

2016

Arts and Humanities: Program Funding (1976): Correspondence 01

Livingston Biddle

Follow this and additional works at: http://digitalcommons.uri.edu/pell_neh_II_14

Recommended Citation

Biddle, Livingston, "Arts and Humanities: Program Funding (1976): Correspondence 01" (2016). *Arts and Humanities: Program Funding (1976)*. Paper 20.
http://digitalcommons.uri.edu/pell_neh_II_14/20

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: Program Funding (1976) by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@URI. For more information, please contact digitalcommons@etal.uri.edu.

TO: SENATOR

FROM: LB

Mar. 8

The attached two sheets are to brief you for discussion of the Arts and Humanities at the Committee Mark-up on March 10 -- 10 a.m.

This is an important meeting as from it will come the funding levels recommended for all programs under the Committee's jurisdiction -- recommendations for amounts to be appropriated for FY '77 to be transmitted to the Budget Committee.

We can expect a question on Arts and Humanities.

Jean will brief you on Education.

I think the groundwork on A&H has been accomplished at staff level, but there could be a move to reduce. I feel you have enough support to counter -- and it's important as we approach mark-up on this bill to keep the authorization amount which simply projects this ~~year's amount~~ year's sum to next year intact.

To: Senator
From: LB

March 8

At staff meeting held on Fri., Mar. 5, to consider funding levels for all programs under the full L & PW Committee, question was raised concerning levels for Arts and Humanities on attached staff-prepared sheets on which Jean and I had worked in accord with our discussions with you re funding... I was questioned by a Cranston staffer at length -- he being the most outspoken of all present on all issues... Other staffers seemed satisfied in general with the explanations; Jean did a masterful job with Education. Questions raised by staff will probably be reflected in the full Committee meeting on March 10. Thus this briefing paper is prepared to simplify as much as possible.

Attached table summarizes the funding recommended on one page.

Greg Fusco, with whom I've been in close touch as you know, informs me that Sen. Javits is in basic agreement with our figures... His one caveat is that there be enough for a Rockefeller Bicentennial Era project -- such as we have discussed, and which Rockefeller has also discussed with Javits personally... Javits is not certain this should be authorized now, but wants an option to go ahead if that course seems best.

Under our basic rubric of no higher funding for FY '77 than presently authorized, I believe we have enough flexibility to do a Bicentennial project. At least a first year, which is all that is at stake right now.

We could substitute this for the proposed arts in education project (arts teachers upgrading on next page table)... This would begin as shown at \$10 million. It's the program which we discussed at lunch with Brademas and with which he concurred in concept... Jean advised this program could not go in the Education Amendments as the governing Title (V) is repealed... We were asked to inaugurate this program by Roger Stevens in keeping with his arts-in-education program headed by Jean Kennedy Smith... It's to be considered in mark-up... It is not an absolute must, in my view. But an excellent concept.

Or

We could also rearrange the figures to accommodate both the arts teacher program and the Bicentennial project. This would be difficult but possible.

BUT I THINK IT'S IMPORTANT NOT TO LOWER NOW THE ^{million} \$265/figure or grand total.

In discussing this, you can point out:

- a. Senate approved in May, 1973, after two days of debate a \$400 million authorization for Arts and Humanities (\$200 million for each Endowment -- vote 61-30.)
- b. All leading witnesses at the recent joint hearings called for at least \$225 million next year for the Arts alone, to meet immediate, carefully researched needs.
- c. In these terms the \$250 for both Endowments is modest.
- d. To recommend for FY '77 less than currently authorized for FY '76 would be considered by the constituency involved a major set-back.

				<u>Arts and Humanities</u>		Outlays (Money spent)		
	1975 Final	1976 Approp.	1977 Pres. Est.	Committee Recommend.	1975 Actual	1976 Est.	1977 Pres. Est.	Committee Est.
	(In millions of dollars, rounded off)							
Promotion of Arts	75	82	87	137 (a)	68	79	84	130
Promotion of Humanities	74	80	87	113 (h)	50	77	84	107
Administration	<u>11</u>	<u>11</u>	<u>11</u>	<u>15</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>11</u>	<u>15</u>
	160	173	185	265	128	166	179	252

(a)

137 Arts = 110 basic program (includes 20 for States)

15 -- New challenge program. To develop new sources of non-federal support and financial stability for non-profit arts organizations, often existing today in a "from crisis to crisis" situation... Matching would be on a 3 non-federal dollar to one federal basis, rather than one for one as in present law. Arts Endowment has been successful in pioneering this concept. Is fully ready to implement it -- Humanities Endowment is not so prepared.

7.5 -- New program to support museums, in keeping with legislation introduced in Congress since 1972. Would be in the nature of a pilot program to meet museum unmet need, estimated at \$40 million per annum... Would include administrative help to museums considered most pressing unmet need.

5 -- Program to aid in upgrading of teachers of art at all levels
137 (rounded)

(h)

113 Humanities = 100 for basic program

7.5 -- share of museum program (total 15)

5 -- share of art teaching program (also applicable to the Humanities)

113 (rounded)

GRAND TOTAL: 250.... Presently authorized -- 252

Administration: Traditionally treated as "such sums..." in authorizations since 1965 when program began. The 15 in the Committee Recommendation column reflects pro rated increase for higher funding levels.