

University of Rhode Island

DigitalCommons@URI

---

National Foundation on the Arts and  
Humanities (1976-1979)

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

---

March 2017

## National Foundation on the Arts and Humanities (1976-1979): Correspondence 01

Livingston L. Biddle Jr.

Follow this and additional works at: [https://digitalcommons.uri.edu/pell\\_neh\\_II\\_55](https://digitalcommons.uri.edu/pell_neh_II_55)

---

### Recommended Citation

Biddle, Livingston L. Jr., "National Foundation on the Arts and Humanities (1976-1979): Correspondence 01" (2017). *National Foundation on the Arts and Humanities (1976-1979)*. Paper 16.  
[https://digitalcommons.uri.edu/pell\\_neh\\_II\\_55/16](https://digitalcommons.uri.edu/pell_neh_II_55/16)

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 National Foundation on the Arts and Humanities (1976-1979) by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@URI. For more information, please contact [digitalcommons-group@uri.edu](mailto:digitalcommons-group@uri.edu).

TO: SENATOR

FROM: LB

April 26

The House passed the attached bill by a substantial margin this afternoon -- first order of business. The vote was approx 280 - 60... You might want to congratulate J. Brademas, though his bill is not too helpful to us on two issues in particular.

Parity -- it keeps absolute parity between Arts and Humanities

State Programs -- <sup>seemingly</sup> it allows for a continuance of the status

quo. There is, however, an interesting feature which apparently no one has yet noticed. Our bill would grandfather out the existing State committees over a 3-year span, with the majority of members appt. by State governors after that period. The Brademas bill requires that only two of the State committee members be appointed by the Governor in any particular State... This seems a considerable modification of your already somewhat modified stance. (Your original bill called for mandated State Humanities councils from the word go.) But if a Governor did not appoint any members, he could effectively end the State committee -- and then set up a new council.

House  
Adapted

Sec. 101

Adopted by the House Committee, this Section eliminates "in the United States" from the general mandate of the Arts Endowment, so that there would be flexibility to support American arts activities if sent or taken abroad... i.e. a touring orchestra, a special exhibition, a theater group. Organized labor advocated this change in the House, feeling that the present arts program is now overly restrictive -- and that the State Dept's program, which has been reduced since 1968 to approx. \$1 million per year (slightly up for the Bicentennial year to \$1.2 million) is overly restrictive.

Background:

In the initial legislation (1964-65) the words "in the United States" were added, chiefly because of the testimony of Harry McPherson, then Asst. Secretary of Educational and Cultural Affairs, who testified that the new federal arts program should not conflict or compete with the existing State Dept. program. At that time we were looking for all the help we could get. The State Dept. supported the new program with the words which were added. Since that time, and until the recent hearings, no one has particularly raised the issue. There are cooperative efforts now between the Arts Endowment and the State Dept., with -- for example -- the Endowment doing the United States part of an exhibition and the Dept. doing the actual overseas funding. of it.

I believe the usefulness of "in the United States" has passed. John Richardson favors broader efforts than the State Dept. alone can undertake -- he's Asst. Sec. for Educational and Cultural Affairs now.

The Humanities Endowment has never had an "in the United States" restriction -- and, for example, supports archeology abroad.

I'm getting more back-up from the Endowment, which would not object to the removal of the words, "in the United States".

We should have language in the report -- if we do remove these words. Overseas funding of American arts should be done carefully with limited funds.

*House  
Adopted.*

Section 102

State Matching...

State Arts agencies have been traditionally required to match 50/50 federal assistance. In 1973 when the Act was last amended, a more complex formula for State funding than in the past was adopted in Conference. The language requiring State matching was somewhat blurred. This has not been a problem to date, but it should be cleaned up.

The appropriate small change, specifying that the States must match as they always have is recommended.

The recommended amendment is purely technical in nature. It merely clarifies existing practice.

94th CONGRESS

2d SESSION

S.

(NOTE.—Fill in all blank lines except those provided for the date, number, and reference of bill.)

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. PELL

introduced the following bill; which was read twice and referred to the Committee on \_\_\_\_\_

**A BILL**

To amend and extend the National Foundation on the Arts and Humanities Act of 1965, to provide for the improvement of museum services, to provide for a cultural challenge program an arts education program and an American Bicentennial Photographic and Film Project, and for other purposes.

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Arts, Humanities, and Cultural Affairs Act of 1976".*

TITLE I--ARTS AND HUMANITIES

SCOPE OF PROGRAMS CARRIED OUT BY CHAIRMAN OF

NATIONAL ENDOWMENT FOR THE ARTS

Sec. 101. Section 5 (c) of the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities Act of 1965 is amended by striking out "in the United States".

ALLOTMENTS FOR PROJECTS AND PRODUCTIONS RELATING TO THE ARTS

Sec. 102. Section 5 (g) (4) (A) of the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities Act of 1965 is amended by inserting immediately after "(4) (A)" the following new sentence: "The amount of each allotment to a State for any fiscal year under this subsection shall be available to each State, which has a plan approved by the