, 1941
CLS has a long history of encouraging the exploration of new subjects in humanities research. This work has been grounded in the premise that knowledge is always changing and that its place in departments, fields, and curricula was historically conditioned and is by no means static.

Incubating fledgling fields of scholarly inquiry was a way to rebalance the intellectual assets of the humanities, and ACLS research-planning committees led these explorations. Perhaps the most prominent outcome was the development of area studies—the study of the history, culture, and societies of different world regions—beginning in the 1920s. But a number of other important fields grew out of, or were strengthened by, the work of these committees. The subjects included African American studies, intellectual history, musicology, the history of religions, linguistics, especially the study of Native American languages, as well as many specific lines of inquiry. While the number and scale of these developmental efforts waxed and waned, the commitment to stimulating intellectual innovation remained constant.

The process, described in its early phase as “careful planning and development... both in the established disciplines and in otherwise neglected intellectual areas,” brought together trans-institutional networks of scholars at a time when few universities had more than one specialist in any area. ACLS often provided seed money for meetings. Funds also supported surveys to assess current interest in a particular subject and to catalogue existing research resources.

ACLS committees founded influential journals that have endured as the scholarly switchboards of several fields of study: These include Speculum. A Journal of Medieval Studies, founded in 1926; the Journal of the History of Ideas, launched in 1940; and East European Politics and Societies and Cultures, started in 1986.

The hope—often vindicated—was that the committees could articulate a coherent program that might attract long-term support for a journal, a new learned society, or an ongoing research program.

Area Studies

China studies was one of the earliest and most enduring of these efforts. At its first meeting in 1920, the Council endorsed a proposal from Paul S. Reinsch to “take up a discussion of curriculum and research on China.” Reinsch was United States Minister to China from 1913 to 1919, president of the American Political Science Association (APSA) and later an APSA delegate to ACLS. In 1927, the Council secured Rockefeller Foundation funding to develop the field of China studies and hired Mortimer Graves to form
an ad hoc group of scholars. The group proposed a survey of U.S. academic institutions that offered instruction and research possibilities for this field and published a guide for potential students.

The survey found that the few universities offering courses on China were dependent on connections to U.S. missionaries who had served there. These courses were mostly history, with little focus on language or culture. Graves described China studies as an “almost untouched, though exceedingly vast, field of learning [that] may be compared to the wide Pacific, while what we know of it is only San Francisco Bay.”

To help develop suggestions, in 1929 ACLS organized a conference of American and European sinologists, including Henry W. Luce, professor of Chinese history and religion at the Hartford Seminary. On the recommendation of these specialists, the Council appointed a permanent Committee for the Promotion of China Studies. One member, Berthold Laufer, curator of the anthropological section at Chicago’s Field Museum, stated the case for this work:

“We hold that a truly humanistic education is no longer possible without a more profound knowledge of China. We endeavor to advance the scientific study of China in all its branches for the sake of the paramount educational and cultural value of Chinese civilization, and thereby hope to contribute not only to the progress of higher learning, but also to a higher culture and renaissance of our civilization and to the broadening of our own ideals.

We advocate with particular emphasis the study of the language and literature of China as the key to the understanding of a new world to be discovered . . . [and] as an important step forward into the era of a new humanism that is now in the process of formation.”

Soon after the new committee’s launch, ACLS began funding doctoral fellowships in Chinese studies. It also supported summer institutes for students and scholars at American universities. These provided intensive language training and seminars on history and culture. The China committee’s work had a snowball effect. In 1937, it launched a newsletter that quickly evolved into a formal journal, the *Far Eastern Quarterly*. The journal led to the creation of the Far Eastern Association, which, in turn, grew into the Association for Asian Studies, an ACLS member.

At the time, ACLS Assistant Secretary Mortimer Graves described China studies as an “almost untouched, though exceedingly vast, field of learning [that] may be compared to the wide Pacific, while what we know of it is only San Francisco Bay.”
Expanding into Other Regions

ACLS’s early engagement with China studies set the course for many more programs in the following decades, including the Committee on Scholarly Communication with China (see p. 44). It also served as a model for the development of additional committees focused on other world areas. In 1932, ACLS created a Latin American studies advisory committee, focused mostly on literature. Following a series of hemispheric conferences, it organized summer institutes and library projects, and in 1936 published the *Handbook of Latin American Studies*. The Committee’s stature grew during World War II, as government support for this field began to eclipse foundation funding.

After several years of supporting the study of Slavic languages at selected universities and awarding individual fellowships, in 1938 ACLS established a Committee on Slavic Studies. This panel trained scholars, built up research materials, published biographies, and compiled library acquisition lists. It also encouraged ACLS to set up an extensive Russian publications reprint program. The *American Slavic and Eastern European Review* was among several strong scholarly journals that emerged from this work.

ACLS–SSRC Joint Committees

The Slavic Studies committee became a joint committee with the Social Science Research Council (SSRC) in 1948. The two councils had worked together on a number of joint ventures since SSRC’s founding in 1923, but their collaboration in the development of area studies from the 1940s through the 1990s was particularly effective. In 1946, they created, together with the National Research Council, an Exploratory Committee on World Area Research. In 1959, three more ACLS–SSRC joint committees were formed: contemporary China, Near and Middle East studies, and African studies. For the next four decades, the constellation of joint ACLS–SSRC committees helped promote and guide the growth of area studies at American universities. The members of each committee were approved by both councils, and staffing was divided between them. Individual committees raised funds through the councils, which also solicited grants to support the system of collaboration. While each committee designed its own strategy for cultivating its particular field, they all used similar approaches: organizing conferences, subsidizing publications, and providing grants and fellowships to individual scholars.

The cumulative impact of these efforts shifted area studies from the “exotic” margins of the academy to its forefront. However, some social scientists began to question the area studies paradigm, uncertain if it was sufficiently capacious to accommodate the analysis of globalization. Funders also changed directions. In 1996, the two councils decommissioned the joint committees. ACLS continued the work of the two it had staffed—China studies and East European studies—with funding from the Henry Luce Foundation, the Chiang Ching-kuo Foundation for International Scholarly Exchange, and the U.S. State Department.
In addition to broadening the substance of humanities research by exploring new subjects of inquiry, ACLS has helped scholars engage new research methods, most notably the use of digital technologies. When the Council first ventured into this realm more than a half-century ago, computers were used mostly by large corporations, the military, and universities. Today, digitization has transformed daily life, with profound effects on the creation and transmission of knowledge. Cyberspace is increasingly where humans find and conceive meaning. Indeed, digitization is no longer just a research method; it has become an important subject of humanities research.

ACLS’s involvement includes analyses that address systemic structural questions. It also supports especially promising research projects proposed by individuals and teams of scholars.

Early Efforts

In 1964, the Council received a grant from International Business Machines to support what became the ACLS Committee on Information Technology. The purpose was to develop a program of “computer-oriented research.” Over nine years, ACLS made sixty-four awards for research that employed computers. ACLS also created a bibliographic center to develop technologies for cataloguing and citation and, together with learned societies, explored the applications to journal publishing. Finally, the Council organized summer institutes that trained scholars in the new technologies. A number of fellowship projects analyzed historic voting patterns. But the committee was particularly interested in research that went beyond “the mere computation of information originally found in numerical form” and supported, for example, research on literary creativity.

ACLS was one of the sponsors of the National Enquiry on Scholarly Communication, a major research project that sought “to understand better the effects of changing procedures and technology not on financial ledgers alone but on the process of discovery and creation.” The findings, published in a 1979 report, continue to be cited by scholars of communication, higher education, and library studies. ACLS opened its Office of Scholarly Communication in 1984 as a resource for researchers interested in deploying digital tools. However, it was an effort ahead of its time and the office closed three years later for lack of funding.

Cyberinfrastructure Report

By the early twenty-first century, humanities scholars who pioneered the use of digital tools were developing increasingly sophisticated projects. However, they often had no systematic relation to each other or to systems of research support and scholarly communication. With backing from the Mellon Foundation, in 2004 ACLS appointed a commission to address the needs of digital scholarship.

The commission found that the humanities cyberspace lacked the essential infrastructure that had been built over centuries in analog scholarship. This traditional system had provided accessible primary sources; retrieval resources such as bibliographies, citation compilations, and concordances; distribution avenues including journals and university presses;
and editors, curators, and librarians who could link the operation of this structure to the scholars who use it. In 2006, after extensive deliberation that included five public sessions around the country, the commission issued Our Cultural Commonwealth. The report focused on institutional innovations that would allow digital scholarship to be cumulative, collaborative, and synergistic. The report also stressed that the emerging cyberinfrastructure should be interoperable, sustainable, and accessible as a public good. NEH Chair Bruce Cole cited this report as the inspiration for the Endowment’s Office of Digital Humanities.

Encouraging New Approaches

From 2005–2015, ACLS awarded Digital Innovation Fellowships (DIF) to sixty scholars pursuing digitally based research projects in all disciplines of the humanities and related social sciences. The program sought to showcase venturesome humanities scholarship that could advance the digital transformation and overcome the skepticism of humanities senior faculty members and administrators. History professor Dan Cohen, now vice provost for information collaboration and dean of libraries at Northwestern University, described his 2005 fellowship as transformational. “It was extraordinarily helpful to my scholarship and my career,” he said. “The fellowship aided my work, together with many others, to develop the ideas and methods of the digital humanities, while at the same time affirming the value of those concepts to my field and colleagues. In addition, participating in the DIF selection process gave me a front-row seat on interesting new techniques and topics of other academics across multiple disciplines.”

The range of research helped demonstrate that the energy unleashed by rapidly evolving new technologies outpaced any simple definition. Projects included examination of new tools and databases and the application of these tools to traditional subjects of study. These inquiries also identified the emergence of a community of practice where digital pioneers share innovations across institutions, both in the United States and internationally.

A more recent successor to the innovations fellowships, the Digital Extension Grant program, provides project funding to foster collaborations around established digital research projects, especially with scholars at less well-resourced institutions. ACLS continues to encourage digital scholarship widely across its network of member societies, college and university associates, and humanities organizations.

The challenge going forward is how best to advance digital research in the humanities. The guiding questions include the optimal role of libraries, the resources required to maintain digital projects, and the most promising approaches to inter-institutional collaboration.

K.J. Rawson of the College of the Holy Cross has received both an ACLS Digital Innovation Fellowship and an ACLS Digital Extension Grant in support of his effort to build the Digital Transgender Archive, an online clearinghouse for transgender history.
Native American Languages

For ten years, beginning in 1927, the ACLS Committee on Research on Native American Languages engaged more than forty researchers to document in excess of seventy languages and dialects spoken in the United States. Anthropologists Franz Boas and Edward Sapir led the project, providing small sums to promising researchers so they could travel to Native American communities. Their job was to learn from the few remaining speakers of a particular language, often tribal elders. Each researcher was trained to produce texts that were translated and phonetically transcribed in a way that conveyed the phonology, grammar, morphology, and syntax of the language. Many of these studies were published independently or in compilation.

Boas had two goals for this work: “the salvage of vanishing languages on the American continent” and “the reestablishment of an interest in linguistic studies in American Universities.” The second goal met with success. It has been observed that by 1939 almost all university specialists in American Indian linguistics were trained in the empirical methods developed by Boas or Sapir. Many of these linguists later applied the same methods to the development of the Intensive Language Program used by the U.S. Army in World War II (see p. 36).

The linguistic salvage work continues today. In 2018, the Tunica-Biloxi Tribe of Louisiana received a grant from the federal government to revive its language using materials that ACLS researcher Mary Haas developed from her work with its living speakers in the 1930s.

Musicology

At its 1929 annual meeting, the Council resolved that “the history and science of music constitute an important branch of learning.” It called for the appointment of “a standing committee on musicology and to take such other measures as may be calculated to promote research and education in that field.”

The committee’s initial activity was to survey the state of musicology in the United States. The findings were published in State and Resources of Musicology in the United States, a 1932 volume prepared by W. Oliver Strunk. The needs and existing facilities identified by the survey provided a course of action for the committee and for the new American Musicological Society, which committee members helped found in 1934.

Even if we did not know how to derive any further knowledge from the record of a language, we should feel a powerful and instinctive urge to record all these forms of speech, much as archaeologists study ancient civilizations or astronomers the distant bodies of the sky.

—Anthropologist Franz Boas describing the work of the ACLS Committee on Research on Native American Languages
During its thirty years of activity, the ACLS committee on musicology made major contributions to the development of ethnomusicology and folklore. An ACLS grant to the Library of Congress enabled the Archive of American Folk Song to send folklorist John A. Lomax to tour the South and record African-American songs. Lomax’s son, Alan, joined him. The road trip prepared the younger Lomax, who later received an ACLS fellowship, for his career as an ethnomusicologist, folklorist, and political activist.

**Committee on Negro Studies**

Not all developmental committees thrived. ACLS convened a Conference on Negro Studies at Howard University in March 1940 led by anthropologist Melville J. Herskovits. Participants included Herbert Aptheker, Ralph Bunche, J. Franklin Frazier, Alain Locke, and Eric Williams, the future prime minister of Trinidad and Tobago. The conference was designed to address the following problem: “Although studies of the Negro are conducted within a large number of disciplines . . . these different types of research . . . are not frequently enough recognized.” The discussions led to ACLS’s appointment of a permanent Committee on Negro Studies as an antidote to that dispersion and marginalization.

The committee focused on the development of research resources. With Rockefeller funding, it organized the microfilming of all African-American newspapers published before 1900 and deposited more than 14,000 feet of film at the Library of Congress. Convinced that potential researchers were unaware of relevant material in federal records, the committee persuaded the National Archives to compile *A Guide to Documents in the National Archives for Negro Studies*, which ACLS published in 1947. But more ambitious projects did not move forward. ACLS’s proposal that SSRC and the National Research Council join in the sponsorship of the committee was not taken up. A planned conference on “The Negro as Scholar and as Subject of Scholarship” stalled, perhaps because the topic was too contentious. The committee voted its own dissolution in 1951.

**Research Planning in the Twenty-First Century**

The success of ACLS committees in developing new fields of study helped widen the scope of humanities research. Today, that work continues, often embedded in fellowship and international programs.
The harsh fact is that the humanities do not matter to the American public nearly as much as they should.

We must work to make them matter more by... trying harder to provide the benefits to society that lie within our power to provide: frontline troops in the wars against illiteracy and insularity; leadership in the struggle to improve and inform the civic consciousness of this nation; intellectual resources with which to help unite a country and culture too often split by antagonism among its constituent groups, too widely ignorant of its past and shortsighted as to its potential for the future.

—Richard W. Lyman, Rockefeller Foundation president, from his address at the 1985 ACLS annual meeting
The creation of knowledge is ACLS’s abiding purpose. The Council has consistently sought to make that knowledge available not just to scholars and to students, but also to policymakers and others seeking the insights and expertise that the humanities provide.

ACLS award letters encourage all new fellows to contact their state humanities council to explore how their research can have wide circulation. Engaging the humanities in the public arena has taken various forms through the years. Efforts have included facilitating access to scholarly expertise for specific national needs, convening discussions on topics of public concern, and—most recently—promoting a wider application of the research and analytical skills of humanities scholars by placing them in positions beyond the campus.

ACLS’s public role became particularly significant just before and during World War II. Thirsty for knowledge about strategically important parts of the world and their languages, the U.S. government turned to humanities scholars for help. With war on the horizon, the U.S. State Department reached out to ACLS to assist its first ventures in cultural diplomacy.

One early concern was the influence of Axis powers in Latin America, a worry shared by the Office of the Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs (OCIAA). To avoid bureaucratic rivalry, the State Department and OCIAA in 1940 created a Joint Committee on Cultural Relations chaired by ACLS Director Waldo Leland. ACLS became the “fiscal agent” for the transfer of U.S. government funding to private libraries and cultural institutes in the region. With a Rockefeller Foundation grant, ACLS intensified its support of Latin American studies in the United States.

Leland recognized the public importance of partnering with government at this time, but he understood the potential perils. Sharing the concern of critics, he strongly advocated for a collaboration that would maintain the integrity of ACLS’s contribution by separating the academic and cultural operations from national security policy.1

“Once cultural relations programs became the servant of foreign policy there would be nothing to prevent their continuing in that capacity under a deteriorating policy,” Leland wrote in 1943. But, he added, “If the object is a foreign policy [that is] accepted as the promotion of those conditions which will make possible peaceful relationships throughout the world, any misgivings concerning the use of the cultural relations program to implement such a policy would be allayed.” 2

---

**The New York Times**

**Exchange of Scholars Between Americas to Improve Relations is Dr. Leland’s Goal**

Dr. Waldo G. Leland, executive secretary of the American Council of Learned Societies . . . returned from his first trip to South America yesterday on the Grace liner Santa Barbara. He said he had studied the present system of exchange of scholars between the two continents, made acquaintances, and gathered information “for closer intellectual and cultural relationships.”

South American scholars were very interested in the United States, he said. He predicted that within a generation English would have replaced French as the secondary language of the Latin republics. The motion pictures, he said, were influential in spreading the use of English.

“German propaganda there,” he said, “has broken down under its own weight. The Germans have gone too far in propagandizing. They have even tried to form colonies in Brazil and Argentina, but their efforts have failed.”

The United States does not have to engage in propaganda in South America, he said. The South Americans like the short wave broadcasts they receive from this country and would like to receive more.

---

From November 23, 1939. Copyright © The New York Times
Intensive Language Program

A distinctive contribution to the U.S. war effort was the development of an innovative method for language instruction that would make it possible for military officers and specialists to learn a specific foreign language relatively quickly.

This work built on the study of unwritten Native American languages that ACLS carried out in the 1920s and 1930s. In 1939, ACLS Administrative Secretary Mortimer Graves began to wonder whether the same method could be applied to modern spoken languages that might be of strategic importance in the imminent global conflict. Graves created a Committee on Intensive Language Instruction composed of linguists and funded with grants from the Rockefeller Foundation. Directed by J. Milton Cowan, secretary of the Linguistic Society of America, the committee developed an entirely new pedagogy of language acquisition that focused on imparting spoken fluency in the vernacular. The Intensive Language Program (ILP), which came to be known as the “Army Method,” mainly taught Chinese, Japanese, and Russian but also included Arabic, Turkish, and Southeast Asian languages.

In addition to classes for officers and specialists, the ILP created field manuals for use during the war. Hundreds of thousands of these “quick guides” were sent to soldiers in the field across Asia. After the war, the language teaching materials, as well as the instruction methods and network of linguists, would exert a significant influence as increasing numbers of universities began offering high-level language classes based on the intensive language program model.

Applying Expertise: The Ethnographic Board

Another wartime program that tapped scholars’ expertise was implemented through the new Ethnographic Board. Established in June 1942, the board served as a clearinghouse through which government agencies and scholars and scientists could be brought together more rapidly and effectively to address questions relating to world regions. It was sponsored by ACLS, the Social Science Research Council, the Smithsonian Institution, and the National Research Council, with funding from the Rockefeller Foundation and the Carnegie Corporation. The nongovernmental organization, guided by a group of members selected by each of the sponsors, sought to contribute to the war effort, and the eventual peace process, by focusing on “ethno-geography,” the study of human and natural resources of world areas.
Led by William Duncan Strong, a Columbia University anthropologist, the Ethnographic Board forged official liaison relations with the Army, the Navy, and the Office of Strategic Services. It also established informal relations with a number of other government agencies. The board fielded information requests and identified the appropriate researcher to provide answers. The inquiries it handled ranged from one-off questions requiring just an hour of research to large-scale investigations resulting in months of research and a formal report. A few examples of the variety of projects: The board prepared a series called Strategic Bulletin of Oceania; updated sections of a Yale University institute’s Cross-Cultural Survey relating to the Japanese Mandated Islands; gathered information about the linguistic, cultural, and interpersonal relationships of the Kodiak and Aleutian Islanders; and produced a bulletin, Survival on Land and Sea, for soldiers and sailors. On December 31, 1945, the Ethnographic Board was disbanded.

**Protection of Cultural Treasures**

Alarmed by the threat that wartime destruction and Nazi looting posed to the world’s cultural heritage, ACLS formed a Committee on the Protection of Cultural Treasures in War Areas led by William B. Dinsmoor, chairman of the Department of Fine Arts at Columbia University and president of the Archaeological Institute of America. The committee engaged a range of concerned experts who urged President Franklin D. Roosevelt to mobilize government resources to protect, insofar as possible, historic monuments and art treasures at risk.

The ACLS committee eventually became part of a federal commission that coordinated intelligence to aid the armed forces’ execution of this plan. The ACLS committee identified experts on European and Asian art and monuments who could serve as consultants, and a number were deployed in war zones. Decades later these scholar-soldiers were celebrated in the film Monuments Men. The maps, inventories, catalogues, and conservation manuals produced by the ACLS committee were essential tools for the experts in the field. They were used by military units that encountered at-risk or looted artistic artifacts. The salvaged art works were taken to secure places for safeguarding and eventual restitution.

Although wartime mobilization of scholarly expertise proved effective, it also reaffirmed that this knowledge cannot be summoned instantly when an emergency strikes. Rather, it must be continuously cultivated. **Society cannot expect vital expertise to come out of a spigot unless we have maintained the aquifer of disciplined knowledge the spigot draws from.**
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**THE ETHNOGRAPHIC BOARD, SPONSORED BY THE NATIONAL RESEARCH COUNCIL, THE SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION, ACLS, AND THE SOCIAL SCIENCE RESEARCH COUNCIL, FIELDED WARTIME RESEARCH REQUESTS, PRODUCING MATERIALS SUCH AS THIS SURVIVAL MANUAL FOR SOLDIERS AND SAILORS.**

**AMERICAN SOLDIERS CARRY PAINTINGS DOWN THE STEPS OF NEUSCHWANSTEIN CASTLE, WHERE THE GERMAN MILITARY HAD STORED LOOTED ART.**
Peacetime Public Engagement

In peacetime, ACLS continued to find opportunities to engage humanistic knowledge in issues affecting the broader society and, in some cases, the world. Director Waldo Leland was an active member of the U.S. delegation to the October 1945 London Conference that drafted the charter of the United Nations Economic, Scientific, and Cultural Organization (UNESCO), dedicated to fostering mutual understanding and a culture of peace that could help prevent another world war. ACLS representatives have often been members of the U.S. National Commission for UNESCO since its founding.

An example more focused on U.S. dilemmas was the 1951 Corning Conference that asked “How good, in human terms, is the industrial life we have created? . . . Where do we go from here?” Convinced that the humanities were essential to the exploration of these questions, Corning Glass Works asked ACLS to organize the conference and gave it autonomy in choosing the topics. The conference brought together humanists, labor leaders, and corporate executives to discuss attitudes toward work, leisure, the declining sense of community, and—as described in ACLS’s annual report—“what contribution industry and the humanities can jointly make to central human values in our day.” The conference did not aim to offer policy prescriptions. Its goal was to identify what was currently known, to expose attendees to a range of perspectives, and to begin a conversation that might lead to further explorations.4

Comparative Constitutionalism

In 1986, the Ford Foundation asked ACLS to propose activities to commemorate the bicentennial of the U.S. Constitution. Stanley N. Katz, ACLS’s new president and a prominent scholar on legal and constitutional history, suggested an alternative. Rather than focusing on the American experience, examine, instead, the progress of “the idea of constitutionalism” in the contemporary world. With funding from Ford, ACLS launched the Comparative Constitutionalism Project in 1987.

The project sought to provide an opportunity for a range of experts and stakeholders to explore how constitutionalism had played out in their countries. Katz later noted: “It was never the intention of the project to produce a global definition of

The comparative approach was appreciated for expanding a too narrowly defined interpretation of the concept and for highlighting aspects of constitutional study that are routinely neglected. Participants also credited the project with enhancing, and in some cases restoring, the legitimacy of constitutionalism in the academic and political agenda.
constitutionalism or to produce a generalized theory of constitutional change." The primary goals were to stimulate the study of comparative constitutionalism, and to expand networks of knowledgeable scholars and practitioners committed to collaborating on further inquiry.

Over three years, the project sponsored five locally planned conferences held successively in Uruguay, Thailand, Zimbabwe, Germany, and Hungary. The participants—academics, journalists, and public figures—were intentionally selected to bring diverse perspectives and expertise, providing the intellectual depth required to initiate these explorations. To encourage the kind of cross-pollination that would broaden knowledge and connections across regions, a number of participants at each conference were invited to attend subsequent gatherings.

The project’s final report noted progress toward the goal of enhancing the academic field of comparative constitutionalism, while also producing theoretical insights that could be useful to both writers and users of constitutions. Most participants emphasized the importance of framing constitutionalism as more than the formal study of legal structure. They also underscored the value of examining how constitutional processes shape the relationship between the state and society. The comparative approach was appreciated for expanding a too narrowly defined interpretation of the concept and for highlighting aspects of constitutional study that are routinely neglected. Participants also credited the project with enhancing, and in some cases restoring, the legitimacy of constitutionalism in the academic and political agenda.5

**Constitutionalism in Eastern Europe**

The conference intended as the last in the Comparative Constitutionalism Project was held in West Berlin in the fall of 1989. It occurred just a few days before the dismantling of the Berlin Wall. The ensuing collapse of Communist governments in Eastern Europe prompted ACLS to add a final conference the following spring in Pécs, Hungary, focused on that region.

Sensing a new urgency to foster more of these explorations in countries experiencing sweeping political transitions, ACLS launched a project on East European constitutionalism that ran from 1991–1994. Conferences in the Czech Republic, Hungary, Poland, and Slovakia brought together experts in law, politics, journalism, and education to discuss the history of constitutionalism in each country, its current status, and its future prospects.

The discussions identified a need to educate people about citizens’ rights and responsibilities in democracies. Conference participants were invited to elicit proposals from local groups for programs that would train high school teachers to introduce courses relevant to these concerns. A grant from Pew Charitable Trusts helped launch the teacher training program in 1995, extending ACLS’s constitutionalism work in Eastern Europe an additional five years.

In 1950, ACLS Executive Director Charles Odegaard wrote, "If the many are to plant their faith in the few researchers and to give them needed support, the researchers in turn have an obligation to pass good works back to the many, works which will enable them to understand their own lives and live perhaps more satisfying lives."6 Committed to that goal, ACLS continues to explore how the humanities can be made ever more present in public life.
The humanities are an essential element of scholarship and education, but how can they serve society beyond the campus? In 2010, with funds from The Andrew W. Mellon Foundation, ACLS launched the Mellon/ACLS Public Fellows program. The program offers new PhDs two-year substantive fellowship placements at partnering nonprofit and government organizations, as well as the opportunity for professional mentoring and networking. The program was conceived as a way to demonstrate—both within and beyond the academy—that the expressive, analytical, and research capacities honed in the course of obtaining a humanities PhD have broad value in a variety of workplaces. Equally important, the program gave fulfilling and consequential work options to fellows interested in career paths outside academia.

While new PhDs in the humanities recently have faced a difficult academic job market, ACLS emphasized that the opportunities of the Public Fellows program were intended as the starting point for a career trajectory and not as a consolation prize in the competition for tenure-track jobs or as a way station until a sunnier job climate appeared. The results so far have affirmed the validity of this premise. Fellows often see their two-year terms as a time to explore the kinds of careers they might want to pursue.

ACLS recruits institutions interested in hosting a Public Fellow. New doctorates can apply for one specific position. Peer review plays a decisive role in the selection of Public Fellows. Accomplished PhDs from a variety of fields outside the academy evaluate all applications and designate the finalists, who will advance to an interview with the senior leadership of the hosting organization.

Since the program’s inception, ACLS has partnered with a wide range of organizations, including the National Immigration Law Center, Public Radio International, the National Trust for Historic Preservation, the Environmental Law and Policy Center, the United Negro College Fund, the Smithsonian Institution’s Office of International Relations, the Innocence Project, and the Los Angeles Review of Books. Fellows are integrated into the staffs, and host institutions provide mentoring and access to professional networks.

The success to date of the Public Fellows, during and after their placements, should encourage doctoral programs to embrace a broadened conception of the career horizons of the PhD. To accelerate that change, ACLS began, in 2018, the Mellon/ACLS Scholars & Society fellowship program for humanities faculty who teach and advise doctoral students. The fellowships provide an opportunity to pursue research projects while in residence at a cultural, media, government, policy, or community organization of the fellows’ choice. These residencies are designed to foster fruitful
exchanges with colleagues at the host institutions. Even more, they provide the opportunity to acquaint faculty with the kind of organizations where, increasingly, their PhDs are most likely to find jobs and to explore how the methods of advanced humanities research can have value outside the academy. The program is also designed to help fellows deepen support for doctoral curricular innovation on their campuses—an effort that will be strengthened by their connections with each other, as well as with the Public Fellows community and organizations supporting PhD career pathways.

The Public Fellows Experience

Each of our two fellows demonstrated a curiosity of mind that allowed them to jump on diverse projects and apply what they learned as academically trained researchers to our work in other areas. Both also drew on their experiences as graduate students, when you have to roll with the punches and be resourceful and adaptable to survive and thrive on your journey.

—Brian Whalen, president and CEO, The Forum on Education Abroad

Our fellow stands out not only for her skills, but for her attitude and her judgment. I’ve come to realize how useful her teaching experience is in her nuanced approach to working in a complicated organization. It’s not something we would have known to look for, but I can see how her teaching background comes in handy with the communication parts of her job.

—Rebekah Krell, deputy director of cultural affairs and chief financial officer, San Francisco Arts Commission

I’m a PhD with a good job outside the academy and I’ve never looked back. ACLS’s Public Fellows program helped immensely and we need more programs like it.

—John Carl Baker, 2015 Public Fellow, now nuclear field coordinator and senior program officer, Ploughshares Fund

As an alum, I cannot say enough good things about Public Fellows... There’s so much more opportunity out there than the academic job market suggests.

—Jessica Neptune, 2014 Public Fellow, now associate director of national projects, Bard Prison Initiative
In its scholarly exchange program, ACLS paid significant attention to the reality of Vietnam’s situation, employed relevant approaches and proactively implemented the programs with creativity.

The vision of an international community of scholars that prompted the formation of ACLS also informed its efforts to advance scholarly projects throughout the world. The Council’s first action, indeed its founding purpose, was to represent American scholarship abroad by joining the new Union Académique Internationale (UAI), a body created by humanities scholars that has since grown to include members from eighty-one countries. The UAI’s conferences, projects, and publications continue to produce authoritative scholarly resources.

From its earliest days, however, ACLS leaders also recognized the importance of deepening in the United States an understanding of the broader world, reflecting the founders’ post-World War I conviction that this knowledge was critical to strengthening future prospects for world peace. In fact, at ACLS’s inaugural meeting as a network in 1920, delegates approved a proposed project to promote the study of China at U.S. universities.

ACLS’s support in the United States for the study of other countries and regions greatly expanded in the following decades (see p. 29). At the same time, the Council sought to build international channels that would enable scholars in different countries to connect, conduct research, and share knowledge across political and cultural borders. This work has taken many forms, including, at different times, establishing scholarly exchanges with countries that were politically estranged from the United States—such as the Soviet Union and Eastern Bloc during the Cold War, the People’s Republic of China, and Vietnam.

**Forging Scholarly Links Across the Iron Curtain**

Cooperative exchanges during the Cold War were formalized through bilateral cultural agreements between governments. ACLS and its subsidiary, the International Research and Exchanges Board (IREX), were responsible for managing the U.S. side, working with state agencies in the Soviet Union and Eastern bloc that selected participants from their countries. Through this arrangement, ACLS and national academies in those countries also formed joint commissions that promoted collaboration on specific projects or conferences. These commissions provided an opportunity for the first exchange of emails between the United States and the Soviet Union. Stanford University historian Norman Naimark later observed: “For Soviet scholars, communication meant liberation.”

Both parties are in favor of having the Academy of Sciences of the U.S.S.R. and the American Council of Learned Societies come to an agreement on exchanges of scholars in the social sciences and the humanities...

—Section II (4) of the Cultural Agreement between the United States and the U.S.S.R., signed November 21, 1959
ACLs’s initial effort to connect in that period with scholars in China was not as successful. In 1966, ACLS, the Social Science Research Council, and the National Academy of Sciences jointly formed the Committee on Scholarly Communication with the People’s Republic of China (CSCPRC) in the hope that academic contacts, severely constricted since 1949, might resume. Mao Zedong’s launch that same year of what would come to be known as the Cultural Revolution put that hope on hold.

President Richard Nixon’s 1972 visit to China promised new openness. Both governments agreed to scholarly exchanges and recognized the CSCPRC as the agency to facilitate them. It became clear, however, that change would take time. Shortly after Nixon’s visit, ACLS President Frederick Burkhardt sent an invitation to the Chinese Academy of Sciences to participate in an international conference on Taoism to be held in Japan. The ACLS received a handwritten reply from the “Red Guard Team in [the] Academy of Sciences” that rejected the overture. Asserting that religious sects were “big poisonous weeds,” the letter warned that “the aggressive ambitions and schemes of the United States can never be concealed before the devil-finding mirror of Mao Tsetung thought,” and if such tricks as the invitation continued, “we will certainly smash your dog head.”

Within a few months, however, the winds had shifted enough to allow Burkhardt and other U.S. academic leaders representing the Committee to form one of the first U.S. scholarly delegations to visit China in more than three decades. These contacts paved the way for exchange programs subsequently developed by the Committee on Scholarly Communication with China (CSCC—“People’s Republic” was dropped from the name). Over forty years, the programs provided more than 1,000 American and Chinese scholars opportunities for study in each others’ country. The research conducted by U.S. scholars ranged from inquiries into the effect of climate on the nitrogen cycle in agriculture to studies of the history of Lamaism in Inner Mongolia. Chinese scholars who came to the United States examined such topics as research methods in studying contemporary religions in the U.S. and pragmatism and American individualism.

From a Beijing office that facilitated the exchanges, the CSCC served a critical role in the early years by helping American researchers gain access to materials necessary for their work. As former ACLS President Stanley Katz later noted: “The first class of scholars who went to China in 1979 sometimes had disappointing experiences, but most succeeded in unexpected ways. Everything had to be negotiated, in the words of an early grantee, but everything was therefore negotiable.”
The Devil-Finding Mirror

July 25, 1972

Dear Mr. Burkheart;

We have received the two letters you sent us on behalf of the American Council of Learned Societies. We the Chinese people are very dubious about your purpose and intention of your sending the two letters to us. Religions the very product of remaining feudal system had long been listed among those objects which should be struggled and destroyed as early as at a time when China was liberated by Chairman Mao. At present, the People’s Republic of China has only Mao Tsetung thought. All other sects are big poisonous weeds and they are not allowed to exist under the revolutionary line of the proletariat dictatorship. Whether or not you are thinking again to poison the revolutionary Chinese people by the help of religion and to revive remaining feudal ideology among the Chinese people with the invitation of our representatives to attend the “International Taoism Conference” the aggressive ambitions and schemes of the United States can never be concealed before the devil-finding mirror of Mao Tsetung thought. Here we would solemnly warn you that if you dare to play any schemes and tricks, we will certainly smash your dog head.

Long live down with U.S. imperialism!
Long live Mao Tsetung Thought!

Red Guard Team in Academy of Sciences, Peking
The Chinese government’s crackdown after the 1989 student-led protests in Tiananmen Square brought new strains. The National Academy of Sciences, which had administrative responsibility for the CSCC, passed that role to ACLS. Despite occasional obstacles, the CSCC forged a path for subsequent exchange programs after normalization of U.S.-China relations in 1994. Since then, scholarly exchanges have grown apace.

ACLS also developed partnerships on the other side of the Taiwan Strait. From 1965 to 1981, ACLS and the Academia Sinica jointly sponsored research projects on Chinese history, literature, and art. For more than sixteen years, ACLS has partnered with the Chiang Ching-kuo Foundation for International Scholarly Exchange to support Comparative Perspectives on Chinese Culture and Society, a carefully articulated program of international conferences and workshops that explore dimensions of China studies. The activities bring together scholars from different institutions and areas, a number of whom would not otherwise have an opportunity to work together. Twenty-five volumes of conference proceedings have been published in English by U.S. and European presses.

A New Fulbright Program in Vietnam

In 1992, ACLS became involved in an effort to re-establish U.S. scholarly connections with Vietnam. At the time, there were no diplomatic ties between the two countries, but the path to reconciliation had already begun, and two prominent Vietnam War veterans were helping to move that process forward. Senators John McCain and John Kerry had led the successful effort to locate and repatriate the remains of a number of American soldiers who were listed as MIAs. To express appreciation for Vietnam’s official cooperation, they drafted and won approval for legislation that resulted in a new Fulbright fellowship program in Vietnam.

The United States Information Agency (USIA) was responsible for getting the program off the ground. Lacking a diplomatic presence in the country or other customary channels for academic exchanges, USIA turned to the few NGOs already working with scholars in Vietnam. One was the Harvard Institute for International Development, which proposed in 1992 that the Institute and ACLS jointly administer a larger Fulbright effort that would award fellowships to mid-career Vietnamese professionals and establish a teaching center in Ho Chi Minh City. The collaboration expanded to include the Institute for International Education and the Mennonite Central

MINH KAUFFMAN (LEFT), EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR OF THE ACLS CENTER FOR EDUCATIONAL EXCHANGE WITH VIETNAM, MEETS WITH MAJOR GENERAL LE VAN CAU (CENTER) OF VIETNAM’S MINISTRY OF DEFENSE IN 2016. WITH CEEVN’S SPONSORSHIP, CAU EARNED A MASTER’S DEGREE IN INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS IN 2000.
Committee’s Educational Exchange office, each overseeing a specific component of the new program. The partnership won approval from Vietnam’s Ministry of Foreign Affairs to conduct an independent, peer-reviewed selection process throughout the country. From 1993 to 1998, ACLS awarded 197 Fulbright Fellowships for the study of economics, management, and international relations—fields that were specified in the Congressional authorization of the program—at leading U.S. institutions. Many of the program’s alumni from this period became senior officials in Vietnam, including minister of agriculture and the director of the foreign service training school. The teaching center later became the Fulbright University Vietnam, one of the country’s first private, nonprofit universities.

ACLS ended its administration of the Fulbright program in 1997 when the United States opened its embassy in Hanoi. But it continued its work in Vietnam through an affiliation with the Center for Educational Exchange with Vietnam (CEEVN), which has administered an additional 350 fellowships to Vietnamese scholars for study abroad through the Ford Foundation’s International Fellowships Program and in collaboration with institutions funded by Ford. Through CEEVN, ACLS in the 1990s organized study tours in the United States for Vietnamese university presidents and leading government officials, including the deputy premier. CEEVN also supported research by Vietnamese scholars on, among other topics, the preservation of intangible culture, customary law, and gender studies.

Seeding Communities of Scholars Abroad

Just as ACLS incubated new fields within American academia, several of its programs aimed to seed and nurture communities of scholars abroad. In 1962, the ACLS American Studies Program, with Ford Foundation funding, began offering fellowships that enabled overseas scholars who taught American history, literature, law, economy, or government to conduct research at U.S. colleges and universities. Over thirty-five years, the program awarded 1,389 fellowships to faculty from East Asia and in Western and Eastern Europe. Many of these ACLS fellows became leaders of American studies associations in their home countries.

ACLS has also responded to more immediate needs. Concerned about the precarious financial plight of humanities scholars after the collapse of the Soviet Union, the Council, with support from Carnegie Corporation of New York, offered emergency grants...
that enabled more than seven hundred scholars to sustain their academic research and writing without resorting to multiple jobs in order to get by. The transnational peer-review structure created to award the grants brought together humanities faculty and advisers from Belarus, Russia, and Ukraine. Inspired by the sense of common purpose forged in these deliberations, the participants later formed a new “learned society,” the International Association for the Humanities, that formalized and expanded their network.

This distinctive approach shaped the African Humanities Program (AHP), also funded by Carnegie Corporation of New York and administered by ACLS. With its launch in 2008, AHP followed the same peer-review model in the selection of fellows, involving faculty and advisers from the participating countries (Ghana, Nigeria, South Africa, Tanzania, and Uganda). Like the post-Soviet fellowships, this model represented a paradigm shift in the oversight of these decisions and, as a consequence, the setting of scholarly research agendas. In both cases the programs supported individual scholars while also fostering the formation of regional networks of colleagues (see pp. 49–50).

The painstaking work of building horizontal communities of scholars that cross institutional and national boundaries requires negotiation. It also calls for solutions to logistical challenges and the management of sometimes complicated funding mechanisms. The shared reward of the effort is not only mutual respect across borders, but also a keener understanding of knowledge itself and the many pathways to it.

ACLS & Fulbright

Even before its work in Vietnam, ACLS was a part of the Fulbright programs. The collaboration began shortly after the programs were established in 1946. The State Department reached out to ACLS and other national research councils to help assure that the administration of the new government programs remained independent of political influence and upheld the highest academic standards.

Two years earlier, the ACLS, the Social Science Research Council, and the National Academy of Science had formed the Conference Board of Associated Research Councils. Its purpose was to “consider matters of concern to more than one Council” and to pursue “joint or common action” when necessary. Many of the conference board’s earliest activities involved cooperation with the U.S. government during World War II, such as the work of the Ethnographic Board (see p. 36). The American Council on Education joined the conference board in 1946. When Congress appropriated funds for Fulbright fellowships, the State Department asked the conference board to administer, and thus provide academic oversight for, the “senior Fulbright fellowships,” awarded to faculty for research or teaching abroad. The conference board then created the Council for International Exchange of Persons (later changed to “Scholars,” with CIES as its new acronym). Representatives of the participating councils formed its board.

The staff of all councils advised on the development of application materials and selection mechanisms for senior Fulbright fellowships. The councils alternated fiduciary and managerial responsibility for CIES. ACLS served that role from 1986 to 1997, when CIES became a unit of the Institute for International Education. ACLS continues to appoint a member of the CIES Advisory Board and to advocate for robust appropriations for the Fulbright programs and for the defense of scholarly values.
A New Paradigm of International Scholarship

In 1998, with encouragement from Carnegie Corporation of New York, ACLS began developing a new paradigm for international programming. It started with using open, merit-based, peer-reviewed fellowship competitions to support the research of young humanities scholars in regions where this approach was still novel. Young scholars faced particular challenges sustaining their academic careers. The peer-review process and related fellowship activities catalyzed transnational networks. They also served the larger purpose of promoting a new type of scholarly self-governance.

International Association for the Humanities

The first program was created in response to the 1998 economic crisis triggered by the collapse of the Russian ruble and associated currencies. A disastrous plunge in real incomes threatened the viability of the region’s higher education system, and the humanities were hit particularly hard. Individuals began to flee to lucrative positions outside academia or in the West. This brain drain exacerbated the isolation of scholars who found themselves separated from colleagues by new national borders in other parts of what had been the Soviet Union.

Responding to this existential threat to intellectual life, Carnegie Corporation provided funding to launch the ACLS Humanities Program in Belarus, Russia, and Ukraine. The program supported scholars doing exemplary work in exigent times.

The transnational collaborative peer-review process fostered a community of scholars across the three participating countries. Finding renewed energy and purpose in assisting young researchers, in 2007 reviewers established the International Association for the Humanities (also known by its transliterated Slavic acronym MAG) to sustain the work of the humanities program. A civil society institution, MAG’s mission is to bridge divides among academic communities in the region, between those communities and their counterparts in Western countries, and among different generations of humanities scholars. Since it began, MAG has organized annual conventions modeled on meetings of ACLS learned societies. Every second year, these gatherings are held jointly with the Association for Slavic, East European, and Eurasian Studies (ASEEES), an ACLS member society.

African Humanities Program

Young academics in Africa today face many obstacles. Their teaching loads are burdensome; the brightest of them are “cherry-picked” for administrative positions; and the appeal of better-paid consultancy work with international development agencies leads them to focus...
on near-term problems with practical solutions rather than on fundamental, wide-horizon scholarly inquiry. The African Humanities Program (AHP), begun in 2008 with Carnegie funding, has offered a much needed opportunity for junior faculty in Sub-Saharan African countries to concentrate on scholarship in the critical period just prior to the dissertation and in the several years immediately after.

The fraught humanities landscape in Africa shares some similarities with the dislocations of the former Soviet Union, requiring an articulated and systemic response. Using open, merit-based, peer-reviewed fellowship competitions as a base, AHP designed activities to help fellows complete their research projects, write manuscripts, and prepare them for publication. Fellows may take two- to three-month residencies at AHP-affiliated institutes for advanced study. They can bring their book manuscripts for collegial feedback to week-long manuscript development workshops. Finally, they can submit them for publication in the prestigious African Humanities Series, a joint venture of the AHP and African publishers.

The most easily measurable AHP outcomes are the awards made—fellowships, residential allowances, subsidies for publications. But the quality of the awards has depended on the quality of evaluation and selection. All reviewers are based at African universities. AHP travel grants enable them, when possible, to participate in mentoring workshops for fellows and in annual regional assemblies, where reviewers and fellows explore progress toward reinvigorating the humanities and securing them a stronger place in African universities. These activities have fostered a community of scholars committed to this goal.

In 2014, the AHP convened a forum at the University of South Africa to formulate recommendations that were forwarded to the African Summit on Higher Education in Dakar in March 2015. The opening statement described the importance of the humanities to Africa’s future:

"Yet the key contribution of the humanities goes beyond cultural education and training in analytic skills. Humanistic studies help ground national dialogue on urgent issues in enduring humane values. Technical and technological solutions today raise ethical questions that require public understanding and public debate. Humanities research and teaching illuminate the ethical principles that frame the discussion and provide examples of objectivity and fairness in dialogue."
CHAPTER 6

Advocating for the Humanities

In 1965, President Lyndon B. Johnson signed the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities Act into law. The creation of the National Endowment for the Humanities was a momentous achievement for ACLS.

Ideas are explosive materials.
All the activities of the American Council of Learned Societies have been directed at creating and fostering in America the mechanisms through which ideas can be handled understandingly and without fear.

— July 21, 1954, statement submitted by ACLS to the Congressional Select Committee to Investigate Tax-Exempt Foundations and Comparable Organizations
Representing the humanities to policymakers, foundations, and the public has been a critical part of ACLS history. This advocacy has taken different forms, often responding to, or anticipating, specific needs of the field as well as changes in the political environment that affect the teaching and study of the humanities.

The challenge in the early years was to secure a stronger footing for the humanities in a university culture that was increasingly focused on the sciences. The rise of totalitarianism before and during World War II made asserting the value of humanistic studies more urgent. In 1943, ACLS published Liberal Education Re-Examined: Its Role in a Democracy. Inspired by a symposium on the future of humanistic studies at the 1938 annual meeting and written by a team of leading scholars, the book presented a forceful argument:

“The importance of liberal education can hardly be exaggerated. The war which is now being waged involves . . . a conflict between two radically divergent philosophies. . . . If democracy is to make headway against authoritarianism, it must rely on a form of education which is as effective for the promotion of democratic ideals and the liberal spirit as propaganda has been effective for the achievement of authoritarian ends. . . . Whoever believes in democracy must believe in the value and dignity of the individual, and whoever believes in this must believe that the disciplines which deepen and personalize human individuality should be allotted a central role in a liberal curriculum.”1

Liberal Education Re-Examined came out at an opportune time, when academics, university administrators, and educational theorists across the United States were envisioning a new postwar curriculum. A review in the *Journal of Higher Education* suggested that “for college teachers and administrators, this book goes on the imperative list.” But perhaps the book’s greatest contribution, noted decades later, was its service as a critical voice in a larger conversation that would eventually help persuade many colleges and universities to increase their emphasis on the humanities.

**Congressional Attacks**

ACLS has sought to make the case for the humanities practically, through the work of its programs, and rhetorically, through the words of its leaders. In the politically fraught McCarthy era, the U.S. House of Representatives appointed a select committee to investigate tax-exempt foundations and the “comparable organizations” they funded. ACLS was accused of “dominance” over American

Perhaps nobody knows how to make any human being better, happier, and more capable, but at the very least the humanities, humane learning, and humanistic scholarship help to sustain a universe of thought in which these questions have meaning and in which adults may have the opportunity to work out such problems for themselves.

higher education by serving as a “clearinghouse” for subversive ideas—particularly a vigorous internationalism and moral relativism.

In 1954, ACLS submitted a statement to the Congressional committee, responding to the charge, and rejecting efforts to limit freedom of thought. The statement, signed by ACLS Board Chair C.W. de Kiewiet, president of the University of Rochester, noted “more than a little irony” in the charge of dominating American scholarship, especially “for anyone who has visited the offices of the Council or read its financial reports.” Above all, it asserted that the “free enterprise, self-organizing” character of American higher education meant that such dominance was impossible. “Ideas are explosive materials. All the activities of the American Council of Learned Societies have been directed at creating and fostering in America the mechanisms through which ideas can be handled understandingly and without fear.”

Turning Points

Two of the most significant instances of ACLS’s advocacy for the humanities are closely linked. The first was the 1955 convening of a Commission on the Humanities, comprising scholars, educators, and business leaders.

At the time, the Council was on the brink of insolvency, and the commission’s purpose was to present a case for greater support. The group conducted a series of deliberations over the next two years. The resulting recommendations led to a transformation that stopped the organization’s tailspin, secured new funding, and set the broad contours of the course ACLS would follow for the next fifty years.

ACLS Board Chair Howard Mumford Jones, a Harvard English professor and one of the founders of the field of American studies, drew on the commission’s discussions to write his influential book-length essay, One Great Society: Humane Learning in the United States, published in 1959. The book presents a thoughtful argument for increased humanities funding. Jones imagines, and tries to answer, a series of questions that “[a] leading businessman” would ask “if called upon to support scholarship in this field.” They were: “What are the humanities? Why do you think they are so important? Speaking quite practically, what can the humanities do for me, for my family, for my business, for my community? Do the humanities make people better? Do they make people happier? Do they make people more capable? How do you know?”

“These are intelligent questions,” Jones affirms, adding, with characteristic wit, “[i]t does not affect the excellence of the questions that some of them are unanswerable.”

A Milestone Achievement

A decade earlier, a report to President Franklin D. Roosevelt from Vannevar Bush, head of the U.S. Office of Scientific Research and Development during World War II, made a strong case for postwar government funding of scientific research. The report led fairly quickly to the establishment of the National Science Foundation. One Great Society inspired humanities leaders to replicate this success. Many of Mumford’s arguments were taken up by a second Commission on the Humanities, appointed in 1963 by ACLS, the Council of Graduate Schools, and the United Chapters of Phi Beta Kappa.
This commission sought to make a difference on a broader scale. Its final report argued for the creation of a National Foundation for the Humanities and the Arts, emphasizing the civic value of the humanities. “Democracy demands wisdom of the average man. Without the exercise of wisdom, free institutions and personal liberty are inevitably imperiled. To know the best that has been thought and said in former times can make us wiser than we otherwise might be, and in this respect the humanities are not merely our, but the world’s best hope.”

The commission’s arguments ultimately convinced President Lyndon B. Johnson and Congress. In 1965, the National Endowment for the Humanities was established. The report’s phrase “democracy demands wisdom,” was incorporated into the authorizing legislation. When testifying before Congress in support of the bill, ACLS President Frederick Burkhardt stressed the broad public purpose of this effort. “If what was at stake here was nothing more than the pleadings of a group of scholars who wanted more for themselves, or who were selfishly concerned for the advancement of their own narrow specialties, I can assure you that I would not be appearing before you today. Or, if I did appear, it would be to take the other side. The fact is, however, that the case for supporting the humanities is the case for the preservation and improvement of the very bases of our civilization.”

Humanities Under Siege

The creation of the National Endowment for the Humanities was a milestone in ACLS’s advocacy for the humanities, but not its culmination. Since 1965, the Council has worked to support, defend, and enhance the NEH. President Johnson appointed Brown University President Barnaby Keeney, who had led the Commission on the Humanities, to be the first NEH chairman. He and his successors have been featured speakers at nearly every ACLS annual meeting over the past fifty-four years. When the NEH’s viability was threatened by budget cuts during the Reagan administration, ACLS and other organizations founded the National Humanities Alliance to promote federal support for the humanities.

Humanists were united in their support of the new endowment, but that unity was short-lived. Only a few years after NEH began, Vietnam War protests and other unrest on college campuses drew ACLS member societies into a maelstrom. Meetings of several societies were disrupted by protests. The increasingly contentious atmosphere led the committee of learned society directors to convene a special conference in 1969 on the theme “Confrontation and Learned Societies.” Speakers recommended that the scholarly associations avoid engaging in the public fray. Expressing this cautious consensus, one asserted: “There is little good we are equipped to accomplish by contentious involvement and much harm may come of the attempt.”

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

—President Lyndon B. Johnson’s remarks at Brown University, September 28, 1964
But the humanities were soon drawn into new debates. In the years that followed, political divides continued to widen outside academia, while the academy itself became a regular object of suspicion and target of derision by those who objected to the social and cultural changes unleashed by the conflicts of the 1960s. The so-called “culture wars” of the 1980s and ’90s put new pressures on the humanities, as successive NEH Chairs William Bennett and Lynne Cheney charged that scholars, preoccupied with specious theory and voguish multiculturalism, had forsaken the study of the great works that defined Western culture.

As one response, ACLS published in 1989 Speaking for the Humanities, a statement by twenty-one directors of campus humanities centers. The pamphlet grew out of discussions among the authors of the need “with particular urgency” to address the disparity “between the popular indictment of the humanities and the energy and significance of the work being done in the field.”

Reflecting on that period more recently, Francis Oakley, president emeritus of Williams College who served as interim ACLS president from 2002 to 2003, said: “It was a great opportunity missed by both the conservative critics who were deeply resentful of the Academy, and by the bruised defenders. What they missed was the need for facts. To offer proscriptions without being able to give a description is useless.” In an essay for the 1997 volume What’s Happened to the Humanities? Oakley cited facts to correct misperceptions. His detailed study of curricular offerings found remarkable persistence in the subjects and methods taught by faculty, and shattered the idea that “the American professoriate is somehow bent . . . on engineering nothing less than the collapse of Western civilization itself.”4

Writing in the same volume, classicist John D’Arms, who became ACLS’s president in 1997, asserted that “no one would seriously question the value of rigorous and sympathetic study of the history and aesthetic expression of previously subordinated groups and ignored traditions” and that “the intellectual contributions of postmodernist theoretical approaches have significantly affected the way in which many of us go about our work.” He nevertheless welcomed “hopeful signs of eventual emergence from . . . the epistemological doubt and disciplinary fragmentation that have replaced the earlier confidence and coherence of the humanities.”5

At Brown University in 1964, President Lyndon B. Johnson endorsed the creation of a National Foundation for the Humanities as recommended by the commission sponsored by ACLS, the Council of Graduate Schools, and Phi Beta Kappa.
Sharing Scholarship with a Broader Public

Advocacy has also taken the form of raising awareness beyond the academy. ACLS’s success in supporting research that generates new knowledge brings with it the obligation to help that knowledge circulate widely. An early example of this commitment was a statement, “Research is Not Enough: The Challenge Facing Humanists,” issued by the ACLS board in 1950. The statement, deploying the language of the time, urged each constituent society “to consider ways by which the knowledge and insight of scholars may be brought to bear more effectively on the lives of living men. . . . Beyond the discovery through research of a truth hitherto unknown lies the challenge of relating this truth to other truths in an ever enlarging network of meaning which finally touches upon the great questions of life which have vitality for each succeeding generation.”

Among the efforts to advance this goal was a series of eight half-hour public radio programs in 1954 on “Understanding Other Cultures,” broadcast in New York and Washington, D.C. The talks by specialists on varying topics were published in a booklet, and taped recordings were distributed through the National Association of Educational Broadcasters.

ACLS’s publication ventures have also served a broader public. Multi-volume reference works such as the American National Biography and the Correspondence of Charles Darwin, available in libraries and online, are valued resources for researchers, educators, and students. They also appeal to other people interested in the topics. Just as the humanities re-explore and re-explain the cultural record for each succeeding generation, the humanities themselves must be re-explained regularly. Through the years, ACLS leaders have sustained a strong commitment to address this need, not just to maintain and increase public support, but to present to the public the values that are analyzed and clarified by humanistic scholarship.

A 1950 resolution by the Council’s board framed that obligation: To express understandably the faith by which men may hopefully live and work is not a secondary responsibility of the humanist, which can be shelved or sidestepped, but a primary obligation, the neglect of which impoverishes both society and the humanists.
The invitation to join a learned society is a call to professional citizenship.

—James Grossman, executive director of the American Historical Association
Modern learned societies emerged in the late nineteenth century to provide the nervous system for a new, more muscular body of higher education taking shape in the United States during that period. But the history of scholarly associations has deeper roots. In eighteenth-century America, local groups of intellectually curious physicians, lawyers, naturalists, and autodidacts met regularly to share their enthusiasms. The best known example is the Junto, a club formed by Benjamin Franklin that met every week in a Philadelphia tavern. These gatherings led to the founding in 1743 of the American Philosophical Society, which nearly two centuries later became one of the original members of ACLS and today is the oldest continuing learned society in the United States.

With the development of the research university, the older form of learned society where amateur and expert shared authority over broad intellectual territories—such as social science, the natural sciences, or arts and sciences—could not accommodate the expansion of knowledge or the ambitions and style of young academics eager to specialize. The new model of a learned society dovetailed well with the changing university model by reinforcing the very idea of “research.”

Nascent societies sought to set national standards for emerging disciplines of study. “If there is a single crucial point in the process of academic professionalization,” wrote historian Roger Geiger, “it would be of a national association with its attendant central journal.” J. Franklin Jameson, the first editor of the American Historical Review and one of the founders of ACLS, had noted in 1902 that the journal’s primary mission was “to regularize, to criticize, to restrain vagaries, to set a standard of workmanship and compel men to conform to it.”

As the higher education enterprise grew in the United States, and especially as doctoral programs spread beyond a few elite institutions, the learned societies became a critical means of establishing standards for research that created truly national professional disciplines. They have served as the icebreakers opening new routes of knowledge.

ACLS scholarly associations have provided portals to the academy. When émigré scholars fleeing Nazism sought refuge in the United States, learned societies helped them secure academic homes and connect with new colleagues. Learned societies have also been the crucibles of a more diverse professoriate. As women and minority scholars sought to assert their place in the academic vanguard, the learned societies were one vehicle for advancing change.

[When I... think of our friendship and collegiality over the years, I realize that it has been nurtured by learned societies, constituent societies of ACLS, which have provided—especially to the women of my generation—a safe space and an important context for intellectual life and the human relations that sustain it.

—Historian Linda Kerber, paying tribute to Gerda Lerner]
Paying tribute to Gerda Lerner, an ACLS Haskins Prize Lecturer, historian Linda Kerber recalled:

“The learned societies—among them the Organization of American Historians, of which Gerda was the first immigrant and the second woman to serve as president, and the American Historical Association, which gave her its Award for Scholarly Distinction more than a decade ago—have provided the context in which our cohort of feminist historians have conducted our careers. How much of our resilience, indeed our sanity, we owe to the learned societies . . . is hard to measure.”

Over the years, the numbers of ACLS member societies and the roles they play have expanded. They publish magazines and academic journals, usually with peer-reviewed contributions, that present new ideas in their areas of study. They organize regular conferences at which members present and discuss current research, and they often award prizes that celebrate important new work. Through this process, scholars collectively help establish a reliable body of research and knowledge.

The learned societies also help bring cohesion and collective purpose to a system of higher education that is decentralized, combines public and private funding, and has great institutional variety, encompassing private institutions, huge state universities, and small colleges. Within this complex ecology individual scholars have plural identities: as teachers and researchers, as disciplinary specialists and those whose interests cut across disciplines, and as authors who are also readers.

Learned societies provide the connective tissue of scholarship by interacting with the departments in which their members work, the colleges and universities that house those departments, with publishers and funders, and with the libraries, museums, archives, and collections that form the infrastructure of the humanities.

**Membership in ACLS**

The seventy-five scholarly associations that are members of ACLS include large societies focused on a single broad discipline (e.g., the College Art Association or the American Philosophical Association), sizable interdisciplinary societies concerned with a world region or temporal period (e.g., the Association for Asian studies or the Medieval Academy of America), and many smaller associations concerned with a particular topic (e.g., the American Society of Comparative Law or the Shakespeare Association of America). Individual membership in ACLS societies ranges from 500 in the American Dialect Society to over 25,000 in the Modern Language Association. About one-half employ at least one paid staff member; several

**LEARNED SOCIETY INITIATIVES:**

**Career Diversity**

Several ACLS member societies are seeking to expand the roles of scholars by exploring the many settings where their skills can make a distinctive contribution. The American Historical Association’s Career Diversity for Historians initiative is working to better prepare graduate students and early-career historians for career options both within and beyond the academy. With generous funding from The Andrew W. Mellon Foundation, the AHA and three dozen history departments around the country are exploring how the culture and practice of graduate education can better support the changing needs of PhD students. The Modern Language Association also has received support from the Mellon Foundation for a major project, Connected Academics: Preparing Doctoral Students of Language and Literature for a Variety of Careers. The project, which runs through August 2019, supports initiatives that identify how doctoral education can also develop students’ ability to apply the expertise they gain through advanced humanistic study to a wide range of fulfilling professional positions. The Society for Classical Studies has begun a program to marshal the experience of classicists working outside the classroom to help expand doctoral students’ consideration of career options.
have more than fifty. Many operate only with volunteers, including the executive director. The American Oriental Society (AOS), founded in 1842, is the oldest learned society in the United States devoted to a specific field of scholarship. The American Society for Environmental History, founded in 1977, represents a field unimaginable when the AOS was established.

This greatly varied universe is interactive. A survey commissioned by ACLS found that most long-time members of one ACLS society were also members of several other disciplinary, interdisciplinary, and sub-disciplinary specialized societies. Indeed, several ACLS societies hold joint meetings, and the bigger disciplinary societies provide platforms for smaller affiliated groups to meet together with the larger society. The goal of all society leaders is to practice the “hermeneutics of hospitality” and achieve “an organizational largeness of heart that emphasizes improving relations with and services to members.”

Learned Societies are Democracies

Most ACLS member associations are democratically governed organizations with small professional staffs. The governance is designed, in the words of one society executive director, “to put usable democratic structures in place, structures through which the winds of change can safely blow.” The relationship of the society’s elected president, who likely serves only a short term and has been chosen for scholarly accomplishment rather than administrative expertise, and the executive director, who while often trained as a scholar has since become a professional association executive, is critical to the success of society governance. ACLS annually convenes an all-day seminar for incoming presidents and their executive officers to help them strengthen their working partnerships.

Democracy, however, can be contentious, and the winds of change that sometimes blow through learned societies can acquire gale force. Some conflicts concern methodological or epistemological differences among scholars. The Society for the History of Technology, for example, was created by a dissenting group within the History of Science Society who felt that attention to the social and cultural adaptation of scientific advances was ignored in favor of a formal history of scientific ideas and theory. At an ACLS conference, David Hoekema, then-executive director of the American Philosophical Association, shared this recollection of change in...
his society: “Why the Pluralist Sans-Coulottes Sacked the Citadel of the Analytic Ancien Régime and Why Tout Le Monde Were Sitting Happily at the Table by the Salad Course.”

In the late 1960s and 1970s, many societies underwent upheaval when scholarly differences were intensified by political conflict over the war in Vietnam and the civil rights struggle. These conflicts often brought an even more democratic governance structure and a more diverse leadership no longer drawn primarily from elite Eastern universities.

The Conference of Executive Officers

ACLS’s federative operations have taken many forms through the years, including as incubators for new scholarly communities that develop into learned societies. But the core work has been the responsibility of a conclave of society executive directors. Meetings of the Conference of Executive Officers provide opportunities to exchange information, innovations, and best practices in society governance and management, and to keep current with the changes in theoretical approaches, methodological innovations, and subjects of study that continually reshape how scholarship is produced. The conference is increasingly focused on how the ACLS societies can work collaboratively to analyze and engage with the issues affecting the professional lives of their members. Examples include efforts to assess learning outcomes, the over-reliance on adjunct faculty, sexual harassment in academia, and attacks on academics for specific views presented in their courses.

The Value of Membership

Many candidate societies want to join ACLS’s network to gain information and improve their own connectivity. For many society leaders, the meetings of the executive officers are the only peer group they have. But there is also a higher-order purpose, the same that motivates an individual scholar considering membership in a learned society. No scholar is required to join a society—there are successful and prominent scholars who do not. Similarly, there are societies that subsist outside of ACLS. For those who join, the benefits are important, but the overall objective is a desire for solidarity with the larger cause of expanding scholarship. Membership is an expression of idealism. The learned society enterprise concerns many things, but it is ultimately about the value of ideas to society and the necessity of rigorously scrutinizing and disseminating them.
Current Challenges

The environment for American scholarly associations is changing in ways that require their leadership to adapt and innovate. None of their revenue streams are assured. A number of external factors may limit attendance at a society’s annual meeting. The digital disruption of established, income-generating publishing affects scholarly societies even as digital methodologies promise new gains in research and teaching. Will the ready availability of online journals distributed through college and university libraries reduce a scholar’s incentive to join a learned society? For how long can hard-pressed libraries subscribe to both print and electronic editions of scholarly journals?

Retaining and increasing membership poses the most intriguing challenge to societies. The invitation to join a scholarly association is, in the words of James Grossman, executive director of the American Historical Association, “a call to professional citizenship.” Learned societies have been social networks since before the term was in vogue. But what if today’s new ways of networking displace the sense of solidarity a learned society has supplied? To minimize this risk, several ACLS societies are actively developing ways to provide digital connection, discovery tools, and collaborative online work spaces.

American scholarly associations have been stimulated by these changes, just as they have adapted to them. But the helix of change and adaptation spins around a straight line of mission: to advance research, improve teaching, and bring to the public the results of scholarship. Higher education is the crucible in which our society molds its future, one that we hope will be shaped by the values of democracy and inclusion, even as those values seem under siege today. As the climate surrounding higher education turns chillier, it will be increasingly important for the learned societies to pursue their mission as an independent force with both new tools and lasting ideals.

THE AMERICAN ANTHROPOLOGICAL ASSOCIATION’S PROJECT RACE: ARE WE SO DIFFERENT? COMBINES MUSEUM EXHIBITIONS AND PUBLICATIONS TO IMPROVE UNDERSTANDING OF THE COMPLEX SOCIAL AND CULTURAL CONSTRUCTION OF RACE.

LEARNED SOCIETY INITIATIVES:

Public Engagement

ACLS member societies often seek to engage the public in analyzing the complex phenomena that humanists study. To help promote a broad understanding of race and human variation, the American Anthropological Association has undertaken the RACE project, which has produced an award-winning public education program titled RACE: Are We So Different? The program is geared for middle school students through adults, and includes a traveling museum exhibit, an interactive website, and educational materials. Two ACLS member societies, the Oral History Association and the American Folklore Society, coordinate a program for the Veterans History Project of the American Folk Life Center at the Library of Congress. Folklorists and oral historians have offered more than four hundred community-based workshops on documenting the wartime experiences of U.S. veterans. This resource has reached nearly ten thousand people. The Law and Society Association sponsors Life of the Law, a website that explores the relationship of law to American society and culture, reaching into the parallel worlds of scholars and journalists. The website engages the listener’s imagination through sound-rich narrative storytelling and presents investigative reporting and thoughtful analysis over multiple platforms, including radio, podcasts, blogs, an interactive website, and live events.
Humanistic knowledge must be active and vital, renewed by continuous research and insistent questioning.

And it must be democratic. Students from every circumstance and institution of higher learning deserve access to the humanities. Access is especially important today as financial pressures and policy memes currently work in the opposite direction. In the twenty-first century, this grand project must be a global effort—global in terms of the knowledge it transmits and global in terms of the scholarly community it builds.
The second principle is that the vitality of humanistic scholarship depends on the dynamic interaction among scholars, fields, and institutions. ACLS is determined to push beyond incremental advancement of scholarship by encouraging rigorous testing of established ideas by new interpretations.

The ACLS board has established several priorities for the next decade: increase the number of fellowships awarded annually to scholars; stretch its reach across the full range of higher education; continue expanding the ambit of humanities scholarship within and beyond the campus; and build greater organizational capacity to assure the vitality of the humanities in the academy and beyond.

**Advancing and Creating Knowledge**

Advancing scholarship is the first purpose of ACLS’s mission. The principal path for supporting innovative research is by awarding fellowships to scholars across all fields of learning in the humanities and related social sciences. Even though the numbers and amounts of ACLS fellowships have increased, this growth has not kept pace with the need. The Council is forced to turn away many worthy applicants.

ACLS will continue to explore the best ways to accommodate the growing breadth of research and critical analysis in the humanities and interpretive
social sciences, including work in new and established fields of study, broad disciplines, and smaller specializations.

**Extending ACLS's Reach**

ACLS aims to support more scholars from across the whole spectrum of U.S. higher education. Professional development opportunities have been curtailed at all but a shrinking number of the best-resourced institutions. This means a growing group of meritorious faculty lacks the time and resources to pursue new knowledge. At the same time, an ever-larger number of students is left without the lifelong benefits that come from studying the humanities with dynamic teacher-scholars.

Community colleges are particularly stressed, despite their vital role in the higher education ecosystem and the academic humanities in particular. Nearly half of all undergraduate students in the United States are enrolled in community colleges. According to new data released by the Humanities Indicators, a substantial proportion of undergraduates experience their first or only encounters with the humanities in community college classrooms.1 A new program, the Mellon/ACLS Community College Faculty Fellowships, provides opportunities for educators at these two-year institutions to pursue scholarly research, pedagogical innovations, and community-oriented work in the humanities or humanistic social sciences.

There is a great social, national, and international need for what the humanities can offer. But scholarship requires support and structure to have the greatest impact. Another new ACLS initiative will increase support for scholars at four-year institutions where extensive teaching responsibilities can make it difficult to pursue scholarly research. A grant from Arcadia, a charitable fund of Lisbet Rausing and Peter Baldwin, has allowed the Council to increase the number of fellowships for these scholars. The teaching load of applicants and, thus, their need for time away from the classroom to conduct research, are factored into the selection process. ACLS also offers Project Development Grants to a select number of finalists to refine their application proposal for possible resubmittal.

ACLS is also committed to strengthening the humanities in other countries and to fostering transnational academic communities. Programs in Sub-Saharan Africa and Eastern Europe are the most recent efforts to encourage scholarly networks outside the United States (see pp. 49–50) and the Council will continue to vigorously pursue this work. Two of the newer ACLS programs, the Robert H. N. Ho Family Foundation Program in Buddhist Studies (see p. 23) and the Getty/ACLS Postdoctoral Fellowships in the History of Art are open to applicants from throughout the globe, setting an example for future efforts.

---

The object of the Council shall be the advancement of humanistic studies in all fields of learning in the humanities and the social sciences and the maintenance and strengthening of relations among the national societies devoted to such studies.

—ACLS Constitution, Article I, Section 2
Sharing Humanities Expertise

Our society is in the midst of an enormous cultural shift in how knowledge and ideas circulate. This shift is driven both by technology and a public hunger for meaning and wonder. The humanities serve an essential social purpose as a platform for matters of the mind, heart, and spirit. ACLS continues to find new ways to amplify the presence of humanistic values and reasoning in the public arena. The Mellon/ACLS Public Fellows program (see p. 40) is a substantial experiment in making the humanities a ready element of our social toolkit. Reconfiguring the public role of the humanities, however, will also require some reimagining of doctoral education, and that is one aim of the new Mellon/ACLS Scholars & Society fellowship program (see p. 40).

A third venture is the Luce/ACLS Program in Religion, Journalism & International Affairs (RJIA), launched in 2015 and designed to encourage connections between scholars and journalists. The program’s fellowships go to scholars in the humanities and related social sciences who are pursuing research on religion in an international context and want to exchange insights with journalists who cover these issues. Scholarship and journalism are two distinct practices for producing knowledge, each with its own standards, protocols, perspectives, and time horizons. But both confront an enormous challenge: to apply reason and undaunted questioning to analysis of the complex and sometimes confusing dimensions of human behavior. The Luce/ACLS program braids together these two strands of knowledge production to promote keener public understanding of how religion shapes today’s world.

Lives of Learning

The Charles Homer Haskins Prize Lecture series, titled “A Life of Learning,” was launched in 1983 to honor the Council’s first chairman. The lecturer’s charge is “to reflect on a lifetime of work as a scholar, on the motives, the chance determinations, the satisfactions (and the dissatisfactions) of the life of learning; and to explore through one’s own life the larger, institutional life of scholarship.” This set of intellectual autobiographies celebrates individual achievement and collectively chronicles the advance of humanistic knowledge across decades. The lectures are distributed annually and are available on the ACLS website.

Excerpts from Haskins Prize Lectures

I grew up believing that in the evenings one either read or wrote. It was always easy to read something worthwhile, and if one worked at it hard enough he might even write something worthwhile. I continue to believe that.
—John Hope Franklin, 1988

For some of us, teaching is itself a mode of scholarship. Continually revised lectures amount to new if unprinted editions.… On exceptionally good days, the effort to re-think a subject or problem in advance of a lecture or seminar session is capped by new tentative ideas emerging in the lecture or seminar itself.
—Robert Merton, 1994

[T]he study of the past provides rewards for moral sensibility and tools for critical understanding. No matter how evil the times, no matter how immense the cruelty, some elements of opposition or kindness and goodness emerge…No matter how static and despairing the present looks, the past reminds us that change can occur… The past is an unending source of interest, and can even be a source for hope.
—Natalie Zemon Davis, 1997
Building Capacity

ACLS is known for its nimble and proficient management of programs. The Council plans to expand its capacity to strengthen outcomes of its programs through careful analysis, for example, of data yielded by its fellowship programs and by communicating the perspectives gained from its work. To meet these goals, ACLS will need to build its organizational capacity. Toward that end, the Council has launched a $125 million Centennial Campaign to lay the foundation for a second century of achievement.

1919 to 2019

The founders of ACLS could not have imagined how much American higher education and research would change over the course of one hundred years. They hoped that a national organization representing U.S. humanities scholarship would prove a worthy partner to European academies. That goal was surpassed as the American university became the central crossroads of global scholarship. After World War II, U.S. higher education transformed from a preserve of elites to a mass enterprise, requiring academic culture to become more inclusive, both intellectually and socially. That transformation was by no means simple. But it was helped by the generalized prosperity of the “golden age” of university expansion in the 1950s and 1960s. ACLS and its member societies helped form the matrix of that growth.

The challenge in 2019 is no longer to establish and demonstrate scholarly excellence. The challenge is to preserve and extend this excellence across the full institutional spectrum at a moment when competition for public and private resources is ever more intense. The structures and practices of higher education are certain to be transformed again in the Council’s second century. ACLS can again be a matrix of change, offering the distinct perspective that comes from sustained work with scholars and scholarship across many fields and institutions.

What can the humanities offer a contentious society and culture in a world that is being reshaped not just by economics and geopolitics, but also by natural forces? The answer to that question is the rationale provided in 1919 for creating ACLS. The generation that lived through World War I had seen the passions of war overcome the values of peace. It understood that it would take determined efforts to sustain the ideals that underlie humanistic study against the forces of domination, destruction, and materialist distraction.
The breadth and depth of humanities scholarship are greater than ever.

by President Pauline Yu

It’s been an enormous privilege and honor to have served American Council of Learned Societies for the past thirty-six years: as a member of various committees and then the board, and as president for the past sixteen years. ACLS has a noble mission, a history of accomplishment, and a community poised to go forward.

One might ask: To what question is ACLS the answer? What is our distinct role? There are other funders of humanities research, to be sure. There are more scholarly associations in the humanities that are not members of ACLS than the seventy-five that currently are. Other organizations are intensely active in international scholarship and in scholarly communication. But no other entity is directly responsible to as broad a scholarly constituency as we. “Where do we find national leadership for the academic humanities?” That is the question to which we are the answer.

Because ACLS is representative of and responsible to the ideals and dedication of humanities scholars, we have the trust that allows us to mobilize scholarly energy and to use our reputation as a means of directing attention to critical issues concerning the production and transmission of humanistic knowledge in society. As Charles Odegaard, ACLS’s executive director, wisely put it in 1950: “The ‘Council’ is not something different from individual humanists; it is of humanists, by humanists, for humanists.”

I have been witness to the good citizenship of many such humanists. I am grateful to the scores of volunteer scholars who serve on selection committees, as delegates, and as wise and prudent members of our board. I am thankful also for the colleagueship of the executive directors of our member societies, who carry their heavy responsibilities with élan. And I cannot overemphasize how obliged I am to our dedicated staff, whose energy and expertise has given ACLS a deserved reputation for effective and thoughtful execution of whatever task we take on.

The “crisis of the humanities” is an overused and lazily invoked meme. There is no intellectual crisis: The breadth and depth of humanities scholarship are greater than ever. Is there a crisis of confidence? A crisis of faith in reason, of faith in the future? If there is, the story of ACLS’s growth and achievements over a century of service can give us ample ground for hope.
ACLS’s century of achievement opens new vistas.

by President-Elect

Joy Connolly

We are living in a turbulent time for humanistic studies and for higher education in the United States. The moment is ripe for a powerful reiteration of the core values of humanistic scholarship and its capacity to sustain the knowledge and capacities necessary to maintain a robust and ever more inclusive democracy. I am honored and thrilled at the prospect of leading the American Council of Learned Societies, which supports outstanding work in humanistic studies.

Building on Pauline Yu’s success, I look forward to advancing ACLS’s mission to advocate for the value of research among diverse publics, to make more resources available to scholars, and to work with ACLS’s seventy-five member organizations on the complex challenges that face us today as scholars, teachers, and citizens.

ACLS has a long and distinguished history of innovation and exploration. I am proud to serve on the board of one of its creations, the Journal of the History of Ideas. As president, I will be the beneficiary of the Council’s achievements in broadening the intellectual scope of humanistic research, nurturing robust learned societies, and fostering exchange and collaboration among them. The remarkable roster of ACLS’s philanthropic and programmatic partnerships shows that trust in our work and our vision is the Council’s greatest asset.

ACLS’s second century opens up new horizons. We envision the humanities and social sciences vividly present and accessible at all levels of education and throughout society. We want scholar-teachers to have more opportunities to create knowledge. We will build communities of scholarship that circulate new understanding in our increasingly interconnected globe. We will ensure that new generations of students, including those who are economically underprivileged or the first in their family to attend college, encounter the enduring value of humanistic studies, which extends beyond their formal education.

Because our future rests partly in connecting persuasively with audiences outside academia, we will help scholars learn to communicate the value of their work to the world. I look forward with frank excitement to working with our many partners to realize our collective vision.

Joy Connolly was elected by the ACLS Board of Directors to be the Council’s president beginning July 1, 2019. Her positions before joining ACLS included terms as interim president and Distinguished Professor of Classics at The Graduate Center, The City University of New York (CUNY). She has served as provost and senior vice president of The Graduate Center and as dean for the humanities at New York University. An eminent scholar of Greek and Roman literature and political thought, she also studies their transformation in the modern era.
### Presidents and Early Leadership

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Term</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Joy Connolly</td>
<td>Incoming President, July 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pauline Yu</td>
<td>President, 2003–July 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Francis C. Oakley</td>
<td>Interim President, 2002–2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John H. D’Arms</td>
<td>President, 1997–2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stanley N. Katz</td>
<td>President, 1986–1997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John William Ward</td>
<td>President, 1982–1985</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frederick H. Burkhardt</td>
<td>President, 1957–1974</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mortimer Graves</td>
<td>Executive Director, 1953–1957</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles E. Odegaard</td>
<td>Executive Director, 1948–1953</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cornelius Krusé</td>
<td>Director, 1948</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Shyrock</td>
<td>Acting Director, 1947</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waldo G. Leland</td>
<td>Director, 1939–1946; Permanent Secretary, 1928–1939; Executive Secretary, 1924–1929</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles Homer Haskins</td>
<td>Chairman, 1920–1925</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Chairs of Board and Council

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Term</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>William C. Kirby</td>
<td>2018 to present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Howard Mumford Jones</td>
<td>1955–1959</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James J. O’Donnell</td>
<td>2013–2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.W. de Kiewiet</td>
<td>1953–1955</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earl Lewis</td>
<td>2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cornelius Krusé</td>
<td>1949–1953</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kwame Anthony Appiah</td>
<td>2006–2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William C. DeVane</td>
<td>1946–1949</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fred N. Robinson</td>
<td>1941–1946</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patricia Meyer Spacks</td>
<td>1997–2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William E. Lingelbach</td>
<td>1937–1941</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Francis Oakley</td>
<td>1993–1997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert P. Blake</td>
<td>1935–1937</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neil Harris</td>
<td>1989–1993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edward C. Armstrong</td>
<td>1928–1935</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georges May</td>
<td>1982–1989</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph P. Chamberlain</td>
<td>1926–1928</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curt F. Buhler</td>
<td>1974–1982</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles Homer Haskins</td>
<td>1920–1925</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## MEMBER SOCIETIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Member Society</th>
<th>Year Founded</th>
<th>Year Admitted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>American Philosophical Society</td>
<td>1743</td>
<td>1919</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Academy of Arts and Sciences</td>
<td>1780</td>
<td>1919</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Antiquarian Society</td>
<td>1812</td>
<td>1919</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Society for Classical Studies</td>
<td>1869</td>
<td>1919</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archaeological Institute of America</td>
<td>1879</td>
<td>1919</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Historical Association</td>
<td>1884</td>
<td>1919</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Economic Association</td>
<td>1885</td>
<td>1919</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Sociological Association</td>
<td>1905</td>
<td>1919</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Oriental Society</td>
<td>1842</td>
<td>1920</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modern Language Association of America</td>
<td>1883</td>
<td>1920</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Philosophical Association</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>1920</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Political Science Association</td>
<td>1903</td>
<td>1920</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History of Science Society</td>
<td>1924</td>
<td>1927</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linguistic Society of America</td>
<td>1924</td>
<td>1927</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medieval Academy of America</td>
<td>1925</td>
<td>1927</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Society of Biblical Literature</td>
<td>1880</td>
<td>1929</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bibliographical Society of America</td>
<td>1904</td>
<td>1929</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Anthropological Association</td>
<td>1902</td>
<td>1930</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Numismatic Society</td>
<td>1858</td>
<td>1937</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Association of Geographers</td>
<td>1904</td>
<td>1941</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Art Association</td>
<td>1911</td>
<td>1942</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Folklore Society</td>
<td>1888</td>
<td>1945</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Society for Aesthetics</td>
<td>1942</td>
<td>1950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Musicological Society</td>
<td>1934</td>
<td>1951</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Association for Asian Studies</td>
<td>1941</td>
<td>1954</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Association of American Law Schools</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>1958</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Society of Architectural Historians</td>
<td>1940</td>
<td>1958</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Studies Association</td>
<td>1950</td>
<td>1958</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metaphysical Society of America</td>
<td>1950</td>
<td>1958</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renaissance Society of America</td>
<td>1954</td>
<td>1958</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Dialect Society</td>
<td>1889</td>
<td>1962</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Society for Ethnomusicology</td>
<td>1955</td>
<td>1966</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic History Association</td>
<td>1940</td>
<td>1967</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Society of International Law</td>
<td>1906</td>
<td>1971</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization of American Historians</td>
<td>1907</td>
<td>1971</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic Society of America</td>
<td>1904</td>
<td>1973</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Society for Legal History</td>
<td>1956</td>
<td>1973</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Society for the History of Technology</td>
<td>1958</td>
<td>1973</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Comparative Literature Association</td>
<td>1960</td>
<td>1974</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Society for Theatre Research</td>
<td>1956</td>
<td>1975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Society for Eighteenth-Century Studies</td>
<td>1969</td>
<td>1976</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Academy of Religion</td>
<td>1909</td>
<td>1979</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Association for Slavic, East European, and Eurasian Studies</td>
<td>1948</td>
<td>1984</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Association for Jewish Studies</td>
<td>1969</td>
<td>1985</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle East Studies Association of North America</td>
<td>1966</td>
<td>1988</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African Studies Association</td>
<td>1957</td>
<td>1990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Society for Cinema and Media Studies</td>
<td>1959</td>
<td>1990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latin American Studies Association</td>
<td>1966</td>
<td>1990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Association for the Advancement of Baltic Studies</td>
<td>1968</td>
<td>1991</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Society for French Historical Studies</td>
<td>1956</td>
<td>1993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Society of Comparative Law</td>
<td>1951</td>
<td>1995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Society for American Music</td>
<td>1975</td>
<td>1995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German Studies Association</td>
<td>1976</td>
<td>1995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Forum of the National Council of Teachers of English</td>
<td>1911</td>
<td>1996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dance Studies Association</td>
<td>1979</td>
<td>1996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Communication Association</td>
<td>1914</td>
<td>1997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law and Society Association</td>
<td>1964</td>
<td>1997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Schools of Oriental Research</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>1998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Center of Medieval Art</td>
<td>1956</td>
<td>2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Society for Music Theory</td>
<td>1977</td>
<td>2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Society of Church History</td>
<td>1888</td>
<td>2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Association for the History of Medicine</td>
<td>1925</td>
<td>2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Council on Public History</td>
<td>1979</td>
<td>2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Society for the Advancement of Scandinavian Study</td>
<td>1911</td>
<td>2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Society for Environmental History</td>
<td>1977</td>
<td>2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North American Conference on British Studies</td>
<td>1950</td>
<td>2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhetoric Society of America</td>
<td>1968</td>
<td>2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Society for Military History</td>
<td>1933</td>
<td>2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World History Association</td>
<td>1982</td>
<td>2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oral History Association</td>
<td>1966</td>
<td>2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shakespeare Association of America</td>
<td>1972</td>
<td>2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austrian Studies Association</td>
<td>1961</td>
<td>2017</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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