

University of Rhode Island

DigitalCommons@URI

Arts and Humanities: Pell Amendments (1975)

Education: National Endowment for the Arts
and Humanities, Subject Files II (1962-1996)

November 2016

Arts and Humanities: Pell Amendments (1975): Correspondence 01

Livingston Biddle

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalcommons.uri.edu/pell_neh_II_12

Recommended Citation

Biddle, Livingston, "Arts and Humanities: Pell Amendments (1975): Correspondence 01" (2016). *Arts and Humanities: Pell Amendments (1975)*. Paper 36.

https://digitalcommons.uri.edu/pell_neh_II_12/36https://digitalcommons.uri.edu/pell_neh_II_12/36

This Correspondence is brought to you for free and open access by the Education: National Endowment for the Arts and Humanities, Subject Files II (1962-1996) at DigitalCommons@URI. It has been accepted for inclusion in Arts and Humanities: Pell Amendments (1975) by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@URI. For more information, please contact digitalcommons@etal.uri.edu.

TO: SENATOR

Apr. 1

FROM: LB

Attached is a Section-by-Section analysis of action taken by the House Subcommittee on Arts and Humanities -- they anticipate Committee action next week.

On page 3 as clipped is their Museum Services Act -- pretty much verbatim from the version we began considering in 1972-3.

It's placed under HEW as was our original.

I'm told that Al Quie insisted on this -- I suspect John Brademas was not too displeased as he does want emphasis on science and technology museums, which the Arts Endowment was not funding, nor was the Humanities Endowment, in more than relatively small fashion. As mentioned to you, I think Nancy Hanks is not adverse to the HEW location, as she has felt all along that a special legislated program for museums under the Endowment favors one arts area over others, and mitigates against even-handedness.

I still would like to see Museum Services under the umbrella of the Arts and Humanities rather than separated, but there are strong political considerations for not disturbing this one. Greg Fusco tends to present a Javits view favorable to the House (Quie) action.

I have checked with Gen. Seybolt -- he's delighted that it is finding its way into legislation, and leaves the legislative

and political considerations to us.

The House took the Challenge Grant Program which we had suggested at the lunch with Brademas verbatim, and all hands here seem to like it.

I had a long meeting with Fusco this afternoon, and with other staffers as I could find them. General agreement on principles and concepts -- but not yet on specifics.

We will not be able to include Arts and Humanities in Tuesday's Exec. The staffs aren't able to focus on it until after the Ed. bill clears Committee (hopefully Tuesday) -- though I will do as much ground work as possible.

We were eminently successful (thanks mainly to Jean) in getting excellent staff support on Education, but the same members are involved with A & H, and except on a person to person basis, they won't be ready to sit down and discuss things until after Tuesday morning. Nik Edes feels a delay on A & H at this time favors your Berman stance; it postpones need for decisions.

Both Mondale and Eagleton have strong State Humanities people (and good programs for the most part in Minnesota) urging them not to change the set-up... But the staffs see the merits in our cause -- and I foresee a somewhat better solution than the House adopted in this respect in Subcommittee. It appears to me that Brademas pretty much caved in to a substantial academic group in Indiana.

Basically, the House version for State Humanities allows Berman to maintain a status quo, but provides provisions so that the State committees will be more representative, more accountable, ~~more~~ less limited in their programs.

We would grandfather in State councils, or grandfather out the existing committees, *in three years*